

**THE MINUTES OF THE 639TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2015
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sara Merriman, Acting Chair, Commerce Department
Ralph DiPietro, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
Melissa Long, Office of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Marissa Parker, Esq., Stradley Ronon
Nancy Bastion, Cecil Baker Partners
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker Partners
James Pearlstein, Pearl Properties
Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties
Chris Tood, Priderock Capital
Jim Rice, Transystems
Deborah Cahill, Department of Public Property
Benjamin Nia, Abitare Design Studio
William Steedle, Graboyes Windows
Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners
Martin Jay Tackett, Tackett & Co.
Neil Sklaroff, Esq. Ballard Spahr
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Elliot Greenleaf
Sean McCauley, Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania
Richard Sanford, Dauntless Design Company
Michael Cassidy, MRP Realty
Joseph Menkevich
Lionel Guerra
John C. Manton
Kevin Tis, St. Albans
Paul Adler, St. Albans
Kevin D. Cooper, St. Albans
Alan Barr, St. Albans
Michael Connor, RBA Group

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Merriman, the vice chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners DiPietro, Gupta, Hawkins, Leonard, Long, Mattioni, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined her.

MINUTES OF THE 638TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Leonard noted that her recusal in the 201 S. 13th Street matter, listed as Old Business, was not noted in the minutes, but should have been. Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 638th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 October 2015, as revised per Ms. Leonard's request. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CONTINUANCE REQUEST

81-95 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE

Proposal: Continue review of nomination from Committee on Historic Designation meeting of 2 December 2015 to subsequent Committee meeting

Applicant: Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr LLP

Owner: Piazza Management

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission has notified the owner of the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue that its Committee on Historic Designation will review the nomination for the property on 2 December 2015 and that the Commission will review it on 11 December 2015. The property owner has asserted that more time is needed to study the nomination and understand the implications of a designation and has therefore requested that the Commission table the nomination and refer it to the subsequent Committee on Historic Designation meeting. The Historical Commission will retain jurisdiction over the property in the interim.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. No one represented the request or the nomination.

The Commissioners discussed the request and concluded that it should be granted, especially in light of the fact that the Commission's jurisdiction over the property would persist. No one in the audience commented on the request.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to table the nomination for the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue from the Committee on Historic Designation meeting on 2 December 2015 and refer it to the subsequent Committee meeting. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 16 SEPTEMBER 2015

Richardson Dilworth III, Chair

6769 RIDGE AVENUE, ST. ALBAN'S RECTORY

Nominator: John Manton

Owner: Church of St. Alban

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the rectory at 6769 Ridge Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D, G, H and I. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the rectory at 6769 Ridge Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D, G, H, and I. The rectory was built in 1879 and the nomination contends that it embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Carpenter Gothic style, which is rare in Philadelphia. It is situated on a large corner lot in Roxborough, which the nomination claims has the potential to yield archaeological information related to Native American occupation. A one-car garage located on the parcel is considered non-contributing in the nomination.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorney Richard DeMarco and Sean McCauley, the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania property manager, represented the property owner. Nominator John Manton represented the nomination.

Mr. DeMarco stated that the rectory is a very nice and attractive building, but a historic designation will be burdensome for the church. He continued that, from a legal standpoint, they disagree with the Criteria listed in the nomination, with the exception of Criterion D, which Mr. DeMarco referred to as possibly applicable. He stated that the owner does not agree that the other Criteria cited in the nomination are satisfied. He stated that it is not a part of a park, referring to Criterion G. Referring to Criterion H, Mr. DeMarco stated that it is an attractive building and people know about the building, but it does not meet the spirit of Criterion H; it is not an established and familiar visual feature. He stated that Criterion I, the archaeological criterion, is too speculative. Regarding Criterion D, Mr. DeMarco stated that it is an attractive and somewhat unusual building, but they still do not feel that it meets the Criterion. He stated that they did not have time to consult an expert before today's hearing, but they intend to speak with an expert to obtain guidance if they have to "go to the next level" and appeal a designation. Mr. DeMarco stated that the Episcopal Church has been a very good caretaker of its many historic properties. He offered the example of Saint Peter's Church in Germantown. He explained that the cost to maintain the historic properties is exponentially higher than that of non-historic properties, and asserted that the Church has maintained its historic properties admirably. He asked that the Commission err on the side of choosing not to designate St. Alban's rectory as historic, because historic designations make it extraordinarily difficult for the Church to maintain the properties. He stated that there have been instances when it has been a hardship to maintain historically-designated properties.

Sean McCauley stated that he has been active on both the planning board and historical commission in his community. He noted that the Episcopal Diocese has about seventy properties within the City of Philadelphia, and the majority of those were constructed prior to 1900. He stated that the Episcopal Diocese has been a very good steward of its historic properties, but explained that a historic designation can place a burden on a parish because there is only one pool of funds that is provided primarily by congregants. The majority of those funds are designated for mission-related activities, to help those who need help, and placing a

financial burden related to a historic building could take away money that would otherwise go to mission work. He asked that the Commission give the latitude that the Diocese needs so that it can care for and maintain its properties under its own standards.

John Manton responded that he is a former Episcopalian, but he walked away from that religion, a fact that he claimed is not essential to the discussion. He stated his belief that a designation would not result in a financial hardship, and offered his understanding of how the church would be operating were it on the brink of solvency. Mr. Manton referred to the letter received by the Historical Commission from St. Alban's Church, and stated that the letter makes claims with which he does not agree. He stated that the letter makes the following claims with which he does not agree: the designation would interfere with the Rector's ministry; it would preclude them from installing a fence or air conditioning; it would interfere with the financial stability of the parish as a whole; and it would prevent the church from being a place of prayer. Mr. Manton stated that he also does not agree with the following claims in the letter regarding the significance: various exterior features of the rectory have been replaced with modern-day materials which have drastically altered its appearance and thus its historical importance; the rectory is not a pure Gothic building such as the National Cathedral; the garage is a part of the rectory; it is not a park, but rather private property; Ridge Avenue is not an Indian trail but rather a major busy commercial street; there is no conclusive evidence of pre-historical artifacts on the grounds. Mr. Manton stated that the above-named points are groundless counterclaims in the face of historical evidence presented to the Committee on Historic Designation and the Commission. He opined that the owners do not understand the historical significance as presented in the nomination, and that there should be no mention of financial hardship, as it has no relevance to the Commission's review. He stated that the focus of the review should be on the historic rectory and its historic significance.

Researcher Joseph Menkevich commented that he recently read the Commission's Rules & Regulations and he began to reference a section regarding financial hardship. Ms. Merriman stopped Mr. Menkevich and noted that the Commission is not reviewing a hardship application. Mr. Menkevich responded that he was going to make that point. Ms. Merriman stated that she agrees with him. Mr. Menkevich responded that the Commission should base its decision on the documentation in the nomination.

Mr. McCauley briefly responded to Mr. Manton's comments about the financial stability of the church. He stated that the Commission should look at their record of stewardship of their existing historic buildings, and commented that they are capable of making decisions for their historic properties. He suggested that the Commission look not just at their downtown churches, but also Trinity Oxford Circle, which dates to the 1680s. Mr. McCauley stated that they have been outstanding stewards of that property.

Mr. DeMarco stated that no one would dispute that the property is attractive, and that it has some very attractive architectural features. He continued that the question for the Commission is whether the uniqueness, unusual nature, and attractiveness of it allows it to be designated such that the police power of government should be applied to it and should control the owner's decisions on alterations. He stated that they do not believe it meets the level of significance that would justify such an intervention. He reiterated that no one would dispute that it is a very attractive and interesting property, but questioned if it is enough of a significant property that it warrants the government's oversight.

Mr. Manton responded that he maintains that the case made in the nomination is undeniable. He claimed that the nomination's evidence is impeccable and accurate. He stated that the Commission should not be concerned with other churches such as Christ Church or Trinity

Oxford Circle or some other remote structures, but should instead focus on the single rectory building that is the topic of the nomination. He opined that what the Diocese does with its other buildings is irrelevant. He claimed that the owner is exaggerating the impact of a designation.

Ms. Merriman asked the Commissioners if a representative of the Committee on Historic Designation meeting could speak about the review of the nomination at that meeting. Mr. Schaaf responded that he was in attendance at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting, and said that there was support for Criteria D, G, H and I. He commented that he had brought up the issue of whether it satisfied Criterion G, relating to a square, park or other distinctive area which should be preserved. He noted that it is a large site along Ridge Avenue; however, the site is merely a very large lawn with a building on it, not a park. He opined that Criterion G is the weakest Criterion for Designation as it relates to this nomination. He stated that he agrees with the Committee on Historic Designation's recommendation regarding Criteria D, H, and I. Supporting Criterion D, he claimed that framed Carpenter Gothic structures are very atypical in upper Northwest Philadelphia. Most buildings along Ridge Avenue were built using Wissahickon schist or other stone material. Mr. Schaaf opined that it also meets that Criterion H. Supporting Criterion I, he asserted that Ridge Avenue was a Native American trail, so there is the possibility of archaeological resources anywhere along it. Mr. Mattioni questioned whether the possibility of archaeological resources is sufficient to meet Criterion I. He opined that it troubles him, and stated that there are many places in the area situated near former Indian trails. He contended that the Commission should not deploy this Criterion without some level of assurance that the site includes archaeological artifacts. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff and the Committee on Historic Designation relied on the expertise of Doug Mooney, the archaeologist on the Committee. He stated that Mr. Mooney considers that this site has a potential for archaeological resources because it is a large open area that has seen perhaps no construction other than the rectory and garage, and because of its proximity to the Native American trail. Mr. Farnham noted, however, that designating this site under Criterion I would likely have little or no impact on the current property owner. He explained that the best practice is to leave archaeological resources in the ground, undisturbed. He continued that, unless a significant construction project with significant ground disturbance was planned for this site, it is likely that the property owner would never confront any restrictions deriving from that Criterion. Mr. Mattioni responded that the claim of archaeological resources appears to be very speculative. Mr. Farnham agreed with Mr. Mattioni that it is highly speculative.

Mr. Thomas spoke to the property owners about the review process for a nomination. He stated that the Commission must determine whether or not the property satisfies at least one of the Criteria cited in the nomination. He noted that the Commission has made findings of financial hardship for religious or formerly religious buildings. He also commented that anyone may nominate a property to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places; owner consent is not required. He suggested that the owners look to published reports regarding how to affordably work on historic buildings. He also commented that window air conditioners are permitted in historic buildings, because they are removable. Fences and central air conditioning can likely be approved administratively. He stated that everyone has financial concerns, but that the Commission does not consider finances when making designation decisions.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the property at 6769 Ridge Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D, H and I, but not G, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 3. Messrs. DiPietro, Gupta, and Mattioni dissented.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 OCTOBER 2015

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 1910 Chestnut Street and 1301 Beach Street. Ms. Merriman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. Ms. Merriman asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 1910 Chestnut Street and 1301 Beach Street. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1910 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Construct tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chestnut Square Associates, LP

Applicant: Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties

History: 1928; Boyd Theater, Sameric Theater; Hoffman & Henon, architects

Individual Designation: 8/9/2008

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the understanding that there is no work proposed for the Boyd Theater and Alexander Building front facades or roofs in this application and with the suggestion but not requirement that the Sansom Street façade is further refined in terms of rhythm and scale, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the final segment of a large development project with frontages on Chestnut, Sansom, 19th, and 20th Streets. The Raymond Pace Alexander Building at 1900 Chestnut and the Boyd Theater at 1910 Chestnut Street are designated as historic. The remainder of the site, 1902-06 and 1912 Chestnut Street and 110 and 112 S. 19th Street, has not been designated as historic. The site is not located in a locally designated historic district. None of the interiors of the buildings are designated as historic.

In March 2014, the Historical Commission found that the building at 1910 Chestnut Street, the Boyd Theater, could not be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted and approved the demolition of all but the headhouse on Chestnut pursuant to the hardship provision in the preservation ordinance. In June 2015, the Commission approved the rehabilitation of the front façade of the Boyd Theater. In August 2015, the Commission approved the rehabilitation of the Alexander Building at 1900 Chestnut Street and the construction of an infill building along Chestnut Street between the Alexander Building and Boyd Theater.

The current application proposes a tower at the southern end of the site along Sansom Street. The tower would be 32 stories and 382 feet tall. The Historical Commission approved a tower for the same location in 2010, but that project was not undertaken. The tower would include below-grade parking, retail space at the first floor, and residential space above. The main residential entrance would be located on 19th Street. The parking and loading would be

accessed from 20th Street. The loading docks would service all of the buildings in the large complex. The retail space would open onto Sansom Street. The lower floors of the Sansom Street façade would be clad in limestone. The tower would be massed with a shorter section to the west, which would correspond in height with the adjacent Kate's Place building. It would be clad with metal panels and include windows in punched-like openings. The main bulk of the tower would be located at the eastern end of the site and would be clad primarily in a glass and aluminum window wall system with some metal panels.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1301 BEACH ST

Project: Replace playground equipment; restore stone monument

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia, Department of Public Property

Applicant: Michael Connor, The RBA Group, Inc.

History: 1827; Penn Treaty Park

Individual Designation: 3/9/2012

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the new metal fence immediately surrounding the obelisk is reduced in height to 2' to 2'-6" tall, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 8.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to relocate an existing playground to a higher elevation within Penn Treaty Park and to conserve the white marble obelisk commemorating the 1682 signing of the Treaty of Amity and Friendship between William Penn and the Lenni Lenape Indians. The existing playground equipment would be removed from the site, and new equipment would be installed just west of the current play area. The new playground would be established within the limits of the existing circular walkway adjacent to the marble obelisk. Ground disturbance in this area would be limited to the top 6" of soil, although playground equipment would be anchored to a depth of 2'-6". Excavation would be done by hand, and existing curbing, sidewalks, trees, and benches would remain. Grass would be replaced with bonded safety surfacing to cover the play area surface.

The proposed work to the adjacent marble obelisk includes removing the existing 1978 plaque and tablet, reducing the height of the base to 3'-6", and providing new paving at the monument base and surrounding walkway. The obelisk would be conserved offsite and returned after the completion of the new base. The design is being modified to allow for better legibility of the obelisk based on historic images.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 401, 411, AND 421 RACE ST

Project: Construct 4-story, 216-unit apartment building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PRCP- Philadelphia Investment, LLC

Applicant: Christopher Todd, PRCP- Philadelphia Investment, LLC

History: 1940; Maxwell Brothers Pincus Brothers Building; Louis Magaziner, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

- the rooftop condenser units are not visible from the public right-of-way;
- the windows are aluminum-clad, metal, wood or steel, with simulated-divided lites or no muntins;
- the low perimeter wall is no taller than four feet in height;
- the metal panels along Race Street either project, mimic the 5th Street elevation, or recess, so that they are not flush with the brick;
- the rooftop trellis is pulled back from the edge of the roof;
- the stone veneer at the base is raised to protect the other building materials, and that it be of a limestone appearance in texture, with larger-scale stones; and,
- the balcony railings are metal;

with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story apartment building on the site of a non-contributing industrial building located in the Old City Historic District. The new building features a main entrance at the corner of N. 4th and Race Streets, in addition to direct entrances into the rental units along Race Street, where there are also bays with balconies on the second through fourth stories. The exterior of the building is clad primarily in red brick, fiber cement paneling, and metal paneling.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Owner and developer Christopher Todd represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Todd to explain any revisions made to the project as a result of the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Todd responded that the application now provides sightlines for rooftop mechanical units, in which the visibility has been minimized to the greatest degree. He explained that the material on the base of the building is a large-sized Arriscraft stone veneer, and the balcony railings will be vertical metal pickets. He stated that the low brick wall may or may not be built, but the height will stay below four feet, should the wall be built. The revised design shows projecting bays along Race Street, and Mr. Todd opined that the building looks better without the projecting bays, but that they can be incorporated, should the Commission decide to approve the revised design. He asked about the allowance of vinyl windows and whether they are disallowed in a historic district, or if that rule only pertains to actual historic buildings located within historic districts. He noted that the proposed vinyl windows will have dark frames. Ms. Hawkins opined that vinyl windows are not appropriate because they do not have the same visual profiles as windows constructed in a different material. She noted that there would be vinyl windows at street level, and stated that it is not a question of whether vinyl windows are allowed, but rather whether they are appropriate to the historic district.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the Civic Design Review Committee reviewed this project twice. He asked Mr. Todd about the size of the brick, which had been discussed at those reviews. Mr. Todd responded that the brick is standard brick, and clarified that larger stone veneer is used at the base of the building.

Ms. Hawkins thanked Mr. Todd for incorporating nearly all of the comments from the Architectural Committee, and opined that the projecting bays shown in the revised design offer a better solution.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application presented to the Historical Commission at its 13 November 2015 meeting, provided that the windows are aluminum-clad, metal, wood or steel, but not vinyl, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 20-22 BANK ST

Project: Construct 6-story multi-family residence with parking and roofdeck

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Mych, LLC

Applicant: Benjamin Nia, Abitare Design Studio, LLC

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the proposed construction is generally appropriate to the Old City Historic District, but that the penthouse should be reduced in height by at least four feet and should be a brick color, that a pilot house be considered in place of the penthouse, that the cast stone at the base be a warmer buff limestone color, that the garage doors be consolidated or removed from Bank Street, that the base of the building be made taller, and that rooftop mechanical units are not visible from the public right-of-way.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a six-story, five-unit residential building on a currently vacant lot. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to Review and Comment because the lot is considered an undeveloped site. At the first floor, the Bank Street front elevation features an entrance door and two garage doors. The Elbow Lane side elevation features entrance doors and a wide garage door. The Bodine Street rear elevation features one entrance door and a row of small windows. The upper floors feature projecting bays and cantilevered balconies. The proposed building would be clad in brick and stone.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Benjamin Nia represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Nia if he has or intends to incorporate any of the comments received at the Architectural Committee review. Mr. Nia responded that he initially met with Randy Baron of the staff, and as a result of that meeting, design changes were made to the building. That revised building was presented to the Architectural Committee, where much of the feedback was focused on the height of the building and its materials. He stated that the client tasked the architects with maximizing the livable area, which explains the height of the building. Regarding the materials, Mr. Nia stated that cladding the penthouse in a darker color, as suggested by the Architectural Committee, will counter-intuitively make the building look taller. Ms. Hawkins responded that the penthouse looks like it has been dropped onto the building, and the color is

playing a role in that. She suggested that the verticality of the windows may also make it look taller.

Mr. Schaaf asked if there is a way to reconfigure the parking so there does not need to be two garage doors on Bank Street. Mr. Nia responded that they did initially look into the garages fronting primarily onto Elbow Lane, but that Streets Department approval for curb cuts and the practicality of turning radiuses dictated the location of the garage openings. Mr. Schaaf asked if the garage doors could have glazing. Mr. Nia responded that he will consider the suggestion.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the comments of the Architectural Committee that the proposed construction is generally appropriate to the Old City Historic District, but that the penthouse should be reduced in height by at least four feet and should be a brick color, that a pilot house be considered in place of the penthouse, that the cast stone at the base be a warmer buff limestone color, that the garage doors be consolidated or removed from Bank Street, that the base of the building be made taller, and that rooftop mechanical units are not visible from the public right-of-way; and to additionally comment that the impacts of the garages on the street should be mitigated. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 400-14 WALNUT ST

Project: Replace existing steel windows; install new storefront and signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Center City Chestnut, LLC

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners, Architects

History: 1915; General Fire Accident & Life Assurance Company

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the upper-floor windows for floors three and above, provided that:

- a paint analysis is conducted to determine the original color of the windows, and that color is used for the aluminum windows,
- the muntin/mullion width of the windows is minimized to maximize the amount of glazing while retaining the appropriate vertical dimensions of the individual panes of glass,
- the location of the windows within the masonry opening is retained,
- the second-floor windows are restored or new steel windows that more closely match the historic windows are installed; and,

denial of the ground-floor entry doors and windows, with the recommendation that the applicant pursue a more historically-appropriate replacement, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the existing, historic steel windows with aluminum windows on floors 2 through 10. While the configuration would match that of the historic steel windows, the aluminum windows require thicker framing. The application also proposes to replace the ground-floor entry door and windows. The staff recommends that the ground-floor windows be revised to match the proportions and configuration of the historic windows, as shown on the original drawings, and that the entrance doors be revised to have a more substantial frame matching the proportions and configuration of the historic doors.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Jonathan Broh, and window contractor William Steedle represented the application.

Mr. Broh noted that they agree to comply with most of the comments of the Architectural Committee, but would prefer to replace all of the windows on the second through tenth floors, not just the third through tenth. He noted that they do not intend to replace the storefront windows, so retaining or replacing the second-floor windows in steel would create three different window types on the building.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant had worked with the window manufacturer to improve the sizes of the windows since the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Broh responded that they have not, but that they know that they cannot reduce the size of the jambs or the heads. Ms. Hawkins opined that much of the size of the proposed jamb seems to be driven by the need to retain a portion of the existing frame, and that that does not seem like sufficient reason to reduce the sightlines of the windows to such an extent. Mr. Steedle responded that they looked at many different manufacturers and window styles in order to keep the appropriate sightlines and minimize the frames. He noted that they are straddling a small portion of the existing frame, which is narrow to begin with, and are able to cut off a portion of the frame in order to minimize its encroachment on the new window position, however the frame is sandwiched between the interior and exterior masonry of the façade, and they are not able to remove it completely without disrupting the surrounding masonry. For that reason, they are proposing to retain a portion of the existing frame, and saw cut it as close as possible without marring the masonry. Ms. Hawkins responded that she did not read the drawings in that way.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the proposed frame will sit forward about one inch from the existing frame. Mr. Broh noted that the plane of the glass would be approximately in line with the existing glass, but slightly forward.

Mr. Thomas questioned the material of the existing second-floor windows. Mr. Broh responded that they are steel from the second floor up. Mr. Schaaf asked if the existing windows are casements. Mr. Steedle responded that they are bi-fold windows and operate similarly to a closet door, cantilevering out over the street.

Mr. Schaaf asked about the height of the existing windows. Mr. Steedle responded that the windows are approximately 7'-6" tall.

Mr. Schaaf asked about the condition of the existing windows, and whether they could be retained and interior storms installed. Mr. Steedle responded that the primary issue is that they have to supply natural ventilation to the residential units, and the cantilevered arms of several of the windows have weakened and broken, and this poses a danger since the windows open out over the street.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant has evaluated the cost of repairing the existing windows. She noted that the Architectural Committee has generally recommended that the lower-floor windows of a building be consistent with the historic windows. In this case, she noted, the existing windows are very unique, and recommended that the second-floor windows be restored below the cornice. She stated that steel sash can be restored. Mr. Broh asked if bi-fold steel windows can be restored. Ms. Hawkins responded that, if they have not explored the issue, then they have not answered the question. Mr. Broh asked if a steel replacement would be acceptable. Ms. Hawkins responded that, if a material or feature could be matched in-kind, that would be an option.

Mr. Thomas agreed with Ms. Hawkins, noting that the building above the second-floor cornice really reads as one building, and the break in the window type could occur above that cornice. Mr. Thomas opined that the second-floor windows should retain their historic appearance,

noting that the current condition of the building already appears as three different window types, owing to the cornice.

Ms. Merriman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee related to the upper-floor windows, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9, and approve the upper-floor windows for floors three and above, provided that:

- a paint analysis is conducted to determine the original color of the windows, and that color is used for the aluminum windows,
- the muntin/mullion width of the windows is minimized to maximize the amount of glazing while retaining the appropriate vertical dimensions of the individual panes of glass,
- the location of the windows within the masonry opening is retained,
- the second-floor windows are restored or new steel windows that more closely match the historic windows are installed.

ADDRESS: 219-29 S 18TH ST

Project: Open three blind windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates

Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett, Tackett and Company, Inc.

History: 1925; Penn Athletic Club, Parc Rittenhouse; Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects; alts, Cronheim & Weger, architects, 1957

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a portion of the brick in three blind windows at existing fire stairs on the Locust and Chancellor Street facades of the Parc Rittenhouse building. The brick would be removed down to the levels of the adjacent second-floor window sills and limestone sills would be added to align with the adjacent sills of the flanking windows. Glass railings would be installed on the inside face of the openings and extend approximately 18 inches in above the new sills. New steel doors and louvers would be installed within the vestibules, perpendicular to the façade.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Dipasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Martin Jay Tackett represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked if the Commission had seen this project before. Mr. Tackett responded that the Commission had reviewed the concept previously, but had wanted to see details.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Tackett to explain the purpose of the louver in the vestibule. Mr. Tackett responded that there are dryer exhausts on each floor that are typically at that location. He noted that dryer exhausts are required to function on their own and cannot be coupled with another exhaust duct. Ms. Merriman asked how that is handled currently. Mr. Tackett responded that on all other floors, the vestibule is open-air, so the dryers vent to that location in the stairway. Mr. Tackett commented that there are other ways to vent the dryer.

Ms. Hawkins questioned the need to punch a balcony in historic fabric for a minimal number of tenants, and whether the impact on the exterior of the building is beneficial to the building. Mr. Tackett clarified that the project would provide exterior space for two tenants. Ms. Hawkins responded that the proposed modification would be very close to the ground, and the level of intervention is inappropriate for such a visible location. Mr. Tackett disagreed, opining that the impact of the project on the composition of the building would be minimal.

Ms. Merriman asked if these areas were ever open. Mr. Tackett responded that, in some of the blind openings, the bond does not run through, while in others, it does run through. He noted that on this floor, the second floor, there are three blind windows and one that is open. Mr. Tackett opined that the original architect wanted there to be the shape or line of the blind opening, and that if that shape is maintained on the façade, it is still in keeping with the building.

Mr. Tackett stated that the premium for outdoor space is huge, and that people want to be able to go outside and breathe air without having to go down the fifteen feet in an elevator to the beautiful park next door. Mr. Tackett noted that many of the tenants of the building are elderly, and that out of the twenty units on the floor, only two will have outdoor space with these balconies.

Mr. Thomas noted that the blind openings are only at the second floor, and asked what would be exposed behind the openings. Mr. Tackett responded that the brick wall is approximately 18 inches thick, and the treatment inside of the fire tower is also brick. Mr. Thomas expressed concern about the possibility of looking into the void of the fire tower. He noted that a glass railing is a reflective element. He opined that blind windows were part of the original design in order to hide the service function of the fire tower. Mr. Tackett disagreed, noting that there is a stack of openings above the blind windows.

Ms. Hawkins reminded the Commission that the proposal is essentially to create balconies, and that balconies get occupied by lighting, furniture, flower pots, and other objects and opined that such intrusions are inappropriate in this location. Mr. Schaaf agreed, commenting that such things may also pose life safety issues.

Mr. Tackett stated that the recesses are not part of egress. Ms. Hawkins disagreed. Mr. Tackett withdrew his statement, noting that the two at the west side of the building are not part of the means of egress.

Ms. Merriman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2119 PINE ST

Project: Add decks/green roofs, pilot house, balconies, and doors; add to bay

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gerard Van de Loo

Applicant: Richard Sanford, Dauntless Design Collaborative

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal on the mansard roof of the main block and the glass railings, but approval of the remainder of the application with appropriate railings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided

- the bay is reduced in height to sit below the third-floor cornice,
- an engineering plan is submitted showing that the green roofs can be supported, and
- no stucco or vinyl siding is installed.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several alterations to the building at 2119 Pine Street. It proposes to add green roof decks with glass railings and privacy fences on mansard roof of the main block, the rear ell, and a one-story side addition. A pilot house would be added on the main block to access the green roof. It proposes enlarging a rear bay, adding a second floor. It also proposes adding balconies and French doors to the side of the rear ell.

The deck on the main block would be highly visible and would adversely impact the mansard roof of the main block, which is a character-defining feature. The other alterations would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Richard Sanford and contractor John Hovanec represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained how the architect had submitted a modified plan, which incorporated many of the Committee's suggestions. Most importantly, the deck had been removed from the roof. The roof access had been reduced in size and moved away from the edge of the building. HVAC condensers had been added to the main roof. However, the staff can work with the applicant to ensure that they are not visible from the street. The glass railings were replaced with metal vertical pickets and the base of the decks are now clad in AZEK rather than vinyl siding. The windows of the rear bay addition have been lengthened; however, it was not possible to keep the height of the bay below the existing cornice because of the low ceiling height. Mr. Baron pointed out that the rear bay is not visible from a public right-of-way. Mr. Baron said that the staff now recommends approval of the application, with the staff to review details, but asked that the green roofs are fully engineered to avoid any roof collapse from the additional weight.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission and its staff should not be requiring engineering reports that guarantee structural stability. The Department of Licenses & Inspections has the expertise and responsibility to verify that construction will be structurally sound. Making such determinations is outside the Commission's purview. Mr. Baron assured Mr. Thomas that the staff would not approve or deny an application based on a structural review. Mr. Thomas suggested that Mr. Baron leave such reviews to the experts at the Department of Licenses & Inspections and not seek to take on responsibilities outside of his expertise or mandate. Mr. Sanford said that they would have their engineer inspect the design once the interior framing had been exposed to ensure that the structure will support the green roofs.

Mr. Reuter asked if the deck had been removed from the main roof. He was told that it was removed.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented at the Historical Commission's meeting of 13 November 2015, provided an engineer confirms that the green roofs are appropriately supported and the hatch and mechanical equipment are not visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 240 W TULPEHOCKEN ST

Project: Construct dormer; cut roof for balcony; replace windows and doors; repair stucco

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tulpehocken Palazzo LP

Applicant: A. Robert Torres, StudioTorres LTD

History: 1893; Harry K. Cummings Residence; Frank Miles Day, architect

Individual Designation: 3/9/2012

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert a carriage house into a dwelling. The carriage house sits at the rear of a large lot and fronts on Pastorius Street, an alley. The main house faces onto Tulpehocken Street. The carriage house is original to the property and was designed by the architect of the main house in the same style as the main house.

The application proposes to install new windows and doors and to restucco the exterior. A dormer would be added to create more space. The design of the dormer is difficult to ascertain from the plans, but it may have a hipped roof. A section of the roof would be cut away and a door installed to create a balcony within the roof.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Lionel Guerra, who holds a long-term lease on the carriage house, represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the architect modified the plans to take into account the Committee's recommendations. The balcony cut into the roof has been deleted. The dormer has been reduced in size and has three windows centered on the first-floor windows below. Mr. Baron said that the staff now recommends approval of the application, with the staff to review the details.

Ms. Hawkins said that she thought that the face of the dormer should be clad in stucco to match the stucco on the rest of the façade. Mr. Guerra was in agreement.

Mr. Guerra asked about the possibility of installing aluminum-clad windows. Ms. Merriman said that the Commission has at times approved clad windows, provided they match exactly the details of the original windows. She noted, however, that the application specifies wood windows.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented at the Historical Commission's meeting of 13 November 2015, provided the dormer cheeks are

stucco and all windows are wood, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Guerra asked why the Commission had turned down his proposal for cutting a balcony into the roof. Mr. Baron explained that the Committee thought that it did not meet the Standards because of the removal of historic fabric. Mr. Schaaf elaborated that it would be very tricky to design the inside of the trough that would be created by such a cut to protect the building and match the appearance of the building. Mr. Thomas suggested ways to get light into the space without cutting the roof.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:49 a.m., Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 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 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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.