

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

**TUESDAY, 27 JULY 2010
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

John Cluver
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Jason Tete, Tete Construction
Myra Eskin, Society Hill Civic Association
Betty Mon, Mon Associates
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Michael Ascher
Samuel Gordon, SGA
Emily Strup, SGA
Robert Powers, Powers & Company
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Company
Ray Brogden, RRR
Nathan Flanigan
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects
Kenneth Johnson, Architecture, Urban Design, and Policy LLC
Richard Stokes, Stokes Architecture
Ronald Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison
John Reydler, Total Parent Solutions
Dominic Aspite
Ursinio Nunez

CALL TO ORDER

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

221 PINE STREET

Owner: Ning Yu

Applicant: Betty Mon

History: c. 1813-24; new façade, c. 1970

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

Project: Demolish and reconstruct portion of rear ell

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to retain a portion of the historic rear ell, to demolish the remainder as well as an extension of the ell built sometime between 1910 and 1922, and to construct a new extension. The extension would be the full width of the lot and two stories high with a parapet and roof deck. A stair tower, roof modification, and parapet are proposed for the historic portion of the rear ell to provide access to the roof deck. The application mentions window replacement and roof repair, but provides no details. The windows in the historic portion of the rear ell should be six-over-six double-hung sash windows.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Contractor Jason Tete and expediter Betty Mon represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to clarify which section of the rear ell would be removed. Mr. Tete indicated on the plans and in photographs that the rear ell from the first downspout back would be removed. Mr. Cluver asked if the sloped roof of the historic ell would remain. Mr. Tete said that it would. Mr. Tete stated that an engineer's report indicates that the bricks in the rear ell are in bad condition and must be replaced. He also explained that the new addition to the ell would be as wide as the lot; the historic rear ell is only seven feet wide and is virtually unusable. He stated that the new addition would be 11 feet wide.

Ms. Gutterman noted that a portion of the new masonry wall is proposed to sit on top of the historic rear ell wall. Mr. Cluver observed that part of the new wall will support a spiral stair to access the roof deck. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was another option for roof deck access than adding a masonry wall to the ell. Ms. Pentz asked if the stair could be moved to the new addition. Ms. Cote pointed out that the applicant is also proposing access from the main block to the roof deck. Mr. Tete stated that the stair to the roof deck can be moved into the new addition.

Mr. Cluver noted that the roof line would change and stated that the way the proposed addition projects out is counter to the way rear ells are typically constructed; rear ells are designed to allow light into the backs of buildings. He added that the proposed windows in the ell on the property line may not meet the building code. Mr. Tete replied that the neighboring lot is only six feet wide and not fit for a dwelling; therefore, he claimed, windows may be installed in the party wall. Mr. Cluver stated that the building code may not allow windows in a party wall.

Mr. Baron stated that a proposal to demolish the entire rear had come before the Commission previously and had been denied. He stated that the staff met with the applicant and discussed a design that would keep and restore the oldest and most historic portions of the building and remove the cinder block portion that had been modified. He stated that he was not aware that the roof line would be altered. He asserted that an appropriate compromise would be to allow the wider rear ell, given the extraordinary narrowness of the lot, provided the historic portions of the rear ell and main block were retained and restored. He stated that building would also gain from the restoration of two dormers on the main block. Ms. Gutterman objected to adding on top

of the original ell. Mr. Cluver suggested maintaining the rear ell roof intact and moving the access stair to the new addition. He also suggested having a light open railing at the deck instead of a masonry parapet. He suggested that this would allow the top of the addition to align with the existing rear ell and continue the roofline. He also suggested that the stair be moved to the opposite party wall to be less visible.

Ms. Gutterman mentioned that she was concerned about the proposed window in the back. Ms. Cote stated that she thought that that rear window would not be very visible.

Mr. Tete stated that the windows would be all wood and the arched window in the dormer would be restored. He stated that the aluminum siding would be replaced with appropriate siding. The Committee suggested that the applicant could finalize these details with the staff.

Myra Eskin of Society Hill Civic Association encouraged the applicant to participate in the Association's voluntary review process.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition, provided that there are no modifications to the roof of the historic portion of the rear ell and the roof deck railing is transparent, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

2137 ST. JAMES STREET

Owner: Heather and Michael Ascher

Applicant: Tim Kerner

History: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect

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

Project: Replace windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace windows at the rear of the property that are visible from the public right-of-way. Rather than restore the windows with the 7- $\frac{1}{4}$ " wide center post as they were originally and still are at a neighboring property, the applicant proposes a 3" wide center post.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Michael Ascher and architect Tim Kerner represented the application.

Mr. Kerner stated that his client does not want to restore the wide center mullion at the two sets of rear double windows at the second and third floors. He noted that the windows are at the rear of the building on Chancellor Street and that the rears of these buildings have undergone a series of modifications. He stated that the current, non-historic width of the mullions is 3 inches. He stated that the photographs show that the neighboring building to the left has a narrower mullion; the neighboring building to the right has a wider mullion, which mostly likely represents the original historic configuration. It is 7- $\frac{1}{4}$ inches wide. He asserted that the owner wants the narrow mullion to allow the maximum light into the interior.

Mr. Cluver asked about the condition of the property when it was designated. Ms. Cote stated that the narrower mullion existed at the time of designation. Mr. Cluver stated that the narrower

mullion is an existing condition and the Commission cannot force the owner to restore the mullion to its original width. Ms. Cote disagreed, stating that the Commission may review within the scope of work proposed by the owner. She added that, although this is a minor detail, the staff referred it to the Commission because it is not a restoration and does not meet the Standards.

Ms. Pentz asked if there was a photograph showing the 3-inch mullion in place. Mr. Kerner provided a photograph showing a closer view.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she was not opposed to the 3-inch mullion. Mr. Cluver concurred and stated that it would be a different case if this was proposed for the front façade. He advocated approval owing to the location and current condition.

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

1827 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Brian & Shirley Sharkey

Applicant: Dominic Aspite

History: 1901, Charles Barton Keen, architect

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

Project: Reconstruct roof decks and pilothouse

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to expand the pilothouse and alter and reconstruct the roof decks. A pergola is proposed, which would be minimally visible from 19th Street down the rear alley. All other proposed work would not be visible from a public right-of-way.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Sam Gordon and Emily Strup, his associate, represented the application.

Mr. Gordon displayed two photographs, one of the existing and one with the proposed alterations added. He explained that they propose to remove the satellite dish, replace the deck railing, and add a pergola. He also stated that he is proposing to enclose the center space with the existing elevator penthouse and reuse the existing metal structural elements of the current roof deck.

Ms. Pentz asked if an engineering analysis had been conducted. She stated that the proposal included heavy components including the stone decking and water feature. Mr. Gordon stated that they will consult an engineer to ensure that the house can support the extra weight. He stated that the stone would weigh more than the water feature, which would only require about 10 gallons of water.

Mr. Cluver stated that he was concerned about the visibility of the pergola and asked if the Commission had approved pergolas in the past. Ms. Cote stated that the Commission had approved some inconspicuous pergolas in the past. Ms. Pentz concurred. Mr. Gordon recalled that the Commission had approved a pergola for a project he worked on across the street. Mr. Cluver opined that the pergola would be too large. He stated that it would look like an additional

story. Mr. Gordon noted that the property is four houses in from the corner. He claimed that the pergola would not be conspicuous. The Committee suggested shortening the pergola or moving it to the other side of the deck. Mr. Gordon stated that moving the pergola was not an option for functional reasons. Mr. Cluver agreed that the pergola is in the right location from a functional perspective, but reiterated his objection to it. Ms. Pentz and Ms. Gutterman did not object to the pergola. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that this deck is on a service alley and is minimally visible.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details.

1502-04 GREEN STREET

Owner: Michael Loonstyn

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

Designation: non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Construct infill building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an infill building in the Spring Garden Historic District. The building would have a stone base on the first floor, while the upper floors would be brick. Two-story bays and French doors with Juliet balconies are proposed for the second and third floors. The staff suggests that the transom windows be eliminated and the French doors be full height with the lintels to align with the neighboring buildings and the balconies to be in the same plane of the building. The staff also suggests double-leaf doors at the main entrances.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Mr. Cluver noted that the bays and balconies on the front façade are not found elsewhere in this row of buildings, but can be found in the neighborhood. He suggested eliminating the Juliet balconies. Ms. Gutterman agreed, stating she did not understand the balconies.

Mr. Cluver stated that the French doors should be changed to windows that are the same size as the windows at the adjacent properties. Ms. Pentz agreed. Ms. Gutterman suggested a single door instead of the double doors to reduce the width. Mr. Cluver stated that both the bays and balconies are focal points and are in conflict with one another. Ms. Pentz concurred.

Ms. Pentz asked if the Commission had plenary or Review and Comment jurisdiction over this property. Ms. Cote stated that the staff contends that the Commission has full jurisdiction because the property was “developed” at the time of designation. It has walls and other features.

Mr. Cluver stated that he liked a chamfered bay found on the side of the neighboring corner property because it is less boxy. Mr. McCoubrey objected to the bays, stating that they break up the plane of the block face. Mr. Cluver pointed out that no rear elevations were provided and the plan shows triple ganged windows at the rear. He stated that he would like to see what those look like. The Committee suggested that rear elevations should be submitted and reviewed.

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

100 N. 17TH STREET

Owner: 1701 LP Partners

Applicant: Robert Snow, Agoos Lovera Architects

History: 6-story structure, 1914, Ballinger & Perrot for Methodist Church; 8-story addition, 1921

Designation: individually designated, 1/7/1982

Project: Rehabilitate building and add canopy

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate this former office building to create 111 apartment units. An entrance canopy would be added. Storefronts would be rebuilt. HVAC equipment and a stair house would be added at the roof.

The Historical Commission reviewed a similar project to convert this building into a hotel in 2008. At that time the "Historical Commission voted to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the upper roof penthouses, owing to incompleteness, and the storefront details; and to approve the remainder of the application with the following revisions: the lower roof mechanical screen and railing are painted a neutral color, and the terra-cotta sills are repaired up to the 6th floor break."

The current application differs from the previous application in several ways. The applicant has provided drawings showing both the earlier and current designs to facilitate the review. The extensive mechanical equipment and screening at the 4th floor roof have been eliminated as has the elevator tower. The stair house proposed for the main roof has been reduced in size and shifted to a less visible area. However, the HVAC unit on the roof has been increased in size by a third and shifted closer to the edge of the building on 17th Street. Two doors previously proposed to be changed to windows at the first floor will remain doors and will be replaced in wood. The storefronts will be replaced with new storefronts with a single sheet of plate glass. A new glass and stainless steel canopy is now proposed for the main entrance of the building on 17th Street to provide shelter for the residents of the building.

The details of the storefronts, which were not previously approved, may not be appropriate. The size and location of the rooftop HVAC may not be appropriate. A site visit to view a mockup of the HVAC equipment would help to determine whether it would be inconspicuous. Although it will be freestanding and not attach to the historic building, the canopy may hide important architectural detail. Also, the canopy does not currently appear to be detailed to include drainage; the supports may become larger when the drainage is added.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the canopy; approval of the remainder of the project, with the staff to review details including storefront and door details and a mockup of the rooftop HVAC equipment, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Developer Ashley MacCrary, architects Ted Agoos and Adam Jeckel, and preservation consultant Bob Powers represented the application.

Mr. Powers explained that this is the third proposal in the past two years to adaptively reuse this building. He claimed that this is the most sympathetic of the three proposals. Mr. Powers

explained that his client would like to withdraw the canopy proposal at this time; the team may propose a canopy at a later date.

Mr. Baron stated that the storefront details have been revised to provide more energy-efficient storefronts. He said that the building was built in two phases, each with its own storefront configuration. The historic photograph shows that the building in original six-story form had thick wood-framed storefronts. He suggested that the present thinner copper-framed storefronts were installed when eight stories were added to the building. He stated that even those storefronts have some later vertical corner elements. The proposal documented in the drawings will have thicker glass with simple square aluminum frame elements; the molded copper storefront frames will be removed. The applicants introduced revised drawings that propose adding moldings with the shape of the copper elements onto the outside of the aluminum storefront. The Committee members asked that the moldings be placed in the location of the existing originals. The applicants agreed to attempt to do so.

The architect explained that they would prefer to use single large sheets of glass for the storefronts, but this may prove impossible. If they must subdivide the storefront windows, would the Committee prefer the glass divided into two pieces or three pieces to follow the division of the transoms? The Committee members thought it better to butt-glaze two smaller pieces and use an internal muntin, but only if it was impossible to obtain the larger glass.

Mr. Baron directed the discussion to the HVAC equipment on the main roof. There is currently a unit and dunnage in this location. The application proposes a unit that would be wider than the existing unit and closer to the edge of the building. Various air conditioning units will be consolidated at this location. The staff questioned whether it would be conspicuous from the street. The applicant explained that they worked with their HVAC engineer, but were unable to identify a smaller unit. He stated that they are reusing existing dunnage and that other possible locations would be more visible than this one. Mr. Powers provided photographic studies of the visibility of the air conditioning unit. The current unit is visible in one photograph taken from the north side of the Parkway, but is not conspicuous. Mr. Cluver stated that what was previously approved is very similar to what is now proposed. Mr. McCoubrey said that the larger unit seemed a worthwhile trade off for the elimination of the sixth floor HVAC unit.

Mr. Baron shifted the discussion to the north side wall, where some openings would be altered. He explained that the staff contends that the changes meet the Standards, particularly because of the proximity of the building to another to the north.

Ms. MacCrory officially withdrew the canopy from the application.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance reminded the Committee that the Alliance holds an easement on this property. In light of the withdrawal of the canopy from the application, he supported the staff's recommendation of approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including storefront and door details and a mockup of the rooftop HVAC equipment, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

200 MARKET STREET

Owner: Sandra Schwalb and Andrew M. Ullman, Trustees of the Joan S. Loyd and Bruce Loyd Trusts

Applicant: Raymond Brogden, architect

History: unknown

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

Project: Rehabilitate building and construct rooftop addition with deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate and add to this building for restaurant use. The Historical Commission has reviewed versions of this application several times and has approved it in concept twice and for final approval once. The latest revision of the plans proposes minor amendments to the overall scheme to add a second-floor addition and deck. The building would be clad in stucco at the first floor and metal panels at the second floor. The Commission reviewed a rendering of this plan at its July 2010 meeting and approved it in concept. The latest plan complies with the many suggestions proffered by the Committee and Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission's July 2010 approval in concept and Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Raymond Brogden represented the application.

Mr. Baron reminded the Committee that this is a non-contributing building. He stated that the architect has returned with a design that addresses many of the concerns voiced by the Committee at its last review of the project. The Commission approved in concept the rendering of this design at its last meeting, but thought that the Committee should review the design in greater detail. Some of the revisions requested by the Committee that have been implemented include the alignment of the deck railing with the second-floor windows, the addition of a cornice line at the top, the breaking up of the mass to differentiate the screen that hides the mechanical equipment from the building below, and the substitution of materials including stucco and metal panels. Mr. Brogden stated that he has deleted the proposed large air conditioner units and is now using an interior system.

Mr. Cluver stated that the design is much better composed. However, he noted a discrepancy between the drawings and the renderings relating to the size and color of the panels. Mr. Brogden stated that they proposing 30" x 60" panels, as shown on the drawings. Mr. Brogden stated that the panels would be a grey zinc color with an applied weather material to protect against rust. The light fixtures and awnings also differ between the renderings and the drawings.

Mr. Cluver stated that he preferred the rendering. He asked about the material of the doors and windows and suggested that they should be consistent throughout the project. Mr. Brogden stated that he will not use the goose neck light fixtures. Mr. Brogden said he would prefer to use all metal at the second story. The front entrance door will be wood. The Committee members discussed the clock. Some liked it; others did not. Mr. Brogden said he was unsure of the glass rail and may switch to mesh, which the Committee decided was acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's July 2010 approval in concept and Standard 9.

2140 GREEN STREET

Owner: Michael Young

Applicant: Frank Kakos

History: c. 1854 by Edward R. Parry, builder

Designation: individually designated, 11/2/1972

Contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the rear façade and restoration of a missing feature on the front façade. The rear of the property faces a service alley lined with garages and back yard walls. The proposed rear alterations include the demolition of the non-historic rear façade. Currently, the rear façade cantilevers out over the ground floor. The applicant proposes to demolish the cantilevered section and align the rear façade with the plane of the ground floor. The applicant proposes to construct a deck over an existing parking deck area. This alteration is consistent with neighboring properties. Nearly every property along this block has rear decks over parking garages. The applicant also proposes enlarging or creating window openings in the east elevation of the rear ell facing the side yard. These windows are not visible from the public right-of-way. The application includes a third-floor addition. This addition would be located over the rear ell and connect to the main block of the house. The addition would be slightly taller than the main block of the house. However, this height difference would not be discernable from Green Street. The addition would open onto a roof-top deck with glass railing and a small green roof. The public would not be able to see much, if any, of these alterations from the rear service alley.

The south side of this block of Green Street has front gardens enclosed by wrought iron fences. The gardens are found in front of a row that occupies most of the block. This particular property is part of that row. The applicant proposes to restore the missing front garden. The extant fences are not all identical, but they share some common elements, such as cast iron posts and either hair pin or pickets with finials. The applicant proposes to install a similar fence that would follow the pattern already established on the block. The dimensions of the garden would match those of the neighboring houses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Frank Kakos represented the application.

Mr. Cluver questioned the applicant's decision not to align the roof line of the addition with that of the front block of the house. Mr. Kakos responded that the home owner wishes to have a 10-foot ceiling in the bedroom, which accounted for the slightly higher roof line. Mr. Danta clarified that this height difference would not be visible from any public-right-of-way.

Mr. Cluver expressed his reservations regarding the new windows and new transoms along the east elevation, owing to their random locations and proportions. Mr. Kakos noted that all of these windows face a very small side yard, which is not visible from any street. He further noted that, owing to the increased height in the master bedroom, the windows needed to have transoms in order to keep them proportional to the space. He summarized that all the changes were connected to interior functions or special relationships and proportions. Mr. Danta stated that, in this case, the owner gains a significantly without taking anything away from the public,

given that the public will never see these windows. He also clarified that this elevation is stuccoed and already greatly altered. Ms. Pentz and Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. Danta that the side window alterations in the ell were acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

22 S. 3RD STREET

Owner: 22 S. 3rd Street Associates

Applicant: Nathan Flannigan

History: 1837, William Strickland, architect

Designation: individually designated 4/30/1957

Significant to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Illuminate façade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install light fixtures to illuminate the façade of this former bank building. The façade is clad in marble. However, the ceiling over the porch is plaster over lathe, not marble. The applicant proposes exterior light fixtures that would be attached to the roof, not the marble of the pediment. The gooseneck fixtures would extend out over the pediment and then downward. In addition, the applicant proposes fixtures for the ceiling over the porch. The conduit would be concealed above the ceiling and only the fixtures would extend out of the ceiling. An unsympathetic exposed electrical conduit that runs the entire width of the façade above the ground-floor would be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the goose neck fixture, pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the porch lights, provided they are recessed or flush fixtures, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Nathan Flannigan represented the application.

Mr. Flannigan clarified that he had included the gooseneck fixtures as a concept only and he was open to suggestions. He reiterated that the goal was to light the pediment and create a visual accent. The lighting was not intended to illuminate the steps or the rest of the façade. Ms. Gutterman stated that LED lights such as the ones used on the Avenue of the Arts lighting project may be preferable for this location. Mr. Cluver agreed and suggested that the applicant pursue this option. All Committee members rejected the gooseneck fixtures. Mr. Flannigan agreed.

The Committee discussed the staff's recommendation to use recessed or flush fixtures instead of pendants at the porch. Ms. Pentz asked if there was a brick vault above the plaster ceiling of the porch. Mr. Flannigan said that there was an attic space with wood trusses. He was not sure what else was present behind the wood trusses. Mr. Cluver stated that the recessed fixtures should only be used if the necessary space exists to accommodate the electrical boxes and conduits above the plaster ceiling. Mr. Danta described the porch area as a simple, austere space and stated that recessed ceiling fixtures would maintain the simplicity of the space. He also added that the public view would not change at all. Mr. Cluver agreed that recessed lighting would be more appropriate for the porch area.

Ms. Gutterman suggested a mock up to test the efficacy of LED lights on the pediment. She stated that the applicant should present the results to the Committee at a later meeting. She stated that the Committee should recommend approval of the porch ceiling lighting only. The pediment area illumination should be reconsidered. Mr. Flannigan agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of recessed light fixtures in the porch ceiling, but denial of the gooseneck fixtures at the pediment, pursuant to Standard 9.

122-24 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Leroy E. Keene Real Estate

Applicant: Richard Stokes

History: 1898, Cope & Stewardson, architects

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

Project: Exterior alterations.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes minor exterior alterations to the facades of two buildings at the corner of 18th and Sansom Streets. Although originally two separate buildings, they have since been internally connected. The prospective tenant would occupy the ground and second floors of both buildings.

The corner building was altered with a storefront in the 1910s or early 1920s. The storefronts have been altered several times in the recent past and only retain their historic transoms. The applicant proposes to install operable double-hung windows in place of the existing non-historic plate glass. The transoms would remain in place. A lantern-like internally-illuminated sign would be hung over the corner entrance. The design of the sign has not been finalized. The applicant also proposes to replicate the same storefront design on a non-historic storefront along the Sansom Street elevation of the same corner building. The second-floor windows would be replaced. The existing windows are not original.

The applicant also proposes some minor exterior alterations to the neighboring building to the north. The proposed changes are limited to the ground floor only. The existing highly-carved oak door is original. The applicant proposes to refinish it. The storefront currently has illegal windows, which are highly inappropriate. The applicant proposes to install sympathetic casements in the center with flanking fixed windows. A decorative railing would be installed in the center. The existing transom, which is original, would remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the second-floor windows in the front bay of the corner building replicate the original curved windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Stokes and attorney Ron Patterson represented the application.

Mr. Danta presented a photograph of the curved windows in second-floor in the front bay of the corner building to the Committee members. Mr. Stokes stated that the third-floor windows in the front bay are curved. He stated that he would not object to similar curved windows at second-floor, provided they are able to obtain such a window. Mr. Danta responded that the staff can provide him with the names of manufacturers of curved windows.

Mr. Stokes noted that he made minor revisions to the elevations after the drawings were submitted to the Commission for review. He distributed revised elevations to the Committee members. He noted that the intent was to mimic an English pub. He explained the revisions to the façade, which included the removal of painted signage on the lower half of windows at ground floor and the insertion of frosted decorative panels in the lower sashes for privacy. Along the Sansom street elevation, the new storefront would not replicate the leaded glass transoms found in the corner storefront. The upper transom would have a frosted panel instead. Ms. Gutterman inquired about the reasons for the frosted glass panels in all three storefronts. Mr. Stokes stated that it was mostly for privacy, given that the windows are so large. He noted that he had looked at other options, such as curtains, but none seem as permanent as the proposed frosted glass. Mr. Cluver opined that the frosted sash looked odd.

Mr. Cluver noted that a grill for mechanical equipment in the transom along Sansom Street was eliminated. Mr. Stokes clarified that it has been moved to a location above the service door on Sansom.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the railing in front of the French doors along 18th Street. Mr. Stokes clarified that a railing is required by code and that the 1960 photograph showed that the original storefront had been altered by that time. He opined that the original design may have had French doors, given that the transom is divided. He also stated that the owner would like to have fresh air come in and create a sense of openness in this area. Mr. Danta noted that the façade is very decorative and that the French doors work well with the building and would be appropriate. Ms. Pentz concurred with Mr. Danta.

Mr. Cluver stated that an illuminated sign would be acceptable in the proposed location. He remarked that the staff could review the final details and mountings for the sign. The other Committee members agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the second-floor windows in the front bay of the corner building replicate the original curved windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

304 NEW STREET

Applicant: Kenneth Johnson

Owner: Ron David Mahlah

History: c. 1820

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

Project: Demolish and install roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish an existing roof deck and install a copper roof and new roof deck. The existing deck has a tiled floor and metal picket rail that extends to the edge of the roofline. It was installed prior to designation as part of complete rehabilitation of the building that included significant alterations to the roof. The proposed deck would have a composite wood floor and the existing railing would be reinstalled in its original location.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the railing is recessed two feet from the façade, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Kenneth Johnson represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Johnson if he would agree with the staff recommendation to recess the railing two feet from the façade. Mr. Johnson confirmed that it would be possible to set the railing back from the front facade. Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Sell to explain the staff recommendation. Ms. Sell responded that highly visible roof decks on front facades have a negative impact on the streetscape. She stated that this application provides a good opportunity to minimize the visibility of a deck while retaining the deck itself. Mr. Cluver added that a deck over the cornice line is not appropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the railing is recessed two feet from the façade, pursuant to Standard 9.

1531 – 35 LOCUST STREET, E.W. CLARK & CO. BANK BUILDING

Applicant: Dominic Aspite

Owner: Sherbert Victor, VDM LLP

History: 1928; Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects

Designation: individually designated, 4/18/1990

Project: Install ADA ramp

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a concrete ADA ramp with metal handrail at the northern entrance on the 16th Street side of this building. The ramp would extend 19 feet along the façade.

The E.W. Clark & Co. Bank Building was designed by the noted architectural firm of Zantzinger, Borie & Medary and constructed in 1928. It is one of Philadelphia's few high style Art Deco buildings and is situated on a prominent corner; both the Locust Street and 16th Street elevations are main facades. The proposed removal of original fabric and alteration of spatial relationships on the facades of this building is inappropriate. There is currently a defunct and boarded ATM machine kiosk in the southernmost bay of the 16th Street elevation, where historic fabric was previously removed. The staff suggests exploring other options for ADA accessibility, perhaps utilizing the altered ATM opening.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Expediter Dominic Aspite, tenant representative John Reydler, and architect Mathew Piotrowski represented the application.

Mr. Piotrowski stated that he investigated the ATM opening and found that the floor levels on the interior are higher than those at the northern entrance. The northern entrance has a difference of 10 inches from sidewalk to first floor while the southern ATM entrance has a difference of 17 inches. The ramp would have to be longer in the southern entrance. He explained that there is no way to get people in the building and lift them up because the floor level is 10 inches above the sidewalk level and the base is poured concrete. To cut into the base would be a massive undertaking and might compromise the overall structure. He added

that there is a newspaper stand and fire hydrant that prohibit a ramp entrance into the ATM opening. Ms. Gutterman stated that 16th Street is a very busy street and a ramp would obstruct pedestrians.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the concrete base of the building is reinforced. Mr. Piotrowski stated that it is reinforced and it provides the base for a series of columns that support the mezzanine.

Mr. Cluver asked about the possibility of an interior ramp within the northern entrance. Mr. Piotrowski stated that there are steps from the landing and the boiler room is beneath them, precluding such a ramp.

Mr. Baron stated that he understands the disadvantages created by the greater sidewalk to floor distance at the southern or ATM entrance, but he contended that it would be an advantage to have the ADA access closer to the front door. Mr. Baron asked if there was a way to cut down the ATM entrance and install a lift. Mr. Aspite said that it would not be possible because lifts require a state variance. He explained that one would have to prove that no other ADA access is structurally feasible in order to obtain a variance for a lift. The applicants reiterated that they had studied the problem very carefully and determined that the proposed ramp is the best option.

Mr. Cluver recommended exploring options for interior ADA access before the Commission meeting to allow for a full discussion at the meeting. He stated that he understands that there are limitations below the floor, but he advised the applicants to take photographs to be able to explain what each option would entail, allowing the Commission to have a full discussion. He suggested that, if the exploration proves that an exterior ramp is the only possibility, then the architects should explore ways of minimizing the ramp. He stated that part of the problem with the ramp is the five-foot turn-around zone that must project into the sidewalk even though the ramp itself is only required to be three feet wide. He recalled that the five-foot turning radius is not required if the ramp and platform is T-shaped. Ms. Gutterman stated that the door could be modified to allow for other ramp options. Mr. Cluver suggested bringing the ramp close to the building to limit its visual impact and obstruction of the sidewalk.

Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Cluver summarized the Committee's position, stating that the applicants should demonstrate that interior options are infeasible and, if an exterior ramp is the only alternative, then propose options to minimize the impact of the ramp on the building and the public right-of-way.

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

1700 DIAMOND STREET

Owner & Applicant: Ursinio Nunez

History: c. 1886-87

Designation: Contributing to the Diamond Street Historic District, 1/29/1986

Project: Install internally illuminated signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install internally illuminated signage to read "Diamond Pizza & Mexican Grille." A channel letter system is proposed on the front façade and a box sign

is proposed on the side elevation. No information has been provided regarding attachment details, materials, or specifications of the lighting units.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Ursinio Nunez represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman noticed a patched area above the windows and suggested installing new signage to cover the space. Mr. Nunez stated that he is proposing a 6'x4' box with letters to be attached to the box.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Commission does not approve internally illuminated box signs. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if it was possible to illustrate "& Mexican Grille" with the open-faced channel letters, as shown in the "City View Pizza" example. The applicant stated that he could eliminate that phrase from the exterior signage and put it behind the window.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of open-faced channel lettering reading "Diamond Pizza" with a separate sign behind the window glass reading "& Mexican Grille," with the staff to review sign attachment details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 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 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.