

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

**TUESDAY, 27 MARCH 2012
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects
Howard Haas
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Sherman Aronson, BLTa
Geoffrey Klein, BLTa
Chris Mrozinski, PREIT
Nancy Kilpatrick, PREIT
Everett Custer, PREIT
Terry A. Necciai, RA, TANRA Historic Preservation Consulting
Samir Benakmoume, Rimas Properties
Kit Leary
Ron Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Alon Glasberg
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Jafar Malek
Thomas Chapman, Esq., Blank Rome
Luan Tota
Carl Massara
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
John Cunningham
Amber Allison Luther

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Cluver joined her.

ADDRESS: 411 SPRUCE ST

Project: Construct garage with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David Naussbaum

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harmon Deutsch Architects

History: 1818; James Hall and Joseph Lyndall, carpenters; rear addition, 1926; restored, 1968; side stuccoed, 1968

Individual Designation: 12/3/1981

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a garage addition at the rear of the property. The rear faces a service alley, which is lined with garages and parking pads on both sides. A brick rear wall would be removed and the ground-floor, rear façade of the rear ell would be altered. However, they are not historic, but instead date from a mid twentieth-century restoration. The one-story garage would be topped by a roof deck. The brick walls of the garage would extend up to serve as railings for the deck. A second-floor rear window opening would be enlarged and a door installed for access to the deck.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the garage door would be a wood door. Mr. Ohler answered that it would be a vinyl door similar to the doors found along the alley. He added that the door would be painted to match the color of the trim in the house. Mr. Cluver stated that a metal door would be better because paint does not adhere well to vinyl. Mr. Cluver noted that the drawings propose a fiberglass door to the deck at the second floor. He suggested a wood door to match the wood windows on that elevation.

Mr. Cluver voiced his concern with the proposed stucco on the sides of the garage addition. Mr. Ohler stated that the neighboring building is faced with stucco. Mr. Cluver stated that it was an odd transition and that brick would be better. Mr. Ohler noted that they are merely copying the existing conditions on the alley. Mr. Cluver stated that he would prefer higher grade materials, but that he understood that the setting is a service alley.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the garage door is metal and the deck door is wood, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 801 MARKET ST

Project: Install canopy with signage, replace doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PREIT Rubin, Inc.

Applicant: Sherman Aronson, BLT Architects

History: 1903, 1929; Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store; Addison Hutton, Grant Simon, architects

Individual Designation: 6/9/2006

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a canopy with signage and replace non-original metal doors on the Market Street façade of the older or western section of the former Strawbridge & Clothier building. The entrance retains an original bronze door surround with a cast spandrel. The publisher of the Philadelphia Inquirer will move from its historic headquarters on N. Broad Street to this building. The newspaper publisher proposes a metal canopy with glass and metal letters to mark the entrance to its new facility. The canopy would be attached to the stone jambs of the entranceway and to the façade of the building with cables, not the original bronze door surround. The doors proposed for replacement are non-historic.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Sherman Aronson, attorney Michael Sklaroff, and property owner's representative Chris Mrozinski represented the application.

Mr. Mronzinski noted that establishing a street presence along Market Street is very important for the newspaper publisher moving to this space. It is one of the primary reasons the publisher is relocating to this space.

Mr. Aronson described the proposed design. He noted that most of the weight of the proposed marquee would be carried by the metal cables attached to the facade, not the side connections into the jambs of the opening. He added that the attachments are designed to weld to the steel structure inside the wall of the building.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the cladding stone on the façade is limestone or marble. Mr. Aronson answered that it is limestone. He explained that the building predates the construction of the flagship store directly to the east, but that the ground floor was altered in 1929 during the construction of the flagship store and the cladding changed to limestone to match the adjacent new building.

Ms. Hawkins asked if there was any work proposed to the display windows flanking the entrance. Mr. Aronson answered that no work was being proposed but that the publisher may utilized them in some way in the future. Mr. Hawkins asked if the doors would be replicated. Mr. Aronson answered that they would be replicated with a minor alteration to the widths of the leaves. He explained that the existing doors are not original, but date to the 1970s. He added that the existing doors do not meet the code-required minimum width for ADA access. The replacement doors would be made slighter wider to meet the code. Mr. Cluver noted that, if the doors are made wider, they will not align with the transom mullions above. Mr. Aronson clarified that the mullions do not align with the doors now. Mr. Aronson explained that the intent is to

match the historic configuration as close as possible and that the new doors would have the same finish and color as the historic transom above.

Ms. Pentz expressed her concern with the proposed attachment. She stated that the Commission does not usually approve penetrations to historic stone facades to attach canopies. Mr. Aronson explained that they had studied several attachment options. He noted that any canopy on this façade would have to be attached to the façade in some way. He explained that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to simply attach to the jambs, owing to the thinness of the structure at that location. He showed preliminary studies of other canopy designs. He also presented to the Committee members a design for a square canopy. Ms. Hawkins noted that the proposed canopy would project six feet from the façade of the building, and that such a large projection was necessitating the proposed attachments. Ms. Hawkins asked if there was a particular reason for the proposed six-foot projection. Mr. Aronson answered that the proposed projection derived from the diameter of the arch in the transom. He clarified that the arch in the transom is not a perfect semicircle, but is slightly flattened. Mr. Aronson contended that the six-foot canopy is well proportioned for the opening, the large building, and the wide sidewalk. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that she is opposed to the proposed attachments and noted that she would be more comfortable with attachments that stay within the masonry opening. Mr. Aronson stated that simply attaching to the jambs is possible, but would be structurally difficult. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Aronson how much historic fabric would be disrupted by the proposed installation of the cables. Mr. Aronson answered that two areas, four inches square each, would be affected. Ms. Hawkins clarified that it would also affect the jambs. Mr. Aronson noted that they had designed the canopy to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Mr. Cluver stated that he found it unusual that the applicants were proposing to install the canopy above the frieze panel which runs across the opening above the doors. He stated, however, that he understood the reason for such an installation. He noted that such an installation allows views of the frieze from the street. Mr. Aronson noted that the canopy was located high enough to allow access to the sill of the transom. Mr. Cluver stated that he has hesitations about the proposed canopy drainage, which routes storm water into the building. He noted that a failure of the internal pipes could cause tremendous damage. Mr. Aronson explained that they are proposing two drainage pipes, instead of one, as a failsafe system. He added that the drainage pipes would be connected to the drainage main for the building underneath the floor. Mr. Aronson contended that the fears regarding the drainage are unfounded because the small canopy would only collect a small amount of rain water. He also noted that the building code requires that canopies are drained. He added that he is confident that the water drainage will work reliably.

Mr. Cluver asked for clarification on the metal finish of the canopy and doors. Mr. Aronson clarified that the display windows are bronze, but the door and transom assembly are metal, but not bronze. He explained that the new doors and canopy would have the same color and finish as the transom.

Ms. Pentz asked how they intend to create the proposed square holes in the façade to mount the canopy anchors. Mr. Aronson answered that they would create a circular core and square off the corners. Ms. Pentz noted that it would be more reversible to create circular penetrations, the cores of which could be saved and utilized to patch the façade in the future.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment. Howard Hass read a statement into the record. He stated:

On your March 27, 2012 agenda is review of a proposal to "install canopy with signage"

which I understand involves a canopy with signage for the Philadelphia Inquirer on the west building of the former Strawbridge and Clothier flagship department store but does not include installing replicas of the metal letters that proclaimed Strawbridge & Clothier.

When I testified in 2006 for the inclusion of the building on the Philadelphia Register the Strawbridge & Clothier sign was intact and so should have been legally protected when the building was included on the register. The sign should not have been removed. It should be replaced because it is important to the building's heritage. A new canopy can proclaim a new tenant's name, but the original identity of the building should be restored. Since 1868 generations of people were fond of Strawbridge & Clothier. People walking by should be able to point to the metal letters saying Strawbridge & Clothier and tell their grandchildren that they shopped there. Former department stores nationwide like Woodward & Lothrop of Washington DC have been restored with the name of the department store prominently on the building, even though there are new canopies and new signs for new tenants. On Market Street, signs indicate the Wanamaker Building and even the Market Street National Bank Building. In short, the Strawbridge & Clothier lettering was important to the building, was legally protected, and no request to install new signs should be approved without replication of the Strawbridge & Clothier sign. I appreciate the good work done by the Historical Commission, and respectfully ask your consideration of this issue.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance distributed photographs of the façade of the building that were included in the nomination. He noted that the photographs clearly show the Strawbridge & Clothier sign over the entrance. He stated that he considers the sign to be integral to the designation and the façade as it was designed in the 1920s. He described the signs as character-defining features. Mr. Gallery stated that he had alerted the staff at the time of the illegal removal of the letters. He stated that the letters can be easily replicated and unless the letters are restored the proposed marquee should not be approved. He explained that, if a homeowner sought the Commission's approval of a roof deck while having illegal windows on the building, the Commission would not approve the deck until the illegal windows were replaced. He noted the situation is the same in this case, and that approval would violate the Commission's practice. Discussing the merits of the proposed canopy, Mr. Gallery noted that the six-foot projection was excessive and unnecessary and would significantly affect the view of the transom.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that the signs were removed by a previous owner. He noted that the current application proposes the installation of a marquee. He asked that the application be reviewed on its merits, as the staff had done. He noted that the nostalgia for Strawbridge & Clothier is something all Philadelphians can share, but that the stone medallions with the name of the store are still present and the ghosting of the letters is still present. He stated that the Commission has allowed new uses and owners to remove historic signs from designated buildings. He noted the case of the former Fidelity building on S. Broad Street, where the stone sign has been replaced several times, to First Union, then Wachovia, and now Wells Fargo. He added that the vestige of the sign tells the true history of the building, which once housed a department store, but will now houses offices. He asked the Committee to consider the application on its merits, and to recommend approval of the marquee.

Ms. Hawkins asked the staff to summarize the Commission's practice when reviewing new work at a property where illegal alterations may be present. Mr. Farnham answered that he is not aware of any instance when the Commission denied an application because of allegations of illegal work elsewhere at the property. He stated that Section (7)(k) of the historic preservation

ordinance lists a series of review criteria that the Commission and Architectural Committee must apply when reviewing applications. He stated that the preservation ordinance does not authorize the Commission to deny an application because another part of the building may be out of compliance. Mr. Farnham noted, however, that he did have a question for the applicants, given that their architectural plans call out the ghosting of the Strawbridge & Clothier sign above the doorway in question. He asked the applicants if they were proposing to legalize the removal of the signs with this application. Mr. Sklaroff answered that they were not requesting any action on the signs. He once again asked the Committee to focus on the proposed marquee. Mr. Farnham suggested that the appropriate mechanism for addressing the signage would be for the Ms. Hawkins or Messrs. Gallery and Haas to raise the signage issue with the Commission, which could direct the staff to request a violation or take some other enforcement action. He concluded that the Architectural Committee, a technical advisory committee, should focus on the merits of the application and leave the question of the signs to the Commission.

Ms. Hawkins pointed to a designation photograph, which showed small awnings over the display windows. She stated that the attachments and size of the proposed canopy are inappropriate and are driven by the choice of materials and design of the canopy, specifically its proposed projection. She suggested that the projection of the new canopy should be limited to the projection of the small awnings in the photograph, about two and a half feet. A smaller canopy would not necessitate the cables for the added structural support and the internal drainage lines. She added that a smaller canopy could be attached to the jambs and it would not alter the façade of the building. Mr. Cluver stated that the letters on the canopy spelling Philadelphia Inquirer sign are too far away from the face of the building, and that pedestrians walking on Market Street would not notice them. He stated that they would have a stronger presence if they were closer to the building.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that his team is offering two alternative proposals: a semicircular marquee and a square marquee. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the square marquee was not included in the Committee's materials for this application. Mr. Gallery objected to the review of the square design without the proper public notice. Mr. Sklaroff noted Mr. Gallery's objection. Mr. Sklaroff explained that the curved sign would require a variance from the Zoning Board. He noted that the curved sign is the Inquirer's preferred option. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the marquee would not obstruct any character defining features or damage any historic fabric. The limestone could be easily repaired or replaced in kind when the canopy is removed. He pointed out that the staff had correctly valued the impacts of the project on historic fabric and the views of the historic building.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee had recommended denial of similar applications that would have impacted historic stone facades. She expressed her support for Ms. Hawkins's suggestion to consider a smaller awning. Mr. Cluver described the proposed marquee as "very big"; he stated that the scale and design of the proposed marquee are not appropriate. He also expressed his support for Ms. Hawkins's suggestion for a smaller canopy. Mr. Aronson stated that the size of the canopy is small when considered in relation to the building and the street. He also noted that many canopies have been installed on historic buildings in the city in the last 10 years. He mentioned Le Meridien Hotel at the former Elkins YMCA on the 1500-block of Arch Street as an example. Ms. Hawkins noted that the proximity of the anchors to the carved scroll at the keystone of the arch created tension between the elements and that the anchors were competing with the historic keystone. She suggested that the anchors be moved lower and away from the keystone of the arch. She noted that the attachments to the façade, if any, should not be prominent elements on the façade. Mr. Aronson responded that it may not be possible to lower the anchors; their locations are based on the locations of the structure. Mr. Cluver stated

that, if a marquee had been installed in this building originally, it would have been designed and attached as currently proposed. He noted, however, that he finds the proposed marquee too large. He also noted that the marquee would have aligned with the transom bar. Mr. Aronson expressed his surprise that the Committee would advise obstructing the most decorative element of the door surround, its cast spandrel at the transom bar. He reiterated that they would like to expose this decorative element and leave enough space to access the sill at the transom. Ms. Hawkins stated that it would not be appropriate for the Committee to design the canopy during the meeting. She reiterated that she objects to many aspects of the proposal.

Mr. Cluver stated that the doors are acceptable as submitted. He suggested that the canopy should be redesigned to be smaller; especially its projection from the face of the building, and that any penetrations to the face of the historic stone, particularly the voussoirs, should be avoided. Mr. Cluver also requested that the Commission address the removal of the original Strawbridge & Clothier signage.

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

ADDRESS: 263 N 03RD ST

Project: Construct building on one-story remnant

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: N. 3rd St. LLC

Applicant: Ronald J. Patterson, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1840; upper floors removed

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story addition on top of a one-story building. The one-story building is a remnant of a nineteenth-century building. It is classified non-contributing in the district.

The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a similar application in May 2005. The 2005 approval included the demolition of the nineteenth-century ground floor and the construction of a five-story building with mansard and small balconies. The staff approved construction drawings in July 2008, but the building was not erected.

The application has been revised since the Architectural Committee meeting. The applicant has incorporated all the comments received at the meeting. The revised application is very similar to the application approved in 2005 by the Commission. The revised design presents a building of the same massing and height as the one previously approved. The detailing of the building differs slightly from the one previously approved. The proposed design, however, is compatible with the district. There are two major components of the current application, which were not part of the previous approval. The current approval proposes to clad the building in brick, and it proposes the retention and restoration of the marble ground floor along 3rd Street. These two elements are far more compatible with the district than the previous approval for the demolition of the remnant and the cladding of the new construction with stucco.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Samir Benakmoume and attorney Ronald Patterson represented the application.

Mr. Patterson noted that the 2005 approval and the subsequent permits deriving from it were still active. He stated that his client wanted to construct the building based upon those approvals and permits. He stated that they had requested some zoning changes related to number and size of units as well as the coverage of the building on the lot, but not its height or overall massing. He distributed a photograph of the proposed cladding material for the ground floor. Ms. Hawkins asked for clarification. Mr. Patterson explained that the material would flank the café windows proposed for the ground floor. He further stated that the marble would not be painted as originally proposed, and that they intend to restore the historic storefront. He noted that they are open to suggestions on the design of the building.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the drawings are very preliminary. She did not consider them to be fully developed. She asked if the windows were double-hung or casement windows. Mr. Benakmoume answered that they would be double-hung windows. Ms. Hawkins stated that she objected to the projecting bays on the side of the building along Vine Street. She stated that bays are not appropriate for Old City. Ms. Hawkins also objected to the lack of a cornice, the replication of the historic ground-floor storefront at the upper floors along 3rd Street, and the width of the proposed railings on the balconies. She stated that the railings should fit the masonry openings.

Ms. Pentz objected to the rubble-stone cladding. Mr. Benakmoume stated that he could change the ground-floor cladding to brick. He noted that he would not construct a stucco building, which the Commission had approved in 2005. He further stated that stucco should not be allowed in the Old City Historic District. He pointed out that the previous approval included bays on the Vine Street elevation, and that, by right, they could project three feet from the façade of the building. He expressed his desire to include bays to provide more interior space to the residential units.

Mr. Cluver described the 2005 design as more handsome than the design currently proposed. He noted that the proportions of the previous design are more in keeping with the historic district and its surroundings. Mr. Benakmoume agreed that it looks like a beautiful rendering, but that from experience, the as-built would not look as nice. He noted that a five-story stucco building would not be attractive. Mr. Cluver clarified that he was referring to the details and proportions of the design, not necessarily the choice of materials. Mr. Cluver expressed his disapproval with the replication of the ground floor design at the stories above. Mr. Benakmoume explained that the building directly to the south had a similar treatment and that they had been inspired by this building and other examples found throughout the district. Mr. Cluver stated that the building to the south is of a later period, and may not be a good example to replicate. Ms. Hawkins stated that the early nineteenth-century buildings usually had taller windows at the second floor and smaller windows in the upper stories. Ms. Benakmoume stated that he would prefer the same size windows throughout to allow more light and air into the residential units.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the current proposal had many positive elements. She pointed out the change from stucco to brick as a great improvement. She reiterated, however, that the drawing was too preliminary and that the details should be fully developed. Mr. Cluver stated that he would not want to see a poor imitation of a historic building built on this site. He advised the applicant to look at the details and proportions more closely. Mr. Benakmoume stated that his building would not match a nineteenth-century building. Ms. Hawkins stated that the building

should not mimic a nineteenth-century predecessor, but that it should fit comfortably within the neighborhood. The Committee members advised the applicant to look at the details and to develop them further, and to eliminate the replication of the ground floor in the upper stories.

Mr. Patterson stated that time was of the essence and that, owing to financing constraints, they would like to move forward with a revised proposal and not have to wait two months to return to the Committee. Mr. Danta stated that the application could be revised based on the comments received at the Architectural Committee meeting.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance objected to the proposal. He noted two elements that he found unacceptable: the pilasters in the upper stories and the bays along Vine Street. He stated that there are no bays in Old City. He objected to these elements and the cladding material for the bays. He stated that they should be removed or redesigned. Mr. Patterson stated that bays do exist in the Old City Historic District.

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

ADDRESS: 229 MARKET ST

Project: Legalize signage and lighting

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rimas Properties

Applicant: Jafar Malek, Old City Frozen Yogurt

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize signage and lighting installed on the façade of this building. A very large, existing, projecting sign armature mounted on the second and third floors of the building was refaced with internally-illuminated plastic-faced signs. The armature was in place when the building was designated in 1976. A large sign was added in the transom area of the storefront. Three light fixtures were installed in the transom area. A small projecting sign was installed at the west end of the storefront. The signs and lights were added without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Business owner Jafar Malek represented the application.

Mr. Malek stated that he opened his business in the building in May 2011. He claimed that, while seeking approval of an application from the Commission's staff for interior work only, he asked if changing the name on the existing box sign would require the Commission's approval. He claimed that he was told an approval would not be required, but he could not recall the name of the staff member with whom he spoke. He explained that the lighting fixtures were extant prior to his lease. He explained that, when the previous business vacated the space, the removal of channel letters on the metal transom panel left several holes. He stated that he covered the metal panel with a vinyl sticker sign to cover the damage. Ms. Hawkins asked the

applicant if the smaller projecting sign on the storefront was new. Mr. Malek stated that the sign was an existing feature, but that he relocated it to the west side of the storefront and refaced it in vinyl. Ms. Hawkins asked if the light fixtures were repaired in the larger projecting box sign. Mr. Malek stated that he replaced the light bulbs.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that a previous tenant may have added the lights on the storefront without a permit. She contended that the lighting is in appropriate for this storefront.

Ms. Pentz suggested that a wood or metal sign would be more appropriate for a wall sign. She acknowledged that the projecting box sign was present at the time of designation and therefore did not object to its refacing. Ms. Hawkins argued that the internal illumination is problematic and recommended that the light bulbs are removed from or the power is cut to the sign. Mr. Malek noted that the lights are on only three hours per night.

Mr. Cluver stated that, if the applicant had proposed the alterations prior to installation, he would have approved the refacing of the box sign, but denied the illegal storefront lights and the small projecting sign. Ms. Hawkins asked the staff if the smaller projecting sign was approved. Ms. Sell stated that the Commission's file does not contain an approval for that sign. Mr. Cluver added that he would have approved of the laminate covering over the metal panel.

Mr. Malek stated that removing the storefront lights will make the storefront dark and asked if there was another solution. Ms. Hawkins suggested that there are more appropriate lighting options, but that these fixture types are the problem. Ms. Malek asked for a list of appropriate lighting options. Ms. Hawkins recommended he work with staff to select a compatible lighting fixture and that he should look at other examples in the neighborhood.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the vinyl sign over the metal panel transom and refacing of the box sign, but denial of box sign's internal illumination, storefront lighting, and smaller projecting sign, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 626-30 N 21ST ST

Project: Remove rear section of church building, replace side windows, remove sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alon Glasberg

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: 1926; Welsh Presbyterian Church

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the rear portion of a church building, which is being rehabilitated for a new use. The church building is a simple rectangle in plan. It extends 80 feet back from the front façade on 21st Street, from front to rear property lines. The rear wall is separated from the building to the west by a very narrow slot. The rear 20 feet of the building would be removed and a stucco wall constructed at the opening. No details have been provided for the new rear wall or the altered side walls. Elevation drawings should be provided. Five-foot-wide alleys run alongside the building at the north and south, separating it from the buildings to either side. No portion of the rear wall is visible from the public right-of-way. The rear sections of the side walls are minimally visible from the street.

The side windows would be replaced. No details have been provided for the new side windows. The windows would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

A non-historic box sign would be removed from the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler and developer Alon Glasberg represented the application.

Ms. Sell stated that the staff visited the site to determine the visibility of the sides and rear of the building from various points along 21st Street. She distributed photographs from the visit. She explained that the side wall to the north and side windows toward the front of the building are visible. She clarified that side elevation drawings must be submitted to determine what sections of the side walls would be removed and what their visibilities from the public right-of-way would be. She added that window material and configuration details should also be submitted. She stated that the side windows toward the front of the building are highly visible from the street.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if he agrees that the information is needed or if he would prefer they evaluate the application as it was submitted. Mr. Ohler concurred that the information is needed, but the staff should have informed him of the deficiencies earlier in the process. He explained that Mr. Glasberg is not the owner and has the property under an agreement of sale. He explained that he is in the due-diligence period of obtaining the requisite approvals. He stated that he could provide the information that is needed and would like to move forward, owing to time constraints.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicant to identify the portion of the building that would be removed. Mr. Ohler stated that there is a mezzanine level and a large open portion with a pulpit toward the rear. He stated that they would be removing the pulpit and the rear bay containing one of four windows on each side. He explained that the current owner would prefer to retain the entire building and use it as it exists, but, owing to its R-10 zoning, decided to sell the property. He explained that, after meeting with community groups, they found that neighbors wanted them to demolish the entire building and construct single-family homes. He acknowledged that that proposal is not feasible, owing to the property's historic designation. He explained that this proposal is a compromise. Removing the rear would provide rear yards and the zoning would be as-of-right.

Ms. Pentz asked if the demolition included the two rear chimneys. Mr. Ohler stated that the demolition would include the two rear chimneys, the rear wall, and rearmost window on each side wall. Mr. Cluver asked if there is a logical structural line for the demolition. Mr. Ohler stated that the roof system is composed of trusses running from side wall to side wall. They propose to demolish one roof section at the rear, up to the second-rearmost roof truss. Ms. Pentz asked if there were ever two chimneys at the front like those at the rear. Mr. Ohler stated that there is no evidence of such chimneys left in the building.

Mr. Cluver asked if the request for the demolition is being driven by the community opposition to the zoning variance that would be required to redevelop the entire building. Mr. Ohler clarified that the proposal to demolish is being driven by the desire to use the building as the property is zoned.

Kit Leary, a neighbor, stated that he represents nearby property owners. He stated that the claim that the community advocated for the total demolition of the building is not correct. He stated that they had discussed at a community meeting their preference for two or three residential units on the site, if the Commission would allow complete demolition. He stated that the lower density would be the community's preference over the eight, eleven, or twelve units that are proposed for the existing building. He asserted the community did not suggest completely demolishing the building. He clarified that is it their desire to preserve the population density of the neighborhood and the entire fabric of the church. He claimed that the developer had stated that he would not be making any exterior changes to the building. Mr. Leary stated that the neighbors would accept two owner-occupied units in the church building without any exterior modifications. He explained that, in order for the applicant to create 11 or 12 units, he will need to create a backyard, which can only be accomplished with partial demolition. He concluded that the proposal to increase the density in the neighborhood with renters and destroy 25% of the building is unacceptable. He stated that he reviewed the Commission's file on the property last week. He distributed a statement on the project and photographs demonstrating that the portion to be demolished is visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Hawkins agreed that the staff's photographs show that the sides are minimally visible. Mr. Leary argued that, as an engineer, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards would be violated by this demolition. Ms. Hawkins suggested that he obtain letters from members of the community or a petition that would demonstrate the general community interests for the Commission meeting.

Bob Powers, a historic preservationist who heads Powers & Co., stated that he is representing the Spring Garden Civic Association to express its opposition to the project largely because of the loss of historic fabric. He explained that the application proposes to demolish 25% of the building. He noted that this building is listed as Significant in the Spring Garden Historic District and that it should be considered as such. He stated that he is a long-time resident in the neighborhood and understands the effect that these types of projects have on the community.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance quoted Mr. Cluver when he referred to the proposal earlier in this discussion as a "demolition." He agreed that he considers the proposed work a demolition in the legal sense. He claimed that the staff incorrectly considers the proposed to be an alteration, not a demolition. He argued that the proposal should be reviewed under the demolition provisions of the ordinance. A financial hardship application should be required. He claimed that the community was shown plans to rehabilitate the building without the demolition and concluded that it would be financial feasible to reuse the building in its current configuration. He argued that the only reason the demolition is proposed is to avoid having to seek a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. He contended those are not grounds for demolishing 25% of a historic building. He concluded that the Alliance supports the position of the community. He added that there is broader issue at stake: the difference between an alteration and a demolition. He recalled a recent court case about the Dilworth House and noted that the Board of License & Inspection Review overturned the Commission's decision to approve the demolition of the rear portion of the Dilworth House. He stated that this case is similar and the proposed work is a demolition. He concluded that the applicant should be required to adhere to the demolition review requirements.

Mr. Farnham objected strenuously to Mr. Gallery's claim that the staff had opined that the proposed work would be an alteration and not a demolition in the legal sense. He stated that Ms. Sell clearly stated at the start of this review that the staff considered the application incomplete because it did not have enough information to fully understand the proposal. The claim that the staff had labeled this an alteration and not a demolition in the legal sense was incorrect.

Mr. Cluver observed that primary differences between the community and the developer relate to zoning. He acknowledged that the building is one volume and does not have a rear ell or addition that could be cleanly removed. He stated that, in his opinion, the church should be retained and redeveloped as a single, intact volume. However, that would require some compromises on the part of the community. He acknowledged both the developer's need for a profitable project and the community's desire for lower density. He cautioned that the community and preservation advocates should not adopt a position that renders this building unable to be redeveloped, thereby making it a successful candidate for complete demolition, owing to financial hardship. He stated that he hopes that the community and the developer can reach common ground and save the church. A stalemate would likely lead to its decay and eventual demolition.

Mr. Glasberg stated that he met with the Spring Garden Association months ago to try to find a solution. He explained that he would rather work with than against the neighborhood. He reported that the neighborhood has suggested the construction of twin single-family houses on the lot. He argued that building twins would require the complete demolition of the church. He explained that it is financially infeasible to convert the church to two units. Ms. Hawkins reminded the applicant that the Committee's review is limited to applying the Standards to the proposed work. She contended that unit counts and zoning are outside their purview. She stated that, in her opinion, the Committee has not been provided with enough information to reach any conclusion but denial. Ms. Pentz agreed. Mr. Glasberg remarked that this property is encumbered with \$50,000 in debt to the City. Ms. Hawkins explained that the applicant may submit financial information as part of a financial hardship application.

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

ADDRESS: 259 AND 261 S 17TH ST

Project: Legalize deviations from approved plans

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: LMT Associates

Applicant: Quinn Blackwell, Carl Massara & Associates Architects

History for 259: 1860; first floor refaced in marble, Stewardson & Page, architects, 1920

History for 261: 1860; front façade rebuilt, 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the stuccoing of the side and rears of two rowhouses at 259 and 261 S. 17th Street.

In June 2011, the Historical Commission approved an application that included alterations to the front façades and fourth-story additions to the rear ells. The approved additions were to have pitched roofs like the original third-story rear ells. The additions were to have been stuccoed, but the brick was to be retained and left exposed at original rear ells. Barge boards indicating the original roof lines were to have divided the original brick ells from the stucco additions. The windows were approved as six-over-six wood sash; the balcony doors as wood. The siding on the south elevation was to be removed and the underlying brick repaired and repointed.

In February 2012, the staff observed that stucco, vinyl windows, and a new door were installed into the south elevation without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses and Inspections. A stop-work order was requested and a violation was subsequently issued.

The photographs submitted by the applicant show that other work also deviates from and exceeds the Commission's approval. Stucco was installed over the south side wall and all rear facades of both buildings. The rear additions were not constructed according to the approved plans. The additions destroyed the original third-story slopes of the roofs and were constructed flush with the existing rear facades. The roofs of the additions were constructed flat with no slopes. Vinyl windows and doors were installed in the south and rear facades. They do not replicate the historic or approved configurations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Business owner Luan Tota, attorney Thomas Chapman, and architect Carl Massara represented the application.

Mr. Chapman explained that there is no dispute that some of the work that was done was not in accordance with the application approved by the Commission. He stated that it is their intention to commit to working with the Commission and the staff to find a solution that is satisfactory to the Commission and the owner of the property. He asked the Committee for direction. He showed several photographs of the building: the first was taken yesterday; the second was taken from Google Earth and shows the siding before it was removed; the third is a view of the alley next to the building showing that the side is a mix of brick, stucco, and siding; and the fourth shows the stucco installed on the side wall with the windows. Mr. Chapman clarified that two windows on the third floor side elevation are new, but the windows on the first and second stories were extant at the time of designation.

Mr. Cluver asked if the applicant removed the vinyl siding. Mr. Massara stated that siding was removed and that the brick beneath it was in terrible condition. He explained that he did not manage the construction, but merely provided the architectural drawings. Therefore, he was not involved in the work and did not see the condition of the brick himself. He explained that the stucco company at the site decided that the brick was in bad condition and needed to be stuccoed. The stucco contractor was unaware of the correct procedures. He stated that a Commission staff member had suggested at one point that the siding should be removed. Ms. Hawkins asked if the stucco was real or EIFS (Exterior Insulation Finishing System). Mr. Massara stated that it is real stucco. He explained that the alley façade had a mix of different materials and that the owner thought it was appropriate to unify it. Mr. Cluver asked the applicants if they have any photographs of the side wall after the siding was removed and before the stucco was installed. Mr. Massara said that they do not. However, he did provide photographs of the condition of the brick at the rear.

Ms. Hawkins stated that it appears that two window openings at the third story are new, but that the openings in the first and second-story were extant at the time of designation. It appears that new vinyl windows were installed at the third floor; it is unclear whether new windows were installed below. She stated that she is not opposed to the stucco installation on the side wall as it is a secondary façade and party walls are often stuccoed. She stated that she is opposed to installation of the two vinyl windows and any change to the existing windows on the lower stories. However, there are no good photographs to show the change. Mr. Chapman stated that the lower windows are difficult to see, but that he could try to obtain a better photograph of the

ground floor windows. Ms. Hawkins stated that the thickness of the stucco may have changed some elements around the windows; capping may have been added. Mr. Chapman asserted that the capping old and, in fact, hanging off the building. Ms. Hawkins concluded that she would be opposed to any new capping or windows.

Ms. Hawkins contended that the rear alterations are radical different than was approved. She summarized that the approved drawings show an existing three-story piece capped by a differentiated forth-story; as built, the rear is monolithic, with no differentiation. She added that the windows were also not built according to the approved plans. Mr. Massara clarified that the forth-story addition was approved to be stuccoed with a sliding glass door. Ms. Hawkins asked if the drawings in the current application accurately depict the existing conditions. She stated that there appear to be many inconsistencies between the existing conditions and the drawings that purport to show the existing conditions. Mr. Massara agreed that the as-built drawings do not accurately reflect the existing conditions. She added that the side elevation drawing, which includes no windows, is not accurate either. Mr. Massara agreed that the drawings need to be revised to show true conditions. Ms. Hawkins asked about the materials of the windows and doors. Mr. Tota replied that they are vinyl.

Ms. Pentz agreed that the Committee needs better information about the existing conditions and any new work. Ms. Hawkins stated that the original approval was specific in differentiating the existing three floors from the top floor at the two rear ells. She added that the stucco application hides the fact that the fourth floors are additions to three-story ells.

Mr. Cluver asked if the approved windows were called out on the original plans. Ms. Sell stated that the approved plans indicate that the windows would be wood.

Mr. Tota stated that he comes from an old country that does not have a Historical Commission, but they do have a city that is 2000 years old. He stated that the people of that city preserve it. He opined that there was nothing historical about this building. He stated that his restaurant was a tenant in the building for eight years and then he recently purchased the building. He stated that he faced many issues over the years and had a landlord who never maintained the building. He stated that there were leaks, a wall was almost falling down, and a bay window was falling. He stated that he removed the bay himself. He claimed that the building issues were interfering with his business and that they became safety concerns. He explained that he thought he was doing something good with the building.

Mr. Chapman acknowledged that some work was undertaken without the approval of the Commission, but he stated that there seems to be a lack of understanding of what can be done at this point. Based on the number of permits in the file, he asserted that there was an effort to do the necessary work. Ms. Hawkins stated that when the Committee and the City approves drawings, they must have confidence that they will be followed; owners need to obtain the appropriate approvals when plans change. She noted that there is general support for the stucco on the south elevation. She stated that there is not enough information about visibility of the rear from the public right-of-way. However, the Committee does not typically approve of vinyl windows. She noted inconsistencies in the drawings. Mr. Chapman asked if it would be beneficial to withdraw this application and resubmit with revised drawings and additional photographs. Ms. Pentz stated that it would be beneficial.

Mr. Cluver concluded that the Committee cannot recommend approval of the current application. He stated that they do not have enough information. He stated the documentation regarding the existing conditions and proposed work must be improved. Mr. Chapman asked if

there a possibility of a positive recommendation, if additional information is provided. Ms. Pentz stated that there is a possibility, but there is not enough information today. She explained that, based on the comments, the applicants can develop a good application.

Mr. Massara stated that the rear is not visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Hawkins suggested he demonstrate that condition. Mr. Massara added that removing the stucco would be very difficult and would further damage the brick. Ms. Hawkins suggested that he look at it from a design perspective and find ways to differentiate the historic rear ell from the new addition. Mr. Cluver added that he would not be opposed to recreation of the bay that was removed because there is a matching bay on the other side. Mr. Massara again stated that the rear is not visible from the public right-of-way.

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

ADDRESS: 271 S VAN PELT ST, UNIT 2

Project: Construct rooftop addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Cunningham

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio, LLC

History: 1870; altered, 1970

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition and deck on this carriage house. The stucco addition would be set back over 13 feet from the Van Pelt Street façade and 10 feet from the Manning Street façade. The addition would be visible but inconspicuous from the corner of Van Pelt and Manning Streets. The Historical Commission has routinely approved additions on two-story carriage houses such as this one. Numerous additions like the one proposed in this application have been approved for similar carriage houses in this section of Rittenhouse Square as well as Spring Garden. The Commission has approved these additions to allow for the adaptive reuse of carriage houses, which were originally constructed for storage, not residential use.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tim Kerner and property owner John Cunningham represented the application.

Mr. Kerner provided a brief overview of the project. He stated that, with the setbacks, the addition would not be visible from Van Pelt Street or Manning Street, but would be visible from Spruce Street. He stated that, although the addition would be visible, it would not be conspicuous. He stated that the addition would be clad in stucco with wood elements, playing off of the materials found in the building.

Ms. Hawkins asked if they were proposing a real green roof. Mr. Kerner stated that they are proposing to create a sedum roof, if the roof structure can support it. He added that, if the roof cannot support the additional weight, then they will forego the green roof rather than restructure the roof.

Mr. Cluver stated that this rooftop structure would not simply be a pilot house to access the roof, but would be an addition, and would be visible from the street. He stated that the Committee has consistently required that rooftop additions are inconspicuous from the street. Mr. Kerner stated that the addition would only be visible from Spruce Street and not from Van Pelt or Manning Streets. It would be inconspicuous. Ms. Pentz stated that the architect provided generous setbacks to make the addition as inconspicuous as possible. She agreed that it would be visible but inconspicuous. Ms. Hawkins stated that she could accept a pilot house addition on the roof, but this is a full addition for a study.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Commission has approved rooftop additions that are minimally visible but are compatible with the architecture of the building. He stated that this design is compatible and the combination of the setbacks and compatibility makes it an inconspicuous addition. He stated that the Preservation Alliance supports the proposal.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the addition be reduced in size to that of a pilot house. Ms. Hawkins concurred with Mr. Cluver that, if addition was relocated or the deck was reduced in size, it would be more appropriate.

Ms. Pentz stated that she was not opposed to the suggestions of her fellow Committee members, but felt that the addition as submitted would be appropriate for the building and would satisfy the Standards. She noted that the Commission has approved many similar additions on two-story carriage houses and stated that she would vote for a recommendation of approval.

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

ADDRESS: 739 S 02ND ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: George and Karen Roskam

Applicant: Amber Luther, Hugewindow

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 3/30/1965

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a third-floor addition and a portion of the rear wall of the main block at the third floor and construct a new third-floor addition at this property at the corner of 2nd and Pemberton Streets. This application proposes several alternatives for a third-floor addition as a result of the Architectural Committee's review of an in-concept application last month. Alternate 7 retains the historic roof shape and a 1-foot section of the rear cornice at the corner. The other alternatives cantilever out over the rear wall and/or encroach more on the main roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Alternate 7, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Amber Luther represented the application.

Ms. Luther stated that the owners can accept Alternate 7; however, they would like to have a window in the proposed master bedroom, which would mean cutting an opening on the third floor on the main block of the building, as is shown on the drawing labeled SK-5.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee could recommend approval provided that the fanlight in the gable is restored. She stated that it appears that it had been altered at some point. Ms. Coté informed the Committee that the Commission has no record of an approval or permit for this change.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the roof of the addition slope down slightly to the north, to a point below the historic cornice line of the main block.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Alternate 7 with a new window on the third floor of the main block that matches the size, shape and configuration of the other windows on that façade, provided that the gable fanlight is restored, the window in the addition is aligned with the windows below, the roof of the addition has a slight slope, and the HVAC equipment is located toward the party line on the roof.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

Standard 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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs—their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roof material such as slate, wood, clay, tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.