

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

**TUESDAY, 22 AUGUST 2017
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos
Christian Jordan, PJA Architecture
Jessica Nonnenman, PJA Architecture
Bill O'Brien, Esq., MNYK Law
Jason Arasim, Core States Group
Clarence Pollard, RJP (TD Bank)
Sandra Rekstad
Jon Wilson
Craig Sokolow
Emily Ou
Jessica Clifford, JBCI
Colleen Boulden, JBCI
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Company
Maria Sourbeer, Shift Capital
Anthony Noga, Kitchen & Associates
Lorraine Wilson
Albert Raman
Jake Blumgart, PlanPhilly

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 414-22 S 16TH ST

Proposal: Install ground floor doors and windows, construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 414 S. 16th, LP

Applicant: Rachel Royer, 414 S. 16th, LP

History: 1926

Individual Designation: None

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of all aspects of the application except the reconfiguration of the storefront, which should retain its existing configuration and proportions, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert an existing garage building into a mixed-use building. In order to do so, the application proposes to install a new storefront system, retrofit or replace all existing windows, enlarge window openings on the side elevations, and construct rooftop stair towers, elevator overrun, and roof deck.

On the primary, 16th Street elevation, storefront alterations would include the installation of glazed garage doors in place of the existing metal slat garage doors. The application also proposes to alter the configuration of the existing storefront through the removal of one historic brick panel and relocation of another for the installation a pair of doors centered within the southern storefront system. The application also proposes to alter the divisions of the existing storefront windows. The staff notes that, although the existing system may be a replacement of what was there originally, the existing proportions are in keeping with comparable historic storefronts and should be replicated.

The application also proposes to regularize the window openings on the side elevations by reopening infilled window openings and enlarging smaller openings. It also proposes to lower the sills of several first floor windows, and to install two new egress doors and a single residential entrance door with a minimal canopy.

On the roof, the application proposes to construct a combination stair tower and elevator overrun near the northeast corner, and a smaller stair tower at the southwest corner. A deck would be located at the center of the roof, set in from all sides. No materials are specified for the rooftop additions, which would be visible from the public right-of-way, and the staff suggests that they be clad in an inconspicuous, matte finish material.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Sergio Coscia and property owner Leo Addimando represented the application.

Mr. Coscia noted that the application is fairly straightforward. He explained that the existing primary elevation features three garage openings, only one of which will be retained as a vehicular entrance. He noted that the application proposes to replace the garage doors at the center and right with garage doors that open to a commercial space to enliven the street. He explained that they are proposing to also reconfigure the two existing storefront systems to get a more functional storefront opening. This would involve relocating one of the brick panels and eliminating another. He noted that they are proposing to keep the existing windows but to replace the glass. Where the windows are missing, have been bricked over, or are being

enlarged, they propose to replace them in kind to match the other windows. He explained that the only other major changes are at the roof. He distributed revised drawings, noting that they met with the neighbors the previous week and, following that discussion, were able to slope the roofs of the fire stairs away from the street. He noted that the neighbors were concerned that the side streets are narrow and that the stair additions would add to shadows on the streets. He commented that they subsequently conducted shadow studies that show that the additions will have very little impact, owing to the narrowness of the streets.

Ms. Stein asked about the proposed cladding material for the penthouses. Mr. Coscia responded that they plan to use a neutral-colored stucco.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there is any way to shift the roof deck and penthouse west, away from 16th and Waverly Streets. Mr. Coscia responded that the placement of the penthouse is determined by the unit layouts and the distance between the fire stairs. He noted that there is also an existing ramp there, and that, because it is a steel and concrete building, the proposed location was the easier place to put the fire stair and elevator shaft. He responded that they have shifted it as far west as they could, and will cut back the roof to decrease its impact. He explained that the elevator override is necessary to provide ADA access to the roof deck.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the height of the proposed rooftop condensing units. Mr. Coscia responded that they are small, less than three feet in height. He stated that they will not be visible from the street.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there is a code requirement necessitating the change from a single to a double door in the storefront. Mr. Coscia responded that there is not a code requirement to do so. Mr. Addimando replied that the double doors create a more modern storefront. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that, if a door was added to the existing doorway, the applicants would not have to reconstruct one of the brick panels. Mr. Coscia agreed, noting that they would only have to remove one panel to do so. Mr. Addimando opined that there may have been a fourth panel in that opening originally. Mr. Cluver suggested that the proposed modifications are in the spirit of an historic storefront and that the loss of a brick panel does not have a strong impact on the building. He commented that he is less concerned with the modifications to the storefronts than to the additions on the roof.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to further explain the sloping of the penthouses. Mr. Coscia responded that the penthouses or pilothouses would maintain the minimum headroom within the stairs, which allows them to slope the structures following the stairs. He noted that this helps reduce the visual impact on the street. Ms. Gutterman expressed confusion over the configuration of the stairs. Mr. Coscia explained that the stairs along Addison Street are differently configured than those on Waverly Street, the first run of which is right along the street.

Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with the staff recommendation regarding the glazing of the storefront, suggesting that it should not have the proposed equal rectangular panels and vertical configuration. Mr. Cluver noted that the existing storefront does not appear original but does appear to be a traditional configuration. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff does not believe that the existing system is original, but that the proportions are in keeping with typical storefronts of that period; there were not usually as many divisions to a storefront window as is proposed. Mr. Cluver opined that, since the applicants are adding garage door openings, he is

in agreement with the more consistent rhythm that the proposed storefront system creates. Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed, noting that it is more in keeping with the wide upper window openings to have larger storefront panes. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that perhaps the transoms could be divided into four lites but the windows below could have a single mullion between two panes of glass so that it is more in keeping with an historic storefront. Mr. McCoubrey also suggested moving the proposed door location one panel to the left. He noted that the tripartite division of the existing storefront windows does not look particularly historic to him, but he does agree with the staff that the scale of the window panes should be larger.

Mr. Cluver returned the discussion to the rooftop additions. He noted that they are necessary in order to have a roof deck, and that, even without a roof deck, one stair and the elevator overrun will still be required for access. He noted that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission review numerous roof decks and rooftop additions, and that this is just as aggressive as others that the Committee sees and expresses concerns with. That being said, in this particular case, given the utilitarian nature of the building, he explained, the additions do not bother him. He emphasized that the reason for his acceptance of the rooftop additions in this situation was owing to the utilitarian nature of the building. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the applicants anticipated any other mechanical equipment in addition to the individual condensing units shown on the roof plan. Mr. Coscia responded that there would be mechanical units for the residential units, and then whatever units the commercial tenant needs, which should be similar in scale to that of the residential units as it is a small commercial space. He noted that there may be an agreement with neighbors to limit the uses of the commercial space to prevent any impact on the exterior of the building. Mr. Cluver asked if there were any plans for ventilation ducts out the side walls. Mr. Coscia responded that they would not do that. Mr. Addimando commented that that is not allowed anymore.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the exterior wall of the penthouse in relation to the exterior wall of the existing building. Mr. Coscia responded that the penthouse wall would be flush with the existing exterior wall because the stair itself is flush with the interior wall. Mr. McCoubrey replied that the drawings seem to indicate that the dimensions of the stair could be reduced to allow the exterior wall of the penthouse to be pulled in from the edge of the building. Mr. Coscia responded that the brick wall is only approximately eight inches thick, so there is not much depth to play with.

Mr. McCoubrey thanked the applicants for making the penthouse massing red on the renderings to help delineate it. Mr. Coscia replied that the penthouses would be clad in a neutral material. Mr. Cluver thanked the applicants for a very clear submission packet with side-by-side existing versus proposed conditions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design submitted at the Architectural Committee meeting, with the following suggestions:

- The existing doorway is retained and only widened by one door width
- That all mechanical equipment remains inconspicuous and pulled back from the edges of the building
- The number of mullions in the storefront windows is reduced
- The stair overbuilds are not in the same plane as the brick façade and are clad in a neutral color and material

ADDRESS: 4107 MAIN ST

Proposal: Replace existing window and door with plate glass window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John and Annette McGovern

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut a rectangular storefront window from an existing double-hung window and door. The staff notes that, although many ground-floor alterations have been made to properties along Main Street over the years, this property largely retains its historic residential character. For that reason, the staff suggests that an appropriate alteration to this façade would be a restoration to its historic configuration of one door with two double-hung windows, which would provide the additional desired light while eliminating the redundant doorway.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney William O'Brien and property owner John McGovern represented the application.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the first-floor façade now has two doors and a window. He noted that interior renovations were recently completed, eliminating the staircase to the second floor and the partition wall to that staircase and the first-floor space. The change in grade from Main Street to Station Street is such that the second-floor level is at Station Street level. The entrance to the apartment, which is on the second and third floors, is now provided from Station Street. Mr. O'Brien noted that the first floor of the building is in the floodplain, and the residential unit is now accessed from a non-floodplain entrance. He noted that Mr. McGovern also owns 4109 and 4111 Main Street, which have retail spaces with larger windows. He claimed that work to one of the buildings was approved by the Historical Commission and other work occurred prior to designation. He directed the Committee's attention to photographs in their packets and described the alterations to other first-floor levels on Main Street. He noted that he represented the owners of another Main Street property who were required to retain the front façade of the building but were allowed to install a picture window. He described work to 4131 Main Street, the facades of which were saved and incorporated into a new structure between them, the Nadeau furniture store; those facades were allowed to be modified. He opined that Main Street facades have been altered to accommodate retail use through the installation of large first-floor windows.

Mr. Cluver asked Ms. DiPasquale if this building has some fundamental difference from the other buildings on Main Street. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she does not know if the windows that Mr. O'Brien referenced in the packet have been reviewed and approved by the Commission. She noted that 4111 Main Street was altered recently, but the work was undertaken without the Historical Commission's review or approval. She explained that she did not review every Main Street property file as she prepared for this case.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed retail use, and whether it is for a certified public accountant. Mr. O'Brien responded that the accountant's office is on the second floor, and that

the first floor is currently vacant and being marketed as a retail space. He noted that it was formerly an adult bookstore, but the owners are not interested in continuing that use.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if there are other examples on the street in which the existing configuration has not been changed. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the second, center door is a modification from what would have been there originally, which would have been a second window. Mr. O'Brien asked if there are any buildings on the block that have the single entry and two double-hung windows. Ms. DiPasquale responded affirmatively. Mr. McGovern commented that he is not allowed to have a residential tenant on the first floor, which makes it difficult to rent the space. Mr. D'Alessandro asked again whether there are other buildings on Main Street that retain their original first-floor configuration. Ms. DiPasquale responded affirmatively. Mr. O'Brien disagreed, asserting that he has been on the street for over 35 years and is not familiar with any buildings that retain their single entrance door and two windows. Ms. Gutterman replied that that is a bad argument to make, because that means that this configuration is rare and worthy of preservation. Mr. O'Brien responded that the reason it is rare is because it does not make sense because the City has imposed zoning requirements on the properties.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the door is in the place of the original window. He noted that he can see that Main Street has evolved from a residential street to a commercial one, and that for commercial activity, a building does need a shop window. He suggested retaining the masonry opening from the edges of the existing window and the head and jamb edges of the center door. He opined that such a change would be reversible. Mr. Cluver mused that the question is whether one is preserving the remnant of the residential history here or acknowledging the evolution of the street and its use. From the perspective of a traditional use of these properties, without a historic district in place, if this was retail, it would be built with a storefront to reflect that it is retail. He expressed his personal concern that if the Commission is so adamant about retaining the existing window and not respecting the evolution of how this particular street changed and the history of that change, it is almost running counter to preservation concerns. He suggested that the new storefront window be well-designed, like that of 4131 Main Street, with more traditional storefront detailing. He agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that the window should be limited to the head height of the existing window and the width of the jamb of the window and door. He stated that an awning like that at 4111 Main Street should be avoided.

Ms. Stein questioned the accuracy of the drawings and the extent of the proposed changes. She noted that the way the main door is drawn does not depict the existing transom window. She asked whether the applicants planned to retain the transom. She also noted that the heights of all the windows and doors are shown as aligned in the existing conditions drawings, but in reality, they do not align. Mr. McGovern responded that the street is not level. Mr. Cluver responded that the street slope has nothing to do with the inaccurate drawings; the inconsistencies between the existing conditions drawings and the photographs of the building are clear. Mr. O'Brien acknowledged that the drawings are inaccurate and responded that he does not think there is any intention to change the door that would remain or the transom. He noted that Mr. McGovern does not object to installing a window that maintains the height of the existing windows to extend from jamb to jamb. Ms. Stein asked if the application is solely for the installation of the storefront window. Mr. O'Brien responded affirmatively and offered to provide corrected drawings.

Mr. Cluver questioned the material of the proposed storefront window, noting that it appears to be a low-grade system of vinyl or aluminum. He reiterated that the window should be a high-

quality storefront system with a more traditional appearance. He requested clarification of the proposed storefront system, and noted that he is not comfortable recommending approval of the proposed system.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the owner avoid changing the masonry opening. Ms. Gutterman asked if the application proposed to rebuild the entire first floor. Mr. O'Brien responded that it is his understanding that the height of the existing window would be retained. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that the drawing details do not seem to reflect the actual proposal.

Mr. Cluver reiterated that he is in favor of the installation of a traditional, high-quality storefront window conceptually, but that that is not reflected in the drawings presented.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant return to the Committee with any proposed signage for the accountant as well as the commercial tenant. Mr. O'Brien responded that the signage will be determined by the tenant, which they have not yet secured. Ms. DiPasquale noted that some signage can be approved at the staff level. Ms. Gutterman questioned the accountant's sign shown in the photographs. Mr. McGovern responded that it is a temporary sign, intended to help people disassociate the building with the former adult bookstore. Ms. DiPasquale noted that, if the proposed signage exceeds the staff authority to approve, the staff will forward the application on to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission.

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

Mr. McGovern asked if there was a way to approve the application with the existing drawings. Mr. Cluver responded that the current drawings have numerous problems, and they should be updated to reflect the existing conditions and a more appropriate storefront system. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the drawings also show the main door being replaced, although the applicants claim that the door will not be replaced. Mr. Cluver and Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated that the documents are inconsistent and not able to be approved as presented.

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

ADDRESS: 4328 MAIN ST

Proposal: Construct commercial building with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bazemore Property II, LLC

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: Imminently dangerous; Demolished 2016

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the roof deck as proposed, but approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story commercial building with roof deck on Main Street in the Manayunk Historic District. The historically designated building on this site was demolished in 2016, after it was declared imminently dangerous by the Department

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 AUGUST 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

of Licenses and Inspections. Main Street in Manayunk has a wide variety of architecture, and the staff suggests that the proposed building is compatible with the district in terms of massing, scale, and materials; however, the highly visible roof deck is not in keeping with the historic district and should be redesigned to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Additionally, the staff notes that the rear of this building will be a presence along the Manayunk Towpath, and therefore the first floor rear could be redesigned to look less like a service entrance.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Bill O'Brien and architects Christian Jordan and Jessica Nonnenman represented the application.

Ms. Chantry commented that the staff member who suggested a redesign of the first-floor rear recently learned that there are significant floodplain restrictions related to the design of the rear, which informed the current proposal. Mr. Jordan agreed.

Mr. Cluver observed that no plans were submitted with the application. Mr. O'Brien responded that plans are not yet complete. Mr. Cluver noted that a lack of plans makes for a difficult review. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that it could be acceptable in concept. Mr. Jordan provided several sets of floor plans and a site plan for review by the Committee. Mr. Cluver commented that plans are necessary to understand the roof deck. Mr. Jordan agreed, and directed Mr. Cluver to the second page of the plans. Mr. Cluver observed two sets of stairs. Ms. Guterman asked about the proposed use of the building. Mr. O'Brien responded that the entire building will be used as a restaurant. Mr. Cluver asked about the rooftop occupant count. Mr. Jordan responded that it is over 50. Mr. Cluver commented that the roof deck is very prominent and aggressive. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, and noted that it is almost like an additional floor. Ms. Stein commented that it is all stair and elevator, and suggested that the railing be pulled back from Main Street enough to get 49 occupants, and then a stair could be removed. Mr. Jordan responded that that is not entirely accurate because the entire building is an assembly use, and they are required by code to have two sets of stairs regardless of the count. He commented that the building essentially exists as vertical circulation, with two stair towers and an elevator that goes to the roof. He explained that he asked the Department of Licenses & Inspections to allow the elevator to be a second means of egress, but the inspector was adamant about having two staircases. He noted that the issue is assembly on the second floor. Mr. Cluver commented that the Committee typically looks for roof decks to be on a rear ell, or if none exists, then on the back half of a main block. Ms. Guterman commented that visibility from the towpath is also of concern. She commented that the neighboring one-story building is too short and therefore this proposed roof deck is highly visible. She suggested that the one-story building could be made taller, or the deck could be put on top of it to keep the deck low. Mr. O'Brien noted that both properties have the same property owner. Mr. Cluver suggested that the use of a parapet at the roof would help to screen the roof deck. Others noted that the deck in question would be located on a new building, not a historic building; the criteria employed when reviewing a deck on a new building in a historic district are very different from the criteria for a deck on a historic building.

Mr. Cluver asked about the windows on the property line. Mr. Jordan responded that it is the same property owner, and the windows will be fire-rated. Mr. Cluver asked about the muntin details. Mr. Jordan responded that the owner is proposing fully divided lites with muntins that would have a profile.

Mr. Cluver commented that this has the potential to be a very handsome building, and a nice fit for the district. He agreed with the use of cast stone and brick. He suggested that the cornice

over the storefront could stop short of the brick piers. He commented that the main cornice could be more robust.

Ms. Gutterman asked about mechanical equipment. Mr. Jordan responded that the idea is to put it above the bathrooms, with the goal of locating the equipment inside of the building. Ms. Gutterman noted that it would still need to vent to the exterior. Mr. Jordan responded that they are hoping to run it outside along the stair tower at the rear. Ms. Gutterman responded that it may not look pretty from the towpath.

Mr. Cluver explained that floor plans, sections, information about window details, and information about the location of mechanical equipment are necessary for the Commission meeting. Mr. McCoubrey asked for a section that goes through Main Street down and across the towpath.

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

Ms. Gutterman proposed recommending denial, owing to incompleteness of the application. Mr. McCoubrey asked if she agreed with the staff recommendation of denial of the roof deck. Ms. Gutterman responded that she is opposed to the application in part because she does not know where the mechanical units would be located. She elaborated that the detail of the cornice is a problem; there are no details of the windows; and plans were not submitted with the application. She opined that this makes for an incomplete application that requires adjustment prior to review by the Commission. Mr. Cluver agreed.

Ms. Chantry asked if the Committee would like to consider this an in-concept review rather than a final review, as the Committee's comments reflect an overall acceptance of massing, scale, and materials. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that it should be denied. Ms. Gutterman opined that the idea of the building is great, but that she does not have enough information to judge its appearance. Mr. O'Brien asked Mr. Jordan if he could satisfy the Committee's expectations for completeness by the deadline for revised application materials. Ms. Gutterman commented that the project can still go on to the Commission for review. Mr. Cluver noted that Mr. McCoubrey would attend the Commission meeting and would be able to speak to any amended aspects of the application.

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

ADDRESS: 201 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Install mural at storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Claridge-Matthew Fox-Kaiserman Properties

Applicant: Dan McCall, TD Bank

History: 1955; Rittenhouse Claridge; Samuel O'Shiver, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9, Section 6.8.a.3 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, and the Historical Commission's 1999 decision.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a mosaic mural to both faces of the northwest corner pier of the building. Although the mural would be applied to non-original black granite cladding, that very cladding was never approved and is in violation of a storefront approval granted in 1999. At that time, the Commission approved the black granite appliqué sign band that would run continuously across the piers, preserving the exposed yellow brick pier to continue to read as the architectural and visual support for the building. The staff suggests that the historic yellow brick fabric should be re-exposed and the mural should not be placed on historic fabric pursuant to Section 6.8.a.3 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, as well as being consistent with the Commission's September 1999 approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jason Arasim and Clarence Pollard of TD Bank represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed a rendering of the application approved in 1999. Mr. Arasim said that he had not known about the issue with the black granite being applied despite the Commission's previous denial. Mr. Arasim asked if all the other parts of the application are acceptable. Mr. Baron stated that the staff deemed the other aspects of the application acceptable, but had not yet approved them at the staff level. Mr. Arasim said that he hoped they could withdraw the mural proposal and get the other parts approved. He said that they might modify the mural to be presented at a later date. Ms. Gutterman responded that she does not think that a mural is appropriate in this location. She asked if the large number of proposed signs is really needed. She said that, in her opinion, the proposal calls for too much signage. In particular, she opined that the projecting banners were inappropriate. Mr. Arasim said that the amount of signage has been decreased in terms of area in square feet from what had been on the previous storefront. Mr. Pollard said that they are simplifying the design and removing the word bank as well as the signs on the lower pier.

Ms. Stein addressed the granite storefront. She noted that they are proposing to modify part of the granite area with a metal frame and changing the finish of the granite. She noted, however, that the proposal would leave two other bays unchanged, creating a distinction and severing the granite area in two. She asked how they propose to modify the black granite in place. Mr. Arasim said it would be sandblasted. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the metal frame band and light also further divides the storefront. Mr. Arasim said that they were taking their cues from the tiled entrance on 18th Street. Mr. Baron suggested removing the black granite from the portion that will no longer be leased by the bank as well as the corner pier. This would allow more of the yellow brick to be exposed and connect the whole building to the ground. Mr. D'Alessandro

agreed with that idea. The Committee members asked about the condition of the material behind the black granite. Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the building before the black granite was applied over the yellow brick. He reported that this type of yellow brick is available and has been used to rebuild piers for another storefront at the building.

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

Mr. Cluver stated that one of the problems with the building is the great variety in the treatments of the base of the building. He suggested that the storefronts should be simplified and unified. He said that the storefronts can be individualized, but that that should be accomplished within a unified framework. He recommended against the mosaic, the band, and the modification of the stone finish. He recommended allowing signs in the storefront and the TD sign near the entrance and removing the black granite from the corner pier. This would restore the dignity and simplicity to the building.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested denial of the application, pursuant to the staff recommendation. Mr. Arasim asked if the mural would be acceptable any place on the building. The Committee members responded that it would not. Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro's suggestion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9, Section 6.8.a.3 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations and the Historical Commission's 1999 decision.

ADDRESS: 236 S 21ST ST

Proposal: Legalize rooftop mechanical room and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Craig Sokolow

Applicant: 236 S 21st St Condominium

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the construction of rooftop additions. These additions house an array of solar collectors, mechanical functions and a stair. A portion of the addition features wide overhanging eaves and vinyl siding has visibility from 21st and Locust streets. The drawing, created for zoning does not accurately portray the shapes or materials of the additions. The additions could be lowered and modified to make them less visible from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Craig Sokolow represented the application.

Mr. Sokolow explained that he owns 60% of the property and is the head of the condominium association. Mr. Baron presented a photograph showing the visibility of the building from 21st

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 AUGUST 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

and Locust Street. Mr. Sokolow said that he has included photographs to show that his rooftop additions have minimal visibility from the public right-of-way. Ms. Stein asked how it was that he built the additions without review. Mr. Sokolow said that he got approvals for the rooftop equipment. Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the mechanical equipment and whether the housing could be lowered. Mr. Sokolow said that it is not possible to lower the housing because of the height of the equipment. Mr. Baron clarified that no building permit has been issued for the rooftop work. A zoning permit has been issued. He stated that one of the photographs shows an L-shaped plan for the rooftop additions. He observed that, according to the photograph, it looks like the mechanical equipment is lower than the penthouse, which encloses it. Mr. Sokolow responded that the additions cannot be seen from the street. Mr. Cluver asked again about the height of the penthouse. Mr. Sokolow said it is about eight feet in height. Mr. Cluver said that, when measured on the drawing, it scales out as 10 feet. Mr. D'Alessandro said that accurate architectural drawings are needed. Mr. Baron asked Mr. Sokolow to point out on the photograph the penthouse that houses the mechanical equipment. Mr. Sokolow said that one of the photographs he provided shows the neighbor's rooftop mechanical room. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to clarify the elements in the photographs as they relate to the zoning plan. Mr. D'Alessandro said that there is a need for a section drawing to understand the height of the equipment versus the structures housing the equipment. Mr. Cluver pointed out that the stair house roof could be lowered to make it less visible. Mr. Sokolow said he could modify that roof to make it less visible. Ms. Gutterman said that Mr. Baron should undertake a site visit to look at a mock-up to determine the point to which the penthouse needs to be lowered in order to make it inconspicuous. Mr. Baron responded that he thinks that it would need to be lowered by approximately three clapboard widths in height to make it inconspicuous.

Mr. Cluver recommended denial to the proposal as built. He said that, if the addition could be reduced in height equal to the width of three clapboards and the roof overhang, it would then be acceptable. Mr. D'Alessandro requested additional plans. Mr. Baron stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections would require an architectural drawing to clarify what was being approved and permitted. Mr. Sokolow said that the Department is willing to issue a building permit from the zoning drawing. Mr. Cluver recommended a mock-up in the field to identify the requisite reduction in height. Ms. Stein noted that the zoning drawing does not indicate heights. Mr. Sokolow said it would cost him \$1,500 to obtain such a drawing. He said he only wants to do a mock-up. Mr. McCoubrey said that the zoning drawing could at least be annotated to show heights and modified heights. Mr. Baron stated he did not understand the hatched area of the drawing that looks like a fence. Mr. Sokolow said that the hatching is the housing for the ductwork. It is covered with a blue tarp in the photograph.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor for public comment. Sandra Rekstad suggested a mock-up. Several Committee members suggested marking up the zoning drawing with heights once there is agreement on the heights of the various elements.

Ms. Gutterman voiced her preference for a recommendation of denial, but with the suggestion of reducing the height of the penthouse.

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

ADDRESS: 2122 WALLACE ST

Proposal: Construct addition, and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Wallace Street Land Trust

Applicant: Kelly Ennis, Kelly Ennis Design

History: 1855

Individual Designation: 2/7/1974

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the deck and hatch; denial of the cantilevered portion of the addition, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Architectural Committee's comments at the July 2017 meeting.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a cantilevered rear addition and deck, both of which would not be visible from the public right-of-way. A similar application for this address was reviewed by the Architecture Committee in July 2017, but was withdrawn before a recommendation was offered. The application has been amended since July 2017; the pilot house has been replaced with a hatch, which would not be visible from Wallace Street.

The addition will cantilever out over the side yard into an open area that existed historically to provide light and air to this pair of houses. The applicant has chamfered the corners of the addition but has otherwise returned with the same design as presented in July 2017. At that time, the Architecture Committee expressed concern with the cantilevered addition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Emily Ou, the homeowner, represented the application.

Mr. Baron clarified that the Historical Commission has jurisdiction over the entire exterior envelope of the building as well as its site and any site appurtenances. Some have claimed that it does not enjoy jurisdiction over this real ell, but that claim is incorrect. He noted that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission may choose to exert a reduced level of review for areas that are not visible to the public, but they do have full jurisdiction over the entire building, whether visible from the public right-of-way or not. Mr. Baron noted that the drawings have been modified from those review last month with chamfered corners on the cantilever to create the sense of a bay. He noted, however, that the bay is too wide to be considered a traditional bay. Ms. Gutterman asked if the stair goes to the hatch. Mr. Cluver said that the hatch eliminates the visible stair house. He said that he does not object to the cantilever, given its lack of public visibility, but suggests that the corner at the rear return to align with corner of second floor. Ms. Gutterman asked how much of the rear wall of the main block will be demolished. She said that it seems only about four feet of the wall will remain. A structural member will need to be added. The window on that wall is being moved three feet. Ms. Stein said that she deems the cantilever inappropriate. It creates an undue structural burden on the eight-inch wall, will cut off light and air, and will remove an historic feature of the side yard. Ms. Ou said that they shrank the amount of cantilever and the neighbors have an open deck adjacent to the cantilever. Ms. Stein pointed out that the building is individually designated, meaning that it is more significant than a contributing building in a district.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor for public comment.

Albert Raman of 2120 Wallace Street said that his light and air would be compromised by this proposal. He is also concerned about the alteration destroying the building's historic character. He posited that the addition may be seen from Wallace Street in the future. He stated that he is concerned with the foundation and the shoring that may be needed.

Lorraine Wilson of 2124 Wallace Street stated that her home shares a party wall with this building. She stated that she is concerned that the cantilever will damage their shared structure. She said the building already required foundation work, which is why the former owner allowed the bank to take the building. She stated that she does not think that the party wall is sound.

Sandra Rekstad of 2118 Wallace Street said that, if the addition and deck are built, it will interfere with the neighbor's airflow and views. She said that she is currently able to see fireworks displays and sunsets. If this addition is built, those views will be obstructed. Ms. Stein said that those are zoning concerns outside the purview of the Historical Commission.

Ms. Ou distributed an alternate design, what she called Plan B. This design proposed a smaller bay window toward the south end of the ell. Mr. Cluver suggested that, even with this smaller bay, the rear corner should align with the second floor. Ms. Stein said that she did not think that Ms. Ou could obtain a permit for the windows shown in the bay because of proximity to property line. Mr. Cluver said that Plan B is a better design even though the view from the south is the same. Mr. McCoubrey said that the design will need be modified to narrow the rear sliding window if the rear corner returns. Ms. Stein said that she fears that the bay would be an eyesore if it cannot have windows. Mr. Cluver said that the Commission may approve the design with windows, but the building code may not allow the windows.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested adopting the staff recommendation of denial for both the original design and Plan B, but recommending approval of the deck. Ms. Gutterman agreed, but added that any mechanical equipment should be placed on the rear of the building behind deck on the rear ell.

Ms. Ou said that she has proposed locating the master bedroom at the back of the house because of the smell and noise from the restaurant across the street. She said that it is very hard to build that master bedroom at the rear without the added width to the rear ell.

Ms. Gutterman said that the Committee does not object to a third-floor addition without a cantilever. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant present the Plan B design with windows to the Commission and explain her problem with the restaurant during the discussion. Mr. D'Alessandro said that he still thought that the cantilever would set a bad precedent. Ms. Stein said to be sure to check with the Department of Licenses & Inspections about windows for any proposed bay.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of both bay window additions, but approval of the proposed deck and hatch.

ADDRESS: 3701-03 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct stair tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: North Philly Works

Applicant: Maria Sourbeer, Shift Capital

History: 1927; National Bank of North Philadelphia, Beury Building; William Harold Lee, architect

Individual Designation: 11/27/1985

District Designation: None

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate this building that has been vacant and neglected for many years and to construct a new stair tower addition on the north side. The proposal includes new aluminum windows to match the original wood windows and the restoration of the masonry and terra cotta elements. The window replacement will require the review of the details. The penthouse and roof will be re-clad in a metal to match the approximate the appearance of the original copper. The proposed stair tower will be visible from the north, but is placed in the least conspicuous location. The alternative materials for the roof and cladding of the penthouse should replicate the appearance of the copper color and shapes. The main doors are shown as aluminum and glass units that do not match the paneled doors shown in historic photographs. They should be revised to more accurately reflect the historic condition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Maria Sourbeer of Shift Capital, Anthony Noga of Kitchen & Associates, Jessica Clifford of JBCI Engineering, and Kevin McMahon of Powers & Company represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff approves of the substitution of terra cotta with cast stone. Mr. Baron responded that the Standards would recommend the use of real terra cotta. However, in this case, the terra cotta has already been removed; there would be no loss of historic material. Also, the replacement material would allow for a significant savings for a financially challenged project. Mr. Cluver asked if the staff had reviewed samples of the cast stone. Mr. Baron responded that none have been provided. Mr. Cluver said that the decision to use or not use cast stone needs to be based on how well the mock-up samples match the existing terra cotta.

Mr. Cluver asked if the proposed one-over-one windows are appropriate. Mr. Baron said that most of the original windows as shown in the historic photograph were one-over-one. However, the three-over-three windows on the rear façade will be replaced with three-over-three to match.

Mr. Cluver said that the big questions are the doorway and the stairtower. Mr. Noga distributed copies of an enlarged version of the historic photograph. Ms. Sourbeer posited that the doors in the photograph are temporary construction doors and not the final doors. It was noted, however, that the sidelights in the photograph do appear to be the historic design. They appear to be a glass light above a panel with decorative bars. Mr. Noga said they are open to revising this segment of the application. Mr. Baron pointed out that the doors as shown on Page HCW1 are new doors based on the anodized aluminum doors from the late twentieth century. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the transom area and whether the historic transom might survive beneath the white cladding. Ms. Sourbeer said that the arched window is in place. Mr.

McCoubrey suggested that the transom bar might have matched the spandrels on the side windows. Ms. Sourbeer suggested that there might not have been a transom bar because it was one two-story space. Ms. Stein suggested that there was almost certainly a transom bar and said that we need to be respectful of the historic character of the entrance because it is so prominent. Any new door should accommodate remnant historic fabric and be appropriate to the building. Mr. Noga said that he will survey the doorway carefully.

Mr. Cluver questioned the design of the rooftop mechanical equipment. He suggested that the stair pressurization fan should be positioned in a less visible location. Mr. Noga said that the equipment may extend above parapet. Mr. Cluver asked if there is an alternative to placing the stair pressurization fan at the highest point. Mr. Noga said that he would investigate relocating the fan into the main room. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Baron to review this detail. Mr. Noga said that they can model the fan visibility by computer.

Mr. Cluver asked about the material of stair addition. Mr. Noga said that they are proposing ground face CMU. He showed a photograph of the proposed material. Mr. Cluver asked whether the decision to use that material was based on aesthetics or cost. Ms. Sourbeer said that the use of block was based on cost but the ground face finish is for aesthetics. Mr. Cluver said that CMU is a base material. He said it would be more appropriate in a simple brick to match the building.

Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the structural report was very helpful. Mr. Baron asked if the vents in the stair tower could be vertically proportioned. Mr. Noga replied that they could.

Mr. McCoubrey summarized the comments, saying that the entrance and mechanical equipment placement should be revised and the cast stone should match the appearance of the terra cotta.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants are aware of the maintenance issues associated with the aluminum cladding and its reliance on sealant. She said that the expected life span for the aluminum sealant is 10 years versus 20 or more years for copper. Ms. Sourbeer responded that the copper would be twice as expensive. Ms. Clifford noted that they considered fiberglass, but it was as expensive as the copper. Ms. Stein observed that it may be more expensive, but should be considered because it is such a small part of the total cost of the project and surface area. Mr. McMahon pointed out that the cladding will be fourteen floors above the street and therefore less visible to the public. Mr. Cluver pointed out that the drawings stipulate aluminum-clad windows. He noted that the Commission often approves clad windows for the fourth floor and above. Mr. Baron said that the large decorative windows on the lower floors will remain and be restored. The clad windows on the front and side facades will be located at the upper floors. Mr. Cluver said that the exterior wood details such as the window trim should be of a durable exterior wood such as mahogany rather than pine.

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

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10. She proposed that the staff review mock-up samples of the aluminum cladding and cast stone, as well as the revised details for the entryway, transom, and sidelights. She suggested revising the rooftop equipment so that it would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The louver on the stair tower should be

revised to have vertical proportioning and the stair tower should be clad in brick or brick panels to match the building. She recommended denial of entrance as proposed. Mr. Cluver agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the entrance as proposed, but approval of the remainder of the project, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10, with the following conditions:

- The staff reviews mock-up samples of the aluminum cladding and cast stone as well as the revised details for the entryway, transom, and sidelights for approval.
- The rooftop equipment is revised to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The louver on the stair tower is revised to have vertical proportioning.
- The stair tower should be clad in brick or brick panels to match the building.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:10 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 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 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

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

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.

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

6.15.a.2-3: Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.

6.15.a.3: Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.

14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.