MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 27 OCTOBER 2015
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR

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

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Marissa Parker, Esq., Stradley Ronon
Nancy Bastion, Cecil Baker Partners
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker Partners
James Pearlstein, Pearl Properties
Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties
Jenna Schuster, Cecil Baker Partners
Susan Levin
Michael Niederman
Dan Coyle
Chris Tood, Priderock Capital
Jim Rice, Transystems
Janet Hagan
Gregory Diehl, Old City District
Rosemary Watt
Deborah Cahill, Department of Public Property
Ben Heizen
Theresa Stuhlman, Philadelphia Parks & Recreation
Tom Fein, RBA Group
Michael Connor, RBA Group
Benjamin Nia, Abitare Design Studio
William Steedle, Graboyes Windows
Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners
Nichole Howell, JKR Partners
Jay Tackett, Tackett & Co.
Richard Sanford, Dauntless Design Company
Angie Molnar, Deco Future Management
A. Robert Torres, Studio Torres

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 1910 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Construct tower
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Chestnut Square Associates, LP
Applicant: Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties
History: 1928; Boyd Theater, Sameric Theater; Hoffman & Henon, architects
Individual Designation: 8/9/2008
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the final segment of a large development project with frontages on Chestnut, Sansom, 19th, and 20th Streets. The Raymond Pace Alexander Building at 1900 Chestnut and the Boyd Theater at 1910 Chestnut Street are designated as historic. The remainder of the site, 1902-06 and 1912 Chestnut Street and 110 and 112 S. 19th Street, has not been designated as historic. The site is not located in a locally designated historic district. None of the interiors of the buildings are designated as historic.

In March 2014, the Historical Commission found that the building at 1910 Chestnut Street, the Boyd Theater, could not be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted and approved the demolition of all but the headhouse on Chestnut pursuant to the hardship provision in the preservation ordinance. In June 2015, the Commission approved the rehabilitation of the front façade of the Boyd Theater. In August 2015, the Commission approved the rehabilitation of the Alexander Building at 1900 Chestnut Street and the construction of an infill building along Chestnut Street between the Alexander Building and Boyd Theater.

The current application proposes a tower at the southern end of the site along Sansom Street. The tower would be 32 stories and 382 feet tall. The Historical Commission approved a tower for the same location in 2010, but that project was not undertaken. The tower would include below-grade parking, retail space at the first floor, and residential space above. The main residential entrance would be located on 19th Street. The parking and loading would be accessed from 20th Street. The loading docks would service all of the buildings in the large complex. The retail space would open onto Sansom Street. The lower floors of the Sansom Street façade would be clad in limestone. The tower would be massed with a shorter section to the west, which would correspond in height with the adjacent Kate's Place building. It would be clad with metal panels and include windows in punched-like openings. The main bulk of the tower would be located at the eastern end of the site and would be clad primarily in a glass and aluminum window wall system with some metal panels.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Marissa Parker, architects Nancy Bastion and Cecil Baker, and developers James Pearlstein and Reed Slogoff represented the application.

Mr. Farnham distributed a letter from the Friends of the Boyd and hard copies of a letter and revised site plan from the applicant to the Committee members. He noted that the site plan had been emailed to the Committee members during the previous week.

Ms. Parker introduced the project. She stated that, since the Committee last reviewed a proposal for this site, the architects have worked closely with the neighbors to develop a plan that takes the community into account.

Mr. Baker explained that his firm was originally hired by some of the stakeholders at nearby properties to ensure that their interests were considered during the design process. Mr. Baker reported that, since that time, his architectural firm has been hired as the firm of record for the design of the tower. He stated that they decided that the tower should be located on a north-south axis to minimize interruptions to the view shed. He noted that they moved the tower away from Kate's Place to protect its light and air. Mr. Baker observed that, with the changes to the configuration of the tower to accommodate the neighbors, the floor plate has become smaller and more expensive and, therefore, the tower has increased in height by five floors. He stated that the stakeholders from the nearby buildings are supportive of this scheme. Ms. Bastion showed the aerial perspective views and explained that the massing of the tower at the west matches that of Kate's Place, which is 11 stories tall. She stated that the entrance to the apartments is located on 19th Street, retail is located on Sansom Street, and the loading and parking entrance is located on 20th Street. The loading dock allows a 32-foot truck to turn completely around, entering and exiting forward. She stated that they have made accommodations to handle the trash from Kate's Place and 1920 Chestnut, removing many dumpsters from the area. She stated that the tower will be 13 feet east of Kate's Place at the ground, creating a pleasant outdoor space between the buildings. At the second floor, it will be 23 feet away from Kate's Place. She displayed the floor plans and pointed out a large terrace at the second floor. She noted that the third floor of the retail building on Chestnut will now be developed as residential, not office, space, but the exterior will not change. She discussed the various floor plans, noting that the building narrows as it rises. She discussed the cladding materials including limestone, metal panels, and glass. Mr. Baker stated that the facades of the Alexander Building inform the Sansom Street retail façade. He added that the tower is also designed to respond to the Kate's Place building.

Mr. Cluver asked if they considered using masonry instead of metal panels to clad the section adjacent to Kate's Place. Mr. Baker replied that they did consider masonry, but decided on the metal panels, which relate to the Alexander Building. Mr. Cluver contended that that relationship is too abstract and distant. He suggested a more direct dialogue with Kate's Place. Mr. Baker stated that he was seeking to unify the large complex, connecting Sansom Street with 19th Street. Ms. Stein stated that the metal panels and the glass window wall system appear to be in the same planes. She asked if the different materials should be in slightly different planes. Mr. Baker responded that there will be slight shifts in the planes of different materials. Ms. Stein asked Mr. Baker to indicate the materials of the balconies on the tower. Mr. Baker responded that the balconies will be clear to light gray glass with light gray metal spandrel panels.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants whether they are seeking final or concept approval. Ms. Parker stated that her clients are seeking final approval. Ms. Gutterman stated that she is concerned because it appears that some of the details have not been finalized. She stated that the Committee can consider a concept approval, but asserted that a final approval would not be appropriate because of some open questions like the dimension of the offset between the planes of the metal panel and the glass and the precise color of the glass at the balconies. Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee of its goal, to determine whether the proposed new

construction is compatible with historic resources at the site, which, in this case, are the Boyd Theater and Alexander Building. He noted that the site is not within a locally designated historic district. He also noted that, while some buildings in the area are designated as historic, not all are. He asked the Committee to focus on the task at hand, whether the new construction is compatible with historic resources at the site, and not to get bogged down in details of the new construction that are unrelated to historic preservation. Ms. Gutterman stated that she is confused by the depictions of the metal panels, which are all labeled as oyster in color, but appear darker in some areas than others in the renderings. Ms. Bastion explained that the slight change in color is depicting shadows on sections that are set back.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she does "not get" the relationship between the Alexander Building and the design of the Sansom Street façade. She asked if the architects had considered breaking up the Sansom façade into smaller sections. She stated that the Sansom façade should have more visual interest because people will walk down the street when this project is completed. She claimed that it is an alley of sorts now. She stated that she is "somewhat concerned about what that elevation is actually going to look like when it is completed." Mr. Cluver agreed with aspects of Ms. Gutterman's critique. Mr. McCoubrey stated that there are numerous ways in which one could design this façade, but suggested that the Committee address the proposal as presented.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants if they were planning any terraces or mechanical equipment for the roofs of the Gap Outlet, Boyd Theater, or Alexander Building. Mr. Baker replied that those areas are outside their scope of work; they are not part of this application. Ms. Parker added that the exterior work to those buildings has already been approved and is not changing.

Mr. McCoubrey asked why they ran the metal panels up the east façade of the tower, when the panels are restricted to the lower sections elsewhere. Ms. Stein stated that she had the same question. Ms. Gutterman stated that the panels on the upper section of the tower should be a different color, not a masonry color.

Richard Gross of 1920 Chestnut Street introduced himself as the convener of the stakeholders and stated that he and his fellow neighbors have worked with the architects and developers to create this project. He stated that the Committee's rejection of the earlier tower design provided an opportunity for the neighbors to collaborate on the revised design presented today. The neighbors hired Cecil Baker's firm, which the developers have now retained as the architect of record for the project. Mr. Gross stated that the first tower design was unacceptable to the neighbors, but the new design has their full support. He noted that their agreement with the developer will be memorialized in an easement. He stated that they like the ways in which the trash collection, parking, and loading will be accomplished. The trash arrangement will be permanent. He stated that the materials are now acceptable. The project will now "fit in," not "stand out." It will be a "beautiful project." The outdoor spaces associated with the project also are pleasing to the neighbors. Air and light are protected. Mr. Gross observed that the neighbors also approve of the count and configuration of the units. Mr. Gross thanked Mr. Baker and Ms. Bastion and urged the Committee and Commission to approve the project. Mr. McCoubrey congratulated and thanked the developers and neighbors for working together so collaboratively.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that he was "heartened" by the collaborative process.

Ben Heizen introduced himself as the representative of the Rittenhouse Plaza. He stated that he received a telephone call from the general counsel for Kate's Place last night, who is unable to attend this meeting but is concerned about the hours of deliveries and the configuration of the loading dock. He stated that the general counsel would like to hire an architect to confirm that trucks can successfully turn around inside the loading dock area. Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Heizen to confine his remarks to historic preservation issues. The Historical Commission has no role in mandating rules related to deliveries.

Ms. Gutterman asked the architects to discuss the entry area on 19th Street. She stated that it differs from the entry proposed earlier. Ms. Bastion noted that it has been slightly reconfigured because the interior space on the upper floors will now be used as residential space. Ms. Gutterman stated that she saved the drawings of the earlier tower proposal to compare with this version and wanted to know why this part of the plan had changed. She noted that it was proposed as three floors in the plan that was withdrawn, but is now four. She stated that the massing is out of scale with 19th Street. It was noted that neither this part of the property nor this section of 19th Street is designated as historic. Mr. Baker stated that he changed the design of the entrance for two reasons. First, they decided that the entrance needed to be accentuated. Second, adding residential units in this area allowed for a reduction in the height of the tower. The stakeholders fully support this aspect of the design. He noted that the entrance is set back from 19th Street, creating a courtyard and accentuating the Alexander Building. Mr. Baker stated that the entrance is clad with a combination of metal panels and glass.

Mr. Cluver asked about the tall parapet on the shorter section of the Sansom Street elevation of the tower. Mr. Baker stated that it would support a trellis at the terrace level.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the understanding that there is no work proposed for the Boyd Theater and Alexander Building front facades or roofs in this application and with the suggestion but not requirement that the Sansom Street façade is further refined in terms of rhythm and scale, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1301 BEACH ST
Project: Replace playground equipment; restore stone monument
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: City of Philadelphia, Department of Public Property
Applicant: Michael Connor, The RBA Group, Inc.
History: 1827; Penn Treaty Park
Individual Designation: 3/9/2012
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to relocate an existing playground to a higher elevation within Penn Treaty Park and to conserve the white marble obelisk commemorating the 1682 signing of the Treaty of Amity and Friendship between William Penn and the Lenni Lenape Indians. The existing playground equipment would be removed from the site, and new equipment would be installed just west of the current play area. The new playground would be established within the limits of the existing circular walkway adjacent to the marble obelisk. Ground disturbance in this area would be limited to the top 6" of soil, although playground equipment would be anchored to a depth of 2'-6". Excavation would be done by hand, and

existing curbing, sidewalks, trees, and benches would remain. Grass would be replaced with bonded safety surfacing to cover the play area surface.

The proposed work to the adjacent marble obelisk includes removing the existing 1978 plaque and tablet, reducing the height of the base to 3'-6", and providing new paving at the monument base and surrounding walkway. The obelisk would be conserved offsite and returned after the completion of the new base. The design is being modified to allow for better legibility of the obelisk based on historic images.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 8.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Deborah Cahill of the Department of Public Property and Theresa Stuhlman of Philadelphia Parks & Recreation, landscape architect Tom Fein, civil engineer Michael Connor, and architect Jim Rice represented the application.

Mr. Fein noted that the existing playground is not up to code, is unsafe, and needs to be replaced with a code-compliant surfacing material. He emphasized that it remains a popular play area for residents and that the Friends of Penn Treaty Park supports the renovation plan.

Ms. Stein commented that moving the play equipment west of its current location to surround the historic monument is an unusual choice. Mr. Fein responded that the existing location is a swampy, low-lying area not ideal for the installation of safety surfacing. He indicated that the perimeter of the proposed location, defined by existing paths, would allow for a clean installation of safety surfacing. He further explained that existing benches in this location would enable caregivers to watch children.

Ms. Stein questioned whether the work would require the removal of any historic trees surrounding the monument. Mr. Fein replied that no trees would be removed and care would be taken to avoid compaction of soil and disturbance to the existing root system. He further explained that the proposed surfacing material consists of a gravel layer installed over existing topsoil, with the safety surfacing placed above the gravel. In addition, the safety surfacing material contains large pores to allow for air and water movement. Ms. Cahill then clarified that the safety surfacing would not be placed over the immediate tree root; instead this area would be mulched, and the drip line would serve to delineate the safety surfacing of the play area from the mulch over the tree roots.

Mr. Cluver asked if the existing metal fence would be removed and whether the proposed fence would be installed closer to the monument. He also noted that the proposed height of the fence is 3'-6" and asked whether the height holds some significance to the site. Mr. Rice replied that while there was no code issue or other specific reason for establishing the height, the fence needed to be high enough to serve as an impediment from damage but low enough to allow for visibility of the monument. Mr. Cluver responded that the fence, no matter the height, identifies an area not to be accessed by the public and suggested that it be lowered to be more consistent with the height of the base, which would make it less visually intrusive. While Mr. Cluver preferred the proposed location of the fence, which would bring it closer to the monument, he recommended a height of 2' to 2-6", so the top of the fence is no higher than the pedestal base.

Ms. Gutterman asked how the project team designed the monument base and how they determined which pieces to salvage. Mr. Rice commented that the design was predicated on the monument's pre-1978 height when it was more modestly scaled. In regard to salvaging specific

parts of the base, Mr. Rice explained that one piece of c. 1978 black granite would be salvaged to differentiate the original marble monument from the later base construction.

Mr. Cluver asked if any archaeological issues are present. Theresa Stuhlman provided photodocumentation showing that the park's topsoil had been heavily disturbed in the 1970s when large areas of the park, including the one under consideration, had been bulldozed. The current plan involves excavation of no more than 2"-6". Ms. Gutterman asked about the impact of tree roots in construction areas. Mr. Fein replied that a gravel layer would be placed over the existing surface, and a mulch layer would be covered with plywood. Both measures would minimize compaction of the tree roots by construction equipment. Any areas impacted would be reseeded following completion of construction. Ms. Gutterman inquired about the site that currently serves as the play area and which does not properly drain. Ms. Cahill replied that the area would be reseeded with the potential for further plantings.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the historic monument was once situated directly on grade, and the multi-element base was introduced at a later date. With the original base no longer extant, a black granite element of the current installation visually separates the historic obelisk from its base. Ms. Gutterman asked why the base design has not been simplified to more closely reflect the monument's historic appearance and requested that the applicant clarify which parts of the monument they wish to salvage. Mr. Fein responded that the black granite piece immediately under the historic marble obelisk and the adjacent cast stone piece would be salvaged. The lower profiled cast stone piece, along with the now encased cast base, would also be salvaged. The remaining black granite and cast stone pieces would be removed. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Fein to explain the reasoning behind salvaging the large cast stone element between the two black granite pieces rather than the cast stone element adjacent to the profiled piece. Fein explained that the decision to reuse the proposed pieces was due to potential staining between the larger granite piece and underlying cast stone element. Mr. Cluver agreed with the reasoning and stated his preference to retain one of the 1978 granite pieces to continue to differentiate the historic marble obelisk from the later elements. Ms. Gutterman stated that the difference in materials would suggest different periods of installation; however, Mr. Fein indicated that his preference was also to use the black granite and cast stone elements.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the new metal fence immediately surrounding the obelisk is reduced in height to 2' to 2'-6" tall, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 8.

ADDRESS: 401, 411, AND 421 RACE ST
Project: Construct 4-story, 216-unit apartment building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: PRCP- Philadelphia Investment, LLC
Applicant: Christopher Todd, PRCP- Philadelphia Investment, LLC
History: 1940; Maxwell Brothers Pincus Brothers Building; Louis Magaziner, architect
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story apartment building on the site of a non-contributing industrial building located in the Old City Historic District. The new building features a main entrance at the corner of N. 4th and Race Streets, in addition to direct entrances into the rental units along Race Street, where there are also bays with balconies on

the second through fourth stories. The exterior of the building is clad primarily in red brick, fiber cement paneling, and metal paneling.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner and developer Christopher Todd represented the application.

Mr. Todd thanked the staff for their help and professionalism leading up to this meeting. He stated that demolition of the non-contributing building on the site should be completed by the end of November. Mr. Todd explained that the design of the proposed building is responding to the Mint on one side, the frontage onto Franklin Square on another side, and also how the building can be a gateway to Old City. He explained that he utilized the massing and rhythm of nearby buildings, and introduced direct-entry units on Race Street to make for a more pedestrian-friendly experience. He noted that these units include stoops, which are important to Old City. He explained that he utilized balconies and other human-scale elements so that the building is expressed as a residential building, but with four corners of primarily glass and metal panels that read as anchoring points when traveling past by car. Ms. Stein commented that the scale and massing of the building is very appropriate to the historic district.

Mr. Cluver asked about the rooftop. Mr. Todd responded that all of the individual condenser units will be on the roof, and that each unit will have its own condenser. They will be laid out on the roof in a manner that follows the interior corridor plan. Ms. Stein stated that the units should not be visible from the public right-of-way, and suggested that Mr. Todd submit sightline drawings for review by the staff. Others disagreed, stating that that general rule may apply to historic buildings, but not necessarily to new construction. Mr. Cluver asked about the rooftop trellis location. Mr. Todd responded that it is located close to the edge for several reasons, including shade, creating separate seating areas, and for structural reasons related to the party walls of the units below. Mr. Cluver opined that the trellis should be pulled back from the edge of the roof. Others disagreed, asserting that a visible, rooftop trellis may not be appropriate on a historic building, but was not inherently inappropriate for new construction.

Ms. Stein asked about the use of fiber cement at grade, and stated that it is not a durable product. She suggested using brick or stone instead. Mr. Todd responded that there is a small masonry base. Ms. Stein countered that it is not tall enough to protect the fiber cement. Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed stone veneer. Mr. Todd responded that it is a flat cast stone veneer, approximately 18 by 36 inch pieces, with the appearance of limestone. Mr. Cluver asked about the brick. Mr. Todd responded that he will use real brick, not a veneer or tile.

Ms. Stein asked about the clearance of the projecting bays above the sidewalk. Mr. Todd responded that he will ensure that there is enough clearance below the bays, and noted that the ceilings are nine feet high.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the balconies. Mr. Todd responded that he will use vertical metal pickets for the railings, and the balconies are most often clad in fiber cement, but some are aluminum, depending on the adjacent materials.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the windows. Mr. Todd responded that the windows will be two materials; the vast majority of the punched openings will have vinyl windows, and the windows in the storefront and metal panel areas will be aluminum windows. The color will be medium brown in most cases, with clear glass in the living units. Ms. Stein stated that vinyl windows are

prohibited in historic districts. She suggested a different window material, such as aluminum clad, metal or wood. Others disagreed, contending that vinyl windows are inappropriate for window openings in primary facades of historic buildings, but not necessarily for new construction. Mr. Cluver asked about muntins. Mr. Todd responded that he typically uses a four-over-one configuration. Mr. Cluver commented that the windows need to use simulated-divided lites, instead of sandwiched muntins between the glass. Ms. Gutterman stated that it would also be acceptable to omit muntins.

Mr. Todd noted that the curb cuts are existing, and there is a garage door proposed for Florist Street, which is a private street.

Ms. Stein asked about the low wall along the parking lot. Mr. Todd responded that it is intended to keep cars out of the parking and dog park area. It will likely be 24 or 36 inches in height.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the metal panel system on the Race Street elevation appears to be coplanar with the brick, instead of projecting as a bay. Mr. Todd confirmed this, and explained that the relief is the difference in the metal panel thickness and the brick thickness. Mr. McCoubrey responded that brick is more characteristic of the area, and metal panels are usually used for projecting elements. He suggested it may be more successful with more brick and less metal panel, and the balconies could act as the projection. Mr. Todd answered that he understands, but he has been responding to multiple regulatory entities including the Planning Commission and the Delaware River Port Authority, and his drawings reflect compromises struck during those reviews. Ms. Gutterman stated that even eight inches would allow for a shadow or relief. Mr. Todd responded that the problem is that they are built to the property line currently, and are trying to not project beyond the property line, as zoning approval has already been obtained. The Committee members discussed potential solutions to this concern. Ms. Gutterman stated that she finds the materials to be acceptable, but would like to see a change in plane, even if it is a small change. She suggested that the staff can review the amount of offset. Mr. Cluver opined that the order of preference for achieving the offset is a projection, followed by an elevation that looks like the 5th Street elevation, followed by a recess instead of a projection.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided:

- the rooftop condenser units are not visible from the public right-of-way;
- the windows are aluminum clad, metal, wood or steel, with simulated-divided lites or no muntins;
- the low perimeter wall is no taller than four feet in height;
- the metal panels along Race Street either project, mimic the 5th Street elevation, or recess, so that they are not flush with the brick;
- the rooftop trellis is pulled back from the edge of the roof;
- the stone veneer at the base is raised to protect the other building materials, and that it be of a limestone appearance in texture, with larger-scale stones; and,
- the balcony railings are metal;

with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 20-22 BANK ST
Project: Construct 6-story multi-family residence with parking and roofdeck
Review Requested: Review and Comment
Owner: Mych, LLC
Applicant: Benjamin Nia, Abitare Design Studio, LLC
History: vacant lot
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a six-story, five-unit residential building on a currently vacant lot. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to Review and Comment because the lot is considered an undeveloped site. At the first floor, the Bank Street front elevation features an entrance door and two garage doors. The Elbow Lane side elevation features entrance doors and a wide garage door. The Bodine Street rear elevation features one entrance door and a row of small windows. The upper floors feature projecting bays and cantilevered balconies. The proposed building would be clad in brick and stone.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed construction is generally appropriate to the Old City Historic District in terms materials and rhythm of window openings, but suggests that the overall height of the building should be reduced, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Benjamin Nia represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked for clarification regarding the staff's comment that the overall height of the building should be reduced. Ms. Broadbent responded that the proposed building is situated next to a four-story building, making its six stories appear too tall. Ms. Stein stated that she agrees with the staff comment regarding height, and commented that taller buildings are typically found on corners, not mid-block like the proposed building. Ms. Gutterman commented that the change in material for the top floors makes it appear even taller. Mr. Nia responded that he met initially with Randy Baron of the staff, and that this design is the result of that meeting. He stated that he attempted to visually reduce the height of the building, while addressing his client's wish to maximize the density. He confirmed that the penthouse unit has an additional ten-foot-high two-story space. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that the building is too tall, and the material on the upper floors is inappropriate. Mr. Nia directed the Committee's attention to photographs showing context, where there are several taller buildings. Ms. Gutterman responded that those taller buildings are all brick, whereas the change in material at the top of this building draws attention to it. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the only reason for the height is the bathroom wing, and that the front piece could be reduced in height. Mr. Nia responded that he explored the option of using a traditional pilot house instead of the penthouse, but it was decided that the penthouse maximized the visual appeal of the living space.

Ms. Gutterman stated her concern regarding the number of garage doors, specifically on Bank Street. Mr. Nia responded that he initially proposed a two-wide garage door on Bank Street, but Mr. Baron suggested he try to maintain the rhythm of the street. He noted that he is working with existing curb cuts.

Ms. Stein asked about materials. Mr. Nia responded that everything is clad in metal panel with the exception of the brick veneer and the stone at the base. The entire first floor is cast stone panel. The upper floor is metal panel. The windows are aluminum clad single-lite casements.

The balcony railings are metal. Mr. Nia stated that he intends to differentiate the metals by using different colors. Mr. Cluver responded that he is not achieving that goal, and instead he is drawing attention to the upper stories.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that proposed construction is generally appropriate to the Old City Historic District, but that the penthouse should be reduced in height by at least four feet and should be a brick color, that a pilot house be considered in place of the penthouse, that the cast stone at the base be a warmer buff limestone color, that the garage doors be consolidated or removed from Bank Street, that the base of the building be made taller, and that rooftop mechanical units are not visible from the public right-of-way.

ADDRESS: 400-14 WALNUT ST
Project: Replace existing steel windows; install new storefront and signage
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Center City Chestnut, LLC
Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners, Architects
History: 1915; General Fire Accident & Life Assurance Company
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the existing, historic steel windows with aluminum windows on floors 2 through 10. While the configuration would match that of the historic steel windows, the aluminum windows require thicker framing. The application also proposes to replace the ground-floor entry door and windows. The staff recommends that the ground-floor windows be revised to match the proportions and configuration of the historic windows, as shown on the original drawings, and that the entrance doors be revised to have a more substantial frame matching the proportions and configuration of the historic doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the upper-floor windows, but denial of the ground-floor entry doors and windows, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Dipasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Designer Nichole Howell, architect Jonathan Broh, and window contractor William Steedle represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman commented that the Commission typically allows the replacement of windows in alternate materials above the base cornice-line of larger buildings, but not typically below the third floor. She asked Ms. DiPasquale why the staff had recommended approval of all of the windows above the first floor. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff found that the replacement windows match the historic windows in most aspects and that the consistency of the windows across floors, rather than a mix of new and old, was more consistent with the intent of the original design. Mr. Broh commented that he was pleasantly surprised at the staff recommendation, which was unexpected. Mr. Broh noted that they would be happy to work with the staff to revise the door and window design for the entrance to be in keeping with the historic appearance of the building. He noted that they would still want some sort of storefront signage, and asked if it would be possible to retain the structure supporting the individual letters. Mr.

McCoubrey noted that they do not have original drawings, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff determined that the weight and proportion of the doorway system depicted in an elevation drawing from an earlier project at the site, which was included by the staff with the application materials, was more appropriate to the character of the building. Mr. Broh commented that they were proposing something similar to the current doorway system, but would be happy to work with the staff to find something more appropriate.

Ms. Stein asked why the five windows on the first floor where the fitness center is located are not being replaced. Mr. Broh responded that there is no desire to replace them at this time. Mr. Cluver opined that they are going to get several different window appearances, with the upper-floor windows having one look, the storefront another, and the remaining first-floor windows another look. Mr. Broh responded that that is the current condition as well, that the current storefront system is a frameless glass system. He explained that, instead of a bronze frame, they are proposing a stainless or clear aluminum. He reiterated that he is willing to collaborate with the staff to find a suitable doorway system.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants knew the original color of the windows. Mr. Broh responded that he does not, but that the original windows are existing, and he would imagine they have always been white. Mr. Cluver opined that he likes the one window on the rear elevation done in a dark color. Mr. Broh responded that the window to which Mr. Cluver referred is the lone, non-historic, aluminum, replacement window in the entire building. It is not an appropriate basis for a restoration. Mr. Cluver opined that he prefers the darker metal on the cream colored stone. Ms. Gutterman opined that the applicant should conduct a paint analysis to determine the original color of the windows so that the aluminum windows can be created in that color. Ms. Gutterman commented that that information should be shared with the staff when they are reviewing the details. Others noted that the Commission does not regulate paint colors for wood and metal trim.

Mr. Cluver noted that the upper-floor windows are very much set into the masonry, while the proposed storefront windows appear to be set very shallowly in the openings. Mr. Broh responded that the storefront entrance does not fit into the masonry opening, but is actually set within the vestibule, rather than the visual masonry opening. Mr. Cluver clarified that he was speaking of the windows flanking the entrance, not the entrance itself.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the windows at the second floor should retain their historic appearance, either by being repaired or replaced to match the exact historic profiles. She noted that the placement of the upper-floor windows within the masonry openings should match the historic placement. Ms. DiPasquale directed the Committee members' attention to the proposed jamb section, noting that the plane of the proposed glass aligns with the plane of the historic glass. Ms. Gutterman noted that a piece of trim projects around the frame in the proposed windows that does not exist in the historic windows. Mr. Broh questioned whether the depth of the glazing or the frame is more important. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Gutterman responded that the relationship between the frame and masonry is more important because that is what will be visible in or out of shadow.

Ms. Stein asked the applicant to explain what exactly they are doing to the existing window frames. She noted that it appears that they will be partially cut and then clad over with the new windows. Mr. Steedle responded that the existing windows are uniquely low-profile steel windows that are embedded into the joint between interior and exterior masonry. The best option, he opined, since they cannot get the existing frame out without disrupting both wall systems, is to remove the operating sash and saw cut down to as close to the masonry as

possible without marring the masonry. He noted that they would need to install a subframe receiver to attach and anchor the window. It would be positioned slightly out from the existing caulking bead for a new caulking surface. They would then position the window so that the glass plane of the new window is in nearly the same position as the existing glass plane. Ms. Gutterman noted that the dimension of glass is being reduced. Mr. Steedle responded that the jamb detail was the most difficult to match. He acknowledged that the glass would be slightly smaller, but the reduction would be an insignificant percentage of the total size.

Mr. Cluver opined that replacing the windows on floors three and above with the thicker-framed aluminum windows over more historic-appearing steel windows at the second floor would create an odd line of sight. Ms. Gutterman responded that usually the Committee reviews the replacement of upper-floor windows in terms of their visibility from the street.

Ms. Stein asked whether the applicants get a thermally-broken condition with the new windows. Mr. Steel responded that there is a thermal barrier in both the operating sash and the perimeter frame, and that the receiver system is actually two separate pieces.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the condition of the existing windows. Mr. Steedle responded that the biggest issue, beyond the fact that the existing windows are solid steel and single glass, and therefore extremely inefficient, is that they are bifold, with the operating sash folding outside the plane of the building, and held on with cast cantilever bars, several of which have already broken. As a result, he noted, the windows are not safe for operation any longer, and he has never seen a piece of hardware that could be used to update the windows. Mr. Cluver asked if the new windows would be operable. Mr. Steedle responded that the new windows would be tilt-and-turn windows, where they turn at the top. He noted that this would consist of essentially two windows in each opening to keep consistent sightlines across the top. He noted that the two aesthetic features they thought would be most important to retain are the horizontals at the top and bottom. As a result, he continued, in the four elements there are two windows. He noted that they looked at six different manufacturers and several different designs trying to minimize certain portions of the sightline encroachment, and yet keep a certain amount of consistency. He assured the Committee that they had considered every reasonable option very carefully.

Mr. Cluver opined that, since the aluminum frame causes the glass size to shrink, the size of the intermediate muntins in the windows should be reduced so that the glass proportion does not change as much. He noted that the existing muntin has a slight change in plane that helps reduce its absolute width. Mr. Cluver commented that perhaps it could be narrowed by an inch or so to get the glass closer to its original proportions.

Mr. Cluver commented that, if the windows are going to be replaced, he does not see how they would replicate the exact dimensions of the existing windows, regardless of the system they would use. Mr. Broh responded that they did look into a Hopes window system, and found that the narrowest jamb profile Hopes could achieve is 2-7/16 inches. Mr. Broh stated that he understood that the Commission is not interested in cost, but noted that the Hopes system would increase the cost of each window by $10,000, increasing the total window cost from roughly under $1 million to $2.4 million, which is more than 15% of the total job. He noted that that would be cost prohibitive to use a real steel window. Ms. Gutterman noted that they might also have to demolish portions of the interior wall. Mr. Steedle responded that to get down to the existing sightlines, they would have to demolish interior structural masonry walls. Mr. Cluver commented that part of the reason for the jamb depth is because they are proposing to keep part of the existing frame. Ms. Gutterman asked if they have done any exploratory work to see if additional portions of the existing frame can be removed. Mr. Steedle responded that removing

the entire frame would minimize the jamb a very small amount, but that they decided that modifying the masonry elements inside would radically increase the cost and complexity of the project with very little return. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Steedle to define a very small amount. Ms. Gutterman asked why they could not cut the existing frame flush with the masonry. Mr. Steedle responded that there is approximately ½ inch that projects beyond the masonry; they cannot cut closer to the masonry. Mr. Steedle commented that they might be able to pick up a whole inch on the sill.

Mr. Cluver commented that there seem to be two battles and conceding on both: first is the window itself, which is a little bit fatter, and second is the retention of a portion of the existing frame, which creates a subframe, something the Committee tries to avoid.

Mr. Broh asked Mr. Steedle if the jamb is as difficult to cut down as the head. Mr. Steedle responded that, in order to cut more off the heads and sills, they would have to cut into finishes. Mr. Broh proposed to flush-cut the jamb, which seems to be the biggest issue.

Mr. Cluver asked how extensive the investigation into alternative options has been. Mr. Broh responded that they have explored six different window manufacturers. Mr. Steedle confirmed this, noting that, staying with insulated glass and thermal frames, they explored six manufacturers and several different product lines. Mr. Cluver asked if it is necessary for the windows to be operable, and Mr. Steedle responded that it is necessary for code for natural ventilation.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there is any way to reduce the dimensions of the jamb assembly so that it is more integral to the remaining portion of the existing window, instead of cladding on top of it. She noted that part of the issue is the fact that they cannot fit any part of the window into the pocket. She reiterated that her problem is the reduction of glazing. Mr. Steedle responded that they did look at modifying the operating sash in order to have two of the four vertical elements operating, which did minimize the jamb condition, and the head condition at the non-operable elements. He noted though, that it created a wide-wide-narrow pattern across the head, which they felt was less appropriate than the overall widening of the jamb. Mr. Steedle presented his working drawings for the various configurations and the proportions thereof. Mr. Cluver agreed that the uneven head condition looked worse than the wider jamb dimension. The applicants noted that the jamb will be wider, but the change in width is miniscule when compared to the total width of the window.

Ms. Stein reiterated Ms. Gutterman's earlier point, opining that they approve aluminum windows only at floors three through ten, and request steel windows for floors one and two. Other disagreed that there was a hard and fast rule and noted that every situation is different. Mr. Broh confirmed that the Committee only intended to apply that restriction to the windows proposed for replacement. Ms. Gutterman responded that it appears they are proposing to replace all of the windows at the second-floor level. Mr. Broh respectfully replied that they may reconsider that replacement if required to use a window with a $10,000 premium.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the applicant should explore more appropriate storefront improvements, and work with the staff to develop a better solution.

Ms. Gutterman asked how difficult it is for the applicant to do a mock-up of the windows. Mr. Broh responded that it is more a matter of timing, and noted that they have provided excellent documentation, and opined that a mock-up probably would not change the opinion of the window's appearance. Ms. DiPasquale responded that it is possible that the details will look

much thicker on paper when compared side by side, but that the added width may appear insignificant over the width of an 80-inch opening.

Mr. Cluver scaled the glass dimensions and noted that the proposed windows contain approximately 80% of the original glazing. He opined that there has been an adequate amount of due diligence on the part of the applicant in terms of the viability of the removal of the frames and the options for replacement windows. He noted that he could support the replacement of the windows as shown, but with the narrowing of the center muntin/mullion element to pick up additional glazing. Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting that the applicant should pick up additional glazing wherever possible. Mr. Cluver opined that the consistency of the windows is important and recommended that all windows from floors two and above should be the same. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey disagreed, opining that the second floor should be more in keeping with the historic windows, owing to their smaller size and closer proximity to the ground.

Mr. Baron commented that, if the Commission requires that the second-floor windows be retained or recreated, the applicant could consider adding a second piece of glass to the existing steel frames, which would cost less.

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

Mr. McCoubrey added that the two light fixtures flanking the doors shown in the rendering are not part of this submission and have not been reviewed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the upper-floor windows for floors three and above, provided that:

- a paint analysis is conducted to determine the original color of the windows, and that color is used for the aluminum windows,
- the muntin/mullion width of the windows is minimized to maximize the amount of glazing while retaining the appropriate vertical dimensions of the individual panes of glass,
- the location of the windows within the masonry opening is retained,
- the second-floor windows are restored or new steel windows that more closely match the historic windows are installed; and,

denial of the ground-floor entry doors and windows, with the recommendation that the applicant pursue a more historically-appropriate replacement, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 219-29 S 18TH ST
Project: Open three blind windows
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affilliates
Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett, Tackett and Company, Inc.
History: 1925; Penn Athletic Club, Parc Rittenhouse; Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects; alts, Cronheim & Weger, architects, 1957
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a portion of the brick in three blind windows at existing fire stairs on the Locust and Chancellor Street facades of the Parc Rittenhouse building. The brick would be removed down to the levels of the adjacent second-floor window sills and limestone sills would be added to align with the adjacent sills of the flanking windows. Glass

railings would be installed on the inside face of the openings and extend approximately 18 inches in above the new sills. New steel doors and louvers would be installed within the vestibules, perpendicular to the façade.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Dipasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Martin Jay Tackett represented the application.

Ms. Stein inquired about the reason for removing the infill of the blind windows. Mr. Tackett responded that he thinks the building will be better without them, and that they want those spaces to be accessible to the outside air.

Ms. Stein asked about the current use of the spaces. Mr. Tackett responded that there are four fire stairs in the building, and two of them are accessible from this the second floor. There is already one opening at a fire stair on this floor, he noted, at the northeast corner of the building along Chancellor Street. Mr. Cluver asked if anything was planned for the currently-open opening, and Mr. Tackett responded no. Mr. Cluver attempted to make sense of the current opening.

Mr. Cluver opined that the blind windows are not integral to the design of the building, and that he would accept openings #2-4, provided opening #1 was treated similarly, with all of the mess removed and the mismatched brick at #2 replaced with matching brick.

Ms. Stein disagreed, noting that she does not understand the historic reason for the blind openings, and that she is concerned about the quality of the construction, which will require an excellent mason. She noted that opening #3 is particularly visible from Rittenhouse Square, and that it is part of the fabric of the city, and she does not know why they should approve an opening when there is no legitimate reason for the alteration. Mr. Cluver asked if there is a programmatic reason to support the alteration.

Ms. Stein noted, furthermore, that the openings would not reflect the architectural language of the building, that all of the other windows along that floor have a spandrel panel of terracotta below the sill, and in this case, the applicant is proposing to add a cast stone sill that does not match the adjacent terracotta sills, and does not have the terracotta panel or detailed surround.

Ms. Stein further noted that, even if they agreed to the opening, a glass railing would not be their preference, since it is more reflective and conspicuous than a simple metal railing.

Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the potential use of metal mesh over the openings, as used in the Philadelphia fire balcony openings above. Mr. Tackett responded that he has not found any evidence that the original architect intended the openings to be filled with mesh, and that they would not propose a similar treatment to the new openings.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that it would be inappropriate to take the vocabulary of the Philadelphia fire stair openings on the upper floors and apply them to the blind windows, which are of the vocabulary of the adjacent windows.

Mr. Tackett responded to the discussion, noting that he supports the recommendation to replace the mismatched brick used at the base of the northwest opening, but disagreed that the new openings would not become ill-maintained because the floors will be occupied by people

spending $1000 per square foot to purchase the space. He disagreed that the blind openings were part of the intent of the original architect. He disagreed with the suggestion to use terracotta or faux terracotta on the new openings to match the adjacent windows, because it goes against the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. With regard to the quality of the work, he explained that the existing brick will be salvaged, cleaned, and reused by toothing in the brick.

Ms. Stein asked again why the applicant wants the three new openings. Mr. Tackett responded that he thinks the interior works better if there is access to outdoor space as there is on other floors. Ms. Stein asked who would use the balconies. Mr. Tackett responded that he does not know yet, but it will probably be the people who live immediately adjacent to them. Ms. Stein asked if they would be balconies for the tenants. Mr. Tackett responded that the people using the spaces will be owners of the adjacent units.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the Philadelphia fire stair still exists at these locations. Mr. Tackett responded that the stairs will continue to exist, the only two that will be accessed as fire stairs from this floor are the two on the east side of the building—the other two pass through the building. Openings #2 and 3 do not serve this floor, he clarified. Mr. Tackett stated that everything would be code compliant.

Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that openings #1 and 2 are on Chancellor Street, which has a much different character than 18th and Locust Streets. Mr. Tackett responded that he agrees, and yet the architect chose to treat the facades the same.

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

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

ADDRESS: 2212-14 WALNUT ST
Project: Replace awning with marquee
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Deco Future Management, LLC
Applicant: Angie Molnar, Deco Future Management, LLC
History: 1928; WPEN Studio; Ralph W. Bencker, architect
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove an existing canvas umbrella-type awning over the front door and install a metal and glass marquee. The marquee would sit on posts in front of ornamental pilasters. The gabled marquee would be faced with a decorative metal and glass end panel that would rise above the edges of the gable. The end panel would be based on a design found in the copper decorations of the upper floors.

A simpler marquee located within the width of the door opening that did not obscure views of historic fabric and did not create a false sense of history would be more appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Angie Molnar represented the application.

The Committee members asked Ms. Molnar to explain her goals for the proposal. She explained that the current round canopy does not fit well with the rectangular opening and the angular design of the building. She stated that she was not seeking to augment the signage on the building. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the canopy should not compete with the architecture of the building. She suggested a canopy that would not require such heavy construction. She suggested a canvas awning without columns, but with a different shape. Ms. Stein suggested that removing the existing awning and the canvas over the transom area, restoring the glass transom, and lighting the larger opening. She noted that the entryway has a sheltering setback. Lighting the area could restore the size and grandeur of the opening, she opined. The Committee members urged Ms. Molnar to work with the staff on a plan to restore the existing opening.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

ADDRESS: 2119 PINE ST
Project: Add decks/green roofs, pilot house, balconies, and doors; add to bay
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Gerard Van de Loo
Applicant: Richard Sanford, Dauntless Design Collaborative
History: 1870
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several alterations to the building at 2119 Pine Street. It proposes to add green roof decks with glass railings and privacy fences on mansard roof of the main block, the rear ell, and a one-story side addition. A pilot house would be added on the main block to access the green roof. It proposes enlarging a rear bay, adding a second floor. It also proposes adding balconies and French doors to the side of the rear ell.

The deck on the main block would be highly visible and would adversely impact the mansard roof of the main block, which is a character-defining feature. The other alterations would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the addition of the green roof, railings, privacy fences, and pilot house to the main block of the building, but approval of all other aspects of the application, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Sanford and contractor John Hovanec represented the application.

The Committee members opined generally that the deck and other structures on the main roof would be too visible. They noted that the element labeled a “roof hatch” on the architectural plans is actually a stairhouse on the main roof. They discussed the visibility of the other aspects of the application from the public right-of-way. Mr. Baron showed a photograph of the area along the side yard of the house. He opined that the aspects of the proposal at the rear of the building

would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The Committee members suggested that the glass railings on the side decks would be unnecessarily visible and asked the architect to use metal railings.

The Committee had questions about the rear bay, although it is not visible from a public right-of-way. They recommended that the architect consider enlarging the windows in the new bay and holding the top of the bay below the existing cornice so that the cornice does not need to be altered or removed. They asked whether the brick would be stuccoed when the window behind the enlarged bay is infilled. The architect responded that he is not proposing to stucco. He said that the bay proposed to provide some additional space to an efficiency apartment.

Mr. Baron asked about supporting the weight of the green roofs. Mr. Sanford said that an engineer will be retained to design the supports for those roofs. Ms. Stein asked about the material for the bases of the green roofs. Mr. Sanford said it was not yet specified, but suggested that it might be vinyl siding. The Committee members suggested painted wood or AZEK instead of vinyl siding.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor for public comment. Attorney Leonard Reuter stated that he was representing the next-door neighbor. He observed that his client has concerns about light and air as well as other zoning related matters. He noted that he is in support of the staff's recommendation of denial of the deck on the mansard roof.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal on the mansard roof of the main block and the glass railings, but approval of the remainder of the application with appropriate railings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided

- the bay is reduced in height to sit below the third-floor cornice,
- an engineering plan is submitted showing that the green roofs can be supported, and
- no stucco or vinyl siding is installed.

ADDRESS: 240 W TULPEHOCKEN ST
Project: Construct dormer; cut roof for balcony; replace windows and doors; repair stucco
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Tulpehocken Palazzo LP
Applicant: A. Robert Torres, StudioTorres LTD
History: 1893; Harry K. Cummings Residence; Frank Miles Day, architect
Individual Designation: 3/9/2012
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert a carriage house into a dwelling. The carriage house sits at the rear of a large lot and fronts on Pastorius Street, an alley. The main house faces onto Tulpehocken Street. The carriage house is original to the property and was designed by the architect of the main house in the same style as the main house.

The application proposes to install new windows and doors and to restucco the exterior. A dormer would be added to create more space. The design of the dormer is difficult to ascertain from the plans, but it may have a hipped roof. A section of the roof would be cut away and a door installed to create a balcony within the roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the removal of a section of the roof for the balcony, but approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the design of the dormer is simplified, with the staff to review all details including window and door shop drawings and stucco color, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect A. Robert Torres represented the application.

The Committee members asked about the location and visibility of the carriage house. The Committee members were not in favor of cutting the roof for a balcony. They also had concerns about the size and design of the balcony. Mr. Torres stated that he is not proposing a hipped roof on the dormer as Mr. Baron had claimed. He stated that he is proposing a shed roof for the dormer. The Committee members noticed that the drawings are inconsistent; the dormer is much wider in plan than in the elevations. The Committee members did not object to the addition of a dormer, but asserted that it should be reduced in size to a narrower three-window dormer centered on the first-floor windows. The Committee members suggested that the bathroom could be moved to the location of the proposed balcony.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:33 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 3: Each property will 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 elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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

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

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

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.