

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

**TUESDAY, 17 DECEMBER 2019
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
NAN GUTTERMAN, ACTING 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 her:

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	Arrived at 9:15
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Suzanne Pentz	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Adam Rogers, Cadre Design
- Annamaria Jaskot
- Kevin Block
- Charles Kerr, Cadre Design
- Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting Group
- Joseph Gaglioti, Joseph Anthony Spa
- Mike Fulforth, ABC Sign
- Chwen-Ping Wang, Sky Design
- Jim Cassidy, C2 Architecture
- Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architecture
- Nunzio Terra, Renewal by Andersen of Greater Philadelphia

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 106-8 AND 110 GRAPE ST

Proposal: Construct four-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Daniel Neducsin

Applicant: Daniel Flesher, Cadre Design

History: Buildings on site approved for demolition

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a four-story mixed-use building on what will be a vacant lot. The Historical Commission approved the demolition of the existing buildings on the site at its 8 November 2019 meeting, owing to a finding of financial hardship. The new building will house the headquarters of the Manayunk Development Corporation, in addition to offering retail space on the first floor, office space on the second and third floors, and a community meeting space on the set-back fourth floor. The design of the proposed building draws from the nearby industrial-style buildings of Manayunk and uses red brick as the primary façade material in addition to a schist veneer base and elevator enclosure.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct four-story mixed-use building.

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 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 proposed building is differentiated from the old and is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the Main Street Manayunk historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Adam Rogers and Charles Kerr represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the decision to use multiple materials, including vertical metal panel siding and vertical cement board siding. She questioned whether the metal is appropriate for Manayunk.

- Mr. Rogers responded that the reason for the different materials is because of setbacks and projections and a desire to break up the massing of the building. He noted that the metal on the fourth floor will likely not be visible from the public right-of-way owing to the set back.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the schist veneer looks like plastic in the rendering. She stated that it should look real, even if it is not real stone, and that the staff should review a mockup.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the width of the siding on the fourth-floor.
 - Mr. Kerr responded that it is shown as twelve inches in width, and likely will not be visible from the public right-of-way. He offered to change the material, should the Committee make the request.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that stucco is preferable.
 - Ms. Stein commented that whatever material is used on the fourth floor should also be used on the rear, so as to simplify materials. She stated that she is not opposed to metal, but that a panel is preferable to narrow vertical boards.
 - The applicants noted that the rear is not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about drainage.
 - Mr. Rogers responded that the downspouts will be off the rear or sides.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro opined that there should be an internal drain.
 - The applicants questioned the relevancy of the drainage for a historic preservation review.
- Ms. Stein asked about the location of mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Kerr responded that the units will be located at the back of the roof, behind the clerestory. They will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
- The Committee suggested that the applicants provide a building section and roof plan for review by the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission approved the demolition of the existing buildings on the site at its 8 November 2019 meeting, owing to a finding of financial hardship.
- The Historical Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the review of new construction at this site.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is differentiated from the old and is compatible with the historic features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the Main Street Manayunk historic district, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following comments:

- The materials should be simplified;
- The staff should review a mockup of the schist and cast stone systems;
- The siding should be a horizontally-oriented panelized metal system;
- The condensing units should be shown on a roof plan and should not be visible from the public right-of-way; and,

- The plumbing and drainage system should be internal in lieu of external.

ITEM: 106-8 AND 110 GRAPE ST MOTION: Approval with suggestions MOVED BY: Stein 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				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4				3

ADDRESS: 260 S 20TH ST

Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Su Bin Jiang and Bo Meng Lin

Applicant: Chwen-Ping Wang, Sky Design

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The application proposes to demolish the rear wall of the main block and three-story rear ell and replace it with a three-story addition. The addition is proposed to cover the width of the property. Historic maps show that the 1860 building originally had a one-story rear wing (see Figure 1). The existing rear ell was added between 1860 and 1895 (see Figure 2).

The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier version of this application in August 2019 and Historical Commission in September 2019. The Historical Commission voted to deny the application, owing to its incompleteness. The Commission's findings and conclusions were as follows:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The rear ell is not visible from any public right-of-way.
- Historic rear ells can be character-defining features of buildings, even if not visible from the street.
- The proposed scope includes removing the entire rear wall of the main block. It was noted by the Commission that the removal of the full rear wall of the building constitutes a demolition. Because of the lack of the detailed information in the application, the Commission could not determine if the proposed scope of work constituted an alteration or demolition.
- The new addition will be wider than original ell and will cover entire rear of building and extend rear property line.

- The application is not complete. The drawings and photographs do not communicate fully what currently exists, current conditions, what is being removed, and what the new construction would look like.
- The application requires additional information to fully evaluate the proposed scope of work. Existing condition drawings (elevations and plans) and existing condition photographs should be submitted for review. The Commission must be able to understand what currently exists on the rear ell including information such as window and door openings and overall condition. More fully developed drawings of the new addition should be submitted as well.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application does not provide enough information to fully assess whether the proposed scope of work does or does not comply with the Standards.
- The staff should visit the site and document the rear of the building.
- The application should be revised to provide explicitly the current state of the rear of the building and the proposal for it.

The staff visited the property on 2 October 2019 and verified that rear of property is not visible from the street. The staff observed that the rear ell has been altered several times including the construction of a one-story addition and changes to window openings. During a walk-through of the interior space, the rear ell exhibited sloping floorboards and other signs that the ell has shifted owing to an insufficient foundation. The staff concluded that the rear ell has little or no historic value and is not visible in any way from the right-of-way.

To address the concerns of the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission raised during the earlier review, the applicant has submitted additional drawings, photographs, and an assessment letter from a structural engineer.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish the existing three-story rear ell.
- Demolish the rear wall of main block.
- Construct a three-story addition with a rear roof deck on second floor and a rear balcony on third floor. The addition will cover the full width of rear property and will have crawlspace rather than a full basement.
- Clad the rear wall with brick.
- Renovate the interior within main block. No work is proposed to the front facade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - Although the demolition of the rear ell will result in the removal of materials and the alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships, none of this area is visible from the public-right of way. Only the front facade facing S. 20th Street is visible from the public right-of-way and no changes are proposed for the front façade. Although the general form of the late nineteenth-century ell still exists, it has been altered many times. Moreover, the rear ell appears to have been poorly constructed and is in poor condition. Also, the adjacent building no longer has an

ell and was built out to the property line at an earlier date. Although historic fabric will be removed, the building's visible historic character will not change to pedestrians walking through the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District.

- *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 historic rear ell is shifting and is structurally compromising the overall building due to the lack of a foundation and a crack in the rear wall. The addition will be the same height as the historic ell and the rear wall will be clad in brick. The adjacent property is already built out to the property line and the proposed new addition will cover the full width of the rear property and be built against this party wall (Figure 5).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:16:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chwen-Ping Wang of Sky Design represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked if rear wall of main block was being removed.
 - Ms. Mehley confirmed that it was.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that drawing provided were not sufficient.
- Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro both voiced concern that no structural support is shown in the architectural drawings for the rear of the roof of the main block, where the rear wall is being removed. They noted that there is no steel beam shown and there is nothing to support the roof of the main block. Ms. Gutterman added that she is not convinced by the drawings submitted that there will be enough support for the back of the historic building and roof when the brick of the rear wall is removed.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said there is no structural beam shown running under the roof and he does not think there will be enough headroom in the hallway from the main block to the new addition.
- Ms. Stein said she had concerns looking at the demolition drawings, specifically the demolition of the front chimney, given its prominence as viewed from the street and front facade. She stated that she cannot recommend approval of the removal of the chimney. Ms. Stein continued that, if they intend to remove all the interior portions of the chimney, then they will need steel underneath the roof to support the exterior portion of the chimney that should remain in place.
- Ms. Gutterman said at this point the architect cannot remove the rear wall of the main block because the applicant has not shown how they will support the roof of the building without the rear wall. She pointed out that the drawings show the eave of the main block not supported. Ms. Gutterman added that there is a question of whether the plan will provide the minimum head height of 6 feet 8 inches by code once the requisite structural beam is in place on the third floor.

- Mr. D'Alessandro said that the problem results from trying to create one single floor level at every floor when the floors currently change levels between the main block and rear ell.
- Ms. Stein questioned the tall parapet proposed on the rear wall of the new addition. She asked why the wall would not simply terminate at the roofline.
- Ms. Pentz said the support beam for the third floor will also have to have columns and footings and these need to be shown in the structural drawings.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed location of the mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Wang confirmed that the mechanical equipment is not shown in the drawings.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that it needs to be shown on their application drawings.
- Ms. Mehley asked the Committee to clarify if the historic rear ell can be removed if it is done correctly with the appropriate structural support beams and columns.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that it would be acceptable to remove the historic ell if it was done properly and to code.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said no demolition should be undertaken until there is a complete application package.
- Mr. Detwiler said that there should be a cross section of the rear roof included that shows the roof slope of the new addition.
- Ms. Pentz said that the application should include a sequence of events that would detail the steps for shoring and demolition.
- Others suggested that the structural details are beyond the Historical Commission's purview, which extends to the exterior appearance of the building only.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The drawings provided do not show how the building's historic main block will be structurally supported during demolition and after new addition is constructed.
- The removal of the front chimney does not meet the Standards 2 and 9. If the interior portions of the chimney will be removed, the drawings should show structural support for the exterior historic chimney.
- The applicant should assess whether the third-floor hallway and addition head height can be achieved with structural support in place. The height may not meet the code required 6 feet 8 inches.
- The mechanical equipment is not shown on drawings and should be included in revised application.
- The application should include sequence for shoring and demolition.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Structural drawings should be revised and incorporated into full application drawing set.
- The current application does not provide enough information to protect the historic building and its structural integrity.
- The removal of chimney should not be approved.

- The historic rear ell can be removed and new addition, the full width of property, may be allowed if it is done properly and to code.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to a lack of information.

ITEM: 260 S 20TH ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Pentz					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					X
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				

ADDRESS: 340 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Create new openings; alter existing openings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Colin and Katie Wetherill

Applicant: Jim Cassidy, C2 Architecture

History: 1805

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes creating new openings and altering existing openings at the building at 340 S. 4th Street. It also proposes stuccoing a brick garden wall. The openings proposed for alteration are not be conspicuously visible from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Add two new windows to the first-floor rear west elevation.
- Expand existing first floor opening on south elevation.
- Alter sill heights of two existing rear windows on north elevation.
- Stucco brick wall in driveway area.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

- The south elevation was originally a party wall. The enlarged opening on the south elevation is behind brick wall in parking area and is not visible from the public-right-of-way.
- *Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.*
 - The infill brick should be recessed slightly to reveal the alteration where the sill heights are being changed. This will visually communicate the change to this area of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the brick is slightly recessed in areas where sill height is altered and brick wall in driveway is not stuccoed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 3.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:37:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jim Cassidy of C2 Architecture represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Mehley noted that proposed stucco on the brick wall in driveway area was incorrectly included on the application and no longer part of the scope of work to be reviewed.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said he does approve of the window sills being raised to accommodate kitchen countertops.
 - It was pointed out that the window openings in question are located at the side, rear of the building and are not visible from any public right-of-way.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about something that looks somewhat like a balcony on the west elevation.
 - Mr. Cassidy responded that it is an odd structure that exists and is hard to tell what it is. He noted that it was discussed with staff and he then decided to leave it alone for this project.
- Mr. Detwiler asked how the proposed door with sidelights on the south elevation relates to the existing door in that area.
 - Mr. Cassidy responded that the new opening would not be exactly centered on the existing opening but would almost be centered. He noted that the placement of the new doors has more to do with the kitchen layout than the existing opening.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the proposed new windows on the rear wall, the west elevation. He noted that the window under the door does not align and recommended lining it up or centering it with the door.
 - Ms. Stein said she does not object to the addition of the two windows on the west elevation but recommends that they be more balanced on the rear façade. She noted that even though there is limited visibility from the public right-of-way, someday, if the balcony structure is removed, the facade will look odd if the windows are not more symmetrically located. Ms. Stein agreed with Mr. Detwiler and said the windows should be better aligned with the door currently on this façade.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed and said the other window should be adjusted as well.

- Mr. Detwiler said that if existing windows on north elevation were removed and the window openings raised, he noted that the applicant could consider changing the window configuration from 6-over-6 to 6-over-3.
 - Mr. Cassidy responded that they would consider that suggestion.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked about the age of the existing windows.
 - Mr. Cassidy stated they are not original; they are replacements. He noted they were installed during the twentieth century.
- Ms. Pentz said she is not in favor of the new openings on the west elevation or changing the size of the window openings on the north elevation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed new window openings on the west elevation are not visible from the public right-of-way but could be better aligned with door opening.
- The raising of the window sills on the north elevation are not required for the installation of kitchen cabinets on the interior. The existing windows are not the original windows.
- The existing opening on the south elevation will be enlarged to accommodate the new door with sidelights.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The building's ell has a high degree of historic integrity and changes should be thoughtfully considered.
- Although there is a public walkway at the rear of the property, the changes will not be visible from the public-right-of-way, owing to an existing wall and fence.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the door with sidelights and new window openings on the west elevation, provided the window locations align with existing door; and denial of raising the sills on the north elevation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 3.

ITEM: 340 S 4TH ST					
MOTION #1: Approval of door with sidelights and window openings					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
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				
Suzanne Pentz		X			
Amy Stein	X				
Total	3	2			2

ITEM: 340 S 4TH ST MOTION #2: Denial of raising sills on north elevation MOVED BY: Detwiler 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				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 1200 MARKET ST

Proposal: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Twelfth Street Hotel Associates, LP (Danny Smith, representative)

Applicant: Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting Group

History: 1932; PSFS Building; George Howe & William Lescaze, architects

Individual Designation: 1/30/1968

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Designed by architects George Howe and William Lescaze in 1932 for the Philadelphia Savings Fund Society, the building at 1200 Market Street was the first International-style skyscraper in the United States. Today, the PSFS building stands as a National Historic Landmark, noted for its progressive design and importance in American architectural history. From an architectural perspective, it is one of the most significant buildings in the city and is known worldwide.

Since designating the building in 1968, the Historical Commission has approved minimal signage for the tenant spaces, and signage has been largely limited to the Market Street façade. The application notes that the storefronts were reconstructed during the 2000 rehabilitation for the Loews Hotel and, at that time, the fascia where the signage is proposed was replaced. The application furthers notes that the hotel cannot accommodate additional tenants beyond the current restaurant and spa.

This application presents two options for signage at the 12th Street ground-story fascia for a fifth-floor tenant. Option A includes halo-lit letters individually attached to the fascia, and Option B includes halo-lit letters attached to a backer box, which would then be attached to the fascia.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install signage at 12th Street elevation.

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 offers two options for signage at the ground-story of the 12th Street elevation. The proposed signage would be placed in the approximate location of the former Lerner signage. The staff finds that the individually attached letters, which are similar to other signage on the building, are more appropriate. The staff contends that while the backer box would require fewer penetrations into the fascia, the projection off the fascia would be less appropriate. The proposed signage under Option A complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Option A, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:51:28

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Cindy Hamilton of Heritage Consulting Group, Joseph Gaglioti of Joseph Anthony Spa, and Mike Fulforth of ABC Signs represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein inquired whether the metal fascia is original fabric.
 - Ms. Hamilton answered that it and all the storefronts were replaced in 2000.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether there would be a way to avoid using a backer box but to attach the letters to the fascia without creating so many holes.
 - Mr. Fulforth replied that there would be two options. One, he stated, includes using a backer box, which would greatly reduce the number of holes on the building. Without the backer box, he continued, each letter with electric would create a series of holes directly in the fascia.
 - Ms. Gutterman questioned whether a third option exists where the letters could be mounted to a new fascia piece that would then be installed on the existing fascia. She clarified that the concept would eliminate the use of the two-inch backer board.
 - Mr. Fulforth responded that it would not be possible to do that with a halo-lit letter. The letters, he continued, are proposed to match the signage at the opposite side of the building that identifies the restaurant. He added that, if the letters were not illuminated, it may be possible to install a flat panel that would then attach to the façade.
 - Ms. Gutterman replied that she would like to find a solution that limits the number of holes and eliminates the backer box.
- Mr. Detwiler asked how many holes the signage would create under Option A.
 - Mr. Fulforth answered that it would require about 50 holes.
 - The Committee commented that it would create too many holes.

- Ms. Hamilton explained that Option A, in which each letter would be attached to the fascia, mimics the Bank and Bourbon sign and is proposed to maintain consistency with that sign.
- Ms. Stein asked the Committee to consider the placement of the signage, stating that in looking at the original placement of the Lerner's sign as it wraps the corner, there is a key architectural detail that defines the building. She contended that the point where the metal fascia steps down and creates a zigzag appearance defines the International Style and that the proposed sign would be positioned in that critical juncture. She noted that the original Lerner's sign was on the curve, away from that defining detail. She asked whether the sign could be shifted to the south and placed in the straight panel to allow the original architectural detail to shine.
- Mr. D'Alessandro argued that the signage could be placed at the interior behind glass.
 - Ms. Hamilton stated that she spoke with Danny Smith of Loews about placing the signage behind the glass, adding that Mr. Smith and others were concerned about the sign competing with the restaurant operation.
- Ms. Stein questioned how one would get to the spa from the street, inquiring whether it would be from the staircase on the Market Street façade.
 - Mr. Gaglioti answered that one would need to walk into the hotel and take the elevator to the fifth floor.
 - Ms. Hamilton further explicated that the space is a remote location from a commercial standpoint, noting that Mr. Gaglioti has been operating for a month without any signage. She added that the goal is to get a sign that could be placed in a location that would attract potential customers.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the purpose of the backer box, questioning whether it would be structural.
 - Mr. Fulforth answered that the purpose would be to limit the number of penetrations into the façade while providing electrical housing.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked for clarification on the electrical housing under Option A.
 - Mr. Fulforth explained that under Option A, each letter would have an electrical wire that penetrates through the façade and ties at the inside. He further noted that the backer box would house all electrical.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the backer box could be one inch deep rather than two inches.
 - Mr. Fulforth replied that it could be made one inch deep.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that another entrance exists further down 12th Street and asked whether the signage could be placed at that location.
 - Mr. Gaglioti responded that moving the signage to that location would hurt his business. He added that, even with a sign on the window, people still cannot find the business.
 - Ms. Gutterman argued that the Committee will not be able to help with the wayfinding in regards to the spa's location on the fifth floor of a building. She stated that she objects to the location at the corner of 12th and Market Streets.
 - Mr. Detwiler contended that the spa would be easier to find if the sign were located at the 12th Street door, since it would let people know that the business is in the building. He then summarized that there are two issues at hand. One, he noted, is attachment, and the other is location.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she prefers that the applicant seek out window space within the restaurant and place a decal at the interior.

- Mr. Gaglioti countered that there are already many decals on the windows.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested that the restaurant eliminate half of the decals.
 - Mr. Gaglioti responded that placing a decal on the window will mislead people into thinking that the business is on the first floor.
- Ms. Hamilton noted that historic photographs were included in the application and that there were historically many signs on the building, including three Lerner's signs on Market Street, at the corner of Market and 12th, and on 12th Street.
 - Ms. Gutterman replied that it branded the whole first floor of the building and that her issue is that the applicant is trying to brand a business that is not located on the first floor.
- Ms. Stein commented that placing the sign at the 12th Street entrance has the best potential. She further contended that the sign is not a billboard and is intended to direct customers to the business. She argued that because the proposed sign is not at a door, it currently appears as a billboard. She reiterated that the current proposed location is at a critical design feature and does not work and that the Committee is attempting to find a better solution.
 - Mr. Gaglioti asked whether placing it slightly south on 12th Street to move it off the architectural feature would be acceptable.
 - Ms. Stein answered that it could be, but the question is how far down 12th Street it should move. She then questioned whether the sign should then be placed at a door and suggested that the entrance be rebranded and become a dedicated entrance to the business.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The PSFS Building is one of Philadelphia's most significant buildings, designed in the International Style.
- The application includes two options: Option A proposes to install individual halo-lit letters on the fascia; Option B proposes to install individual halo-lit letters attached to a two-inch deep backer board, which would then be anchored to the building.
- The sign company can install the letters on a one-inch deep backer board.
- The signage would be placed on a non-original fascia at the corner of 12th and Market Streets.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The signage is inappropriate at the proposed location, because the zigzag design feature within the fascia is a defining characteristic of the International Style. The application does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The signage may be acceptable in a different location along the 12th Street elevation, with preference given to installing the halo-lit letters on a one-inch deep backer board.

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

ITEM: 1200 MARKET ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: D'Alessandro 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				
Suzanne Pentz		X			
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4	1			2

ADDRESS: 2038 WOLF ST

Proposal: Install 18 composite windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph E. Czarnecki

Applicant: Maggie McDevitt, Renewal by Andersen of Greater Philadelphia

History: 1911; James H. and John T. Windrim, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to install Andersen Fibrex windows on the front, side, and rear façade of this twin house in Girard Estate. Neither the frames nor the muntin pattern will match the original design. The application does not include drawings that would show how the subframe of the Fibrex window would fit the existing frame or how the brickmold would match the historic frames that may exist behind the panning. The application indicates a Prairie Style muntin pattern and sandwiched muntins, neither of which match the original window design.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install windows

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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.*
 - The proposed windows do not match the historic windows in design or materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:08:13

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Window salesman Nunzio Terra of Renewal by Andersen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee members objected to the proposed muntin pattern and sandwiched muntins.
 - The applicant said that he could provide a different muntin pattern and an external muntin if requested.
- The Committee members discussed this Fibrex material but agreed that it might be approvable if it was painted.
 - Mr. Terra praised the Fibrex material for its ability to resist rot.
- The Committee members expressed concern about the subframe but recommended that the applicant investigate the removal the capping and aluminum window and look at the ability to hide the subframe in a reconstructed historic frame.
 - The applicant promised to work with the staff to investigate what is behind the capping and to develop shop drawings of a frame that would match the original.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed window does not meet Standard 6 as it does not match the original in design or material.
- The applicant has not done the research or drawings needed to fully review of the proposal.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed design does not match the original because of the Prairie style muntin pattern, the sandwiched muntins, the subframe, and the material.
- The new windows should not have grills.
- The applicant should remove the capping from an existing window and work with the staff to develop shop drawings.

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

ITEM: 2038 WOLF ST MOTION: Denial pursuant to Standard 6 MOVED BY: Nan Gutterman SECONDED BY: Justin 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				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 530 N 19TH ST

Proposal: Renovate building; construct roof deck with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Benjamin A. Horst and Denny R. Kwak

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects LLC

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to add a roof deck and pilot house on top of the main block of this twin house. Because the adjacent house is set back from the street, this deck and pilohouse may be visible from the public right-of-way. A site visit may be useful to document visibility. The deck and pilot house may need to be redesigned to be inconspicuous from the street.

The application proposes to modify the basement windows and cellar well. The basement windows and well have already been modified. The modification to the cellar may be appropriate because the building base has already been modified and an egress well exists.

The application also proposes installing new doors and aluminum-clad windows but does not include sufficient details for review. The existing six-over-six windows were installed without a permit in 2017. The proposed windows and doors would meet Standard 6 if they are wood with ogee molding. The staff should review the details.

The applicant proposes to clad the rear wall in siding; it is currently stucco. The rear wall is visible from the street and the replacement of stucco with siding is not appropriate for a masonry building. Perhaps a panelized system would be appropriate.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install roof deck and pilot house, new door, windows, modify window well, clad rear

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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.*
 - The windows, door, and door frame should match the historic elements in design and materials with staff to review details.
 - The cladding of the visible rear wall does not comply with this standard both in material and design.
- *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 deck and pilothouse does not comply with this Standard. However, it could perhaps be modified to meet the Standard if it could be reduced to be inconspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the door and windows in wood; approval of the roof deck and pilot house if a mock up shows that they are inconspicuous from the street; denial of the rear cladding; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:28:08

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gabriel Deck represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein opined that the deck and pilothouse as now configured will be highly visible and are unacceptable without revisions.
 - Mr. Deck agreed to adjust the design of the deck and pilothouse so that they will be inconspicuous from the street.
- The Committee members objected to the proposed use of siding on the masonry facades.
 - Mr. Deck said that his client is open to suggestions and would restucco if necessary.
- The Committee members considered the window proposal. They concluded that the proposed front windows and doors should be wood and match the historic design. On the rear façade, they questioned the changes to the original symmetrical window pattern.
 - Mr. Deck said that he would install wood windows and a door and retain the existing window pattern and type on the visible rear upper-floor windows.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- As proposed, the deck and pilothouse do not satisfy Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.
- The proposed rear and side cladding do not satisfy Standards 6 and 9.
- The proposed window and door do not satisfy Standard 6.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The location and/or configuration of the deck and pilothouse should be modified so that they will be inconspicuous from the street. The canopy over the door of the pilothouse should be removed to make it less conspicuous.
- The chimney should be retained.
- The stucco finish on the rear and side facades may be retained or replaced if the old stucco is first removed.
- The window openings on the second and third floor of the rear façade should be retained with double-hung windows. One window may be infilled with a reveal. The first-floor openings may be modified if they are not visible from the street.
- The windows and door should be wood and match the original design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted but approval if the revisions outlined above are implemented, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 530 N 19TH ST					
MOTION: Denial as submitted but approval with revisions					
MOVED BY: Amy Stein					
SECONDED BY: Justin 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				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:51:45

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:51 a.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.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 17 DECEMBER 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES