

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

**TUESDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2020
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair	X		
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP	X		
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		Arrived at 9:03

Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, all Commissioners, staff, applicants, and public attendees participated in the meeting remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Gage Williams
- German Yakubov
- Susan Lucci
- Alex Balloon
- Nicole Zhang
- Dane Bombara
- Christian Busch
- Samuel Sablosky
- Sam Hagr
- Richard Stewart
- Andrew Donaldson-Evans
- David Devanna
- Kate McGlinchey, Old City District
- Theresa Stuhlman

Rebecca Oleary
Bonnie Halda
Amea Farrell, Kaplin Stewart
Darren Brown
Mary Purcell
Dan Meza
B. Valunas
Patrick Grossi
Paul Steinke
Paul Boni
Alexandra Grabel
Gregory Curran
Ke Feng
Anthony Cerone
Sylvia Craft
Larry Spector
Changfeng Luo
Eve Kootchick
Susan Wetherill
Suzanna Barucco
Rich Villa
Daniel Sablosky
Nicole Bronola
Lorna Katz
Oscar Beisert

ADDRESS: 510 E WILDEY ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition with balcony

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mary MacLeod

Applicant: German Yakubov, Haverford Square Designs LLC

History: 1855; William Cramp frame house

Individual Designation: 2/28/1967

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The William Cramp frame house is part of a row of four mid-nineteenth-century frame buildings located on E. Wildey Street in Fishtown. Each building includes a two-story main block with a front-sloping half-gable roof and a two-story rear ell. At some point in the past, all four frame buildings were clad in stucco. The massing and form of the buildings largely remain intact, though the majority of the buildings have acquired one-story additions to their rear ells.

At its 13 March 2020 meeting, the Historical Commission denied an application for a rear addition that also proposed to raise the roof of the existing rear ell. In that proposal, the existing roof slope would have been altered in its entirety. While the Commission concluded that it may be possible to raise the roof of the rear ell and construct an addition, it noted that the proposed design was not sensitive to the original character of the building, because it did not maintain any part of the existing roof slope. The current application proposes a similar addition; however, the new design proposes to maintain 48-inches of the current roof slope to satisfy the Commission's request to retain a portion of the character-defining feature.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Alter roof of rear ell;
- Demolish one-story rear addition;
- Construct two-story addition with balcony; and
- Install new windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - This application proposes to raise a portion of the existing roof of the two-story rear ell to create useable space at the interior. The roof currently peaks at the east where it attaches to the rear ell of 512 E. Wildey Street and slopes west. At the lowest point, the interior height is currently 5-feet 7-inches. To achieve additional height at the interior, a portion of the roof would be demolished, and the west wall raised. The application proposes to retain 48-inches of the original roof slope adjacent to 512 E. Wildey Street. The work would alter much of the roofline but would maintain the existing fabric of the east wall. The work complies with this standard.
 - The application further proposes to demolish the non-original one-story rear addition and to construct a two-story addition in its place. Most of the rear ell is

not visible from a public right-of-way, though a portion of the addition would be visible from E. Eyre Street. The proposed two-story addition complies with this standard.

- New one-over-one double-hung windows would be installed at the front façade. Wood windows in the historic configuration should be installed to comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that a material such as HardiePlank siding is used to clad the addition and that the front façade windows are an appropriate material and configuration, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect German Yakubov represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Yakubov stated that this application has been submitted in response to the comments on the previous design. He explained that he is proposing to retain 48-inches of the existing roofline at the rear ell, which is the portion visible from Eyre Street, and that the remainder of the roof would be raised to create usable space at the interior.
- Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Yakubov if he had any comments on the staff's recommendation to change the cladding material.
 - Mr. Yakubov agreed to use HardiePlank siding instead of stucco.
 - Mr Cluver asked why the staff is recommending HardiePlank siding rather than stucco.
 - Ms. Keller answered that the building is of frame construction and that the staff recommends incorporating a material that is more appropriate to a frame structure.
- Ms. Stein stated that the double-pitched roof is complicated and that a simple slope from the ridgeline to the eave would be a better solution.
 - Mr. Yakubov explained that he originally proposed what Ms. Stein is suggesting but it was denied.
 - The Committee discussed whether the roof should be a simple single slope or have the double pitch.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested incorporating the existing slope into a portion of the rear roof of the addition to show the building's original roofline. He stated that the pitch on the ell is significant to the house.
 - Mr. Yakubov responded that his understanding of the issue is that a portion of the existing roof is visible from the street, which is why he proposed to retain 48-inches of it. The slope at the rear of the addition, he contended, would not be visible. He argued that if it is not visible from the street, it would not retain any character or provide any benefit to the historic building. He clarified that a cinder block wall obstructs the views of the rear of the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that it would be important to maintain the portion of the slope at the existing rear ell only and to not continue the double pitch at the addition. In the previous discussions, he continued, it was apparent that the eave is too low. The recommendation, he added, was to increase the height while maintaining some of

the original slope to communicate the historic roofline. He noted that the new design directly responds to the comments the applicant received from the Committee and Commission.

- Mr. Cluver asked that Mr. Yakubov include an elevation of the party wall to show what will be a half-gable at the addition. He questioned whether the addition would extend beyond the addition of the adjacent building. He then requested that a site plan be included with the application to show the building in its context.
 - Mr. Yakubov answered that the proposed addition would align with the one-story addition of the neighboring building and that there would be at least 9-feet between the addition and the property at the rear.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the rear slope would have some visibility from Eyre Street. He then suggested that approximately two feet of the rear roof of the addition incorporate the historic pitch of the ell, with the rest of the addition to appear as a large dormer.
 - Mr. Detwiler shared a sketch of the concept, adding that the sloped rear roof may affect the doors on the end wall.
 - Mr. Yakubov asked whether the slope could be maintained over the balcony rather than the addition. He argued that it would accomplish the visual effect while maintaining usable space at the interior.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the balcony, adding that he would be more receptive to a Juliet balcony at the door rather than a wrap-around balcony.
 - Mr. Yakubov stated that the rear is the only area that receives daylight. He then explained that the reason for the balcony is owing to the lack of light in the yard.
 - Ms. Stein agreed with Mr. Detwiler, stating that the balcony would be highly visible from the street. She asked whether the balcony could be located only at the interior side rather than the rear of the property.
 - Mr. Yakubov replied that the interior alley side does not receive much light and that the balcony at that location mainly provides added space, as well as a second exit. Locating the balcony only at the side would defeat its utility, he added. He then argued that the property is very small and that he modified the design to follow the Commission's recommendations.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the Committee has any comments on the proposed stucco, noting that stucco is not out of character.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that the buildings in the row were all originally clad in siding. Ms. Keller agreed, adding that the buildings were stuccoed at some point in the past without Historical Commission review.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Demolition would largely be limited to a non-original one-story addition and the majority of the roof of the ell, though 48-inches of the original slope would be retained.
- The roof would be raised at the eave to increase the ceiling height at the interior. The current ceiling height is only 5-feet 7-inches.
- A portion of the existing slope and the rear wall of the addition would be visible from Eyre Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The massing of the addition is appropriate, satisfying Standard 9.
- Approximately 18 to 24-inches of the roofline at the rear wall of the addition, which would be visible from Eyre Street, should replicate the original roof slope of the ell. The application proposes a double-pitched roof that would retain 48-inches of the original slope adjacent to the ridgeline. This portion of the work does not comply with Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval with the following revisions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9:

- the footprint of the proposed addition and balconies are acceptable;
- the first 18 to 24-inches of the rear wall of the addition should replicate the original slope of the ell;
- a material such as HardiePlank siding should be used to clad the addition; and,
- the front façade windows should be an appropriate material and configuration.

ITEM: 510 E Wildey St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey		X			
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman		X			
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4	2			

ADDRESS: 11 BOATHOUSE ROW

Proposal: Remove addition, construct addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Ke Feng, University of Pennsylvania

History: 1875; College Boat Club of the University of Pennsylvania

Individual Designation: 1/5/1984

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

Opened in 1875 for the College Boat Club of the University of Pennsylvania, 11 Boathouse Row features several building campaigns spanning over a century. The core of the property is the original two-story stone Victorian Gothic boathouse dating to 1875.

A two-bay wide addition, which is one story at the north, and two stories at the south, was added to the east circa 1920. In 1980, a one-bay wide addition was added to the west side of the building, after being reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission. Plans for the addition are in the Historical Commission's files and show that an addition was also proposed

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 SEPTEMBER 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

on the east side of the building, where the current work is proposed, but was never realized. This addition would have retained the two-story portion of the 1920's addition at the south facing the Schuylkill River, and demolished the remaining one-story portion of the addition that extends to the north, replacing it with a lower 1.5-story addition with similar detailing to the addition to the west.

This in-concept application proposes to demolish the 1920's addition and to construct a new addition in the footprint of the historic addition, but with considerably larger massing. The new addition would be two bays in depth, and feature two cross-gabled portions extending from the roof of the 1875 building at the north and south, with large modern dormers with recessed doors to create balconies. The intersecting gable roofs of the addition would sit just below the ridgeline of the 1875 building, obscuring the remaining portions of the roof from view. The area between the gabled-roof portions of the new addition would feature an asphalt-shingled mansard with a tall parapet to conceal rooftop mechanical equipment.

The application also proposes to enlarge the south-facing dormer of the 1980's addition to match the modern dormer balconies proposed on the new addition to the east, to reconstruct the south-facing balcony on the 1875 building, and to install historically-appropriate windows and doors.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish eastern additions
- Construct new addition
- Modify dormer on western/1980's addition
- Reconstruct south-facing balcony and install historically-appropriate windows and doors on 1875 building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition removes historic fabric that characterizes the property, overwhelms and almost completely obscures the original 1875 building, destroying spatial relationships that characterize the property. A key feature of the proposed addition are the very large, modern dormer windows, which are overly differentiated from the old and not in keeping with the features of the historic building. The scale, massing, and proportions of the addition are incompatible with the historic building. The application fails to satisfy this Standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration work to the 1875 building, but denial of the proposed addition, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff contends that the proposed use could be accommodated with considerably less massing than is proposed.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:36:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Ke Feng, Mark Kocent, and Andrew Evans represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver noted that the dormer sills have been lowered and questioned whether pitch has been changed and the eaves raised as well.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that it is relatively the same pitch but the sills have been lowered.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that he believes the eave has been raised noting that carrying the eave line of the new addition over to where it intersects the 1875 building, it appears to be higher than the existing addition. Other Committee members agreed and expressed concern over the raising of the addition's roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the new addition also extends further towards the water view plane.
- Mr. Cluver expressed concern over the span between the two side gabled portions of the east elevation reading as a blank wall.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the proposed gable on the north side is the same as the river side, making it higher than the existing addition to the west, and increasing the height of the ridge lines considerably where they intersect the original 1875 building. He noted that in the existing south elevation, the ridge lines of the east and west additions do not align, but in the proposed elevation, the ridge line of the east addition has been raised to match that to the west. He noted that these observations are consistent with the staff recommendation that the massing is too large and overwhelms the original 1875 building. Mr. Cluver noted that he is not against the concept of an addition, but that the massing of the proposed addition is too large for the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler remarked that one of the wonderful things about the boathouses on Boathouse Row is that they usually have a residential scale to them, and this building is no different. He opined that in the proposed north elevation the original portion is being dwarfed by the proposed massive dormer and the raised height. He explained that he is not opposed to an overbuild, but that subtle reduction and focus on the relationship of the new to the old will be key to a successful design. He suggested minimizing elements and massing of the new addition wherever possible.
- Ms. DiPasquale clarified that everything shown in blue in the application is proposed to be demolished. Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting it is not an overbuild so much as a rebuild.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that demolition drawings would be helpful.
- Mr. Kocent opined that the truly historic and wonderful piece is the central pavilion from 1875. He opined that the other additions are agglomerations constructed for practical reasons. He argued that the one-story addition from 1920 is structurally insufficient, and that they need additional space to meet Title IX equity and to bring the building up to accessibility regulations.
- Mr. Kocent noted that they considered taller additions, but their cultural resources group advised against that. He noted that the neighboring Vesper and Malta boathouses are three stories in height.
- Mr. Kocent noted that the intent was to honor the historic 1875 building by bringing back its original balcony and installing more compatible doors.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that they have overwhelmed the center original portion of the building with their reconstruction,. She explains that she understands the need to reconstruct, but does not know that they need all of the large porches and glazing. She noted that they have taken smaller windows and made them much larger by turning them into a series of doors, and made it so that the additions totally

- overwhelm the jewel in the center. She explained that she understands program needs that are controlling the footprint, but argued that the applicants should reduce and minimize the impact of the new construction on the original building.
- Mr. Kocent replied that the intent is to provide as much natural light into the space as possible. He noted that the room is intended to be both an exercise and rental space, so there is a financial component in attracting rentals because people will want to be out on balconies.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the need for revenue should not control how the applicants treat the significance of the historic fabric.
 - Looking at the proposed section drawings, Mr. Cluver observed that the top right section shows the men's locker room and shower area on the north as having 14-foot ceilings, which he opined do not need to be that tall. He suggested that area offers the opportunity reduce the height of the ridge line on the north, Kelly Drive elevation and to lower the height of the mechanical screen wall. He noted that the applicants could keep height in the Erg room, but lower other ceiling heights. Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that reducing the mass of the proposed addition wherever possible would make it more palatable.
 - Mr. Detwiler opined that the massive wide dormers are inappropriate in scale to the historic building, and suggested that it would be more appropriate to split them into two smaller dormers. He noted that they would not get the entire mass of doors that way, but breaking up the dormers would bring the scale down to a more appropriate level.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that the least successful part of the design is the connector between the two gables. He suggested that it warrants additional study, and that the applicants should find some way to articulate it and make it a more interesting elevation. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that the wall of shingles is inappropriate.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that they raised that portion over time to conceal the rooftop equipment, but agreed that they could lower the mechanical equipment and break down the massing of the connector. He also agreed to look at reducing the scale of the Kelly Drive elevation and to break down the north dormer. Mr. Kocent asked if the Architectural Committee would like them to look at the scale of the south, river-facing dormer as well.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded affirmatively, noting that the dormer is too wide.
 - Mr. McCoubrey remarked that one of the interesting characteristics of the boathouse is its asymmetry and that the river side has a different scale than the Kelly Drive side. He opined that reducing the volume and mass on Kelly Drive is important, but also recommended reducing the scale of the alterations to the south side of the building. He noted that by extending the roof upward and the mass forward, and that by dropping the sills of the dormer to create a very large and wide balcony, the proposed addition really competes with the original portion of the building.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that they were trying to make the design clean and simple, but acknowledged that it may have made the dormers too much of a feature.
 - Mr. Coubrey noted that in looking at the transverse section of the Erg room in the lower left of the proposed sections drawing, one might expect the right-hand edge to be different, and that a big, pure volume may be difficult to achieve given the context of the various additions and gables.
 - Mr. Kocent asked Mr. Evans if there is anything physical about the building that would limit them from exploring the Committee's recommendations.
 - Mr. Evans responded that the gable height of the reconstructed addition is consistent with the west 1980s bay. He understands that the detailing of the

dormers could be modified to be more consistent with the historic detailing. He noted that there may be difficulties in lowering the flat roof portion, because the equipment height and ceiling cavity is driven by functional requirements. He noted that they would have to explore how much room they have in section.

- Mr. Kocent noted that they should try to make the Kelly Drive side less imposing.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the doors into the boat bays are also being changed, and that the proposed doors are appropriate.
- Mr. Cluver also noted that there are new skylights proposed and asked whether they are taking the form of the existing dormers.
 - Mr. Evans responded that following the profile of the existing dormer, and will have a different profile than the existing skylights. He noted that the existing skylights are not visible from the public right-of-way, and neither will the new ones.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether they are capturing the original gable and smaller dormer in the interior.
 - Mr. Kocent responded affirmatively, noting that one window becomes a door down a corridor. Mr. Detwiler asked if they are keeping the frame structure of the smaller dormer. Mr. Kocent responded that they do not plan to but could look into it.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The central pavilion dating to 1875 is the jewel to which any proposed addition should be secondary.
- The north, Kelly Drive elevation of the boathouse has a different and more residential scale and character than the south, river-facing elevation, and the proposed addition should honor that character.
- The concept of the removal and reconstruction of the eastern addition is acceptable.
- The roof height of the proposed addition should be reduced so that the ridge lines of the cross-gables where they intersect the roof of the historic 1875 building are lower.
- The height of the proposed addition along the north elevation should be lower than the south elevation, which should be lower than the 1980's addition to the west.
- The north and south planes of the addition should be pulled back from the central historic portion of the existing historic building.
- The east elevation of the connector between the two gable portions of the addition presents as a blank wall of shingles and should be reduced in scale and better articulated in order to be more compatible with the historic building.
- The proposed dormers are incompatible with the historic building and should be reduced in scale and split into two dormers.
- The proposed dormer balconies compete with the historic balcony of the central 1875 portion of the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The scale, massing, and details of the proposed addition are incompatible with and overwhelm the historic 1875 portion of the building, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration work to the 1875 building, but denial of the proposed addition, pursuant to Standard 9, with the primary concerns being the overall massing, the treatment of the dormers, and the sheer face of the east wall.

ITEM: 11 Boathouse Row					
MOTION: Approval of restoration; denial of addition					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 232-36 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building; construct eight-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marie F. Cerone

Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 2000; Martin Jay Rosenblum, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application for final approval proposes to construct an eight-story building at the southeast corner of Walnut Street and S. 3rd Street. The existing single-family residence on the property was constructed in 1999 and is non-contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. The application proposes full demolition of the three-story brick residence and garage and construction of an eight-story, 100' tall building. The proposed building will house a hotel and a first-floor commercial space.

An earlier version of this application was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at the 28 July 2020 meeting. The original version proposed a 15-story, 184' tower. The Committee recommended denial of the application, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9. The applicant requested a one-month continuance to revise their proposal and the Historical Commission reviewed the updated design on 11 September 2020. The updated design is eight stories and 100 feet in height; it is seven stories and 89 feet to the cornice line, with an eighth story set back from the facades. At the conclusion of their discussion, the Historical Commission voted to remand the application to the Architectural Committee for an additional review, owing to the degree of change from the original design.

Although the existing buildings are non-contributing to the historic district, the lot is considered Contributing for archaeological potential. This application is subject to full plenary review by the

Historical Commission. The property does not meet the conditions for an undeveloped site, as defined in Section 2.23 of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish existing building.
- Construct 8-story, 100' building.

The revised application reflects the following changes to the original proposal:

- Building overall height is reduced by 84'
- Upper cornice height went from 174' to 89'
- Main exterior material is now red brick
- Top treatment of the arch is now a true half round
- Building is set farther back from Walnut Street than originally proposed
- Plan to use the existing front foundation wall and propose no new excavation north of that wall

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 8: Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*
 - The applicant should engage an archaeologist to assess property for archaeological potential in order to satisfy Standard 8. An initial assessment has not been submitted with application.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The revised design is more compatible with the historic district in massing, size, scale, and materials.
 - Further reduction in height could be achieved by reducing floor height rather than reducing the number of floors.
 - The proposed cladding materials successfully differentiate the building from the Merchants Exchange building and are more harmonious with the historic district.
 - Architectural features, such as the floor to ceiling windows, could be further refined to be more appropriate within the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with modifications to height and architectural details for better compatibility with historic district, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:06:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application.
- Architect Rich Villa, attorney Amee Farrell, and property owner Anthony Cerone represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Mehley to clarify the staff recommendation of approval with lower height.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that the floor heights generally ranged from 12' to 15'. She noted that in reviewing the written comments submitted on the revised design, it was clear that the height was still a concern. The staff was concerned that the floor heights lead to an overly tall building that is not complementary to the surrounding context.
- Mr. Villa stated they did revise proposal greatly from the original application presented to the Commission. He noted that the floor heights are comparable to Walnut Place which is just down the street. Mr. Villa continued that the idea really behind this was to keep the cornice height almost in line with those of Walnut Place at 320 Walnut Street and the Moravian at 143 S. 2nd Street. He noted that the Moravian is a 10-year-old building. He noted the revised height of their design is based on Walnut Place but the Moravian is also within the proposed range of height. Mr. Villa said the floor to floor height is 11' 8" with the first floor at 16' and the top floor at 13'. He added there is potentially some room in there to move things down but its height as proposed is 89' which is pretty much in line with Walnut Place and is set back almost 30'.
- Mr. Cluver requested to see a photograph of Walnut Place.
 - Mr. Villa directed him to presentation page Z4. He pointed out that an image of Walnut Place was in the upper right-hand corner with the proposed building rendered in the background.
- Mr. McCoubrey said one of the considerations is that 3rd Street is kind of a divider line between the commercial scale on Walnut Street and the three and four-story height of Society Hill and Independence National Park.
 - Mr. Villa responded that he understood but that the Moravian sits on 2nd Street and 101 Walnut Street is 11 stories and that's farther down Walnut Street.
- Mr. Cluver noted that Walnut Place is six stories.
 - Mr. Villa replied that it is six stories with a seventh-story penthouse. He stated that its six stories are very tall, and their design fits seven stories into the same height as Walnut Place.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that Walnut Place was constructed in the 1920s or 1930s. She stated that you cannot just take the building out of context. Mr. Gutterman said she objects to this height and massing at this particular corner, given what is around it and its proximity to Independence Park. She continued that there are certainly taller buildings around it but the height of this building is not appropriate in the context. Ms. Gutterman said that, although she understands why they have pulled the building back from the corner of 3rd and Walnut, the set back is in opposition to the streetscape in this area with buildings very close to the street and holding the corners. She continued that for various reasons the proposed design is not holding the corner, which means that this building becomes even more pronounced and more visible. Ms. Gutterman said that the Committee has not talked about the penthouse story. It is not really 89' tall but over 100' tall because of the mechanical equipment. She asserted that the Committee should take into account the total height.
 - Mr. Villa directed the presentation to show a rendering with the full height fully visible, page A203.
 - Ms. Stein commented on this rendering that looked west along Walnut Street. She stated that the view really opens up from the backside of the Merchants'

Exchange Building. She noted that the rendering shows the full 100 feet of height and more.

- Mr. Villa pointed out that visibility of the full height of the building including the roof would be limited along Walnut Street, 3rd Street, and Thomas Paine Place but not so much when looking west along Walnut Street toward the building's east elevation.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he would change course from the other Committee members and stated that he is not bothered by the height of it. He commented that he was bothered by the height of the earlier proposal but not by the revised height. Mr. Detwiler noted that he is bothered by all of the things on top of the building but is fine with the main mass of the building itself. He added that the visible things such as mechanical equipment detracts from the building and takes away from the whole. Mr. Detwiler said he appreciated that the materials were changed. He added that he did not know if the change to brick cladding was necessary, but knew it should not be exactly the same as the cladding of the Merchants' Exchange Building. Mr. Detwiler commented that he is fine with the brick, but his main concern is the additional story of massing on the top that is a little messy in his opinion. He noted that it does not look like the design has any parapet on the main block of the building.
 - Mr. Villa responded that there is a low parapet and then all of those spaces for the roof are set back and you really cannot see the railings as they are set back. He continued that by code the railings need to be at least 5' from the building line.
 - Mr. Detwiler said there is no shortage of long views of this building from various angles. He said that in essence one is looking at a traditional massing of a building, but these buildings always have that kind of tripartite facade where there is a base, a shaft, and a capital. He pointed out that the proposed building does not really have that cap piece and he thinks that if there was a parapet on it, that was a little more pronounced, maybe it would help to hide some of what is currently on top of the building. Mr. Detwiler stressed that he does think that some of that additional massing on top needs to be reduced dramatically.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the windows and doors on the street level along Thomas Paine Place. He referenced the application rendering looking towards the back of the garage doors at page A202.
 - Mr. Villa responded there are air rights over the parking lot and so the first two bays have to remain open so that the parking garage is usable by the Nelson Building. He explained there is a loading dock, but windows could be added to the other portion.
 - Mr. Detwiler said that does not know if windows are needed. It may need more articulation than just a solid mass of garage door or façade. He commented that on the left side of that elevation on the street level it is merely a solid wall and thinks that some articulation would help significantly. He pointed out that there is so much more articulation above that the solidity calls more attention to it. He recommended finding a way to polish it a bit and define it more in a more interesting way.
- Mr. Cluver stated that his overall comment has to do with the scale of it and that it is taller than the vast majority of buildings in the area. He contended that the windows are out of scale compared to the vast majority of the buildings in the area. Mr. Cluver referenced the arch top and noted there is some precedent in terms of the shape in the window treatment, but the scale of the window is probably double or triple what you would normally see where that treatment is applies. He concluded that it is

- almost like a postmodern treatment of a traditional building and it does not feel like it fits in Society Hill.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he is going to go back again to this question of the overall height and mass of the building. He said if you are looking down 3rd Street, you are really in the three-story with an occasional four-story height and he believes at this particular corner the building will really look too tall. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he also agreed with the comments about the architecture. He said that he is not sure what the architectural expression is here but there is a kind of an industrial feel to it and yet it has sort of vertical articulation and then kind of colonial fanlight windows at the top. Mr. McCoubrey noted that it looks kind of more like an Old City industrial building. He added that it is lacking some of the scale elements that you would typically find in this particular part of the city, this kind of precious colonial part of the city. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out again that everything immediately around this building is basically three stories. He said that a 65-foot height limit has been long under consideration in this area. Such a height limit exists in Old City. The proposed building is significantly higher than 65 feet. He concluded that he would rather not see a very vertical expression like this. A more traditional spandrel system might make the building seem less tall.
 - Mr. Villa asked if he was looking for horizontals to break up the single tall bay feel.
 - Mr. McCoubrey confirmed this.
 - Mr. Cluver said that Mr. Villa previously referenced Walnut Place. He pointed out that Walnut Place's articulation does help break down its scale.
 - Mr. Villa pointed out that Walnut Place does have tall pilasters which adds to its height.
 - Mr. Cerone, the property owner, said he appreciated the Committee's concern about this section of the city and the streetscape. He stated that it is his understanding that the 65' height restriction had been pocket vetoed by the Mayor and it is his understanding the Mayor was interested in developing that whole area because the City needs the revenue. Mr. Cerone commented that when you look at 3rd Street, and you will go up to 3rd and Walnut Streets, then you go from 4th and Walnut Streets up to 5th and Walnut Streets, that whole area has much taller buildings. He said he was perplexed by the demarcation line and said he thinks it is arbitrary. Mr. Cerone stated that he would like to address the corner of 3rd and Walnut Streets. He asked the Committee if they would prefer that building to be moved to the corner as opposed to being set back.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that she would need to see a plan for the building moved to the corner before offering an opinion. She explained that she is uncomfortable with the way it is currently sitting but without seeing what would be proposed in a drawing or rendering, she would not make an arbitrary statement. Ms. Gutterman stated that she believes there are ways to hold the corner without having an eight-story building at the corner.
 - Mr. Cerone said he is confused because others say that they do not want the building to encroach on the streetscape with the Merchants' Exchange Building, but now the Architectural Committee is telling him to bring the building up to the corner.
 - Mr. Gutterman disagreed and clarified her previous statements, noting that she said that she needs to see a plan or rendering with the building moved to the corner before she can offer an opinion.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that an eight-story building at the corner is very different than a plan that might be a three-story or four-story massing on the corner with additional floors set back.
- Ms. Gutterman said another option is that it could be a two-story building on the corner and then set back. She added this building can have steps to it. Ms. Gutterman stressed that she is not comfortable with an eight-story building right on the corner of 3rd and Walnut Streets.
- Mr. Cerone replied that he is not comfortable with an eight-story building either because he prefers a 22-story building, but everyone has their opinions.
- Mr. Cerone asked the Committee to explain how they could eliminate the “stuff” at the top of the building because this is not clear to him. He asked Mr. Villa if this was clear to him.
- Mr. Villa replied that Mr. Detwiler’s comment referenced the assembly space on the roof and potentially making it smaller so that it is almost completely invisible from most of the long views of the building.
- Mr. Cerone inquired about the Committee’s comments on the windows. He asked if they wanted the windows smaller and requested more clarity on this.
- Mr. Villa responded that he believes the Committee is asking for more horizontal lines in the building to reduce the perceived visual height.
- Mr. Cluver agreed that it is the verticality and also the overall scale of the windows themselves that is at issue. He pointed out that the existing design is in essence a glass wall with some brick pilasters interrupting it whereas the Society Hill aesthetic is based on punched window openings.
- Mr. Cerone asked for more clarity on changes to the windows and breaking up the verticality.
- Mr. Villa responded that the Committee is looking for them to be broken up with horizontals or potentially be smaller in scale so that the overall height of the building is not perceived alone by its bay height. He said that he could work on this. He communicated that he and Mr. Cerone could discuss and work on these further after the meeting.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the reuse of an existing foundation wall. He noted that he was not sure what that referenced.
 - Mr. Villa replied that this was in response to the Park Service saying that excavations would be potentially damaging to the Merchants’ Exchange Building. He explained that the existing building on the site has a 15’ deep basement and the exterior wall is 14” thick on the north side and 14” on the 3rd Street side. He said they are proposing to excavate no further north of that and most likely they can use portion of that wall as a retaining wall for their construction. Mr. Villa pointed out that, if the design were to move north to Walnut Street, they would have to do some excavation. He noted that the proposed plan leaves this area in place that does not push the building any further north toward the Merchants’ Exchange.
 - Mr. Cerone stated that the basement of the existing is actually a fallout shelter and some walls are actually 18” thick and 15’ deep. He recounted that when 36” water main broke on 3rd and Walnut Streets and leaked millions of gallons, the City came in and looked at the basement and was in awe of the fact that there was not an ounce of water in that basement. Mr. Cerone said it is prudent to use that foundation and that is one of the bases behind the building being pushed back from the street, along with the criticisms from the Society Hill people about it being too close to the Merchants’ Exchange Building.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated reusing that wall would warrant a structural analysis since the new building is likely to have point loads rather than continuous loads.
 - Mr. Cerone responded that a structural engineer will of course review the design and conduct testing.
- Ms. Stein said that her only comment is about the massing which she concurs with everything that has been said by the other Committee members. She stated that she thinks the set back is hurting the project. Ms. Stein pointed out that, if the building were pushed to Walnut Street, because most of the buildings on Walnut Street are pushed to the sidewalk, it would allow them to reduce some of the height from the top of the building. She contended that the Committee has not really seen any alternatives to what she called a tower form. The result is an “object building” that will sit next to another “object building,” the Merchants’ Exchange Building. Ms. Stein questioned if the site would be better off with an infill building like you see up and down Walnut Street. She said that they could put some of the value that is on the top of the building out in the front of the building. Ms. Stein stated that she thought seeing that is important to understand.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Alex Balloon supported the application.
- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia, supported the application.
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, opposed the application.
- Bonnie Halda opposed the application.
- Mary Purcell, vice president of Society Hill Civic Association, opposed the application.
- Lorna Katz Lawson, on behalf of Society Hill Civic Association, opposed the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that the revisions since the original submission include the following:

- The overall height was reduced by 84’.
- The upper cornice height was reduced from 174’ to 89’.
- The main exterior material was changed to brick.
- The top window shape was changed to a true half round.
- The building was set farther back from Walnut Street than originally proposed.
- The existing front foundation wall would be used to avoid any new excavation north of that wall.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is taller than the majority of buildings in its historic context.
- The proposed windows are out of scale with the historic context.
- The eighth floor and rooftop equipment would be extremely visible when viewed from the east looking west down Walnut Street.
- No alternate plans exploring options for placing the building at directly at the corner of 3rd and Walnut Streets were submitted and the setting of the building back from Walnut Street may not be appropriate to the historic context.
- No alternatives to the tower form have been submitted and the verticality is not compatible with the context.

- The revised design is incompatible with its context and does not meet Standards 8 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

ITEM: 232-36 Walnut St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 502 WOOD ST

Proposal: Construct six-story multi-family residential apartment building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Wood Street Associates LP

Applicant: Richard Stewart, JKRP Architects

History: vacant lots

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This Review and Comment application proposes to construct a six-story multi-family apartment building on several vacant, undeveloped parcels within the Old City Historic District. The lots at 313, 315 and 317 N. Randolph Street; 504-08 Wood Street; and 312, 314, 316 and 318 N. 5th Street will be consolidated as 502 Wood Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six-story multi-family apartment building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction over this site. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*

- The design of this building does not relate to the context of the Old City Historic District. The building is to be clad in metal panels of various shades of grey and one described as having a “wood look.”
- The materials and rhythm of the fenestration do not appear to reference any of the architecture seen within the Old City Historic District. In this regard, the design is differentiated from the historic fabric, however it fails to achieve the compatibility that is required by this standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - As the lots are currently vacant, there would be no adverse impact on the surrounding buildings or on the historic district if this property were to be removed in the future.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed new construction is not compatible with the historic district and does not satisfy Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:57:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Daniel Sablosky and architects Dane Bombara and Richard Stewart represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Bombara pointed out that the site was located on the edge of the Old City Historic District, directly in front of the building at 509 Vine Street. He explained that the intent with the new building was to maintain similar window sizes and scale as what was seen at 509 Vine Street.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that it was difficult to understand how this new building would fit into the context of the surrounding buildings.
 - Mr. Bombara responded that, owing to the site being adjacent to a park and the embankment for Route 676, there is no real historic context in this area.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether there had been any thought given to cladding the new building in masonry, like the building at 509 Vine Street, instead of the metal panels they were currently showing in the design.
 - Mr. Bombara explained that the base of the new building was to be cast stone where the above ground parking was located. He said that they had not considered using masonry above this podium structure.
- Ms. Gutterman said that the verticality of the metal panels did not seem to fit into the context of the horizontal nature of the masonry and punched openings seen at the building at 509 Vine Street. She commented that their design seemed to have chosen shiny metal panels over a more contextual use of masonry.
- Mr. Cluver asked the staff why this site was included within the boundaries of the Old City Historic District.
 - Mr. Farnham replied that the boundaries were proposed by the Old City Civic Association and its historic preservation consultant, Bob Powers. He confirmed that the lots in question had been vacant since the creation of the Old City Historic District and could have just as easily been excluded from the boundaries as a result.

- Mr. Cluver commented that, in addition to the proposed materials, his other concern was the ground-level parking.
 - Mr. Bombara pointed out that the material of the parking base was cast stone along with perforated metal panels, though it looked darker in the renderings.
 - Mr. Sablosky remarked that ground-level parking had been on the site for the entire 16 years that he had owned the property. He commented that several other buildings had been constructed along Vine Street using metal panels as a way to differentiate them from the older industrial buildings in the area.
 - Mr. Sablosky told the members of the Architectural Committee that he had used historic tax credits on the building at 509 Vine Street when they converted it from an industrial use to a residential use. He asked that they give consideration to the fact that they have been good citizens in this specific area and designed the current proposal respecting the vision of the City Planning Commission's zoning designation for the site.
- Ms. Stein noted that the job of the Architectural Committee was to provide comment on the design since the application was a Review and Comment. She added that she agreed with Ms. Gutterman's comments about the materials being proposed. Ms. Stein recognized that the site was on the edge of the Old City Historic District. However, it is still within the boundaries; therefore, its design will set the course for future new construction projects. She noted that the large façade of this building would be visible from the adjacent highway and was therefore important.
- Ms. Stein said she agreed with Ms. Gutterman that the proposed metal materials appeared very thin, and the use of so many colors made the façade appear chaotic. She suggested that the use of masonry somewhere on the building would help it connect better to the historic district. Ms. Stein remarked that parking at the ground-level was not pedestrian friendly.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said that he did not see why the applicant could not put the parking underground rather than at ground-level.
 - Mr. Sablosky and Mr. Stewart responded that they had studied this option extensively and that they could not make underground parking work on the site.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that he agreed with Ms. Stein's comments about the ground-floor design, noting that it was too blank for this urban streetscape. He also agreed that the façade appeared chaotic as a result of so many window types and colors and patterns of the metal panels.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that in general he thought the scale of the punched openings was appropriate; however, he agreed that there were too many materials being proposed for the façade. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the windows at the corners could be more effective if they were not quite as large as currently designed. He agreed that the parking base needed some kind of articulation of materials or something that connected its design to the rest of the building. Mr. McCoubrey added that he found the massing of the building to be appropriate to the context.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed building was an improvement to the existing surface parking lots. Mr. Detwiler added that there appeared to be agreement among the members of the Architectural Committee that it was the skin of the building that needed some improvements.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Alex Balloon said that he agreed with the comments of the Architectural Committee regarding the design details but that he was in support of the project's massing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed metal paneling is not reflective of the historic district's industrial, largely masonry character.
- The design proposes too many competing colors and window types which results in a chaotic design.
- The façade of the proposed ground-level parking is unarticulated and should tie into the rest of the building better. Ground-level parking will not enhance the pedestrian experience along this block.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is not compatible with its environment in its building materials and lack of pedestrian engagement at the ground-level parking, but is compatible with its overall massing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that, other than its massing, the proposed design is not compatible with its environment, pursuant to Standard 9. The façade should integrate masonry and a more cohesive fenestration design in order to reflect the context of the Old City Historic District more successfully.

ADDRESS: 917-33 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Install LED screens and temporary event tent in courtyard

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Thomas Jefferson University

Applicant: Christian Busch, 20th Century Preservation, LLC

History: Federal Reserve Building of Philadelphia, 1931; East wing and garden, 1941; Paul Cret, architect

Individual Designation: 9/26/1961

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to install an event tent and LED displays inside the Garden Court located within the former Federal Reserve Bank building complex at 10th and Chestnut Streets. Paul Cret designed the building and added the east wing and garden in 1941. Thomas Jefferson University, the owner of the property, intends to utilize the outdoor space for events of varying size. The proposed tent and LED displays will allow for flexibility of the site, and also for donor recognition, which is the driving force behind the LED displays. Much of the work proposed to bring a use to the Garden Court site was approved administratively by the staff, including lighting, fencing, paving, planters, and other minor site improvements. The two items remaining for review by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission are the event tent and LED displays.

The application includes two videos to provide a walk-through simulation of the proposal. The video tours can be accessed at the following links: <https://youtu.be/dtYrlhCAHrc> and <https://youtu.be/RPUq6zIPKQ4>

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install event tent, to be in place 179 days during the year.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 SEPTEMBER 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Install 17 LED displays.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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 work 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.*
 - The proposed event tent is temporary and will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The proposed LED displays, both moveable and fixed, are largely independent of the historic material and will not destroy historic fabric. However, the sheer quantity of LED displays may alter the features and spatial relationships of the Garden Court.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*
 - The proposed event tent and LED displays can be removed in the future without impact to the historic integrity of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the LED screens are reduced to the locations at the rear half of the courtyard, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:22:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Christian Busch, Eve Kootchick, and Susan Lucci represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler recused and exited the meeting, owing to his position as a faculty member with Thomas Jefferson University, the owner of the property.
- Ms. Stein asked about the use of the term “temporary” as it pertains to the event tent.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that the event tent is proposed to be in place 179 days during the year.
- Mr. Busch asked to present a walk-through video. The short video was presented.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the tent roof shown in the video.
 - Mr. Busch responded that it will be a custom-ordered clear roof.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if there is any permanent structure with the event tent, or if it would all be removed when the tent is taken down.
 - Mr. Busch responded that the entire tent and structure would be removed when the tent is taken down. No frame structure would remain.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the LED displays are considered to be signs as defined by zoning regulations. He cautioned that they could be considered digital animated displays for which there are fairly strict zoning restrictions.
 - Mr. Busch responded that the LED displays will not be used in any sort of commercial or advertising purpose, so it is his understanding that the LED displays are not considered to be signs. He stated that he would look into the matter further to obtain a definitive answer.

- Mr. Cluver asked about the amount of time each day that the LED displays will be in operation.
 - Mr. Busch responded that the LED displays will only be in operation during events, on average two times per week, in the evening. At all other times, the displays will be off.
- Ms. Stein asked if the LED displays are also temporary, like the event tent.
 - Mr. Busch responded that the south displays along the fence are completely portable and can be wheeled away at any time. The north and west displays are “permanent” but with minimal physical impact to the historic fabric. The four small monitors in the planters will be in place all year long, but can technically be removed when their service life runs out or if they are no longer needed.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he appreciates the thought and level of attention to detail that has gone into the proposal, including leaving the decorative elements of the window grilles exposed at the top and bottom.
 - Mr. Busch thanked Mr. Cluver and stated that he and his team pushed to give deference to the architectural elements in the space.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the south LED displays along the fence are retractable.
 - Mr. Busch responded that they do not retract, but rather are free-standing and on a base with wheels that holds the screen. They are braced at specific points back to the fence so that they cannot fall over, but they can be disconnected and wheeled away and into storage when not in use.
 - Ms. Gutterman commented that the south LED displays block views of the Garden Court from the outside, and block views of the historic fence from the inside. She stated that you cannot see through them, and that the view is limited when they are turned off.
 - Mr. Busch agreed, but noted that the three screens will limit the view, but not block it completely. He also observed that from the outside, you would still see the historic fence because the screens are on the inside.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the attachment methods for the LED displays on the north grilles, and the LED displays on the west wall. She asked if it is a physical attachment to the grilles and/or the building.
 - Mr. Busch responded that they are utilizing clamps. The LED screens themselves are hung on a metal framework, and that framework contacts the bronze grilles at about eight separate locations, which is done with stainless steel with an isolated clamp connector. There is no physical metal-on-metal contact between the historic fabric and the modules that hold the screens.
- Ms. Gutterman asked for confirmation about the permanence of the LED displays.
 - Mr. Busch responded that the displays are intended to be in place year-round.
 - Ms. Stein commented that the permanence of the displays is concerning, because she believed it was a temporary installation. She remarked at the sheer quantity of LED displays on the exterior of a significant historic building, and that the Commission would have no control over when the screens would be turned on or off. She suggested that the Committee focus on what is temporary and what is permanent.
 - Mr. Busch responded that the Committee could place restrictions or qualifications on its recommendation. He stated that the development team is not interested in having the LED displays turned on when events are not taking place in the courtyard.
- Ms. Stein voiced concern about obscuring the views into the Garden Court with the south LED displays along the fence.

- Mr. Busch reiterated that the south LED displays are moveable and that a requirement could potentially be made that the displays must be removed when no events are taking place, so that the viewshed is not partially restricted.
- Ms. Gutterman responded that that requirement is problematic because of where and how the displays would be stored, and how it would be enforced.
- Ms. Kootchick confirmed that the three south displays along the fence are completely removable and that accommodations have been made to be able to wheel those displays into storage within the building. The north and west displays are a more permanent installation and will not be taken down after every event. She explained that the owners have a dedicated Information Technology department that will be trained in the use of the equipment and will be responsible for setting it up and putting it away.
- Ms. Lucci agreed with Ms. Kootchick. Ms. Lucci explained that the west LED displays will honor the donors. They are custom to fit into each niche and to blend in with the building when not in use. She stated that removing one or more of these displays would throw off the balance of the space. The north LED displays on the grilles are intended as a wow-factor and are a way to give special recognition to one or two important donors. The south LED displays along the fence serve to add some privacy for the guests within the space, and to offer a wow-factor for the guests. The presentation displays have content that will be specific to the event.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the quantity of LED displays is too great, and the obstruction of historic fabric is too much.
 - Mr. Busch asked if the Committee had suggestions as to how to go about editing the quantity of displays. He reiterated that the Committee could consider including conditions in its recommendation that the property owner would follow.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that the displays are overwhelming the wow-factor that already exists, which is the Garden Court itself. He stated that the ability to communicate at an event is important, but the north and south displays are particularly problematic, and the number of displays on the west wall is problematic.
 - Mr. Busch asked if editing the north displays down to one center display rather than three displays would be preferable.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that she is not in agreement with the covering of the bronze grilles. She suggested that the wow-factor could be created on the north by simply adding lights rather than screens. She suggested that the temporary displays along the south fence could be the place for recognizing the single major donor. She suggested that the seven displays on the west wall be reduced to three to five displays.
- Ms. Stein commented that the durability of the LED displays is of concern. She stated that she would feel differently about the proposal if all of the displays were temporary and were not attached to a historic building every day of the year.
 - Ms. Lucci explained that the visual impact will be minimal when the displays are turned off, and a lot of effort was put into the solution for the north grilles. For the west wall, she acknowledged that the initial reaction to the proposal is that it is a lot of displays, but those displays are custom-built to the size of the niches and it was a request of the client, Thomas Jefferson University, so that they could acknowledge donors in a unique way. She stated that if the displays need to be reduced on the west wall, it would need to be done in a balanced manner. She suggested potentially removing the first and last display. A portable solution was considered but it would likely require going back to the drawing board.

- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the west LED displays were meant to recognize donors in a permanent manner. He asked if any consideration was given to a projection system rather than permanent LED displays.
 - Mr. Busch responded that the LED displays are programmable so that they can display individual donor names per display, or they can be animated over all of the displays, and they would likely change for every event, and they would only be turned on during events. The screens would be a darker brown color when turned off. The bases and frame around the screen could match the color of the marble wall.
 - Ms. Lucci stated that a projection system was considered in the initial design phase, but the events are planned to take place more in the daylight hours, and so projection would not work well owing to the ambient light. Any type of projection outside would require a very large box that would be more obtrusive in the space. The LED solution will work in the daylight hours.
- Mr. Busch asked for further guidance on editing the LED displays.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that Mr. Busch will likely hear five different answers as solutions. He commented that he is typically opposed to LED displays, but that he is more forgiving of their use in this particular case. He stated that he found the moveable displays on the south fence to be acceptable, and that he could find the removal of one display from either end of the west wall to be acceptable, or that perhaps those displays could alterative niches so that there are three displays. He stated that the north LED displays are compelling, but so are the architectural grilles, and so perhaps the solution is to have two flanking LED displays and to leave the center grille exposed as the architectural focus. He reiterated that it is crucial that the displays are only turned on during events.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that his biggest concerns are the north displays on the grilles and the south displays along the fence, and the quantity of the displays on the west wall. He stated that one concern is being able to see into the courtyard rather than having that view obstructed. He stated that it could be acceptable to have the portable south displays in place only during events, and then removed from view. He stated that the north displays on the grilles are problematic because they obscure the grilles.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the wow-factor should be the space itself rather than the electronics.
 - Ms. Stein commented that she is in general agreement with the other Committee members in that the south displays along the fence could be acceptable with conditions regarding their removal after an event, and the west displays could be acceptable if reduced in quantity to five displays. She stated that she is opposed to any displays on the north grilles. She suggested illuminating the grilles with lights instead.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented that Mr. Busch had shared this proposal with the Alliance prior to the meeting. He agreed that a lot of care went into the proposal and particularly with how most of the interventions are completely reversible. He agreed with the spirit of the Committee's comments in that the number and intensity of displays is a bit overwhelming, but that it is a thoughtful project that can work in concept but needs to be scaled back a bit.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed event tent is acceptable owing to its transparency and temporary nature.
- The proposed south LED displays are moveable and can be wheeled into storage when not in use.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The overall quantity of LED displays alters the features, spatial relationships, and views of the Garden Court, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed event tent and LED displays can be removed in the future without impact to the historic integrity of the property, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, pursuant to Standard 9, with the recommendation to reduce the number of LED displays per the Architectural Committee's comments.

ITEM: 917-33 Chestnut St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler				X	
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5			1	

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:19:40

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:19 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Architectural Committee are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.