

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

**TUESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2013
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
Nan Gutterman
Rudy D'Alessandro
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Bart Blatstein
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Shimi Zakin, Atrium Design Group
Nurit Nachim, Atrium Design Group
Jonathan Doran, Atrium Design Group
Stephen F. Gold, Esq.
Maria L. Petrillo, Esq.
Ann Northrup
A. Robert Torres, Studio Torres
Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance
Sarah Gunther
Jarrad Gunther
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Stephen Mileto, QB3, LLC
Tricia Desmarais Clark, Esq., Bochetto & Lenz, P.C.

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mes. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Mr. D'Alessandro joined her.

ADDRESS: 2100 MOUNT VERNON ST

Project: Legalize mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marc & Megan Vetri

Applicant: Maria Petrillo

History: 1855; Oliver Parry & Nathaniel Randolph, builders; storefront added, c. 1890

Individual Designation: 2/7/1974

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize and complete the mural on a rear non-historic garden wall. The mural is not placed directly on and does not obscure historic fabric. Its size and scale does not adversely affect the historic streetscape or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Section 6.15.a of the Rules & Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Maria L. Petrillo and artist Ann Northrup represented the application.

Ms. Petrillo stated that the property owners, Marc and Megan Vetri, commissioned Ms. Northrop, an artist, to create a mural entitled "Our Garden" for the side garden wall at the property. She stated that the owners and artist relied on some misinformation from a neighbor, who claimed that the project did not require the Historical Commission's review because it was paint applied to a non-historic part of the house. The neighbor had wrongly instructed that no building permit or consultation with the Commission would be necessary to install the mural. Ms. Petrillo stated that the owners and artist have been planning this mural for a little over three years and the owners intend to donate it to the Mural Arts Program. She noted that Jane Golden, the Director of the Mural Arts Program, endorses the project. She stated that Ms. Northrop looked to the Azalea Garden in Fairmount Park for inspiration and consulted with neighbors and the Spring Garden Civic Association before the painting began. She stated that the mural installation was stopped when the property owners received the violation and it remains incomplete. Ms. Petrillo noted that the wall is not historic and, therefore, the mural is not affixed to historic fabric, does not obscure historic fabric, and does not adversely impact the historic neighborhood. Therefore, she concluded, the mural is compliant with the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations. Ms. Northrop described the material of the mural and how the mural was applied to the wall. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that Ms. Northrop always seek out approvals and permits before undertaking projects.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Section 6.15.a of the Rules & Regulations.

ADDRESS: 200 S BROAD ST

Project: Replace doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bellevue Associates

Applicant: A. Robert Torres, Studio Torres

History: 1902; Bellevue Stratford Hotel; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove non-historic doors at the Walnut Street entrance and install a revolving door and flanking out-swinging doors. The doors will be mostly glass with satin and lacquered bronze. Without documentation of the historic door configuration, a revolving door at this location would be acceptable. However, the door design and materials should be compatible with the existing polished brass doors with decorative mullions and handles at the main Broad Street entrance. The doors at the main entrance, although non-historic, are well-suited to the style and age of the building.

This application also proposes to install new mahogany wall panels and a new stone floor at this same Walnut Street entrance. Given that the historic wall treatment is unknown, the proposed mahogany wall panels appear to be appropriate. However, no information is provided for the existing and proposed floor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect A. Robert Torres represented the application.

Ms. Cote passed around a sample of the satin and lacquered bronze that was submitted with the application. Mr. Torres explained that there are a pair of double doors at the Walnut Street entrance that are difficult to open, owing to the mechanical systems in the building creating positive and negative pressures; therefore, he is proposing to install a revolving door with single-leaf doors flanking it. He stated that he is proposing a revolving door because this opening had a revolving door originally. Ms. Hawkins asked if Mr. Torres had any documentation of the original door. Mr. Torres pointed to an early photograph and the original floor plan indicating that the original was a revolving door. He opined that these doors with a satin bronze are more in keeping with the building in that the polished brass is too glitzy. He stated that the existing doors have Prairie Style mullions, which do not match the style of the building. He stated that they propose simpler, cleaner doors, with only one horizontal push bar, that better suit the building. He stated that they hope to install this door design at the Chancellor Street entrance at a future date as well.

Ms. Hawkins stated that it appears that, unlike historic doors, the proposed doors have bronze top and bottom rails but no side rails and no real frame. Mr. Torres stated that the stiles will be two inches wide, the top rail will be 5 inches, and the bottom rail will be 10 inches; however, they will be mostly glass doors.

Ms. Cote asked if one could glean anything about the original door from the historic photograph. Ms. Gutterman stated that the door was probably wood.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she felt that the proposed door looks too contemporary for this building. She suggested that it needs a frame and it does not necessarily have to be polished brass. She suggested possibly five inches of frame around each leaf of the revolving doors and each swinging door. Mr. D'Alessandro concurred. He asked if they would consider a true bronze color and an oil-rubbed bronze. Mr. Torres stated that he was concerned about the durability of the oil rubbed bronze, especially the door pull. Ms. Stein contended that the oil-rubbed bronze would be appropriate.

Ms. Pentz stated that she could vote to recommend approval of the proposed design, but would also approve of a door based on the Committee's suggestions.

The discussion turned to the design of the paneling. Mr. Torres explained that the current paneling bumps out to accommodate an electrical panel that has become obsolete. He stated that they propose to reduce the protrusion of the panels so as to provide more room for the out swinging doors. He stated that they propose to continue the same panel design on the interior and extend it through the vestibule. Mr. Torres stated that the current flooring is concrete covered with carpet tiles. He stated that they intend to continue the red granite that can be found at the steps up to the door. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that more information is needed to review the flooring proposal.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the organization holds a façade easement for this property. He stated that he agrees with the comments of the Committee.

The Committee agreed that a separate application should be submitted for a proposal to alter the Chancellor Court entrance door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the new doors have oil-rubbed bronze frames and provided that no historic flooring is removed, with the staff to review the details including the paneling and flooring.

ADDRESS: 240-46 ARCH ST

Project: Construct townhouses

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Beacon of Arch Street LLC

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: vacant lots

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct three five-story, single-family townhouses on a vacant lot in Old City. The lot is "undeveloped" and the Commission's jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The proposed townhouses would have garages on the first floor and off-set,

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 SEPTEMBER 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

square, zinc-clad bays on floors two through four. The proposed materials include stained wooden doors, honed and smooth-finish limestone, Trespa or Dri-Design panels, and glass railings at the roof deck. On this block and throughout the historic district, the buildings were historically used for light manufacturing, storage, and commerce and had storefronts on the first floor. Many buildings have been converted to residential use, but retain vestiges of their former commercial uses. The few buildings in the area originally constructed for residential use were converted to commercial uses years ago. Residential townhouses are not typical of the main streets of Old City. The proposed buildings, especially with the garage entrances, are incompatible with the surrounding streetscape and district.

STAFF COMMENT: The garage entrances on the front façades particularly and the single-family residential scale and appearance of these buildings generally are incompatible with the surrounding streetscape and historic district. The buildings should be completely redesigned to comply with Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Agata Reister represented the application.

Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with the staff that the garage door entrances on the front facades are inappropriate. Ms. Pentz and Ms. Stein also concurred with the staff comment regarding the doors. Ms. Gutterman stated that the materials as well as the window design are incompatible with the neighborhood. Ms. Reister stated she understood that the Historical Commission prefers that new construction does not mimic adjacent buildings and risk confuse the time of construction. Ms. Hawkins stated that there is a difference between mimicking and being compatible.

Ms. Hawkins stated that windows in Old City tend to be punched openings rather than projecting bays and the material tends to be more monolithic. She suggested simplifying the design. She suggested a single-wide garage and a window on the ground floor would be better than the proposed double-wide garage. She stated that stone is lightly used at the ground floor in Old City. She observed that the window sizes get smaller on each story as you go higher up the buildings. She also pointed out the framing with thick mullions of the proposed windows is heavier than the typical in Old City. She suggested a stronger definition to the roof line, some sort of cornice. Ms. Gutterman stated that a bay may work in this location, but suggested that the window openings be punched and work with the cues from the neighborhood.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the garage entrances on the front façades particularly and the single-family residential scale and appearance of these buildings generally are incompatible with the surrounding streetscape and historic district. The buildings should be completely redesigned to comply with Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1914-16 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Renovate building, remove and construct additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Barton Blatstein

Applicant: Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1859; Alfred M. Collins House

Individual Designation: 4/28/1970

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes alterations and additions to the property at 1914-16 Rittenhouse Square, at the southwest corner of the square.

A large house stands on five parcels, 1914 and 1916 Rittenhouse Square and 1915, 1917, and 1919 Manning Street. The house has a long and complex history. The main block of the house stands at 1914 Rittenhouse Square and was constructed about 1859 for Alfred M. Collins. Henry McIlhenny, famed socialite and art collector, purchased the house at 1914 Rittenhouse and the parcels on Manning in 1950 and the house at 1916 Rittenhouse in 1955. In the early 1950s, McIlhenny reconstructed the rear wall of the main block and much of the rear ell at 1914 and constructed a garage along Manning. In 1957, McIlhenny and his architect George B. Roberts undertook a major rehabilitation of the property. They demolished the house at 1916 and constructed a one-story domed entrance pavilion on the site. At that time, they removed a large section of the west party wall at the first floor of the main block of the house at 1914 to accommodate a large gallery that stretches across the entire width of the parcels at 1914 and 1916. They also repaired, reconstructed, stuccoed, and painted the remaining west party wall, which shifted significantly with the demolition of 1916 and was in danger of collapse. The pavilion, main block, rear ell and garage form a U-shaped structure that encloses a courtyard. Although one interconnected property at the time of construction in 1957 and at the time of the designation of the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District in 1995, the main block, entrance pavilion, and garage are treated separately in the district's inventory. The main block at 1914 is classified as Significant, the pavilion at 1916 as Contributing, and the garage on Manning as Non-contributing in the district inventory. Also, the 1916 section is incorrectly dated to 1940 in the inventory; its correct date is 1957, post-dating the district's period of significance, 1801-1950. In 1973, McIlhenny purchased the mansion to the east at 1912 Rittenhouse Square and internally connected it to the buildings at 1914-16. When McIlhenny died in 1986, his heirs subdivided the mansion at 1912 from the remainder of the property at 1914-16 and sold it separately. The property at 1912 is not part of the current application. The property at 1914-16 Rittenhouse Square has remained vacant since McIlhenny's death in 1986.

This in-concept application proposes to remove parts of the building including the entrance pavilion, rear ell, and garage and construct new additions. The application seeks an in-concept approval based on the Historical Commission's 27 September 1999 approval of a very similar application for Henry McNeil Jr., a former owner.

Before purchasing the property and submitting the application that led to the final approval in September 1999, Mr. McNeil submitted an in-concept application to determine whether the Commission would look favorably on the notion of demolishing the 1950s additions and adding to the historic section of the house. At meetings on 31 March and 8 April 1998, the Architectural

Committee and Commission expressed general support for the proposal, albeit in an advisory manner.

In 1999, Mr. McNeil submitted an application proposing to remove parts of the building including the entrance pavilion, rear ell, and garage and construct new additions. It proposed a rooftop addition with deck on the main block of 1914, a 4-story addition on the site of the entrance pavilion at 1916, a four-story rear ell, and a two-story garage on Manning. The Architectural Committee reviewed the application on 25 May 1999, 8 July 1999, and 27 July 1999. The Historical Commission reviewed the application on 9 June 1999, 14 July 1999, and 11 August 1999, and approved it with revisions and conditions on 27 September 1999. The application survived years of appeals, but was never implemented. Following the Commission's approval on 27 September 1999, two neighbors appealed the approval to the Board of License & Inspection Review (Appeals 32363 and 32366). The appeals were placed on hold while dimensional zoning variances were considered. On 29 March 2000, the Zoning Board of Adjustment granted the variances, which were appealed. On 2 January 2001, the Court of Common Pleas reversed the Zoning Board and invalidated the variances. In response, the Board of License & Inspection Review declared the appeals of the Historical Commission's approval moot on 5 February 2001. The appellants appealed that Board's decision to declare the appeals moot to the Court of Common Pleas, which reversed it and remanded the appeals of the Historical Commission's approval back to the Board on 26 April 2001. On 2 August 2002, the Commonwealth Court reversed the Court of Common Pleas and reinstated the zoning variances. Finally, on 21 April 2003, almost four years after the original decision, the Board of License & Inspection Review affirmed the Historical Commission's approval. Despite the decision, the project was never undertaken and the property has sat vacant since 1986.

In 2002, while the approval was on appeal, Mr. McNeil submitted an application to the Commission that proposed revisions to the design of the Manning Street façade. The Architectural Committee reviewed the application on 28 May 2002 and the Historical Commission approved it on 14 June 2002, reaffirming its 1999 approval.

Like the earlier, litigated application, the current application proposes to remove the domed entrance pavilion and construct a four-story addition. The addition would mirror the height of the existing main block and would be recessed from the sidewalk line where it would attach to the main block to respect the mansard on the main block. Like the earlier application, the current application also proposes to remove the rear ell and garage and construct a new rear ell and garage of roughly the same sizes in roughly the same locations. It also proposes removals and alterations to the rear section of the main block including the rear wall, which was reconstructed in 1951, and the west party wall, which was partially reconstructed in 1957.

The in-concept application asks the Commission to determine whether the removals constitute a demolition in the legal sense. The record of the 1999 and 2002 approvals, which were extensively litigated, can be examined to determine whether that case established a precedent for the current application. Beyond the alteration-demolition question, the in-concept application asks the Commission to determine whether the proposed work complies with historic preservation standards, especially Standard 9. With the level of detail provided, the Commission's review should be limited to the overarching concepts such as the footprint, heights, volumes, massing, scale, and proportions, but not the detailing and other parameters of the design, which remain undefined.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Commission find in concept that the proposed removals are alterations, not demolitions, pursuant to the Commission's approval of 27 September 1999, Standards 2, 4, 5, and 9, and Section 14-1000 of the Philadelphia Code; and recommends approval in concept, provided garage section of the Manning Street façade including the garage doors and windows are redesigned to be compatible with the scale and proportions of the nearby three-story rowhouses, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Bart Blatstein, attorneys Carl Primavera and Sean Whalen, and architects Shimi Zakin, Nurit Nachim, and Jonathan Doran represented the application.

Mr. Blatstein stated that he planned to redevelop the property as his residence. He observed that many have speculated that he had purchased the property for other reasons, perhaps to build a tower, but he assured the Committee that he intends to reside at the property.

Mr. Primavera stated that the team has met several times with the staff to discuss the project and explore the record of the Commission's previous actions. He stated that, once they understood the earlier approval, they worked diligently to stay within the parameters set by that approval, while still accommodating Mr. Blatstein's programmatic needs and allowing Mr. Zakin's architectural style to flourish. Mr. Primavera stated that he has submitted this in-concept application early in the design cycle to ensure that the Historical Commission's and public's comments can be incorporated into the design before it is considerably developed. He stated that the design team is at the beginning of the process, not at the end. He stated that the design team would like to make a presentation on the proposal approved in 1999 and the current proposal as they relate to both demolition and new construction.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she would like to break the discussion into two segments, one on the demolition vs. alteration question and the other on the compatibility of the proposed design. She asked her fellow Committee members if they had thoughts on the demolition vs. alteration question. Ms. Gutterman immediately asserted that the proposed work is a demolition, not an alteration. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and asserted that it is a demolition because the applicants are not proposing to use the old foundations. Mr. Zakin started to respond, but Ms. Hawkins asked him to hold his comments. Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee should consider the proposed work an alteration and not a demolition in the legal sense because the Commission had rendered a ruling in this matter, which was upheld on appeal. She stated that she was a member of the Architectural Committee when this matter was considered in the late 1990s and asserted that the current Committee must respect the precedent that was set by the Commission at that time. She stated that the Commission reviewed this matter very carefully in the late 1990s and came to a conclusion that was supported on appeal. She cautioned the Committee not to forsake the earlier Commission decision without considering the matter carefully. Ms. Stein agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro that the proposed work is a demolition because the existing foundations will be removed for the excavation. She added that she had not reviewed the records of the earlier application and resulting litigation, but was basing her opinion on the demolition on her knowledge as an architect. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Farnham whether the Committee should offer a recommendation on the demolition vs. alteration question before proceeding to a review of the proposed construction, or it should consider both matters together in one motion. Mr. Farnham responded that either option was acceptable, but he cautioned the Committee not to reach a conclusion on the demolition vs. alteration question without first hearing from the applicants and the public.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that he had questions instead of comments. He asked the applicants to clarify the extent the demolition of the main block now proposed relative to the extent of the demolition of the main block approved in 1999. He noted that it appears that the rear wall and roof of the main block was approved for demolition in 1999. Mr. Zakin noted that the 1999 application also proposed the removal of the interior floor structure. Mr. Leech asked if the current application proposed to demolish any of the west party wall of 1914. Mr. Zakin responded that they are proposing to remove part of that wall. Mr. Leech posited that the current application proposes a facadectomy. Mr. Primavera objected to the progression of the review. He stated that his architects had not yet had an opportunity to present the application to the Committee; instead, the Committee had turned the floor over to a third party, who was questioning his team. He asked the Committee to allow his team to make its presentation. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicants would have an opportunity to make a presentation. Mr. Leech concluded that he believes that this application proposes to demolish more of the main block of the building at 1914 than did the 1999 application.

Ms. Hawkins asked if any Committee member wished to make a motion on the demolition vs. alteration question. Mr. Primavera interjected that it is “procedurally suspect” that the Committee is ready to decide the demolition vs. alteration question without even allowing the architects to make a presentation detailing the parts of the building that would be removed and those that would be retained. Mr. Primavera acknowledged that the Committee did receive the plans in advance and may be able to come to a conclusion on the matter without a presentation by the design team, but questioned why his consultants had not been allowed to present the plans and discuss the matter with the Committee. Mr. Primavera then contended that the comments of two Committee members about their architectural concepts of demolition predicated on the reuse of foundations are not relevant because the relevant concepts of alteration and demolition in this case are legal concepts, not architectural. He stated that this matter has already been litigated and the Committee cannot simply ignore the result of that litigation. He reminded the Committee that this is an application in concept and he and his colleagues and the property owner had presented this application to elicit comments on the proposal. He asked again that his design team be afforded an opportunity to present the application to the Committee before it reaches a decision. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Committee did receive the plans in advance and is comprised of professionals who can read the plans and make determinations. She stated that the Committee would offer a recommendation on the matter, which the Commission was free to accept or reject. Mr. Primavera responded that he hoped that the Committee had studied the plans in depth before the meeting because he would not want the Committee to merely have a “visceral reaction” and then vote quickly without a presentation from his team on a very complex issue that was litigated for many years and is extremely important to the City and its preservation community.

Ms. Hawkins asked if any other audience members wished to speak on the demolition portion of the application. Stephen Mileto, an architect who was attending the Architectural Committee meeting to represent an application that appeared later on the Committee’s agenda, explained that he had worked as an architect on the project approved for this property in 2002 that was now being offered a precedent for an approval of the current application. He stated that the project approved in 1999 and again in 2002 had proposed to demolish all but the front façade of the main block of the building at 1914. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Architectural Committee did not have time to “revisit the entire history” of the earlier project, but noted that Mr. Mileto was

welcome to review the Commission's public files on that project. She stated that the Committee needed to act on the demolition portion of the application without further delay and asked for a motion from the Committee. Mr. D'Alessandro moved to consider the proposal a demolition, not an alteration. Ms. Gutterman seconded the motion, but added that she wanted the applicants "to clarify the extent of the alteration or demolition as proposed." Ms. Hawkins suggested that the Committee hold the motion until it had received additional information.

Ms. Hawkins directed the applicants to make a presentation on the proposed new construction. Mr. Farnham suggested that the applicants not limit themselves to the proposed new construction, but also clarify the extent of the demolition currently proposed, especially as it relates to the demolition approved in 1999 and 2002. Mr. Zakin stated that his submission clearly shows the extent of the proposed demolition in relation to that approved earlier. He asserted that his proposal is "very much compatible with what was approved before in massing, in what is proposed to be removed, and what is proposed to be built." He pointed to enlarged versions of the drawings in the application and explained that the earlier application proposed to remove the pavilion, rear ell, and garage as well as the roof and floor structure of the main block. He stated that the current application proposes the same removals. He noted that there had been questions about the retention of the west party wall and acknowledged that they are proposing to remove some of it, but pointed out that historically, in the 1999 scheme, and in the current scheme, that wall was encapsulated within the larger structure. It was not an exterior wall until it was exposed in 1957. He explained that the building is very unique in shape because it actually creates the southwest corner of Rittenhouse Square. He stated that the new façade on Rittenhouse would take its cues from the historic façade as well as the pavilion, which is set back from the sidewalk. He noted that there is an easement between 1916 and 1918, which must be maintained as a narrow alley. He stated that the new construction at 1916 would be exactly the same height as the historic building at 1914 and would be set back to reveal the return of the mansard roof on 1914. He explained that the brick on the new façade would match the brick on the historic building, but the new construction would not "mimic" the historic structure. The new building will "balance" the old and will "respect" it. He stated that the proportions, materials, and details of the new are based on the old, but do not simply copy the old. He stated that the "dialogue between the two pieces will be very interesting." He reported that a sculpture will be located in the setback at 1916, adjacent to the door, echoing the art gallery use of the former pavilion. The setback will be clad with stone to create a monumental effect at the sculpture. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Zakin to move to a discussion of the rear façade, owing to time constraints.

Mr. Zakin stated that the program requires two two-car garages on Manning Street. He noted that there are many garages on Manning including at the adjacent properties. He explained that he is proposing a new rear ell at the east and the garage structure at the west. The garage structure will be the same height as the adjacent rowhouse to the west. The ell will relate the adjacent ell at 1912 and, like it, will have a bay window. Mr. Primavera noted that the staff recommendation suggested that the design of the Manning Street façade could be revised to make it more compatible in scale and proportion with the adjacent houses and he asked for an opportunity to address that issue. Ms. Hawkins replied that it was the Committee's turn to speak, not his.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the combination of the garages with the small door and window should be redesigned to respect the 20-foot bay rhythm of the street. She suggested three one-car garages rather than two two-car garages. She stated that the 20-foot-wide garage doors deaden

the street. She stated that the height and massing of the garage and rear ell sections was appropriate, especially in light of the buildings to either side. Ms. Gutterman agreed about the garage doors. About the front façade, Ms. Gutterman stated that she approves of the height and materials of the new construction. She expressed concern about the terrace, but others noted that the Commission routinely approves terraces on new construction. She asked for more information about the “whitish” material. She also stated that she wanted to see more information about the windows. Others noted that this is an in-concept application and details will follow with the application for final review. Mr. Zakin asked to address the comments, but Ms. Hawkins suggested that the Committee continue with the review. Ms. Stein commented that the new façade was very appropriately aligned with the surrounding facades. She stated that she would like more information on the materials. She suggested that the tall windows on the addition were out of character with the historic building. Mr. Zakin responded that the windows were designed to very carefully respond to the historic building and the new construction. He pointed out that the space behind the new Rittenhouse façade is a double-height space and noted that that interior volume is reflected in the window design. He also noted, however, that the pane configurations relate the larger windows in the double-height space to the smaller windows in the historic building. He contended that the windows relate to and connect the new and old, not in a simple way, but in a complex way. He stated that the terrace on the new section will have a custom metal railing that will relate it directly to the cornice on the old building. It will create a dialogue between the old and new. He stated that the terrace would create a connection between inside and out and animate the street. He observed that the facades of the houses on Rittenhouse Square are “very busy.” They incorporate many elements and many materials. He stated that their material choices are intended to complement the historic buildings on the square, to speak the language of those buildings. It is a new interpretation of the old, without copying and pasting. The brick, limestone, and metal are drawn from the neighborhood. Ms. Hawkins suggested that Mr. Zakin hold the comments on the materials choices for later review. She noted that the new façade on Rittenhouse Square is divided into three vertical elements. She contended that the three pieces “do not work together as a whole.” She asserted that the facades of the historic houses on the square are “wider and more generous.” She contended that the scale of the new façade is diminished by slicing it into three pieces. Mr. Zakin stated that the historic entrance on the square will be maintained as an entrance, but the main entrance to the house will be located in the new façade. He stated that the entrances in the historic houses are typically the most important features of the façade and are emphasized. He stated that they are likewise emphasizing the main entrance of this house.

Mr. Zakin displayed a series of drawings showing what portions of the building they plan to remove and reconstruct. Ms. Gutterman asked if they were proposing to “remove part of the main house of 1914.” Mr. Zakin stated that they were proposing to remove part of it, but not more than was approved in 1999 and 2002. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Zakin to specify how much of the front of the house they were retaining. He replied that they are retaining the first 15 or 16 feet of the house back from the front façade. Ms. Hawkins asked if he would classify this as a facadectomy. Mr. Zakin replied, “Yes, pretty much.”

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the proposed removals constitute a demolition, not an alteration. Ms. Pentz dissented. Regarding the new construction, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend that, in general, the form, scale, massing, placement, height, and footprint are compatible with the streetscape and historic district, but that the garages on Manning should be redesigned, the

tripartite division of the new façade on Rittenhouse Square was not appropriately scaled, and the material choices should be developed.

ADDRESS: 2028 PINE ST

Project: Construct addition with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jarrad & Sarah Gunther

Applicant: Richard Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1900

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition to a rowhouse situated at the corner of Pine and S. Capitol Streets. Waverly Street runs along the rear of the property. The three-story building features a stucco façade with brick quoins at the corners and a decorative paneled bay facing Capitol. Wood decks project off the rear of the building; they would be removed to allow for the addition. The addition would be contemporary in style, but would be compatible with the scale, rhythm, and massing of the historic building. A brick wall would extend out from the addition along Capitol to shield parking at the rear of the lot.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Jarrad and Sarah Gunther and architect Richard Villa represented the application.

Mr. Villa explained the project. Ms. Hawkins said that she judged the addition to be generally compatible. She contended, however, that it could be improved by elongating the first-floor windows. The Committee members also recommended against cladding the chimney in new brick. They questioned the one-inch set back of the new wall of the addition from the old wall and suggested that such a small setback was too small to differentiate new from old. They recommended that the architect use a reveal of about three inches rather than a setback of one inch. Ms. Stein asked the architect to confirm that there would be no changes to the wall of the existing house. Mr. Villa confirmed that the old wall would remain unaltered. He also explained the brick system for the addition and noted that it will be a single color of red brick. He said that the new mechanical equipment will be hidden behind a wall in the back yard.

Ms. Hawkins asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment. Lenore Millhollen of the Preservation Alliance asked the architect to clarify whether the garage would be set back from the street. Mr. Villa clarified that it would be substantially set back.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would recommend approval as long as the chimney is not reclad and the one-inch setback of the addition is replaced with a reveal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the chimney is not cladded and the setback of the addition is replaced with a reveal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 335 S 21ST ST

Project: Renovate building, demolish rear addition, add deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Andre Kurman & Linda Chen

Applicant: Stephen Mileto, QB3, LLC

History: 1890; Charles B. Hart House

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade and alter a rear ell of a rowhouse on S. 21st Street. This rowhouse dates to the middle of the nineteenth century, but was significantly altered in the 1890s. The front façade was rebuilt in the Colonial Revival style, a fourth story was added to the main block, and the rear ell was lengthened. In the twentieth century, the building was converted to multi-family residential use. The new owners would like to convert it back into a single-family house. They propose to restore the front façade. They also propose to remove the addition to the rear ell and reconfigure windows and doors at the ell. They also propose to add a roof deck to the ell. The ell is minimally visible from Pine Street and somewhat visible from Waverly Street, a service alley. The alterations to the ell would be inconspicuous from the right-of-way.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stephen Mileto represented the application.

Mr. Mileto displayed photographs documenting that the proposed work would have minimal visibility from public rights-of-way. He stated that the property owners are converting the building back to a single-family house and would like to undo some of the alterations and additions undertaken when it was converted to multi-family residential use. They would like to create a rear yard in which their children can play. Also, the work would return the house to a size that complies with as-of-right zoning. The Committee members commented that they routinely review applications to enlarge houses, but never to reduce them in size. Mr. Baron explained that Mr. Mileto has committed to working with staff on finding the correct window configuration for the front façade. Ms. Gutterman stated that she agrees with the staff recommendation of approval. Her colleagues concurred.

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

ADDRESS: 1636 SPRUCE ST

Project: Legalize roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alexander G. Bochetto

Applicant: Tricia Desmarais Clark, Bochetto & Lenz, P.C.

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a roof deck and related structures that were not constructed according to the plans approved by the Historical Commission. The Commission reviewed an application for a deck and stair house for this property several times in 2008 and eventually agreed upon a specific design. The owner then constructed a deck that is more than twice as large as approved and added a pergola that is particularly visible from the street. A violation was issued, which was forwarded to court for enforcement. The Architecture Committee reviewed the revised design in January 2013 and recommended denial pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines. The application lacked complete architectural drawings. The applicant withdrew the application before it reached the Commission in February 2013. The current application proposes the legalization of the same deck and roof structures presented in January 2013, but the application includes additional architectural documentation.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Tricia Desmarais Clark represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that, although the Committee had reviewed this application in the past, the current application has been supplemented with an elevation drawing. The Committee members reviewed the site plan and noted that the deck that was built is more than twice the size of the deck that the Commission had approved. They also noted that the deck has a pergola that was not proposed in the approved application. Ms. Hawkins stated that the deck and pergola are highly visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz agreed that the deck and pergola do not comply with the Standards. They are highly conspicuous.

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

ADDRESS: 263 S 15TH ST

Project: Remove projecting sign, install projecting neon sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David Blumenfeld

Applicant: Linda Brown, Brown Expediting

History: 1922; Hoffman Henon Company, architects and engineers

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a projecting neon sign. The sign would be based on a sign that once stood on this building and is documented in an historic photograph. The sign in the historic photograph appears to be approximately 6 feet tall and mounted about 12 feet above the sidewalk. The proposed sign would be 8 feet tall and mounted 17'-8" above the sidewalk.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the new sign is sized and mounted like the historic sign, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the proposed sign is very much like a sign that was once mounted on the building, but differs in two significant regards. He explained that the staff had counted brick courses in the historic photograph and determined that the historic sign was smaller and mounted lower on the building than the proposed sign. Ms. Hawkins agreed and opined that the proposed sign would be too large for the building and would be mounted too high on the building, at the second-floor level, well above the storefront.

Ms. Hawkins asked for comments from the audience. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance asked whether the Committee approved of the font of the lettering on the proposed sign, which he contended was atypical of neon signage. The Committee members responded that they approved of the font, which derives from the logo of the commercial establishment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the new sign is approximately 6 feet tall and mounted approximately 12 feet above the sidewalk, like the historic sign, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 SEPTEMBER 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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 Guidelines: 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.

Section 6.15 of the Rules & Regulations

6.15 Murals

6.15.a Policy

6.15.a.1 This policy applies to murals and other similar forms of outdoor visual art.

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

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

6.15.a.4 The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees, and staff shall not consider a mural's content as a part of its review of any application for a building permit, but may consider size, scale, and relationship to the historic context.

6.15.b Public Notice

6.15.b.1 The applicant for a mural or other similar form of outdoor visual art shall place a poster(s) provided by the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the premises notifying the public of the times and dates when the Architectural Committee and the full Commission will meet to consider the application.

6.15.b.2 The poster(s) shall be placed within 24 hours of the submission of a building permit application to the Historical Commission.

6.15.b.3 The poster(s) shall be placed on each street frontage of the premises and shall be clearly visible to the public.

6.15.b.4 The poster(s) shall remain on the premises until the date that the full Commission holds a hearing to consider the application.

6.15.b.5 The applicant shall take time-dated photographs of the poster(s) and present the photograph(s) to the Architectural Committee at its hearing.