

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

**TUESDAY, 22 OCTOBER 2013
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
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

Bob Lane, Esq.
Randi Zemsky
John Milner, John Milner Architects
Christina Carter, John Milner Architects
Kristin D'Amico, John Milner Architects
Adam Jeckel, Coscia Moos Architecture LLC
Sergio Coscia, AIA, Coscia Moos Architecture LLC
Leo Addimando, Alterra Property Group
Jeff Pustizzi, Esq., Alterra Property Group
Richard Thom
Robert Flaynik, RFAA
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co., Inc.
Danielle Drew-Wolas, Han Dynasty
Andy Blanda, Sandvold-Blanda
Terri Steinberg
Douglas Kissel, Ultimate Construction
Larry McEwen, McEwen Architects
Rev. Jarrett Kerbel, St. Martin-in-the-Fields
Jack Dunnon

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 1915-23 PINE ST

Project: Insert garage, replace screen fence, construct rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bob Lane & Randi Zemsky

Applicant: Christina Carter, John Milner Architects, Inc.

History: 1877; Christ Church Chapel; James P. Sims, architect; addition, Furness, Evans & Co., 1892; rear wing between 1901 and 1910

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations and additions for the conversion of a church to a single-family residence. The church was built as Christ Church Chapel, a satellite of the venerable Episcopalian church in Old City, in 1877 and then converted to Fifth Church of Christ, Scientist in 1930. The church building is composed of three sections, the original 1877 sanctuary along Pine Street, an 1892 addition for an entranceway at the west, and a two-story rear wing at the northeast, which was built between 1901 and 1910. A garden runs along the rear of the building. Only the front façade along Pine Street and the upper section of the west façade of the sanctuary are visible from the public right-of-way.

The application proposes a series of alterations at rear facades, none of which are visible from Pine Street or any public right-of-way. It proposes removing a rear dormer from the back slope of the roof of the sanctuary and constructing a small connector addition between a mezzanine level of the sanctuary and the second floor of the rear wing. It proposes constructing a small, one-story, breakfast-room addition off the north façade of the 1892 addition, into the garden. The opening in the rear wall where the breakfast room would be connected to the historic building was altered from its historic condition about 1988. The application proposes removing the lower portions of two windows and cutting the window openings down for doors in the rear façade of the sanctuary. It proposes infilling two rear windows in the rear of the rear wing with recessed stucco panels. It proposes removing a chimney from the rear wing. It proposes removing a non-historic fire escape at the rear of the rear wing and partially infilling the door opening to reestablish the historic window. All alterations proposed for the rear facades can and would be approved administratively, at the staff level.

The application proposes three alterations that would be visible from Pine Street. It proposes replacing existing screen fences on the roof of the 1892 addition with wood screen fences of the same height and location. The fences hide mechanical equipment mounted on the roof of the addition. The first versions of the fences and equipment were installed with a permit in 1975, 20 years before the designation of the property. The application also proposes replacing two sets of non-historic entrance doors on the Pine Street façade with doors that would replicate the historic doors. The designs of the proposed doors should be revised to replicate those seen in historic photographs.

Finally, the application proposes cutting a garage opening in the Pine Street façade of the 1892 addition and installing a wood garage door. The garage would be installed to the west of the double-leaf entrance door. This section of the Pine Street façade has been significantly altered from its historic condition. Originally, this section of the addition included three leaded-glass windows with ornamental, incised lintels and sills. At some point, the ornamental lintels and sills were replaced with plain lintels and sills. Later, two of the three windows were removed, a large

opening cut, and a utilitarian double door installed. Then, in 1988, in a misguided attempt to restore the area, the double door was removed and one not two windows installed in its place.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the new doors in the Pine Street façade match the historic doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Bob Lane and Randi Zemsky and architects John Milner, Christina Carter, and Kristin D'Amico represented the application.

Mr. Lane explained how he and his wife purchased the property. He reported that the church's congregation entertained several asking-price offers for the property and selected his offer because he and his wife are proposing to retain the historic character as much as possible, inside and out. He noted that his wife has experience with former religious structures; she converted a former convent to her home in Villanova. He observed that the developers who considered the property proposed altering the church significantly and even demolishing it. He concluded that they are determined to preserve its historic character as they convert it to a single-family home.

Ms. Carter, the architect, explained all aspects of the project including the construction of the rear addition and connector addition, removal of the fire escape, infilling of two rear openings, and conversion of two windows to doors. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Farnham if any of the rear alterations and additions would be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Farnham responded that he visited the property including the rear garden and can confirm that the rear facades of the building are not visible from any public rights-of-way. He stated that the garden is surrounded by the sides and rears of three and four-story row houses. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicants concentrate their presentation on the proposed alterations to the front façade. Ms. Carter stated that they are proposing to replace the vinyl screening fences with new, wood screens that will be more compatible with the building. Mr. Cluver stated that the screen replacements are acceptable. He also noted that replacing the non-historic doors with replicas of the historic doors is appropriate. He stated that the garage door is "worthy of discussion." He asked if the architects would be retaining the outer jambs of the outer windows when they cut the garage opening. Ms. Carter stated that they are not proposing to retain those jambs, but instead to widen the opening slightly. She reported that the door would be only 8'-4" wide if they retained the jambs and inserted the opening within the existing window openings. They are instead proposing to widen the opening to the minimum acceptable width, nine feet. Mr. Cluver concluded that widening the opening by four inches was acceptable. Mr. Cluver then stated that he is opposed to "privatizing a public parking space" by taking away a parking space at the curb for the garage entrance. Mr. Lane explained that there is no parking at the curb at the proposed location for the garage. He noted that there are garages in the eight townhouses to the west of the church. The public parking on the north side of Pine Street at the curb begins to the east of the proposed location for the garage. Mr. Lane stated that the Streets Department has approved the curb cut. Mr. Cluver observed that the fact that the façade in which the garage opening would be cut is set back from the entrance door to the east as well as from the townhouse to the west. He noted that the setback mitigated the impact of the garage on the streetscape.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she agreed with the staff recommendation of approval, provided the garage door is sympathetic with the replacement doors in the front façade. Mr. Cluver agreed

with Ms. Gutterman and added that the light fixture shown on the plans to the west of the garage door should be relocated because it appears squeezed between the door and the projecting wall of the adjacent townhouse. The applicants agreed to move the light fixture and to work with the staff to develop a compatible garage door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the new doors in the Pine Street façade match the historic doors and the garage door is compatible with the historic front doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 241-45 MARKET ST, 228-30 CHURCH ST

Project: Construct buildings on vacant lots

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 249 Market Partners, LP

Applicant: Adam Jeckel, Coscia Moos Architecture LLC

History: designated buildings demolished, vacant lots

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to expand a project that the Historical Commission approved in September 2013. The initial project proposed to construct, reconstruct, and rehabilitate a series of buildings at the northeast corner of 3rd and Markets Streets for a mixed-use commercial and residential development. The current application proposes to expand that project, extending the new construction onto a series of vacant lots to the east. The Historical Commission has plenary jurisdiction over the application because designated buildings stood at 241 and 243 Market Street. The new section will generally replicate the new construction already approved. The additional land will allow for the inclusion of a loading dock and parking on the Church Street side of the parcel. A metal fence will enclose the parking and loading dock area. The façade of the Church Street building approved in September would be modified slightly to accommodate the parking.

The construction dates and designation histories of the lots added to this project are summarized below:

- 241 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 11/4/1976, demolition approved 1988, Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District 2003
- 243 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 11/4/1976, demolition approved 1988, Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District 2003.
- 245 Market Street, parking lot, Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District 12/12/2003.
- 228-30 Church Street, parking lot, Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District 12/12/2003.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the fence along Church Street is replaced with a wall to reestablish the building wall at the sidewalk; the storefronts in the new section on Market Street are modified to match the design approved for 257 Market Street in September 2013; and, the remainder of the project conforms to the conditions of the September 2013 approval; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 OCTOBER 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Sergio Coscia and Adam Jeckel and developers Leo Addimando and Jeff Pustizzi represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Baron to clarify his recommendation regarding the fence or wall along Church Street. Mr. Baron directed the Committee to the drawing of the Church Street elevation and explained that the fence shown in the elevation drawing is not located at the sidewalk, but is set back onto the site, away from Church Street. Mr. Baron conceded that he had initially misunderstood the drawing and believed that the fence would be located at the sidewalk; it is not, but will instead be set back on the lot. He stated that he recommends a solid wall along Church Street to separate the sidewalk from the loading and parking area and to reestablish the building line at the sidewalk. Mr. Baron acknowledged that any wall would need an opening for vehicles to access the loading and parking area. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants how wide the opening would need to be to accommodate loading. Mr. Addimando responded that he does not want to construct a wall along the sidewalk line on Church Street. He noted that there is no wall there now. He asserted that a wall would not effectively establish a building line along the sidewalk. He stated that they would like to maintain the open area along Church Street for parking. He opined that Church Street is very narrow and “a little bit claustrophobic” already. Adding a wall would make it feel more confined. Mr. Addimando explained that the original design did not have the fence that is set back from Church Street. It was added at the request of a neighbor and is intended from preventing trucks servicing the commercial space from entering the area without first obtaining the store manager’s approval. He additionally explained that the primary loading area for the commercial space will be located on N. 3rd Street, not Church Street, and that the Church Street lot will only be used for loading when all space on 3rd Street is occupied. He stated that some Church Street residents have concerns about the loading and would like the developer to limit it as much as possible. He stated that he prefers to have the space at the rear of the new buildings open to Church Street without obstructions. Ms. Hawkins responded that that would leave “a sixty-ish-foot-wide asphalt parking lot on Church Street.” Mr. Addimando agreed, but noted that the area is currently a parking lot open from Church south to Market Street. He also noted that there is a large open parking lot across Church Street to the north as well. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that there are open lots on Church Street today, and then stated that “there is a sea of asphalt in this city, none of which I’m particularly happy with and I don’t think it’s appropriate in the context of the historic neighborhood.” She acknowledged that Mr. Addimando would prefer not to change the current condition, but contended that that would not be “the best solution.” Ms. Hawkins concluded that Mr. Addimando should accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and appeal to the Historical Commission if he disagrees with it. Ms. Hawkins added that her views on parking lots were her personal views and not necessarily those of the Committee.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the locations of the buildings that once stood on the site. Mr. Baron responded that Bob Powers, the applicants’ preservation consultant, provided information in the application about the historic buildings that once stood on this site. He stated that the buildings at 243 and 245 Market Street extended north almost to Church Street. The building at 241 Market was not as deep, but a separate smaller building stood to the north of it and faced Church Street. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Baron to confirm that, although the buildings no longer stand, the site is subject to the Historical Commission’s full jurisdiction. Mr. Baron responded that that was true.

Mr. Cluver asked about the rhythm of the storefronts along Market Street. Mr. Coscia stated that the rhythms were drawn from the historic buildings, which varied in widths ranging from 13 to 20 feet. Mr. Cluver asked if the storefronts at 241 and 243 Market would be used for retail. Mr. Coscia stated that they would. He pointed out where the CVS pharmacy, which would occupy most of the ground-floor space, would be located and where the second, smaller retail space would be located at 241 and 243 Market. Mr. Cluver objected to the “non-animated” storefront windows of the CVS store. Mr. Coscia responded that the storefront windows at the west, where the CVS will be located, will have window decals to six feet, but will be clear glazing from six to ten feet. He stated that the activity behind those windows will be evident from the street. He also noted that the CVS section of the development has already been approved; the new section, which is being proposed today, will have clear glass in the storefronts and the activity inside will be visible from the street. He added that several bays at the west end of the CVS at 257 and 259 will have clear glass and allow views into the store. Mr. Coscia also pointed out the so-called “art boxes,” which were added to the storefronts at the request of the community. Mr. Addimando stated that the art boxes will animate the façade. Mr. Addimando explained that the additional parcels at the east have been added to the project to provide alternate loading facilities to appease some neighbors who had objected. He noted that the art boxes had moved slightly since the original application was approved, owing to a slight reconfiguration of the CVS floor plate to accommodate the additional loading area off Church. He noted that the new storefront space will likely house a restaurant. Mr. Baron pointed out that the newly proposed storefronts will be animated. The Historical Commission approved the storefronts with the windows with decals already; only the new buildings at the east are under consideration today. Mr. Cluver asked about the film or decals that would be placed on the lower six feet of the storefront windows. Mr. Addimando explained that they would depict scenes of historic Philadelphia, but the actual designs had not yet been generated. He stated that the images may rotate as well. He noted that most Center City pharmacies have obstructed glass in the storefronts; he observed that they place merchandise up against the windows.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed buildings do not follow the traditional building patterns for in Philadelphia. They share the same storefronts, windows, cornices, and other features, as do buildings constructed simultaneously in rows, but they are different widths. Buildings constructed as parts of cohesive rows would all be the same width. These are not. She stated that, “in the context of the city, this looks off.” Mr. Cluver asked if the downspouts are located on the historic property lines. Mr. Coscia stated that they are on the historic property lines. Mr. Addimando stated that the features to which the Committee is now objecting were suggested by Mr. Baron of the staff. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the storefront piers at the locations of the historic party walls should be wider than the other storefront piers. He stated that that convention is largely respected, but is broken in some areas. Mr. Coscia responded that the places where the Committee is claiming that the convention is broken are actually existing historic conditions that are being retained. He reminded the Committee that they are preserving and restoring some historic buildings and building new buildings on vacant lots. He stated that they would not alter the historic storefront conditions to coerce them to correspond to some abstract convention. Mr. Coscia stated that the historic buildings varied in width and he is trying to reflect those diverse widths in the new buildings as recommended by Mr. Baron. Ms. Hawkins objected. Mr. Coscia stated that he was directed by Mr. Baron to maintain the cornice height and design as well as the window design across the various buildings. He stated that he was also directed to recreate the corner storefront design as seen in a historic photograph. He stated that they have made numerous revisions and worked very hard to implement Mr. Baron’s recommendations. He concluded that it appears that the Committee may have a different

philosophy than the staff in this regard. Ms. Hawkins asserted that the Committee is not bound by Mr. Baron's guidance to the architect. Mr. Coscia stated that he felt bound to implement the staff's directives. Ms. Hawkins responded that he is only bound to comply with the Commission's directives, not the staff's. Mr. Baron asked for an opportunity "to explain where the staff's thing was coming from." He explained that the Commission has already approved the designs for the buildings from 247 to 259 Market Street. Today's application proposes new construction at 241, 243, and 245 Market. Mr. Baron observed that, historically, they were all two-bay buildings of the same width. The building at 247 was more than 20 feet wide. The buildings at 241, 243, and 245 were 13 feet wide. The new buildings reflect the historic dimensions. Mr. Baron asserted that "this is appropriate because it comes from an actual thing." He added that his recommendation regarding the storefronts is also based on historic evidence. Ms. Hawkins replied that she is "not arguing that there is historic record. What I am saying is that these three on the end were built at a different time than 249 and 247, in which case they would not have shared the same windows, the same head height, the same sills, the same cornice, etc. And by doing it as a monolithic wall, it implies that they were constructed of the same genre or at the same moment in time. And if the point is to say that there was this rhythm, then make them different. That is my opinion." Mr. Cluver looked at the historic maps and concluded that the historic widths of 241, 243, and 245 were all the same.

Mr. Baron stated that he offered recommendations to the applicants for improving the designs of the Church Street facades. Mr. Coscia responded that they did incorporate Mr. Baron's suggestions for the Church Street facades. He distributed revised designs showing the changes. He pointed out changes to the storefronts at 241 and 243 Market Street, which were made at Mr. Baron's request. Ms. Gutterman commented that the storefront piers were widened. Mr. McCoubrey corrected that they had been narrowed, not widened as Ms. Gutterman stated. Mr. Coscia pointed out changes to the Church Street façade including the storefront and downspouts. Messrs. McCoubrey and Cluver voiced their approval of the improvements.

Ms. Stein asked if the loading dock on Church Street was part of the earlier approval. Mr. Baron explained that the loading dock is part of the current application and was not part of the design approved earlier. Mr. Addimando explained that the owner of a neighboring building on Church threatened to appeal all approvals for the project if Church was used for loading and trash, even though the threatening neighbor uses Church for precisely those activities. He stated that they therefore have secured a loading area on N. 3rd Street, which will be used for deliveries to the CVS, trash pickup, and move-ins and move-outs from the residential space. In the event that all of the loading space on N. 3rd is in use, then an occasional truck will use Church Street. Mr. Pustizzi confirmed that the Church Street loading facilities will be rarely used. Mr. Cluver asked about the number of cars that will be parked at the rear. Mr. Addimando stated that about 10 cars could be accommodated in the area if space is left for the loading.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she would make the motion for a recommendation. She stated that she would enumerate the revisions she wanted made to the project and would then articulate them as a motion. She stated that 241, 243, and 245 Market Street should all be the same width; that the windows in those sections of the façade should differ in configuration and/or head and sill height from those in the new sections to the west; that a seven-foot-tall brick wall is erected along Church Street and that the opening in the wall be the minimum necessary for a truck to enter; and that the recommendation be based on the revised drawings, not the initial submission. Mr. Baron suggested that Ms. Hawkins include a statement about the remainder of

the project conforming to the conditions of the September 2013 approval. Mr. Cluver stated that he would second such a motion with one amendment. He stated that he believes that a solid wall on Church Street would create a safety problem. Ms. Hawkins responded that “we, as a city, should not have to look at cars.” She added that “there are other ways to provide safety.” Ms. Gutterman stated that she objected to the requirement of a wall along Church Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design as presented to the Architectural Committee at its meeting on 22 October 2013, provided that facades of the buildings at 241, 243, and 245 Market Street are the same widths; the windows in 241, 243, and 245 differ in configuration and/or head and sill height from those in the new sections to the west; a seven-foot-tall brick wall is erected along Church Street and that the opening in the wall is the minimum necessary for a truck to enter; and, the remainder of the project conforms to the conditions of the September 2013 approval; with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 123-29 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Legalize sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 123-29 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Danielle Drew-Wolas, Han Dynasty

History: 1903; Corn Exchange National Bank; Newman, Woodman & Harris, architects; alterations/additions, Horace Trumbauer, 1912, 1929, 1931

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a blade sign that was installed at the Chestnut Street entrance of the Corn Exchange National Bank building in Old City. The location of the sign’s mounting plate differs slightly from that shown on the architectural drawing and appears to overlap a recess between two quoins.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Pending until the staff confers with the easment holder and the Art Commission, as this location falls under the Center City Commercial Area Sign Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Danielle Drew-Wolas represented the application.

Ms. Cote stated that the preservation easement holder has not responded to her inquiry, but the Art Commission has responded. She informed the Committee the Bill Burke, the director of the Art Commission, reported that this sign is not permitted by the zoning code and would require a variance. She stated that Mr. Burke opined that the Art Commission was unlikely to approve the sign because it is not complementary in size or installation to the building.

Ms. Gutterman showed Ms. Drew-Wolas how the sign hardware spans the recess between the quoins. Ms. Drew-Wolas stated that the sign could be moved up or down so as not to span the recess. She stated that she was told that the sign had to be at least ten feet above the sidewalk. Ms. Hawkins stated that that is just one issue with the sign and that the Historical Commission

determines whether the sign is compatible with the building and the district. She explained that the installation is one issue, but the Committee has yet to discuss whether this sign is even appropriate for the building or district.

Ms. Hawkins asked how this sign came to be installed without any review and approvals. Ms. Drew-Wolas stated that she was assigned as project manager for the build-out of this restaurant. She apologized for dropping the ball. She stated that she had prepared the paperwork to apply for the sign, but it was lost in the shuffle and the sign was installed. She stated that they were on a tight schedule to open and she submitted the paperwork for the permits after the fact. She asked the Committee to forgive her oversight.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she sees these types of blade signs as appropriate for small first-story storefronts and not necessarily for monumental buildings such as this one. She stated that an appropriate sign for this building needs to speak to its grandeur and work with the architecture of the building. She opined that a projecting sign is not necessarily the best sign for this building.

Ms. Drew-Wolas stated that she ordered the sign herself. She stated that she tried to keep it simple and classic looking.

Ms. Stein pointed out that the building itself has many project elements, with which the projecting sign competes. She suggested that a sign for this building that works with the pilaster would be more complementary to the architecture, such as a flat panel. Ms. Drew-Wolas stated the pedestrian would not be able to see a flush sign unless they were in front of the building and it would be much less conspicuous from a business standpoint. Ms. Gutterman suggested a flag or banner sign, something that is lighter, might be more appropriate.

Mr. Cluver objected to the scale and the extent of projection of the sign. He suggested that, if it projected less, had a vertical orientation that reinforces the pilaster, and was a little more subtle, it would be more appropriate. He also suggested that matching, more discreet signs could be placed on either side of the door to respect the symmetry and monumentality of the building.

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

ADDRESS: 1800 DELANCEY PL

Project: Rehabilitate building, insert garage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1800 Delancey Place LP

Applicant: James Bennett, 1800 Delancey Place LP

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert a multi-unit residential building back into a single-family house. The applicant proposes to cut an opening for a garage in the rear façade of the building, replacing two basement windows and some original brickwork. The rear façade faces a service alley with other garages, but is visible from 18th Street. An entry to the side yard

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 OCTOBER 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

would be modified with the demolition of two brick wing walls. A metal door would be moved into the well in the side yard and would be replaced with a metal gate at the street. The stockade fencing of the upper floor decks would be replaced with metal picket fencing. A door to the second-floor deck would be replaced as well. The application also proposes to replace and/or repair windows and restore masonry work on the front façade, but the details are not provided. If such work is appropriate, it can be approved at the staff level.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details including the windows and masonry work, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Robert Flaynik represented the application.

Mr. Flaynik explained that the owners are committed to restoring the two main street facades on 18th and Delancey Streets. He stated that he will work with the staff on the restoration. He explained that he is before the Committee today primarily to present the proposed garage. He stated that the garage doors would be a darker color than is shown in the renderings, which were lightened to allow for the details to be easily perceived. He stated that the color would be gray. He added that the door would be paneled. He stated that the garage door has been set back into the wall about six inches with brick returns to correspond to the window openings above. He noted that the windows above the garage door would be retained in their entirety, but the sills would be replaced or, at a minimum, removed and reset. A large steel lintel would be inserted to hold the brick above.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the concrete and brick sidewalk shown in the renderings. She asked if some brick sidewalk would be removed and replaced with concrete. Mr. Flaynik responded that the sidewalk has already been altered; the concrete already exists. He stated that they may need to modify it to make it ADA compatible. He reported that he is working with the Streets Department on the design. Mr. Cluver asked if the “dog house” entrance gate along the sidewalk at the rear would be removed. Mr. Flaynik stated that it would be removed and reconstructed as shown in the plans. He contended that it is not original, but its date of construction is unknown. The entrance leads to an areaway along the rear ell. He added that Panama Street is a very narrow service alley with many garages and parking spaces.

Mr. Flaynik explained that he has reduced the height of the garage opening. The garage will not accommodate all SUVs, but will accommodate “city-friendly” cars. Mr. Cluver asked if the jambs of the garage would align with the jambs of the windows above. Mr. Flaynik stated that they would align. He added that he is using some of the vertical lines from above in the design of the doors. Mr. Cluver opined that this is a very prominent corner property. He asked about the support of the brick chimney-like projection. Mr. Flaynik explained that he is proposing to hold the brick above with a specially-cut steel plate.

Mr. Cluver stated that the garage was very well designed, given the parameters and restrictions, but contended that no garage would be appropriate for this location. He contended that the building is very prominent because it is on a corner. He concluded that, if you accept the premise of a garage in this location, this is the best or one of the best designs for it. He noted, however, that he does not accept the initial premise. Mr. Flaynik responded that he has studied the design problem extensively and contended that the design solution is successful. He also noted that the upper floors of the Panama façade would be restored. Ms. Stein stated that she

appreciated the care of the design as well as the restoration work proposed, but agreed with Mr. Cluver that a garage should not be installed in this location. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey concurred. Mr. Cluver asked if the ramp extended into the public right-of-way. Mr. Flaynik responded that he has maintained a five-foot-wide open sidewalk, which is much wider than the sidewalk on most of the block of Panama. Mr. Flaynik explained that he has worked with the clients to find alternate parking solutions, but none met the clients' needs. He stated that the market demands a garage with a house of this size and cost. Ms. Gutterman responded that "not every house gets a garage." Ms. Hawkins concurred.

The Committee members agreed that the proposed railings for the upper floor decks were appropriate.

Mr. Flaynik asked the Committee to state concretely the reason for the recommendation of denial of the garage, which he could relay to his clients. Ms. Hawkins and Gutterman explained that any garage opening in the Panama façade would be inappropriate because of the prominence of the house on the corner. They agreed that they could recommend approval of an identical garage for the adjacent house, one in from the corner of 18th and Panama Streets.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of new railings for the decks, with the staff to review details, but denial of the garage, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 48 E LOGAN ST

Project: Legalize and replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Garnett C. Littlepage

Applicant: Isom Gladden, Ultimate Construction

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 3/28/1967

District Designation: East Logan Street Historic District, Significant, 11/12/2010

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize vinyl windows that were installed in this house without a permit and to approve the installation of additional vinyl windows in all other openings. The designs of the installed and proposed windows do not match the material, profiles, or pane configurations of the historic windows. Moreover, the application is incomplete. It lacks shop drawings as well as drawings or photographs of the facades detailing the locations where windows have been and will be replaced. A cover letter submitted with the application stipulates that it is a financial hardship application, but the application fails to provide many of the documents required for a financial hardship review. The applicant also claims that he purchased the windows before the designation of the East Logan Street Historic District; however, such a claim is irrelevant. The building was individually designated many years before the applicant purchased the property and many years before the district was established. Moreover, a building permit is required for the replacement of windows in residential buildings with more than two units, such as this one, regardless of the property's historic designation status.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing to incompleteness.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 OCTOBER 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Douglas Kissel, an employee of the property owner, represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Commission does not approve vinyl windows in facades of historic buildings that are visible from the public right-of-way because vinyl windows do not replicate the exterior appearance of the historic windows. Mr. Kissel stated that he understood that the vinyl windows do not replicate the appearance of the historic windows and was therefore requesting approval of the application based on financial hardship. He stated that the property owner has already purchased all of the vinyl windows. It would be very expensive to remove the vinyl windows and install new wooden windows. Mr. Kissel stated that he believes that the owner had a building permit to replace the windows. Mr. Baron stated that he did not have a permit. Mr. Kissel then stated that the owner believed that he did not need a permit to replace the windows as long as he did not alter the sizes of the window openings. Ms. Hawkins explained to the applicant that the Commission has a financial hardship procedure, which requires the submission of specific information. Mr. Kissel asked where he could find an enumeration of the financial hardship process. Ms. Hawkins replied that the staff could provide information on the financial hardship process.

Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant to describe the window replacement. Mr. Kissel responded that the owner has purchased windows for all of the openings and has installed some but not all of the new windows. He directed the Committee to photographs in the application. Ms. Hawkins asserted that the photographs do not adequately document the circumstances because they are not annotated. She stated that she does not know which windows have been replaced or will be replaced. She contended that the application is incomplete. She again stated that the Committee does not typically recommend approval of vinyl windows. Mr. Kissel contended that many nearby houses have vinyl and metal windows. Mr. Baron explained that the new windows do not match the historic windows in configuration, in addition to material. He stated that the new windows have three parts, a fanlight transom over a two-over-two window with narrow muntins. The original windows were four-over-four arched-top double-hung sash with a wide vertical muntin and a narrow horizontal muntin. Ms. Gutterman opined that the Committee should recommend denial, owing to both a failure to satisfy the Standards and incompleteness.

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

ADDRESS: 8020 ST MARTINS LA

Project: Install ramp and doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. Martin-in-the-Fields Episcopal Church

Applicant: Lawrence McEwen, McEwen Architects

History: 1888; Saint Martin-in-the-Fields Church; Hewitt Brothers, architects; Baptistry added, T.P. Chandler, 1898

Individual Designation: 8/7/1980

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an ADA access at the sanctuary entrance of St. Martin-in-the-Fields Church. The installation of the ramp would require moving the existing steps out to provide space for a landing at the sanctuary entrance. The ramp would be either brushed concrete or thermal-finish flagstone. The side walls would be schist and the railings black-painted steel.

This application also proposes to install accessible doors in an entrance to the parish hall. The new doors would be compatible in design and materials. The original doors would be retained and mounted to the walls on either side of the doorway.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Larry McEwen, the Reverend Jarrett Kerbel, and Jack Dunnon represented the application.

Mr. McEwen explained the ramp proposal to the Committee. Ms. Hawkins asked if the railing would be metal and the sides of the ramp schist. Mr. McEwen confirmed that they would be metal and schist. He stated that there are no proposed door changes at the sanctuary entrance. Rev. Kerbel stated that, when the building is in use, those doors are always propped open.

Mr. McEwen explained the proposal to alter the parish hall doors. Ms. Hawkins asked if the salvaged doors would be operable. Mr. McEwen stated that they will not be operable, but will be hung on hinges and mounted to the wall adjacent to the opening. Mr. Cluver suggested retaining the historic doors as operable, prop them open during business hours, and install another set of glass doors inside. He stated that, during the day, light could come in, but during off hours the historic doors would be closed. Mr. Cluver stated that similar schemes were undertaken at the Philadelphia City Museum and the Athenaeum of Philadelphia. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the same is true of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant look into withdrawing the parish hall door alteration component of the application, retaining the historic doors, and installing glass doors on the interior.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the ramp and associated railings, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2210 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Renovate building, construct rear addition, stucco rear facades

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark Steinberg & Terri Herman Steinberg

Applicant: Kenneth Acquaviva

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear ell as well as the back half of the main block of this rowhouse and construct a four-story stucco addition on the same footprint. If the amount of demolition proposed qualifies as a demolition in the legal sense, as opposed to an alteration, as defined in Sections 14-203(15) and (88) of the Philadelphia Code, then the Commission cannot approve it unless first finding that there is no reasonable adaptation for the building without the demolition or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. The application makes no reasonable adaptation or public interest claims.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to either Standards 9 and 10 and/or Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Terri Steinberg and architect Andy Blanda represented the application.

Mr. Blanda distributed additional information including copies from historic maps and drawings and explained their relevance. He stated that they plan to make the house handicapped accessible by raising the floor level in the rear ell. He stated that they originally intended to demolish and construct a new rear ell, but, after meeting with the staff of the Historical Commission, they have decided to retain the rear ell and raise the floor level and the windows.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the drawings are confusing and the proposal is unclear. Mr. Blanda stated that they are now proposing to retain the rear ell. Ms. Gutterman asked how the retention of the rear ell was going to work with the addition and proposed bay. Mr. Blanda pointed to a drawing that indicated what historic fabric would remain. He explained that they could move the windows horizontally and vertically. Ms. Hawkins noted that the new windows would be paired two-over-twos with a transom as opposed to the existing six-over-six, and that the windows in the addition would be larger, which is not traditional. She suggested that they would be visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Cluver stated that he appreciates the attempt to keep the ell, but opined that little would be retained with the relocation of windows and construction of the addition.

Ms. Steinberg said that, to make the building habitable, she needs to change the floor levels and raise the windows as well. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the windows could be moved up, but not be moved to either side. Ms. Steinberg asked if the Committee would recommend approval of the application if they modified the window proposal as suggested. Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed design is unclear, especially as it relates to removal and retention of historic fabric. Ms. Cote suggested that, as a matter of process, the Committee make a

recommendation on the original proposal, but offer guidance and suggestions on the revisions during this discussion.

Mr. Cluver stated that he considered both proposals as constituting demolition and that the applicant may have to submit a financial hardship or public interest application. Ms. Stein agreed.

Mr. McCoubrey observed that the ground floor at the rear is not visible, owing to the garden wall, and allows for more change. He suggested that the windows could be moved up, provided they maintain their historic widths. He also suggested setting back the third-floor addition. Ms. Gutterman concurred.

Ms. Pentz stated that the proposed work constitutes a demolition, yet the application makes no reasonable adaptation or public interest claims. She stated that she could not vote to recommend approval.

Mr. Baron stated that there is a difference legally between a demolition and an alteration. He stated that he staff was concerned with the loss of the rear slope and ridge of the main block of the building. He suggested that a revised version of the application might avoid the demolition problem. He stated that he agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's comments.

Ms. Pentz suggested that they redesign the proposal to be more respectful of the existing roofline. Mr. Blanda stated that the elevator pilot house would not be visible from Rittenhouse Square Street. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Commission is concerned with impact on historic fabric as well as visibility. She suggested moving the elevator into the rear ell.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to either Standards 9 and 10 and/or Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:30 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.

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.

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

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