

**THE MINUTES OF THE 599TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 JULY 2012
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Anuj Gupta
Dominique Hawkins
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
John Mattioni, Esq.
Dan Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Betty Turner

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

James Timberlake, KieranTimberlake
Richard Maimon, KieranTimberlake
George Ristow, KieranTimberlake
Shelley Saunders, Rodeph Shalom
Thomas Perloff, Rodeph Shalom
Roy Feinberg, Rodeph Shalom
Martin Rosenblum, architect
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Benjamin Leech, Preservation Alliance
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Bernice T. Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association
Brian Emmons, Toll Brothers
Shawn Frawley, Toll Brothers
Kiki Bolender
Gerry Maguire
Jonathan Merz
Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects
John Hayes, Blackney Hayes Architects
Martin McNamara
Stephen Mileto, QB3 Design

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Gupta, Hawkins, Leonard, Merriman, Mattioni, Quinn, Schaaf, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 598TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 598th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 June 2012. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JUNE 2012

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included 2020 Rittenhouse Square and 339 S 21st Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 2020 Rittenhouse Square and 339 S 21st Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 609-17 N BROAD ST

Project: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Congregation Rodeph Shalom

Applicant: Thomas Perloff, Congregation Rodeph Shalom

History: 1928; Rodeph Shalom Synagogue; Simon & Simon, architects; altered, 1957, 1966

Individual Designation: 11/1/1973

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes an addition and renovation project at Rodeph Shalom Synagogue at 609-17 N. Broad Street. The synagogue was designed by architects Simon & Simon and constructed in the late 1920s. It replaced an earlier synagogue by Frank Furness. The synagogue building is comprised of two sections, the ornate, limestone-clad, Byzantine-style section to the west, which faces Broad Street and houses the sanctuary and other public spaces, and the utilitarian, brick section at the rear, which houses school and other facilities.

The application proposes the construction of a 28,000 square foot addition to the south side of the existing building to house a new entry lobby and gallery, an early learning center, administrative and rabbinical offices, and a medium-sized worship and multipurpose space for 250 people. The addition and renovations would not only provide needed space, but would also improve life safety, accessibility, thermal efficiency, and way finding in the existing building. The

addition itself would be constructed on the parking lot at 601-07 N. Broad Street, which is not designated as historic, but the project would fall under the Commission's jurisdiction because the addition would attach to and require alterations to the historic building.

The proposed addition is designed to maintain views of and light to the important stained glass windows on the south side of the building. The addition would gently attach to the south façade of the front, limestone-clad section of the historic building below the sills of the stained glass windows. The front section of the addition would be one story in height. The addition would rise gently up to the south to create the new worship space, while maintaining views of the side of the historic building. A non-historic fire escape would be removed from the south façade of the historic building. A new door opening would be cut in the south façade near the front façade to provide ADA access to the lobby of the historic building. The front section of the addition would be glazed and clad with limestone.

At the rear, utilitarian section of the historic building, a stair tower would be removed and a new four-story elevator and stair tower would be constructed, providing ADA access to the upper floors. The rear section of the addition would be two stories in height and would include new pre-school and office spaces. The rear section of the addition would be faced with stucco.

The addition would be arcaded at the south, with bronze and mosaic-clad columns, and would open onto a landscaped entrance and drop-off area along Green Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Thomas Perloff, Roy Feinberg, and Shelley Saunders of Rodeph Shalom Synagogue and architects James Timberlake, Richard Maimon, and George Ristow represented the application.

Mr. Maimon provided a brief summary of the history of the congregation and site. The congregation was founded in 1795. The congregation moved to its current site in 1871, where it had erected a Moorish style synagogue designed by prominent architect Frank Furness. The congregation outgrew the Furness building and in 1928 erected the current synagogue, designed by Simon & Simon in the Byzantine style. At the time, a large Presbyterian church stood to the south of the synagogue, where the addition is now proposed. He displayed photographs of the buildings and maps of the location. During the twentieth century, this section of North Broad Street changed considerably, transitioning from a residential and institutional area to a zone dominated by the automobile industry. Rowhouses once stood to the east of the synagogue. After the Presbyterian church was demolished, a car dealership stood on the site. Currently, the remainder block around the synagogue is used as parking lots. Mr. Maimon explained that the west and north facades were the primary, street facades. The south façade was not highly visible until the church was demolished.

Mr. Maimon explained that the congregation is currently growing. It is becoming a regional, rather than local, congregation. The project is designed to accommodate its expanding congregation and needs. The project will address the needs of the very young with the early learning center and the elderly with expanded accessibility. He explained that the synagogue has two distinct segments, a worship space at the front and a school space at the rear. The project is also intended to transform the historic building through enhanced connectivity. Currently, the grand worship space at the front of the building and the rear school space are not well connected. The addition will accommodate the activities that take place in the building, which have changed considerably since the current building was erected in 1928.

Mr. Timberlake explained that they began this project more than three years ago with a feasibility study. A variety of schemes were studied. He stated that the interior of the existing building is very complex and the east and west sections as well as the various levels are not well connected. He also noted the various grades or levels of the spaces on the first floor. This project will enhance connectivity and accessibility throughout the building. The stair and elevator tower along with the hallway in the addition will provide the needed circulation paths. He pointed out the places where the existing building will be modified. The changes to the existing building are largely restricted to the east or more utilitarian half. He pointed out the distinction between the western, limestone façade section of the building and the brick-faced, utilitarian section.

Mr. Timberlake turned to the plans for the addition. He pointed out the drop zone to the south of the addition. An accessible entrance is critical. He pointed out the new rationalized circulation paths through the enhanced building. He pointed out the landscaped zone to the south, the memorial garden and playground, and the parking, which is necessary for the regional congregation. The first floor of the addition includes the entrance, a chapel, and circulation space. The second floor includes a rabbinical suite, classrooms, and a pre-school. The rear section of the building has five levels. The addition will also make the lower floor accessible. He displayed numerous plans, elevations, and renderings.

Mr. Timberlake stated that the addition was designed as a long, low mass to allow light to the stained glass windows and views of the south façade of the historic building. He stated that the overall form of the addition was primarily dictated by the desire to leave the south façade unobstructed and to provide the needed accessibility and circulation. He reviewed various renderings and explained how the design decisions were made. He stated that they worked to reduce the impacts to the historic building. He spoke about the congregation's desire for abundant natural light. He displayed drawings that showed the evolution of the design. The addition would be clad with limestone at the east and plaster at the west. The arcade along the south side would have decorative bronze and mosaic tile columns. The chapel has a slight "swag" to the ceiling, which connects to the tent, a form that has deep religious meaning to the congregation. The glassiness and openness of the chapel is intended to contrast with the inwardness and solidity of the Byzantine sanctuary.

Ms. Merriman asked the architects to elaborate on their decision to clad much of the Broad Street façade with limestone. She stated that the addition is "lovely." Mr. Timberlake stated that the limestone wall at the front of the addition connects with the historic building in materials and mass. It also provides screening for the interior activities from the noise of Broad Street. He also explained that a side street intersects Broad Street directly across from the site of the addition. At night, automobile headlights will shine directly onto the addition. If the facade were all glass, the light would be distracting to the occupants of the addition. Mr. Timberlake stated that they chose a limestone material for this section of the addition to match the exterior of the historic building because the prominent location warranted the expensive material.

Mr. Sherman asked if the ceremonial front entrance would still be used after the addition is constructed. Mr. Maimon explained that the main front entrance is currently only used during ceremonies and would continue to be used in that manner. The north entrance is now used as the main entrance. Mr. Timberlake noted that the hinges of one set of the monumental bronze doors would be altered to allow the doors to swing outward. He stated that they are interested in activating this section of N. Broad Street.

Mr. Schaaf stated that he found this to be "an extremely attractive and appropriate design that solves lots of problems." He noted, however, that he is concerned about the parking lot. He

contended that the parking lot should comply with the City's standards for surface parking lots. He suggested walls and gates that would be as attractive as the addition. Mr. Maimon noted that the project team includes a landscape, who is addressing these issues. He stated that fund raising may limit how much they can do with the parking lot in the near future, but he assured Mr. Schaaf that the congregation is committed to improving the parking area.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance thanked the congregation for preserving its historic building. He noted that the Alliance gave an award to the congregation for its restoration of the interior of the synagogue. Mr. Gallery stated that he has significant concerns about the character of the proposed addition. He observed that the Commission's Rules & Regulations requires the Commission to be guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He stated that he had distributed National Park Service Preservation Brief 14 on additions to the Architectural Committee and asked if it had been provided to the Commissioners. He noted that he had distributed a two-page memorandum to the Commissioners with his evaluation of this addition based on the Standards. He stated that he is concerned with the ways in which the addition "juxtaposes" with the historic building at the front, but not with the simpler education building at the rear. He presented his "general principles" for additions to the Commission. The addition should be subordinate to the historic building; it should not compete with it. It should be harmonious, not stand out from the historic building. He contended that the design does not comply with the Standards. He claimed that the addition "visually competes very dramatically with the building." The addition "is in direct contrast with the existing building." He asserted that compliant designs should achieve a balance between compatibility and differentiation. He stated that this design "is in extreme contrast." He stated that an addition "should not be glaringly different in design, material, or other visual qualities." He stated that this design is "glaringly different and does not comply with the Standards." He claimed that the addition would be "in stark contrast" to the historic building. He contended that the design of the addition was not drawn from aspects of the historic building. He asserted that the historic building had no large windows or blank limestone walls like those proposed for the addition.

Mr. Gallery turned to the second page of his memorandum, which provides specific suggestions. He suggested "a small hyphen" to separate the addition from the historic building. He noted that this design includes such a "hyphen," but it is too tall. He suggested similar materials and noted that, although the limestone is similar, the glass is not. He asserted that the size and rhythm of the windows in the addition should be based on the windows in the historic building, but is not. He asserted that the proposed building does not "respect" the building "type" of the historic building. He stated that the historic building is a religious building and, therefore, the addition should also look like a religious building. He asserted that the addition does not look like a religious building to him. He admonished the applicants for proposing an addition that looks like "the automobile showrooms that were along Broad Street," not a religious building. He told the representatives of the synagogue and their architects that they should, but did not, propose an "intimate, spiritual, and dignified chapel." He concluded that the proposed addition to the synagogue was not religious enough, in his estimation. He recommended that the Commission direct the representatives of the synagogue to redesign the addition to be sufficiently religious. Mr. Gallery stated that the addition should be pushed back further onto the site, away from Broad Street. He suggested that, with the addition shifted to the east, the congregation could construct "a beautiful meditation garden along Broad Street that could incorporate contemporary art." He stated that this garden "would solve a huge number of problems."

Mr. Gallery reminded the Commission that it is required to be guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He challenged the Commission to explain how the proposed addition

complies with the Standards. He asserted that the addition should be redesigned as he had suggested. He contended that his scheme would result in “a very positive addition to the historic building.” He stated that he was reluctant to recommend that the Commission deny the application outright, but he remarked that an approval in concept with recommendations for revisions would not send a strong enough message that the proposed addition was entirely inappropriate. He therefore recommended that the Commission table the application and direct the applicants to redesign the addition to be sufficiently religious and comply with his interpretation of the Standards.

Ms. Merriman disagreed with Mr. Gallery and stated that, in her estimation, the proposed addition is sufficiently deferential to the historic building. She stated that the addition appropriately defers to the historic building by remaining low and exposing as much of the south façade as possible, especially the important windows. Ms. Leonard stated that she agreed with one point made by Mr. Gallery, that the large glass panels on the addition are very different from the windows of the historic building.

Mr. Perloff introduced himself, stating that he is a lifelong member of Rodeph Shalom and is currently Director of Development and Finance for the congregation. He stated that he has worked very closely with the architects on this project. He thanked Mr. Gallery for his kind comments about the congregation’s commitment to preservation, but disagreed with his assertions about the design of the addition. He stated that he loves the Broad Street façade of the historic building, but it is rather foreboding. He explained that the addition was designed to reflect the current orientation of the congregation, which is reaching out to the community. He stated that the addition is intended to appear open and welcoming, which is a reflection of the congregation’s attitude toward the surrounding community and an expression of its religious beliefs. He stated that the differences between the designs of the historic building and the addition reflect changes in the practice of their religion between 1928 and today. He added that light and green space are also important to the congregation. He noted that they will remove chain-link fences and open up their property, adding green space. He stated that the architects had masterfully solved the accessibility and security problems faced by the historic building. He concluded that the architect executed the design for the proposed addition in precise accordance with the practical and spiritual needs of the congregation.

Mr. Timberlake objected to Mr. Gallery’s claim that the addition is not sufficiently deferential to the historic building. He noted that Mr. Gallery based his comments on one particular rendering that was intended to highlight the addition. He explained that the trees that would run along the south side of the addition had been eliminated from the rendering to allow clear views of the southwest corner of the addition. He also noted that the rendering shows the building at dusk with lights on behind the windows, which unduly emphasizes the glass. He stated that the addition would not appear as it does in the rendering. In actuality, several factors will mitigate, softening the views.

Answering Mr. Gallery’s earlier question, Mr. Farnham stated that Mr. Gallery’s letter and other documents including the Preservation Brief mentioned were provided to the Commission members at the same time they received the application materials. Mr. Farnham reported that copies of the Rehabilitation Standards and the Guidelines for new additions had also been provided to the Commission by the staff at the same time. He stated that the staff has recommended that this addition complies with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and he noted that its recommendation cited Standards 9 and 10. He observed that a majority of the Architectural Committee members, three of four, agreed with the staff’s interpretation of the Standards as they relate to this project. Mr. Farnham rejected Mr. Gallery’s claim that the first

criterion of the Standards as they relate to additions is the requirement for compatibility. He quoted from Standard 9 and explained that the first sentence in the Standard stipulates that no character-defining or significant historic fabric should be altered or removed for the construction of an addition. Mr. Farnham stated that this design meets that requirement, which is the primary requirement. He stated that the addition attaches to the historic building in a very gentle manner. He noted that the attachment requires no cuts or holes, but is accomplished through flashing alone. He reported that the Architectural Committee reviewed the flashing in detail. He stated that the design only proposes one penetration of the exterior cladding material of the historical building, where the new door for ADA access to the lobby will be added. Mr. Farnham concluded that the applicants have met the requirements of the first section of Standard 9. He then quoted from the second section of Standard 9, which states that the new addition will be differentiated from the historic building. He noted that the Standard mentions differentiation prior to compatibility, contradicting Mr. Gallery's claim that compatibility is prioritized. He stated that everyone, even the lone objector, agrees that the addition is sufficiently differentiated from the historic building. Mr. Farnham then quoted from the final section of Standard 9, which is related to compatibility. He asserted that the addition complies with this section of the Standard, even though it is designed in a contemporary style. He noted that the addition is visually separated from the historic building by the glass gallery. He noted that the addition is compatible in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing. For example, the materials were chosen to echo the historic building. Mr. Farnham stated that the application likewise satisfies Standard 10, the reversibility standard. This addition could easily be removed and the historic building restored to its original condition. The addition would leave intact all critical pieces of the historic building, satisfying Standard 10. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff also asserts that the proposal satisfies the addition Guidelines and the Architectural Committee agreed. He noted that one of the guidelines is especially pertinent. It reads:

Recommended: Considering the design for an attached exterior addition in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

Mr. Farnham pointed out that the Guideline allows that "Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building," and asserted that the proposed addition is both compatible and differentiated. He stated that it is compatible in materials, color, and relations of solids to voids. He acknowledged that there is a difference between the massings of the new and old, but that that difference is driven by preservation concerns. The addition is low and horizontal precisely to protect and preserve the historic material of, light to, and views of the historic south façade of the synagogue, which includes the important stained glass windows. A taller addition might better comply with the massing section of the Guideline, but it would do great harm to the historic building. He contended that the trade-off was appropriate. He concluded that this project fully satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines.

Ms. Hawkins summarized the Architectural Committee's conclusions. She stated that the Committee was "very impressed" with the design and its solutions to the building's circulation problems. Ms. Hawkins noted that some Committee members did question the blank wall on Broad Street and the horizontality. However, she stated that she and the Committee agreed that this proposal satisfies the Standards. She stated that the addition was very thoughtfully considered and protects the historic building. She observed that the connection of the new to old is very gentle. She reported that the Committee reviewed the flashing details very carefully.

She noted that the front section of the glass gallery, for example, was very carefully placed to avoid damaging or disturbing the historic building. She stated that the Committee concluded that the design was “very carefully considered.” She stated that the design meets the Standards and will maintain the historic fabric and character of the building. She acknowledged that another architect might have made slightly differently design decisions, but that is the nature of architecture. She concluded that this design does what it needs to do, protect the historic building and provide needed features and facilities.

Disagreeing with Mr. Gallery, Mr. Schaaf pointed out that the proposed design does, in fact, relate well to the historic building. He asserted that there are resonances between the historic building and new addition. For example, there are resonances between the five windows with pilasters on the south side of the historic building and the arcade on the addition. He also noted that the glazing of the addition provides a counterpoint to the solidity of the historic building. He rejected facile interpretations of the Standards that mandate additions that are nothing more than simple abstractions of historic buildings. He contended that contrasting additions can enrich our experiences of historic buildings, when carefully designed. He questioned the conservative approach to additions predicated on bland sameness.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 410 S FRONT ST

Project: Construct new multi-family building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Toll PA XV, LP

Applicant: Shawn Frawley, Toll Brothers Inc.

History: vacant lot; New Market, 1973, Louis Sauer, architect; demolished, 2000

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the cladding materials are natural stone and brick as much as possible, the design for the plaza along S. 2nd Street is reconsidered, and a Phase 1 archeological study is conducted, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story residential building on the former New Market site. The site is bounded by Front Street to the east and Market Square at 2nd Street to the west. It runs east-west across the block bounded by Pine Street at the north and Lombard Street at the south.

The Historical Commission has reviewed and approved several proposals for this site, none of which were built. The Commission approved the demolition of the New Market, and the construction of a ten-story hotel building in December 2000. The market was demolished, but the hotel was never built. In November 2008, the Commission reviewed and approved a 15-story mixed-use building. That building was also never constructed.

The current application proposes a four-story building. The proposed building would meet the sidewalk along Front Street. A plaza would link the west side of the building to 2nd Street and Market Square. The building would have a T-shaped plan, and would be mostly occupy the

middle of the parcel with generous set backs from neighboring backyards to the south and north along Lombard and Pine Streets. The main entrance and parking garage entrance would be located on Front Street. The two previously approved proposals also included garage entrances along Front Street.

The ground floor, along Front Street, has been articulated with several other individual entrances with steps. This articulation creates a pedestrian scale and honors the rhythm of steps and entrances in the district. An elevator penthouse would allow access to a deck on the roof. The building would be clad in limestone at watertable and brick with metal panels above. Some of the residential units would have balconies.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Brian Emmons and Shawn Frawley of Toll Brothers represented the application.

Mr. Danta stated that the staff had learned that there was an extensive archeological investigation of the entire block in preparation for the construction of New Market in the 1970s. Mr. Danta stated that additional archeological investigation would be unnecessary, given the extent and scope of the excavation and subsequent report. Mr. Danta also noted that the Archeological Forum had withdrawn their request for a Phase 1A Archeological investigation in light of these findings.

Mr. Emmons distributed revised drawings of the Front Street elevation. Mr. Emmons thanked the staff for researching the archeological question. He stated contended that any additional archeological research was unnecessary.

Mr. Emmons explained that the revisions to the design were direct responses to the Architectural Committee's comments as well as the comments of the civic association and other interested parties. He specifically noted the elimination of the limestone from the ground floor of the Front Street facade. The revised design includes two options: one option proposes a limestone lintel over the garage doors, while the other option proposes a brick soldier course lintel. Mr. Emmons stated that the plaza along 2nd Street is being redesigned. He noted that the development team hired a landscape architect and that the new design would take into account the Architectural Committee's comments as well as the concerns of the civic association. He specifically noted that the plaza would likely be tiered, rather than sloped. He asked that the plaza be approved in concept, and that they be allowed to work with the staff on the final details and approval.

Ms. Hawkins thanked the development team for incorporating the Architectural Committee's recommendations. She stated that the revised Front Street elevation is much more in keeping with the historic neighborhood around the site. She opined that the garage door should have a brick soldier course, not limestone.

Bernice Hamil, the president of Head House Conservancy, expressed her support for the development. She noted that the design of the plaza is still unresolved and that the Commission itself should conduct the final review.

Michael Wass of the Zoning & Historic Preservation Committee of the Society Hill Civic Association expressed his support for the development. He noted that the association's comments mirror the comments expressed at the Architectural Committee meeting. He specifically noted that the character of the public plaza should be respectful of the historic neighborhood around it. He also noted that the quality of the exterior cladding materials should

be of enduring qualities, such as real four-inch bricks and natural limestone. The civic association would not support the use of a panelized system for the brick cladding.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the most remarkable aspect of the entire proposal is its height. He noted that the building that is only four stories tall. Mr. Gallery stated that he never believed that a building of such a small scale, which is so compatible with the district, would ever be built on this site. He commended Toll Brothers for being so conscientious in regards to the historic quality of the neighborhood.

Mr. Emmons asked if the revised plaza design would require a review by the full Commission or only the staff. Ms. Hawkins answered that, owing to the public interest in this element of the proposal, it should be reviewed by the full Commission.

Mr. Emmons stated that the development team hopes to use natural stone on the ground floor along Front Street, but a cast material at the upper stories and secondary facades. He noted that, owing to the scale of the building, maintaining a tight line on construction costs is critical to the success of the development. He added that the cast and natural stones would look exactly the same. He stated the appearance of the project is critical to its success. Ms. Hawkins stated that the original design included a large amount of natural limestone at ground floor, which has since been eliminated. She stated that the trade off should be the use of natural limestone whenever possible, but specifically along Front Street.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to grant in-concept approval for the plan for the plaza and to grant final approval for the remainder of the revised application, provided the brick lintel above the garage opening is adjusted as noted, and with the recommendation that the exterior cladding and detailing on the Front Street façade should be natural brick and limestone, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 247 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct third-floor additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: David Fetkewicz and Michelle Leff

Applicant: Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects

History: 1860; new façade in Moderne style on 247, Morris J. Rosenthal, architect, 1941

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application, in concept, proposes to construct an addition on this nineteenth century carriage house and modify the front façade. The present façade does not date to the nineteenth century. The façade was demolished and replaced in 1941 in a “moderne” style. The proposed addition would be a mansard with a single window centered on the mansard. The mansard would be finished with shingles. The alterations to the front façade include the removal of the ornamental balcony at the second floor and its replacement with a single projecting balcony on the middle bay; that window opening would be cut down to accommodate a French door. The flanking windows in the second floor, which currently have steel windows from the 1941 alteration, would be replaced with clad casement units. The garage door would be replaced.

The Commission has reviewed and approved several additions to two-story carriage houses throughout the city. The majority of those additions, however, have been set back from the front façades of the buildings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Michelle Leff and architects John Hayes and Andrew Lengel represented the application.

Mr. Baron pointed out that he had distributed an email from Mr. Hayes objecting to the recommendation as worded in the Architecture Committee minutes.

Mr. Hayes explained that his clients had searched for a house and recently purchased this building. They need more space as the building was not constructed as a residence, but rather has been used as a carriage house and more recently for commercial purposes. He said that the zoning allows for greater height and they are trying to realize that value. He said that the “as-of-right zoning” would allow for a third-floor addition rising up from the front facade, but that a rear addition would require a zoning variance. Mr. Hayes stated that relocating the addition to the rear would also block the light and air to the neighbors’ deck to the north. He showed photographs of a mansard addition approved by the Historical Commission for another building on Van Pelt and contended that the situations are similar. He showed a rendering of the proposed addition and claimed that it would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. He concluded that this project is very important to him and his clients, who need this space and will likely sell the building if the addition is not approved.

Ms. Hawkins supported the Committee’s recommendation as recorded in the Committee minutes.

Ms. Leff, the property owner, advocated for the approval of the mansard addition.

Kiki Bolender, a neighbor, contended that mansards are a common and appropriate type of addition on carriage houses.

Mr. Gupta asserted that the addition as proposed would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Farnham cautioned that, if the Commission does approve this application in concept, it should not predicate that approval on Mr. Hayes’ argument that they should be able to build out to the allowed zoning envelope or Ms. Bolender’s assertion that her right to light and air to her rear deck supersedes the public’s right to historic preservation.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicant could gain space by converting the first-floor garage into living space. She said that this would involve the loss of parking, but would preserve the historical appearance of the building, which is the Commission’s charge. She said that the preservation of light to a private deck is not within the Commission’s mission.

Mr. Mattioni stated that this particular building has been much altered and asserted that the mansard would be inconspicuous from the street. He contended that this proposal satisfies the Standards.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve the application in concept. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 249 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Jon Merz

Applicant: Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee could not reach consensus. Two members voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9. Two members voted to recommend approval in concept, providing a different cladding material is substituted for the brick.

OVERVIEW: This application, in concept, proposes to construct an addition on a nineteenth-century carriage house. The addition would have a seven-foot set back from the front façade; a small deck would be located in this area. The deck would have a metal railing. The addition would be clad with brick on the front and stucco on the sides. The design of the front façade of the addition is very reminiscent of the historic façade of the carriage house.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the applications to the Commission. Property owner Jonathan Merz and architects John Hayes and Andrew Lengel represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins explained that, although the Committee members did not reach a consensus on a recommendation on this application, their main concern related to the fact that the addition would look like it was part of the original building and not a much later addition. She read the section from the Preservation Brief on additions regarding copying the historic building.

Mr. Hayes said that he designed the addition with a setback to make it less conspicuous and that the owner wanted a deck at the front. He explained that the owner did not like the metal covering of a nearby addition, but instead wanted the addition to reflect the historic front façade of his building, which includes arched openings and brick.

Mr. Merz, the owner, stated that he would be amenable to an alternative material such as a different color brick or perhaps limestone. He expressed a desire to retain the proposed the arched windows, because he enjoys the appearance of arched windows from the interior.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application in concept, provided a more appropriate material is substituted for the proposed red brick cladding on the front façade of the addition. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2020 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Construct 3-story house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael G. Maguire

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company Architects

History: 1970

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

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a one-story garage and construct a three-story house within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The garage is non-contributing to the district. The new building would have a garage on the first story, and two bays of double awning windows on the second and third stories. The exterior would be brick and finished with a string-course parapet. A roof deck is also proposed and would be set back eight feet from the front façade. The rear would have French doors with side lights on all three stories, balconies on the second and third stories, and would be clad with stucco. The rear is landlocked and not visible from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA

ADDRESS: 339 S 21ST ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Martin McNamara

Applicant: Stephen Mileto, QB3, LLC

History: 1870

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

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a one-story garage and construct a one-story garage with a plant roof and an access tower for a wheelchair lift. The first story would have a sliding garage door with architectural metalwork. The elevation of the addition would be clad with "stacked" stone.

In March 2005, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved a similar application to demolish the garage and construct a two-story modern addition. The first story of the addition would have had a garage entrance with fold-away doors and the second story would have been a terrace with a glazed rail. The façade would have been clad in stone.

ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adjourn at 11:01 a.m. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.