

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

**TUESDAY, 22 MARCH 2016
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAN MCCOUBREY, ACTING CHAIR**

PRESENT

Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Lucia Esther
Carolyn Healy, Powelton Village Civic Association
John Phillips, Powelton Village Civic Association
Edward Singer, Plumbob Architects
George Poulin, Powelton Village Civic Association
Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia
Mr. Dougherty
Steven Savage, SRS
Paul Boni
Stephen Foley, Foley Beam Architects
A. Dominick, Powelton Village Civic Association
Stephen Watson
Jonathan Broh, JKRP Architects
Cathie Dopkin, Varenhorst
Karen Paulkner, Powelton Village Civic Association
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Brian Hanstein, Powelton Village Civic Association
Alina Macneal, Powelton Village Civic Association
Joan Weiner, Powelton Village Civic Association
Karen Lewis, Drexel
Dimitri Bouridis, Drexel
Bernadette Wyche, D. Ward Leader 24
Stephen Varenhorst, Varenhorst
James Wright, Peoples Emergency Center
Jackie Gusic, InHabit LLC
Samantha Kin, Samantha Kin Design
Daniel Monreal
Juanda Myles
Mike McHale

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein joined him.

ADDRESS: 1416-22 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Replace windows and doors; cut opening; construct stair tower and walkway

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Elk Street Management

Applicant: Ted Singer, Plumbob LLC

History: 1891; 10th District Patrol Stable; Charles O'Neill, contractor

Individual Designation: 1/1/3000

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate an existing commercial space on the ground floor of this former police stable building into a restaurant and to create two residential units on the upper floors. The application proposes to replace the existing non-historic entrance door with folding aluminum and glass doors with a fixed transom above; create a large opening in the south side wall by removing the masonry between two existing windows; and to construct an enclosed stair addition at the rear to provide access to a new suspended exterior walkway along the north wall for access into the new residential units on the second floor.

The property is currently under consideration for designation; it is not yet designated. Planning for the renovation was underway at the time the nomination was submitted. While not all aspects of the application satisfy a strict interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the Commission may invoke its transition rule, which allows for the consideration and approval of development plans in process at the time of designation. As a compromise, the staff suggests that the Commission require more appropriate, wooden carriage-style doors in the front arched opening, but allow the side door cut and installation of additional glazing, provided only the brick between the windows is removed and the new system does not cut into the base except for the door opening.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the front doors better replicate the historic carriage doors and that the side entrance and glazing is limited to a single door cut and the removal of the brick pier between the windows, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Edward Singer represented the application. Mr. Singer noted that the owner from Elk Street Management was unable to attend the meeting.

Mr. Singer noted that he does not know if the owner would agree with the staff's recommendations.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a reason that the staff did not believe that the existing door is the original door. Ms. DiPasquale responded that a historic photograph of the property from 1958 shows the original door. Mr. Singer presented that photograph, and noted that, furthermore, the doors are not functional owing to a steel bar that runs across the middle. He suggested that some of the original hardware may have been incorporated into the new doors. Ms. Gutterman opined that the doors look old. Ms. DiPasquale noted that, since the applicants desire operability, the staff had recommended that the applicants look into sliding wood doors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MARCH 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Stein asked whether the arched transom is visible from the interior. Mr. Singer responded that it will be, but is currently obscured by a dropped ceiling and plywood. Mr. Singer noted that he was not sure whether glass remains in the transom, as a metal cage on the front elevation prevents a clear view of the opening from the exterior as well. Ms. Stein wondered if the timber frame visible on the interior door photograph is original and extends around the whole opening. Mr. Singer responded that he doubts that it is, as the doors in the historic photograph are much taller than the existing doors and timber frame. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the historic doors extended further and had a coffered corner.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the design of the doors at the stair tower, and asked Ms. DiPasquale if the staff had recommended doors more in keeping with the aesthetics of the building. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff had not discussed the design of the stair tower doors, owing to the limited visibility of the rear from the street. She noted that, historically, the police stable was attached at the rear to a much larger police station building. Mr. Singer noted that the rest of the parcel, which extends to Front Street, will eventually be developed, further limiting or completely eliminating visibility of the proposed rear addition.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the proposed exterior walkway and canopy would be visible from the street. Mr. Singer responded that it would be partially visible from Frankford Avenue. Ms. Gutterman opined that it would be helpful to have a site map included in the submission. Mr. Singer responded that that is something they could provide to the Commission.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a problem with reducing the amount of masonry removal as the staff had recommended. Mr. Singer responded that they could study the concept of retaining the base except at the door, but noted that the tenant for the project has a considerable interest in maintaining a visible connection between the proposed outdoor patio space and the interior dining space. He noted that the height of the existing base is roughly four feet, so, from a seated position, a visual connection to the exterior would be limited. He stated that they could consider that option, but it is not the preference of the tenant. Furthermore, he continued, he is concerned that the removal of the brick but not the base would appear more awkward than a simple, large rectangular opening that appears more like a large garage door than an obviously altered configuration. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff's reasoning was that the removal of the brick is more reversible if a future tenant wants to restore the property, they could easily find salvaged brick, whereas to replicate the stone base would be much more difficult. Ms. Gutterman noted that the application also proposes to remove the window lintels, so it is essentially reframing the entire opening. Mr. Singer commented that a steel lintel would have to be installed regardless. He suggested that they could place a new piece of limestone between the existing limestone lintels supported on a concealed steel channel or plate, rather than removing the lintels and installing an exposed steel beam.

Ms. Stein asked whether the door on the north side of the building is original. Mr. Singer responded that he does not know, as he has not found any historic images of that side of the property.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants planned to keep all of the star bolts on the exterior. Mr. Singer responded, yes, to the extent that they are necessary to maintain the integrity of the wall, but they have not had a structural engineer assess the property since the exterior pointing.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there will be a new exhaust duct. Mr. Singer responded affirmatively, noting that the exhaust will be exiting the rear through the new stair tower, so it will be

concealed. Ms. Gutterman asked if it will be visible on the roof of the stair tower. Mr. Singer responded that it would come out of the roof of the stair tower.

Ms. Stein questioned the location of additional mechanical units. Mr. Singer responded that, to the extent possible, the condensing units will be located on the roof of the stair tower or potentially on the ground. Ms. Stein suggested dropping the ceiling height of the stair addition to create a parapet that would conceal the mechanical units. She opined that placing the units on top of the stair tower and having them be visible against the masonry is not appropriate.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Ms. DiPasquale about the configuration of the original windows. Ms. DiPasquale responded that they were four-over-four double-hung windows with a transom above.

Ms. Stein questioned the materials of the proposed alterations, including the windows, stair tower, and balcony, noting that they are not called out on the drawings. Mr. Singer responded that their preference would be for aluminum-clad wood windows for maintenance. The stair tower, he added, is early in design development, and they are open to different options. Ms. Gutterman responded that it is depicted as a coarse material, and asked whether it is wood. Mr. Singer responded that it could be a lap siding or a Hardi-plank siding. Ms. Gutterman stated that, if they are looking for low-maintenance, wood siding is not ideal. Ms. Stein noted that the Committee usually reviews materials and colors, and suggested that the addition have a masonry base.

Ms. Stein asked if Mr. Singer planned to come back to the Committee with additional details. Mr. Singer replied that the primary focus of this submission is on the alterations to the existing building, so if they need to make further presentations about the new elements, they would be willing to do so. Ms. DiPasquale suggested that the Committee make recommendations about materials they feel would be appropriate.

Ms. Stein questioned the materials of the suspended walkway. Ms. Gutterman asked if it included a glass railing. Mr. Singer responded that it is rendered as a glass railing, but drawn as a steel or cable rail. He noted that it would be a painted steel structure. Ms. Stein questioned the material of the walkway roof. Mr. Singer responded that it is required to have a roof for egress purposes, and would be constructed of steel or glass with a metal roof. Ms. Stein asked if a canopy cover would be needed if the floor of the walkway is a metal grate. Mr. Singer responded affirmatively, noting that egress must be covered from the units to the point where the occupants reach the ground. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the stair is only serving the one floor, and remarked at the distance traveled for egress. Mr. Singer responded that they may utilize the stair for a future phase of development, and that the ground-floor restaurant tenant cannot afford the loss of space to accommodate an interior stair. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any way to enter the building directly from the stair. Mr. Singer responded that that would be less optimal as it would require creating a hallway along the length of the rear unit, which would eliminate the ability of the existing windows to serve that unit.

Ms. Stein questioned the size of the upper-floor units, noting that they appear to be very small. Mr. Singer responded that one unit could be considered a two-bedroom, while the other is a one-bedroom. He noted that it is essentially a bi-level unit with the living space located in the truss bay. He opined that it is a tricky building to make work, as the trusses do not have adequate clearance.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants proposed any skylights. Mr. Singer responded that they are not proposing skylights. Ms. Stein and Ms. Gutterman questioned the installation of bathroom and kitchen vents. Mr. Singer responded that there may be some requirements for typical four-inch diameter vents through the roof, but that they have not yet worked through the mechanical layouts.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed Slateline roofing shingles. Mr. Singer responded that it is an asphalt shingle that replicates the appearance of slate. Ms. DiPasquale noted that that is the roofing material the staff would have approved at the staff level.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that he is not sure what the “transitional rule” is, and whether that is a determination of the full Commission, but that the proposed alterations do not meet the Standards in a way that the Committee would typically apply them.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the applicant’s timeframe, opining that the application is incomplete. She noted that it would be great to have more information about the addition, materials, and a site plan. She asked whether the applicant is trying to secure a building permit this month, or if deferring the review a month to have the applicant submit additional materials for the Committee’s review would be possible. Mr. Singer responded that there is a desire by the tenant to move forward as quickly as possible, and that they were hoping to have the matter of designation and the architectural review completed on the same day.

Mr. Baron seconded Ms. DiPasquale’s previous suggestion that the Committee offer recommendations for improving the design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the following:

- the applicant submit a site plan and photographs of the building’s context and views for Commission’s review;
- the stair addition is constructed of masonry and with a base;
- the doors on the stair addition are more in keeping with the design of the historic building;
- the applicant submit plans showing the location of mechanical equipment, hoods, and roof vents for bathrooms and kitchens;
- the exterior walkway is constructed only of iron, steel, and/or corrugated metal, but no glass;
- wood windows are used on the front elevation;
- the applicant evaluates retaining the base at the new side entrance except at a door cut, perhaps by retaining the existing windows and cutting down large door between them; and,
- the front entranceway is designed based on the historic photograph, with a high lintel and large wood doors.

ADDRESS: 141-43 N 4TH ST AND 319 CHERRY ST

Proposal: Demolish rear building; construct 6-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: John G. Traver Co. Inc., c/o Steven Savitz

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1780

Individual Designation: 4/26/1966

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks in-concept approval to demolish one- and four-story structures at the rear of 141-43 N. 4th Street, and to construct an L-shaped, six-story building on the site, which would be combined with a vacant parcel at 319 Cherry Street. The eighteenth-century property at 141-43 N. 4th Street, which was individually designated in 1966 and categorized as Significant in the Old City Historic District inventory in 2003, would be retained and would become a stand-alone building once again. The structures at the rear of the property are not explicitly called out in the Old City Historic District inventory, but historic map research indicates that the four-story structure at the center of the parcel was constructed prior to 1860, and even perhaps as early as 1796 as a school, and was converted to a warehouse in the mid nineteenth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, pending the outcome of additional research, perhaps Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition in the preservation ordinance. The staff notes that, although altered, the existing rear structure appears to be the remnant of an eighteenth-century parochial school building. The staff also comments that the height and massing of the proposed building are not appropriate for this block of the Old City Historic District, particularly along Orianna Street, which is a narrow, historically-paved street lined with two to three-story buildings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ryan Lohbauer and Steven Savage of SRS represented the application.

Mr. Lohbauer submitted supplemental materials to the Committee members.

Mr. Lohbauer explained that his clients are in their due diligence period for acquiring the two parcels at 141-43 N 4th and 319 Cherry Streets, which forms an irregularly shaped parcel. He noted that the building located at the center of the parcel behind the historic structure along N. 4th Street is essentially a vacant warehouse. He stated that 319 Cherry is a driveway and loading dock that connects to the rear of the parcel at 141-43 N. 4th Street.

Mr. Lohbauer explained that during the due diligence period, it is important to figure out what the constraints for development are, and what they can consider building. He stated that the two biggest constraints he has identified so far are the massing of the proposed development and the Commission's position on the demolition of the central "Component C" building. In response to the staff recommendation, he noted that his research does indicate that there was a parochial school at that site that occupied a similar footprint that may have been used by the German Calvinists; however, the building has been heavily modified from the original structure, if it is the original structure. He noted that none of the windows are original, and it is questionable whether the roof shape is original. On the interior, he continued, the structure has been heavily modified to handle the loads of the paint storage that it once housed. He explained that columns have been inserted on the interior, the windows are steel from the twentieth century, and the exterior

has been stuccoed. From the interior, he added, it is clear that the fourth story is not of eighteenth-century construction, as it has some sort of tensioned beam that would not have been utilized at that time.

Mr. Lohbauer contended that, historically, the central structure was minimally visible to any public right-of-way. He suggested that, if the parking lots that were created in the 1960s are filled with new construction, the center building will be obscured even further. He opined that the center building should not be considered historic, and the focus should be on the preservation of the 4th Street building. He noted that the 4th Street building would be converted back to a free-standing structure, as it was historically.

Mr. Lohbauer noted that the second question is the massing of the proposed new construction along Orianna Street. He contended that the staff's characterization of the property misses the fact that there is a six-story building at 320 Race Street, at the north end of Orianna Street. He commented that a wonderful part of Old City's past is its Victorian industrial architecture which had tall, slender, daring buildings. He suggested that their idea for the proposed development as depicted in the revised renderings is of that architectural language, of very tall, narrow, light-filled buildings. He noted that the Race Street building is approximately 61 or 62 feet in height, and extends approximately 80 to 85 feet along Orianna Street, while their proposed building would be roughly 65 feet in height and extend along Orianna for roughly 130 feet. Mr. Lohbauer argued that there is a precedent for tall buildings on the street, and opined that the only argument he could see against the proposed development is a zoning argument. Ms. Stein responded that Race Street has a much different character than Cherry Street. Mr. Lohbauer replied that there is a six-story, mid-century building on 4th and Cherry Street. He argued that there is no reason to limit the development at Orianna and Cherry Streets to a height lower than the zoning height restriction of 65 feet, or roughly six stories, in Old City.

Ms. Stein questioned the blue volumes shown on the supplemental renderings. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the blue volumes indicate existing parking lots that may be built upon in the future. He noted that future construction on the neighboring parking lots would limit the visibility of the interior parcel in question, and argued that that potential future development should impact how the Committee and Commission think about the demolition of the central structure and the massing of the proposed structure.

Ms. Gutterman asked the staff's opinion about the central structure, inquiring whether the staff entered the building in question. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff has not been in the building, and based its recommendation on historic map research. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the staff would concede that, if the building is the eighteenth-century school, it has been heavily altered. Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff agreed that the construction of a building on Orianna Street would limit visibility of the center building. Ms. DiPasquale responded that new construction on Orianna or Cherry Street would limit visibility of the central building, but that more research should be conducted into the history of the existing building. She noted that even if it is not the eighteenth-century school building, a nineteenth-century warehouse building would still fit in the context of the Old City Historic District.

Ms. Gutterman questioned whether an engineer had inspected the building's structural components to try to date the building. Mr. Lohbauer responded that they have not had an engineer or historian evaluate the structure, but that it really gets down to the individual components of the building. He described the existing building as a shell of four stories with brick, load-bearing walls, typical wood 3B construction, which was heavily reinforced with columns and beams, likely in the 1880s or 1890s. He argued that, if it is the former school

building, it is unclear how much of the joists and floor structure are original, and that it is possible it was entirely redone in the 1880s. He noted that one of the primary structural components is a continuous beam that runs the length of the roof structure, a construction method he has seen in warehouse buildings dating from the 1880s and 1890s, but not in earlier construction.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Committee's dilemma is that this may be a building that has a significant amount of historic material, even if it dates to the 1880s or 1890s, still falls within the Old City Historic District's period of significance. He indicated that he suspects a good portion of the eighteenth-century masonry remains, as the building's footprint has not fundamentally changed.

Mr. Lohbauer questioned the constraints on a low-visibility structure, noting that the building may become minimally visible in the future. Ms. Gutterman responded that that is no different than any other building in the city, and that the development on the parking lot may occur in five years, or in 25 years; the Commission's decision, she opined, cannot be based on something that might happen in the future, but must be based on current conditions and on the potential loss of historic fabric.

Ms. Stein noted that, when applicants propose to demolish a structure, they typically present structural reports or reports from historians indicating the condition or non-historic nature of the building. Mr. Lohbauer questioned whether a hardship application would concede that everyone agrees that the structure is historic, and is something to preserve.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the proposal shows a full build-out, given whatever other restraints there are on the property, including the absolute zoning height limit of 65 feet. He opined that the Committee and Commission need more information on the history of the center building, and agreed with the staff recommendation that the building at Orianna and Cherry Streets is oppressively high given the width of the street. He noted that the property at Race and Orianna Streets happens to overlook a church yard, so it does not have the same context as the other end of the street. Mr. Lohbauer responded that, when the building at Race and Orianna was constructed, the church yard was fully occupied with other structures that surrounded the church building, which was converted into a warehouse for a period of time. Ms. Gutterman stated that a four-story building along Orianna Street would be more appropriate than a six-story building.

Mr. Lohbauer opined that one of the things that is interesting about Old City's industrial past is that it created conditions such as the one proposed, in which tall buildings create impressive, narrow alleys. He directed the Committee's attention to the last page of the supplemental materials, pointing out Little Boys Court and Cuthbert Street, which he contended are very interesting parts of the city. Ms. Stein responded that four stories would already tower over the neighboring two-story buildings to create a similar effect. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the wall along the parking lot side of the proposed Cherry and Orianna Street building would be a blank, six-story party wall.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that more evidence should be provided about the history and integrity of the building proposed for demolition, and whether there are any options for reusing the structure. He suggested that no real decisions can be made until that information is provided.

Mr. Baron clarified the difference between “In-Concept Review” and “Review and Comment,” noting that the Commission has full jurisdiction over the projects proposed for In-Concept Review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, and, pending the outcome of additional research, perhaps Section 14-1005(6)(d). The Committee commented that the scale and massing of the proposed new construction is too large; that the structure should be reduced in height; and that more information about the history, structural condition, and changes to the schoolhouse building should be provided.

ADDRESS: 3600-30 LANCASTER AVE

Proposal: Demolish rear ells; construct 3-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AP Construction

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKRP Architects

History: 1878; William Fennell Row

Individual Designation: 10/9/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 3600-30 Lancaster Avenue is comprised of a block-long row of 16 three- and four-story Italianate buildings that have been consolidated into one tax parcel. This application proposes to remove the rear ells on the buildings and construct a three-story addition at the rear and along N. 36th Street. The entire row, which was not designated as historic until October 2015, was slated for demolition, but was saved through a collaborative effort involving the Powelton Village Civic Association, former Deputy Mayor, and Historical Commission. Since the property was nominated for designation, the property owner has stepped away from the demolition plans and has negotiated with the City Councilwoman, neighbors, and City while seeking a plan that allows for the preservation of the buildings and a financially viable redevelopment of the property. While not all aspects of the application satisfy a strict interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the Commission may invoke its transition rule, which allows for the consideration and approval of development plans in process at the time of designation. Moreover, the property owner has appealed the designation; the case is not yet scheduled before the Court of Common Pleas, but will be shortly. The approval of a redevelopment plan agreeable to all parties would likely preempt that appeal.

The row of buildings would be rehabilitated as a mixed-use development with 92 residential units and 5,450 sf of office space. The rear ells, some with projecting bays, and rear walls of the main blocks would be removed. The addition would be constructed at the rears of the buildings, with a leg running southeast along 36th Street onto a property not designated as historic, 60 N. 36th Street; the Historical Commission would have jurisdiction over the construction proposed for this property because it would be an addition to a designated building. The new construction would clad in red and black brick and aluminum panels and fenestrated with aluminum fixed and casement windows. The front and side facades of the historic buildings would be rehabilitated. Trim would be scraped and painted. Storefront windows would be replaced in kind. Upper-floor windows would be replaced with wood, simulated-divided-light windows to match. Some storefront doors would be made inoperable because residential units would occupy the former commercial spaces. The masonry would be cleaned.

While most of the rear ells slated for removal are located behind the block, not visible from Lancaster Avenue, the rear ell of 3630 Lancaster, the tallest building in the row, is highly visible from the public right-of-way, standing on S. 37th Street. Moreover, the ell at 3630 is taller and longer than the other ells and therefore blocks public views of the rears of the other buildings. The rear ell at 3630 Lancaster should be retained and incorporated into the development.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the rear ell at 3630 Lancaster is retained and incorporated into the development, with the staff to review window, door, masonry, and other details of the rehabilitations of the historic buildings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jonathan Broh and Mike McHale represented the application.

Mr. Broh explained the project strategy, which is to maintain the elevations along Lancaster Avenue and 36th and 37th Streets, as well as the existing roofs, but to demolish the rear walls of the main blocks and the rear ells to construct a common corridor between the proposed new building and existing buildings. He noted that they would reconstruct the interior second and third floors so they are no longer walk-ups from Lancaster Avenue, but are accessed from the new common corridor. He noted that there is a significant grade change along the parcel of approximately 11 feet, which makes it impractical to have the ground floor units accessible from the corridor, so the ground floors of all of the units would still be accessible off Lancaster Avenue. He explained that there are currently two doors for each building—one for access to the ground-floor unit and one for the upper-floor apartments. This second door, he continued, would be fixed in place at each of the existing buildings.

Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification on the amount of demolition. Mr. Broh explained that, in addition to the front facades, the party walls of the buildings would be retained to approximately 38 feet.

Addressing the staff recommendation, Mr. Broh commented that they had not been sure if the rear ell along 37th Street was part of the corner property, and that they could explore retaining it. He noted that this may be difficult, as the windows do not line up, so it likely would have to be a stand-alone unit, but that he thinks they could get it to work.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Broh to elaborate on the proposed materials for the new construction. Mr. Broh responded that they are proposing a cast-stone watertable, red brick with limestone vertical banding, black brick, metal paneling, and casement windows. Ms. Gutterman asked if there are metal panels between the windows. Mr. Broh responded affirmatively. He noted that the darker color in the rendering is black brick. Ms. Gutterman asked about the materials on the rear of the building. Mr. Broh responded that there is red brick along the sides, which then turns approximately eight feet along the rear before becoming metal paneling. Ms. Stein asked if the intention of the red brick is to match the existing red brick. Mr. Broh responded that the proposed brick would be complementary to the brick of the historic buildings. Ms. Gutterman questioned the proposed cornice material, and Mr. Broh responded that it would be aluminum.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the locations of the proposed mechanical equipment. Mr. Broh responded that the new mechanical units would mostly likely be located on the roof. He noted that there will also be a basement electrical and mechanical room. Ms. Gutterman commented that the units should be set back so they are not visible from the street. Ms. Gutterman asked if there would be any roof access for roof decks or roof gardens. Mr. Broh responded that no roof

decks are proposed at this time; however, there is a stair tower that will probably open onto the roof through an access hatch.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there are party walls in the existing building at the corner of 37th Street. Mr. Broh responded that there are and that they would remain. Ms. Stein noted that the applicant may have to relocate the proposed stair tower if they are to retain the rear ell. Mr. Broh responded that they may be able to incorporate a stair tower into the existing ell. He noted that a stair may actually be a good use for the ell, since the windows do not align with the other buildings.

Ms. Stein opined that the precast masonry watertable should step with the grade change to make it more pedestrian-friendly.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the signage shown in the rendering. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the brackets are existing. Mr. Broh noted that they are interesting characteristics and would be retained. Ms. Gutterman asked if there is any proposed façade lighting. Mr. Broh responded that there would be down-lights and egress lights at all of the entrances, but there is no up-lighting or architectural lighting proposed.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the Warren and 36th Street façade. Mr. Broh realized that that façade is not shown, but noted that it would be red brick, and the stair tower would be black brick.

Ms. Stein opined that metal panels extending to grade are not durable in an urban environment and recommended that the applicants include a masonry base of at least 24 inches.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. John Philips, the president of Powelton Village Civic Association (PVCA), spoke in opposition to the proposal. He noted that there is an incorrect statement in the staff overview, as the owners have had no contact with the community organization since the designation, and have cancelled every scheduled meeting. As such, he stated, the community has had no contact and no input into the current plan. He opined that the removal of commercial units from this block is devastating to the block and the community.

George Poulin, the chair of the zoning committee of the PVCA, seconded Mr. Philip's comments, again noting the PVCA's objection to the proposed modifications. In terms of the architectural components, he objected to the removal of the rear ell of the corner property at 37th Street and Lancaster Avenue, which is visible from Lancaster Avenue and Warren and 37th Streets. He also objected to the removal of the remaining ells from 3600-3628, which are currently visible from public right-of-way. He opined that the plans are not compliant with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Poulin expressed concern over the ground plane along 36th Street, noting that the proposed addition meets the ground in a way that is insensitive and does not respect the historic character of the block or neighborhood. He noted that the properties along Lancaster Avenue step so the entrances are at grade, and suggested that a more sensitive treatment of the 36th Street elevation would be to do the same. Mr. Poulin paraphrased Standard 1 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, stating that: "A property shall be used for its intended historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building, and its site and environment." Mr. Poulin commented that, when the properties were designated in the fall of 2015, they were mixed-use commercial buildings, which were originally constructed for their intended purpose of ground-floor commercial with residential units above. By converting the ground-floor retail spaces into residential units, Mr. Poulin continued, it takes away a

defining characteristic of the building, its commercial use. While he admitted that the facades will be restored and will retain their commercial storefronts, he contended that they will have a different presence at the street by being converted into residential units; there will not be the commercial signage, there will be curtains in the windows, there will be a lack of transparency into the spaces, which is concerning to the community.

Karen Lewis of Drexel University stated her concern about the lack of commercial retail and the lack of community engagement. Neighbor Brian Hanstein noted he is not sure if the Commission takes quality of life or aesthetics into concern, but stated his concern that his property at 3633 Warren Street will now be facing a wall of windows.

Neighbor Bernadette White asked the applicant if there is any retail, greenery, or trees planned for the proposed development. Mr. McHale responded that there is greenery on the street and the facades and sidewalks will not change.

James Wright of the People's Emergency Center echoed concerns over the lack of public engagement and lack of commercial use.

Neighbor Alina Macneal bemoaned the lack of commercial use, noting that she frequents the restaurants and businesses along the block. Specifically, she expressed concerns over the reduction of safety as a result of the loss of commercial space, arguing that once the restaurants are gone, life will be gone and pedestrians will not be as secure. Ms. Gutterman responded that, unfortunately, those concerns are not within the Commission's jurisdiction. She attempted to steer comments to the design and architecture of the proposed alterations.

Lucia Esther, chair of the West Powelton/Saunders Park RCO, stated that her organization was not consulted on the proposed development, and seconded concerns over the loss of commercial space and safety.

Elizabeth Stegner, the president of the University City Historical Society, stated that she was "genuinely dumbfounded" when she learned that the Commission was reviewing this proposal. She stated that she believed the space was certified historic by the Philadelphia Historical Commission, and that she did not realize that the Commission was designating the facades only. She noted that the staff overview had stated that the property was just recently designated, but noted that back in the 1980s, the federal government invested considerable money in restoring and refurbishing the block because of its historical significance. Ms. Gutterman responded that the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission is limited to the exterior of the buildings, and the fact that a building is listed on the National Register does not give the City jurisdiction. Ms. Stegner expressed her confusion again. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the entire exterior envelope including the rears of the buildings are designated.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the new interior floor configuration, noting that one continuous floor level appears as though it would cut through several sets of windows. Mr. Broh responded that they have not had a chance to fully survey the property, but that it is likely that the new building will have to have at least one or two steps at some point. He noted that they have to maintain 18-inch sill heights above the floor line, so the interior will have to be ramped or stepped to accommodate those requirements. Mr. McCoubrey noted that, as depicted in the drawings, the floor line cuts through some windows. Mr. Broh responded that they could adjust those drawings for the Commission if needed.

Mr. Broh opined that the design of the rear of the buildings suggests that they were constructed in a different era than the main blocks of the buildings. He noted that there are vinyl windows, stucco, and that the cornices do not align. He clarified that he could not state that for certainty, but they do not appear historic. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any evidence that the rear ells were constructed in a different period. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she would need to consult historic maps to be sure, but that she believes that there were ells there at the time of construction or soon thereafter, although they may have been altered over the years. Mr. McCoubrey observed that, by ordinary standards, the removal of the rear ells and rear walls would be considered demolition, and as such, does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He noted that, given his lack of knowledge of the Commission's "transition rule," he would have to leave that decision up to the full Commission, and determine at the Committee level that the project is a demolition. Ms. Gutterman agreed.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that the project is dangerously close to demolition as opposed to an alteration. Ms. Gutterman agreed. Mr. Grossi expressed his further concerns about the loss of commercial space at the ground-floor level along Lancaster Avenue.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).

ADDRESS: 2050 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Construct garage and roof deck with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mary Dandrea

Applicant: Stephen Foley, Foley-Beam Architecture

History: 1897; Art Deco base and grille, c. 1930

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house and to install a garage at the rear of the building. The property is located mid-block on Locust Street, within the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District, and its rear faces Latimer Street. The installation of the garage would involve demolishing the rear wall below the existing second-story deck and placing the garage door four feet inside the building from the current plane of the wall. The pilot house for the proposed roof deck would be positioned at the center of the roof space, so it would not be visible from a public right-of-way. In the proposed configuration, the railings would be partially visible from S. 21st Street. It is unlikely that any element of the deck would be visible from the front, but that lack of visibility should be verified with a mock up.

The application also proposes to remove paint from the front façade, replace windows at the front and rear of the property, and replace deck boards at the existing second-story deck. This work can be reviewed for approval at the staff level.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, provided that the garage door is located in the plane of the existing rear wall and a staff review of a mockup of the deck and pilot house confirms that they are not visible from Locust Street.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stephen Foley represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MARCH 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. Foley stated that the current configuration at the rear of the property includes a shallow parking space accessible from Latimer Street. He added that the space requires a car to be parked on an angle, which leaves the rear of the car partially extended over the sidewalk. Mr. Foley explained that the proposed garage would require the removal of a portion of the rear wall, the insertion of a steel lintel, and the positioning of the garage door three to four feet inside the building to allow for a 19-foot garage on the interior first floor of the house with an additional parking space outside.

Ms. Gutterman clarified that there would be parking for two cars with one on the interior of the building and the other at an exterior parking space. With the garage door moved in three to four feet, she continued, the parking space would accommodate the entire car without it projecting into Latimer Street. Mr. Foley replied that the front of the car would be under the building. Ms. Gutterman inquired about the deck supports. Mr. Foley answered that the supports would not change and that the garage conversion would occur below the existing deck.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Keller if the staff has reviewed a mockup onsite of the pilot house and roof deck. Ms. Keller responded that the staff has not reviewed a mockup onsite, but noted that the applicant included photographs showing the architect's mockup. She stated that the staff would want to verify the mockup.

Mr. Foley noted that the building is approximately 68 feet in length, and the pilot house, designed as narrow and low in height as possible, would be placed in the center of the roof to minimize visibility. Ms. Gutterman asked if any rooftop equipment would be placed outside the deck area. Mr. Foley replied that there would be condensers for air conditioning units, but any units could be placed on the deck space. He explained that the roof is currently structured to have ceiling joists and roof rafters and that the existing roof rafters are pitched slightly. He stated that the proposed design would require the roof to be removed, so the new deck system could be incorporated into the roof rafter system. He added that the design would not alter the cornice profile.

Ms. Stein asked what the distance is between the curb and the proposed garage door and whether the second car would be in the public way. Mr. Foley replied that the car's rear bumper would be positioned under the existing deck and would not extend to the sidewalk. He added that the distance from the garage door to the end of the existing deck would be approximately 18 feet. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that, with the proposed configuration, a car would not obstruct the sidewalk. Mr. Foley commented that if the garage door cannot be positioned four feet inside the current exterior wall of the building, then a car would obstruct the sidewalk. Ms. Gutterman asked how water infiltration would be avoided once the door is pushed to the building's interior. Mr. Foley responded that the door area is covered by a second-story deck and that the first floor would be sloped to allow water entering the garage on cars to drain. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Foley to confirm that the second car would not properly fit the exterior space if the garage door is not moved toward the building's interior. Mr. Foley confirmed that the car would extend onto the sidewalk if the garage door is not moved in four feet.

Ms. Stein asked if the staff had reviewed the visibility of the roof deck and pilot house with a mockup. Ms. Keller replied that the staff has not investigated the potential for visibility beyond what was presented in the application. She added that the staff recommended reviewing a mockup onsite. Ms. Stein commented that the deck appears not to be visible, but added that due diligence would be important. Mr. McCoubrey stated that one photograph shows where a deck railing could be visible. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the deck would be visible from

Latimer Street. Ms. Keller noted that the only location where some public visibility seemed likely was S. 21st Street. Ms. Stein asked Ms. Keller what would be visible in that location. Ms. Keller responded that it would likely only be the railing and not the pilot house. Ms. Stein asked if the proposed deck rail material is painted aluminum. Mr. Foley answered that the deck rail would be either aluminum or tubular steel with cable.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if a roof plan was included. Ms. Stein noted that a roof plan is necessary to show any changes or new additions, such as vents or mechanical equipment. Mr. Foley apologized for not including the roof plan and added that one has been created. Mr. McCoubrey asked for it to be included for Historical Commission review.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he agrees with the staff recommendation. Ms. Gutterman noted that she does not support the proposed placement of the garage door and added that, if a garage door is necessary, it would need to go in the plane of the existing rear wall.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the garage door is located in the plane of the existing rear wall, and a mockup confirms that the deck, railings, mechanical systems, and any vents are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 421 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish penthouse; construct new penthouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan Wheeler

Applicant: Stephen Varenhorst, Varenhorst

History: 1857; Bank of Pennsylvania/Philadelphia National Bank; John M. Gries, architect; H.C. Oram & Co., iron work; additions, 1892, 1893; one story added, 1903, T.P. Chandler

Individual Designation: 6/24/1969

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

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic sixth floor penthouse and construct a new penthouse on top of the Bank of Pennsylvania building, a highly significant building on Bank Row in the Old City Historic District. The existing penthouse, with a 10-foot setback from the Chestnut Street façade of the historic bank, was approved by the Commission in 2005. The existing penthouse was approved at a height of 13 feet 8 inches, with a small center pediment that reaches 19 feet 9 inches in height.

The Chestnut Street façade of the proposed penthouse will have a 15-foot setback from the front facade of the historic building, with perforated steel sun screens that will be set back 10 feet from the façade. The flat roof rises 17 feet 10 inches above the roof deck. Proposed materials include steel windows, glass, and brick. The penthouse would open onto a deck at the front and sides of the building, and the existing glass railing would remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. For an approvable design, the staff suggests reducing the overall height of the penthouse to 13 feet 8 inches, and omitting the sun screens and associated fins.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Stephen Varenhorst and Cathie Dopkin represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MARCH 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Broadbent read a letter from Doris Fanelli, Ph.D., Chief, Division of Cultural Resources Management for Independence National Historical Park, which states: "The architect for the subject project contacted Independence Park and shared the drawings with us. We have no comments to share. If, for any reason, the penthouse becomes larger or moves further south, we will comment at that time." Ms. Gutterman asked if this means that Ms. Fanelli approves of the proposed design. Ms. Broadbent reiterated that Independence Park has no comment at this time, and opined that this may mean that Independence Park is not in opposition.

Mr. Varenhorst showed photographs of the existing penthouse and renderings of the proposed penthouse. He explained that the goal of the sun screens is to cast shadows and give depth, while breaking up what is a large glass façade.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the proposed penthouse. Ms. Dopkin responded that it will not be any higher than the highest point of the existing penthouse. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the height of the proposed penthouse is carried through end to end, resulting in an overall larger appearance than the existing penthouse. Ms. Stein commented that the highly articulated character of the new façade draws attention to itself, above a highly-ornamented historic cornice, resulting in a distraction to the historic building. She suggested that a simpler design would be better. She stated that she does not mind the glass, but that all of the fins, canopies, and trim make it too noticeable above the historic building. Mr. Varenhorst responded that he feels those elements give depth to the façade, and give it shade and shadow. Mr. McCoubrey opined that steel and glass is acceptable, but the height limit that was established in 2005 should be maintained. He suggested that the end walls make the entire structure appear larger than it needs to, and the entire height should be reduced. He stated that the vertical fins are interesting but ultimately distracting; the horizontal shade is appropriate. Ms. Stein suggested that the front of the penthouse could be lowered, and there could be a raised clerestory portion set back approximately 10 feet, which could help with the overall massing of the penthouse. She agreed that the end walls are too tall, and that a horizontal canopy is preferable.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia commented that the Alliance holds an easement on the property, and they will conduct their own independent review of this proposal, and will work with staff as that process unfolds, which will happen in the coming weeks.

Randal Baron commented that he was involved in the review of the penthouse in 2005, and that color choice was important in that review in order to achieve a penthouse that fades into the background. Mr. McCoubrey commented that this proposal is obviously very different from the 2005 proposal. Mr. Varenhorst opined that the existing penthouse does not fade into the background. Ms. Gutterman responded that the color of the existing penthouse aids in helping it to be diminished. Mr. Baron suggested gray instead of black.

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

ADDRESS: 1318 PINE ST

Proposal: Reconstruct garage; construct rear addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James and Pamela Gertie

Applicant: Jackie Gusic, InHabit, LLC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 3/28/1961

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct a rear garage, add a roof deck and trellis on top of the rebuilt garage, and construct an interior stair between the first and second stories. Two options are presented. Option A locates the stair addition at the rear of the rear ell, which would result in the removal of the second-story rear wall, a section that contains a previously modified window opening. Option B locates the stair addition at the side of the rear ell, which would be less visible from Waverly Street and would result in the removal of a section of the side wall. In both options, the garage door would remain its current width. The 1300 block of Waverly Street, at the rear of this building, has the appearance of a service alley, with the exception of two non-historically designated fronts of houses halfway down the block.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Option A, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff recommends that the roofline of the addition should slope slightly to follow the ghost of the roofline that is evident in the bricks above the second story window; the addition should include more glazing to allow for a lighter appearance; and the parapet wall of the deck should be reduced in height.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jackie Gusic represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the client has a preference between the two options. Ms. Gusic responded that the client prefers Option B, but understands that Option A may be preferable to the Historical Commission, and may also be easier in terms of obtaining a zoning approval.

Ms. Broadbent commented that Ms. Gusic has worked with the staff to improve aspects of the design, including the retention of a narrow garage door instead of a wider garage door that would span the width of the garage.

Ms. Gusic provided a revised Option A elevation drawing in response to the staff's suggestions, which showed a sloped roof on the addition and a lowered parapet wall. Ms. Gutterman asked about the materials of the addition. Ms. Gusic responded that the addition is brick with clad windows and a wood gate and wood garage door. Ms. Gutterman agreed that clad windows would be appropriate, and asked if glass could be added to the garage door. Ms. Gusic agreed. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the railing and trellis. Ms. Gusic responded that they are both cedar. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the deck railing be metal, but that the trellis could be wood or metal. Mr. McCoubrey suggested cap stones that are approximately two to three inches thick. Ms. Gutterman stated that there should be no visibility of mechanical equipment from a public right-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with revised Option A as presented to the Architectural Committee on 22 March 2016, provided windows are added in the garage door, the deck railing

is metal, and the cap stones are made thicker, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 300 MARKET ST

Proposal: Construct 4-story mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: MSP Philly I, LP

Applicant: Samantha Chan Kim, Samantha Kim Design LLC

History: 1785; Demolished by fire, April 2014

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story mixed-use building on a vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. The building, situated at the southwest corner of S. 3rd and Market Streets, would contain retail space on the first floor and twelve apartment units on the second through fourth floors. The design is consistent in scale and materials with neighboring buildings and would contain architectural features, such as bays and a decorative cornice, found on other buildings within the district. The predominantly brick building would have a coursed cast stone base, Azek paneled storefronts and bays, and six-over-six double-hung windows. A roof deck with a stair tower is also proposed and would be housed behind a parapet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9, provided that the proposed six-over-six double-hung windows are changed to two-over-two windows with exterior muntins and that the base is solid rather than coursed cast stone.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Samantha Kim represented the application.

Ms. Kim stated that the proposed building is designed to bring more light to the corner of 3rd and Market Streets, where there is currently a vacant lot, by having retail on the first floor and twelve apartment units on the second through fourth floors.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Kim to identify the unmarked features on the roof plan. Ms. Kim replied that they are mechanical units that stand 3 feet in height and would be hidden behind the parapet, which extends to a height of 4 feet 6 inches. Ms. Kim explained that the parapet may be lowered by one foot, and Ms. Gutterman advised against a configuration where the mechanical units would be too close in height to the parapet wall. Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Kim about the setback for the roof deck. Ms. Kim answered that the setback would be 5 feet. Ms. Gutterman responded that setbacks are typically 10 feet and recommended that Ms. Kim revise the plans to reflect that dimension.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Ms. Keller for clarification on the staff's recommendation about the building's base. Ms. Keller explained that the recommendation is for the base to be comprised of single pieces of cast stone rather than being coursed. Ms. Gutterman inquired about the storefront material. Ms. Kim answered that the paneling would be Azek. Ms. Gutterman asked about the glass and metal materials. Ms. Kim replied that those components would be glass and aluminum. Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the staff agrees with the dimensions and ratio of glass to metal to solid materials. Mr. Baron answered that the building that existed on the lot previously was an eighteenth-century house with only the first story remaining prior to a fire that destroyed the property. He added that the proposed project is neither a restoration of the former

building nor is it based on any other specific historic building; instead, it is a contextual design that borrows a cornice from a neighboring building. Ms. Gutterman responded that the cornice is very tall in relation to the building. Ms. Kim stated that she is considering lowering the cornice, since the owner expressed concern over the height of the cornice and its potential to obstruct the view from the roof deck. Mr. Baron commented that the plans show a deck covering the entire roof, and the cornice as drawn would prevent it from being visible from a public right-of-way. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee already discussed the need to create a 10-foot setback and cautioned the applicant about the height and visibility of the mechanical units. She noted that another issue is the heaviness of the cornice and the disproportionate weight it adds to the top of the building, an issue that results from the design's brackets and panels. Mr. Baron asked Ms. Kim if she included a photograph of the neighboring building. She directed the Committee to the photograph in her application. Ms. Gutterman stated that the neighboring building is taller, reaching five stories in height, and is midblock rather than anchored on the corner. Ms. Stein added that the cornice wraps the corner and spans a greater distance on S. 3rd Street. Ms. Gutterman agreed and stated that the relationship of the bays to the cornice on S. 3rd Street further increase the heaviness at the top of the building. Mr. McCoubrey observed that aligning the brackets on the upper and lower components further contributed to the large scale of the cornice. He then commented that the bottom panel may not be necessary. The other Committee members agreed, and Ms. Stein requested lowering the cornice. Ms. Kim asked whether she could retain the lower panel but shorten the top of the cornice. Ms. Gutterman replied that the geometries of the feature are important to consider and asked that, when revising and redrawing the cornice, Ms. Kim evaluate the overall design.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the material of the wide panels at the storefront. Ms. Kim answered that the panels would be Azek, and their width results from the size of the structural components behind the panels. Mr. Baron stated that the base of the building should be solid rather than coursed. Ms. Gutterman added that the base appears short, and Mr. Baron interjected that he felt the base should be smaller. He explained that on neighboring storefronts there is typically a wood panel below the windows with a stone inserted under the window and panel. Ms. Gutterman replied that there are two approaches: increase the height of the base to approximately 30 inches, or reduce the height so the base appears more as a curb and stands at 8 to 12 inches. Ms. Gutterman emphasized again that the base would need to work with the geometry of the building. Ms. Stein stated that a 24-inch base is not typical of buildings in the neighborhood and suggested that the base be lowered. Ms. Gutterman added that creating a smaller base out of cast stone would be easier. Ms. Kim asked whether the Committee would prefer an 8-inch base with paneling below windows and whether the sills of those windows should be raised. Ms. Gutterman replied that the sill is usually larger on a storefront.

Mr. Baron commented that because of the building's frontage on Market and 3rd Streets, it is important to incorporate a parapet to conceal the roof deck, even if the deck contains a 10-foot setback. Ms. Stein stated that there seems to be too much building above the upper-story windows, resulting from an interior fourth-floor height of 15 feet. Ms. Stein suggested lowering the floor level and cornice, and potentially lowering the roof to minimize the visibility of the deck and roof features. Ms. Kim responded that at the fourth-floor interior, the floor-to-ceiling height is 10 feet 9 inches with a 2 x 10 drop ceiling with approximately 2 feet between the ceiling joists and roof joists. Ms. Kim offered to possibly eliminate the two-foot space between the ceiling and roof joists. Ms. Stein asked why so much more height existed between the fourth floor and roof. She noted that between the third and fourth floors, the height is indicated as 13 feet 6 inches, and between the fourth floor and roof, height is indicated as 15 feet. Ms. Stein stated that a drop ceiling seems unnecessary and that the heights of the floors are inconsistent with too much space allotted to the top of the structure. She felt the height distribution resulted in an odd

proportion. Ms. Kim replied that she would evaluate the proportions, but that the space was tight due to horizontal heat pumps in the ceilings. Ms. Stein noted that it is common practice to install heat pumps over a bathroom or a kitchen to allow other spaces to have more height. Ms. Kim agreed and commented that the heat pumps were over bathrooms but that the mechanical units had to be positioned at a height that would not obstruct the windows.

Ms. Kim asked if the Committee had a preference regarding the cornice material, stating that it is currently planned to be either fiberglass or Azek. Ms. Gutterman replied that Azek can have an integral color and recommended that Ms. Kim create a color palette for the sills, lintels, masonry, and Azek components and consult with staff to ensure the colors reflect the historic character of Old City. Ms. Gutterman added that the relationship between window types should be considered, so the components work together. She reiterated that both the details and whole should be evaluated for cohesion.

Ms. Stein inquired about the material proposed for the windows. Ms. Kim answered that the windows are Anderson 100 series, a composite wood and plastic window that is paintable. Ms. Gutterman stated her apprehension over incorporating so many non-wood components at features such as the cornice, windows, storefronts, and bays. Ms. Stein commented that she would allow the composite window, since it would be paintable and would have the character of a wood window. Mr. McCoubrey added that the horizontal element at the bay windows should be raised to create a transom.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including the color palette, provided the following:

- the dimensions of the cornice are restudied, the bottom band is potentially eliminated, and the entire feature is lowered by eliminating some of the height from the third floor;
- the base is reduced to a single piece of stone at a height of approximately 12 inches;
- the windows in the bays have a transom arrangement with the horizontal element toward the tops of the openings;
- the windows currently shown as six-over-six are revised to two-over-two;
- the roof deck is set back 10 feet from the front façade; and,
- no mechanical equipment or vents is visible from a public right-of-way.

ADDRESS: 2304 ST ALBANS ST

Proposal: Construct pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Anh Trah & Tom Halpin

Applicant: Megan Fitzpatrick, Ambit Architecture

History: 1869; Charles Leslie, developer

Individual Designation: 9/30/1969

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and stair house on the main roof of this row house. Owing to the size, configuration, and location of the house, any deck and stair house would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way. Moreover, the Commission has denied decks of this sort proposed for other properties on this row. Although there is a stair house at 2306 St. Albans, it was not approved by the Commission, has been in place for many, many years, and does not provide access to a deck. The Commission previously approved a

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MARCH 2016

20

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

rear deck for the building at 2304. The very consistent row of buildings, all of which are designated, would be adversely affected with the addition of a roof deck, which would be conspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

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

Although the applicant was not present, Mr. Baron presented what he believed to be the applicant's argument for the addition of the deck and pilot house. He stated that the applicant has pointed out that there are other decks in the area, and a large addition is being constructed on a building behind the subject property. The application provides a photograph of a stair house on 2306 St. Albans Street, next door to this property. Mr. Baron explained that the row behind this block is not listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, and the stair house next door was never reviewed or approved by the Commission, but has been extant for many years.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 900-16 W LEHIGH AVE

Proposal: Install ADA ramps; modify windows; replace doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: La Luz Del Mundo

Applicant: Jafet Granados, J&E General Contracting

History: 1888; St. Simeon P.E. Church; Frank R. Watson, architect; bell tower, 1903, Watson & Huckle; stained glass, 1911, D'Ascenzo Studios

Individual Designation: 3/8/2002

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remodel this church. The architectural drawings submitted as part of the application do not clearly delineate the proposed work. The application does not include existed and proposed drawings, a cover letter detailing the work, or a clear explanation of the work on the building permit application. The drawings appear to document the removal and replacement of historic fabric and the installation of elements that do not match historic and existing elements.

The plans propose two ADA ramps. However, sufficient information is not provided. The materials are not noted. The treatment of the existing steps is not indicated. The plans include a schedule for door replacement, but the proposed doors do not replicate the historic doors shown in photographs. In addition, windows shown on the elevation drawings differ from those in existing photographs, even though the no work is specified on the drawings. The plans appear to legalize the removal of windows and tracery. On the west or "right" elevation, the vertical mullions have been removed from three openings at the first floor and three windows have been removed at the second floor. On the east or "left" façade, the elevation drawing shows modified doors and at least 10 modified windows. Photographs seem to show that tracery has been removed from at least one side of the tower already and is planned to be removed from three sides of the tower.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MARCH 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9 and owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Pastor Daniel Monreal represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked Pastor Monreal about his plans for the property. He said that the building was in very poor condition and abandoned when his church purchased the property, but that he has been working on the rehabilitation for the last five years and is now in the final steps. He stated that he would like to get his mechanical, electrical and plumbing plans approved. Ms. Gutterman asked if his church is occupying the space for services. Pastor Monreal confirmed that it is, and stated that he is familiar with Historical Commission reviews, as he rehabilitated a building in San Antonio. He stated that this church is similar and “in the mold” of many other churches. Ms. Gutterman said that the building was designed by the significant architectural firm of Watson & Huckle. Ms. Gutterman asked Pastor Monreal about his plans and what he hopes to achieve with this application. Pastor Monreal responded that many things have deteriorated or fallen off of the building, and there are many pieces of decoration that do not tell his church’s story or Christ’s story. He stated that there are pieces that his church cannot afford to replace or would look strange if replaced. Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed ADA ramps. Pastor Monreal responded that the City is requiring the ADA ramps. Mr. Baron pointed out that the plans show ramps on Page A7 but there is no mention of materials or what will be demolished at the stairs, doors and transoms. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the plans show a lot of work even if it is not specifically called out, and the building permit application states “remodel of church as per plans” instead of only calling out the installation of two ramps. Ms. Gutterman asked if Pastor Monreal plans to remove windows. Pastor Monreal responded that his church is removing glass but not frames or tracery. Mr. Baron pointed out where the plans show the removal of the tracery. Mr. Monreal responded that the plans are drawn incorrectly.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the architect for the project needs to identify the proposed work correctly and identify new materials. Pastor Monreal responded that he thought that was the purpose for this meeting. He stated the Committee should tell him what to do. Ms. Gutterman responded that the Committee reviews designs prepared by others. Pastor Monreal stated that he has no guidelines to help him. Ms. Gutterman responded that the Commission uses the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards as guidance, and his architect should review those guidelines, create new drawings, and then re-submit for review by the Committee and Commission. She added that it would be helpful if the architect also attends the meetings. Pastor Monreal stated that it should be a conversation. He stated: “We already know the code.” Ms. Gutterman responded that there are many ways to meet the code. Mr. Baron offered that the staff could be helpful by meeting with the architect before a proposal is submitted to the Committee.

Ms. Stein asked if Pastor Monreal was aware that the building was historically designated before purchasing the property. He responded that he knows now. Ms. Stein stated that all of the exterior work needs to be drawn on plans and submitted for review. She stated that the Committee is pleased that he is renovating the building, but it needs to be reviewed on paper, and not in the form of hearsay or verbal description. Ms. Gutterman commented that pieces of the project can be implemented over time, but she urged that the architect work together with the staff.

Mr. McCoubrey pointed out the rebuilding of a corner wall on the plans. Mr. Baron explained that these plans and the accompanying photographs are old and date back to the rebuilding of that corner many years ago. He stated that the staff has approved much restoration work for this applicant over the past few years. Mr. Baron stated that as he met with Pastor Monreal on site and learned that there were certain issues, including ramps and windows, that the staff did not have the authority to approve, and he urged Pastor Monreal to submit drawings showing this work for review by the Committee and Commission. Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff had met with the architect. Mr. Baron responded that he has never met with the architect. Pastor Monreal stated that he only wants to have his mechanical, electrical and plumbing plans approved at the moment. Mr. Baron responded that the staff can approve interior work but that that work is not shown on his drawings submitted to the Committee. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that some of the mechanical, electrical and plumbing work is not reviewed by the Commission because it is on an electrical permit or a plumbing permit, instead of a building permit. Pastor Monreal stated that he wants to fix the internal downspouts, which caused the wall collapse in the first place. Mr. Baron reiterated that the staff can approve that work without review by the Committee, but pointed out that the downspouts are not shown on the plans in any case. Pastor Monreal stated that he has other plans for that work, but noted that the Department of Licenses & Inspections insisted that he submit a complete set of work plans. Mr. Baron suggested that perhaps the Department of Licenses & Inspections is requesting plans showing exits, doors, and ramps because Pastor Monreal is trying to complete the interior fit-out as shown on the plans. Pastor Monreal stated that he is not lying, and he only wants to get a mechanical, electrical and plumbing approval and has never shown these plans to the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that perhaps Pastor Monreal should remove everything from the plans for which he is not seeking an approval at this time. She suggested that perhaps the Commission could approve a temporary ramp. Mr. Baron responded that he is not aware of a permit mechanism for a temporary condition such as this. Ms. Gutterman suggested that perhaps the applicant could modify these drawings to only show the ramps, and those drawings could be reviewed by the Commission. Mr. Baron stated that there are many questions that need to be answered in the design for the ramps, such as the demolition or retention of the stairs and doors. He opined that there are questions related to building code, which are beyond the scope of staff knowledge. The current plans show the removal of the transoms and doors, and the Committee needs to address the proposed plans. Ms. Gutterman suggested ways that the architect could alter the design for the ramp. She stated that the architect should show the retention of the tracery transom, a new wood paneled door, demolition of half of the stone stoop, and addition of the new masonry ramp. Mr. Baron asked if a metal ramp might allow the retention of the stair and allow the basement windows to remain open. Ms. Gutterman responded that she does not favor metal ramps because they can be slippery. Mr. Baron responded that there are also concrete ramps that could be placed over the existing steps to retain historic fabric. Pastor Monreal stated that Mr. Baron is not considering the aesthetics and the cost. Ms. Gutterman stated that the basement windows could be infilled and panic hardware added to an existing paneled wood door. Pastor Monreal asked if the Committee members found the proposed flush metal doors to be acceptable. Ms. Stein responded that flush metal doors are not acceptable. Pastor Monreal responded that it will be expensive to create new wood doors. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee has a narrow scope, and hardship concerns can be addressed by a Hardship Committee.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the windows and about what is specifically proposed for removal. Pastor Monreal asked if he could remove some of the glass. Ms. Gutterman asked about the Commission's policy on the removal of stained glass where the denomination of a church has

changed. She added that the Catholic Church typically removes stained glass windows when it de-sanctifies churches. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Commission approved the removal of stained glass windows from a church in Germantown. Those windows were sold to the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. Mr. Baron responded that the Commission will have to make the determination. He added that currently there is a wide variety of windows and conditions, with some having simple leaded glass, while others are works of German American artisans. Mr. Baron opined that Pastor Monreal wishes to remove some windows because they are too expensive to restore, and wishes to remove others on religious grounds. He stated that Pastor Monreal intends to preserve some of the windows, but the plans do not show which ones are intended for retention versus removal. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant create a photographic inventory of each window, its condition and the intention for removal, replacement or retention. Mr. McCoubrey added that the inventory should be keyed to the building plans.

Mr. Baron stated that the drawings show removal of the tracery in the tower openings. Pastor Monreal responded that some of the tracery is already gone, and they intend to install new glass in the tower which represents their church. The Committee members responded that the drawings should reflect the current conditions and proposed work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9, and owing to incompleteness.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 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.

Section 1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.