

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

**TUESDAY, 28 JULY 2015
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

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

ALSO PRESENT

Marissa Parker, Esq., Stradley Ronon
Ed Eimer, Eimer Design
Kevin Towey, Eimer Design
Jared Brey, PlanPhilly
Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties
James Pearlstein, Pearl Properties
Caitlin Rotkiske, Tackett & Co.
Elizabeth Wotring, Tackett & Co.
Andrew Mulson, Baker Street Partners
William J. O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office
Chris Carickhoff, Morrissey Design
Frank Cuthbertson, CKG Architects
Patrick Starr
Natalie Ludwig, City Living Philly
Eric Blumenfeld, EBRM
William Alesker, Alesker & Dundon Architects, LLC
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
Alexandra Brinkman Wilson, BLT Architects
Rochelle Spahn, TLP
Chas Peruto, Peruto Development
Robert D'Alonzo, D'Alonzo Associates
Charles Norman, National Real Estate Development

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 1900-06 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chestnut Square Associates, LP

Applicant: Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties

History: 1935; Raymond Pace Alexander Building; Frank Hahn, architect

Individual Designation: 9/10/2004

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a commercial infill building on a vacant lot on the 1900-block of Chestnut Street. The vacant lot is not designated as historic, but the new building would connect internally to the Raymond Pace Alexander Building at 1900 Chestnut Street, which is designated as historic. As an addition to the Alexander Building, the Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the application. This application proposes no work to 1910 Chestnut Street, the former Boyd Theater, which is to the west of the site.

The Historical Commission reviewed a proposal for the building as part of a larger project at 1900-06 and 1910 Chestnut Street at its June 2015 meeting. At that time, the Commission voted to approve in concept the massing of the infill building between the Alexander Building and Boyd Theater on Chestnut Street, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following advice for revising the design of the infill building for the final review by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission:

- the application should include detailed drawings,
- the Chestnut Street or front façade should be more compatible with the Alexander Building and not overwhelm the Boyd Theater,
- the front façade should acknowledge the Alexander Building's roofline between its second and third floors, and,
- the front façade should include a setback or chamfer at the western edge of the third floor so not to overwhelm the Boyd Theater.

Since the June 2015 review, the applicants have redesigned the building according to the Commission's advice. In his capacity as the director of Urban Design at the City Planning Commission, David Schaaf, an architect, the City Planning Commission's designee on the Historical Commission, and one of the primary critics of the design presented at the June Commission meeting, has worked closely with the applicants and their architects on the redesign of the infill building.

Several aspects of the design of the infill building have been revised since the last review. Detailed elevation and plan drawings are now provided. The fenestration of the infill building has been revised to replicate the scale of the fenestration of the Alexander Building. The Chestnut Street façade will be clad in natural stone. The exposed third-story façade parallel to 19th Street and above the roof of the Alexander Building will be clad in metal panels; this façade will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. The third floor of the Chestnut Street façade at the western edge will be set back 2'-6" from the lower floors of the front façade to defer to the Boyd Theater. Color and materials will differentiate the two-story base from the third floor along Chestnut Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Commission's in-concept approval of June 2015.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Marissa Parker and architects Ed Eimer and Kevin Towey represented the application.

Ms. Parker noted that the site plan distributed in the Committee's packets had a highlighted border around the portion of the new construction under review at this time. She noted that the coloration of the proposed materials have changed significantly since the previous review, and that they attempted to take the input of the Committee, Commission, and the Planning Commission into consideration to redesign the project to provide better symmetry in the fenestration, to differentiate the roofline, and have more compatibility along the roofline between 1900 and 1910 Chestnut. She noted that there will also be a notch at the western edge of the third floor with uplighting to further illuminate the Boyd façade and make a statement on the street. She noted that the revised application included natural stone cladding along the Chestnut Street façade on the third floor which had previously been proposed as metal, and that the natural stone wraps from Chestnut Street around a few feet onto the 19th Street façade. The elements included in the packet also describe the details. She noted that the outlines of the windows in red were included to show the fenestration pattern from the historic building that informed the design of the new infill building. She noted that the coloration on the third floor is intended to lessen the visual volume and create more continuity along the street. Furthermore, the building has been reduced in height by approximately two feet. Ms. Parker reiterated that they had done their best to respond to the recommendations of the Committee and Commission, and that they had also met with the City Planning Commission and incorporated its recommendations as well.

Ms. Hawkins questioned the distance between the tops of the third-floor windows and the parapet, noting that it seemed rather large. She asked whether there was any occupied space on the roof or whether it was intended to house or hide anything. Mr. Towey responded that there is a 30-inch parapet from the roof surface, and that there will be a new green roof, and then the structure itself. Ms. Hawkins asked whether it would be used as an amenity space for the building. Mr. Towey responded that it would not be an occupied roof, but would be a green roof hidden by a 30-inch parapet.

Ms. Hawkins asked where the HVAC equipment would be located, and how tall it would be. Mr. Towey responded that it would be centrally located towards the rear of the building. Mr. Eimer noted that the HVAC would be multiple small-package units, as the upper floors will be office space, and the intention is to create smaller, controlled areas.

Ms. Hawkins questioned the access to the green roof. Mr. Towey responded that there is a stair in the back of the project. He noted that the stair in the forward portion of the building does not access the roof. Ms. Gutterman noted that it would have been nice to see a roof plan. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the stair tower, elevator overrun, or anything else that accesses the roof, will be part of a different package. The applicants confirmed that the roof access component will be included as part of a different package at a later date.

Ms. Hawkins asked for confirmation that the HVAC equipment will be less than four feet in height, behind a 30-inch parapet, and that no portion of the HVAC equipment will be visible from any public right-of-way in any direction. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the elevator overrun would project above the roofline. Mr. Towey clarified that the elevators Ms. Gutterman was pointing to did not extend past the second floor, and service only the basement, first, and second floors. Ms. Gutterman asked what elevators service the third floor, and Mr. Eimer responded that the elevators that service the third floor are outside of the property in question. Ms. Hawkins offered clarification, describing to the Committee members that, at the

Commission meeting, the applicant chose to pull the application apart into different phases. The tower piece and Sansom Street elevation, she noted, will be part of a separate application that will be heard at a later date.

Ms. Hawkins asked for the column bay to which the current project extends. Ms. Parker responded that it would be F.2 on the ground floor plans (A.112). She noted that there is a small note in line with F.2 reading "Historic Wall," and that is the existing southern wall of 1900 Chestnut, and the extent of the construction currently under review, as highlighted on the submitted site plan.

Mr. Cluver expressed concern that the Committee and Commission are being asked to review an incomplete building. Ms. Hawkins responded that that is the charge they have been given.

Mr. Cluver noted that there are three types of stone identified on the elevations, and that he believed Stone Type 1 was intended to match the limestone of the adjacent Alexander building. Mr. Towey responded that they are trying to match the limestone of the Alexander building as closely as possible, but also transition between the Alexander building and the Boyd Theater. He noted that the proposed material is an Indiana limestone. Mr. Cluver asked what materials would be used for Type 2 and Type 3. Mr. Towey responded that Type 2 would be a Texas Cordova, which is lighter in color, and Type 3 would be Gascogne Blue, which is a darker band. Ms. Gutterman noted that there are actually four types of stone, as granite is proposed at the base. Mr. Cluver noted that in the three-dimensional rendering it appears that the same material is used on the north and east sides of the third floor, but on the plans it calls for a stone return and metal along 19th Street. Mr. Towey responded that the intention is to match the color and appearance of the metal panels as closely as possible to the natural stone.

Mr. Cluver questioned the two-story, U-shaped elements around the doors, which interrupt the stone. He asked whether they are proud of the surface and Mr. Towey confirmed that they would be.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the parapet cap stone, and whether it transitions from stone to metal beyond the masonry return on the 19th Street elevation. Mr. Towey responded that it would.

Mr. Cluver and Ms. Hawkins asked whether the panel adjacent to the westernmost window of the third floor would be metal. Mr. Towey responded that it would be.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the plane of the western portion of the building as it abuts the Boyd Theater. Mr. Towey responded that it would be recessed one inch from the plane of the Boyd, and that the door would be set back six inches from the plane of the new construction. Ms. Stein asked whether the second and third floors would be in plane with one another, and Mr. Towey confirmed that they would. Ms. Stein questioned the material of the dividing line between the two floors. Mr. Towey responded that it would be a stainless steel, recessed band. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the intention was to have a masonry cladding system with a steel horizontal band separating the second and third floors, which would continue to the western portion of the façade. Mr. Towey responded that the western part of the building would be coped with a material that matches the band. Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the coping would be flush, and Mr. Towey responded that there would be no projection to the western portion of the coping.

Ms. Stein questioned the proposed façade lighting, and noted that the current package only includes one light fixture, which is the uplight of the recessed corner. Mr. Towey responded that

the accent lighting was requested by the City Planning Commission. Ms. Stein asked whether the uplight would be lighting the Boyd or just the alcove, and Mr. Towey confirmed that it is just intended to light the alcove. Mr. Eimer noted that the discussions with David Schaaf of the Planning Commission focused heavily on that corner of the building. He wanted to ensure that the new building would not overpower the Boyd. He recommended pushing the corner back as far as possible and lighting the surface to allow the profile to be more prominent at night. Mr. Cluver asked about the location of the proposed light fixture, and Mr. Eimer responded that the light would sit on the small roof of the alcove. Mr. Cluver expressed concern over calling attention to the recessed alcove. Mr. Cluver noted that the eye is attracted to light and that it does not make sense to light a blank wall. Mr. Eimer responded that it was a recommendation about which Mr. Schaaf felt passionately. Mr. Cluver opined that the light could be installed, but, if it does not achieve the desired effect, it could be turned off or removed.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the materials treatment in the notch, and whether the metal panel adjacent to the window wraps the corner. Mr. Towey responded that it does.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the building's signage would be limited to the band between the first and second floors. Mr. Eimer confirmed that that would be the appropriate location for it. Ms. Hawkins asked whether there would be any additional façade lighting, and Mr. Eimer responded that none was anticipated at this time.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the design is much improved, but that the metal panel at the western edge of the façade which turns into the alcove calls too much attention to the corner and that it should be replaced with limestone. Mr. Eimer responded that the accent panel is not the most important element of the façade, and that they would be willing to reconsider that element. The other Committee members concurred.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the following provisions and clarification:

- provided that the accent light in alcove is reviewed in the field after installation and disabled or removed if inappropriate,
- provided that the metal panel turning the corner into the alcove on the third floor is replaced with a stone panel in the same plane as the other stone of that façade,
- provided that mechanical equipment on the roof is not visible from the public right-of-way,
- provided that signage is located in the sign band, and,
- with the understanding that the stairs and elevators servicing the third floor are not part of the application under consideration.

ADDRESS: 4127 MAIN ST

Project: Demolish most of building; alter front façade openings; construct four-story building with decks

Review Requested: originally Final Approval, amended to In-Concept

Owner: Kazimier Sokolowski

Applicant: William J. O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish all but the front façade of this small three-story residential property on Main Street in Manayunk, and to construct a four-story mixed-use building behind the façade. The application proposes to retain the front façade, to install appropriate windows in the upper floors, and to combine and expand the first-floor window openings to create a storefront window matching that of the neighboring building. Behind the façade, a shallow, steeply pitched roof would conceal a third-floor deck. A third-floor unit topped with a roof deck would face Main Street. Towards the center of the lot, a tall pilot house would rise, providing access to roof decks on top of a four-story portion of the building facing Station Street. Given the slope of the lot, the rear of the property would step up to become four stories along Station Street. The Station Street façade would be clad in stucco and feature plate and casement window openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d), the removal of most of the building would constitute a demolition in the legal sense, and Standards 2, 9, and 10, but with the suggestion that the gable slope of the roof be retained, and that a large addition could be constructed from the end of the main block to the property line along Station Street.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Equitable owner Andrew Mulson, attorney William O'Brien, and architect Chris Carickhoff represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins noted that there are two considerations for this application: first, whether the application constitutes a demolition, and secondly, whether the proposed design satisfies the Standards. Ms. DiPasquale commented that it was her understanding that the applicant wished to work with the Committee and Commission to find a compromise, and requested that the Committee review the application and offer suggestions for modifying the project to such a point that it could be considered an alteration as opposed to a demolition.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the application lacked a demolition plan in the usual sense, in that there is no plan showing the portions of the building to be retained versus demolished, but that it appears that only the façade is proposed for retention and that everything behind it would be demolished. Mr. Mulson responded that it is the intention to maintain the integrity of the historic district and the front façade. He noted that Ms. DiPasquale had previously commented on the slope of the roof, which had taken the form of a mansard in this proposal. He described some of the conditions and difficulties of the existing building, including significant settling and sagging problems, and eight-foot ceilings. Mr. Mulson stated that, since they are doing a substantial renovation, FEMA and the City Planning Commission require them to elevate the floor level above the floodplain. If they maintain the front façade, he noted, the floor levels will no longer align appropriately with the windows. Their current design, he noted, would retain the front façade, and reconfigure the interior structure behind the façade. Regarding the rooflines, he

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

noted that Ms. DiPasquale had recommended keeping the full roofline of the original building, but that the properties adjacent to them, which were renovated at different periods, retained only the front slope. He noted that the taller additions behind those properties have a stepping effect, and that their proposal would align the upper floor addition with that of some of the neighboring properties. He noted that, with the retention of the front slope, passersby would see the full roofline before the building steps up. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Mulson to identify the point of the roof from which they would like to step the building up. Mr. Mulson responded that, in discussions with his architect, they would be willing to retain most of the slope to the ridge line.

Mr. Mulson noted that, although he understood that the work to the neighboring properties had been approved by an earlier Historical Commission with different members, the neighboring properties also had fewer constraints in terms of FEMA requirements when they renovated the properties around 15 years ago. Since that time, the FEMA maps have changed. Mr. McCoubrey asked whether FEMA would grant an exception if the applicant were to preserve enough of the building. Ms. Gutterman responded that it might. Mr. Mulson noted that it is a multi-faceted dilemma.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants whether they were trying to obtain advice or seek a final approval at this time. Mr. Mulson responded that they would like to develop a design that is amenable to everyone, the ultimate goal being to convert the property from a single-family residence to a mixed-use building. He noted that the property is not desirable as a single-family residence, and that the Manayunk Development Corporation prefers a commercial use on the first floor, and that there is also a push to bring additional residents to the area and increase density along Main Street. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Mulson if he would be willing to change the application from a final review to an in-concept review to allow for more generalized feedback as opposed to a decision based solely on the application before the Committee, which proposed a demolition. Ms. Hawkins informed the applicants that changing the review would postpone a final decision. Mr. Mulson responded that he would prefer to have the input of the Committee.

The rest of the discussion, Ms. Hawkins stated, would be considered an in-concept review. Mr. Mulson and his attorney, Mr. O'Brien, agreed.

Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification about the location of the proposed stair tower as it relates to the existing roofline and neighboring buildings. Mr. Mulson explained that the stair tower would be located behind the existing ridge line. The ridge, Mr. Mulson noted, is approximately 15 feet from the front façade. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the stair tower would be visible from Main Street, since the set back upper floors of the neighboring properties are visible. Ms. Hawkins noted that the stair tower as proposed appears to extend a full floor above the adjacent buildings. She indicated to the architect that it would be helpful to dash in the setbacks of the neighboring buildings to provide context.

Mr. Cluver opined that, accepting that the internal configuration would have to change, it would be important for the storefront component have a level of animation. He suggested a display ledge for the storefront window, and Mr. Carickhoff indicated that a ledge was already proposed. He noted that the window would be below floor level, but that a commercial/retail space would want a display window.

Mr. Cluver commented that preserving the front slope of the roof was another important component. Mr. Carickhoff noted that the disguising a roof deck along Main Street was the reason for the proposed mansard. Mr. Cluver responded that the full front slope should be retained. Mr. Mulson noted that, if they conceded that point, they would lose the front deck.

Ms. Hawkins questioned how the applicants planned to reconcile ADA requirements with FEMA requirements. Mr. Mulson responded that they would likely have to apply for an ADA variance, as it is impossible to conform to ADA at this location without an excessively long ramp or widening the door. Mr. Baron reported that some buildings have a lift on the interior next to the door for ADA access. Ms. Gutterman noted that, to do so, would require lowering the door and removing the two steps. Ms. Hawkins noted that it still may be something the applicant wants to investigate.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the top roof deck would be an amenity space for the whole building, and Mr. Mulson responded that it would be. Ms. Hawkins opined that one of the most jarring elements of the proposed design was the fact that the stair tower extended the full width of the building. She noted that, if it could turn 90 degrees and be parallel in a traditional stair hall, it would provide some relief, and could be half as wide. The full width of the tower would not be necessary. She noted that it would require some shifting of the interior units, but should be more of a traditional pilot house. Mr. Mulson asked if it would be preferable to incorporate more glass into the wall of the stairhouse. Ms. Hawkins responded that glass draws attention to itself, particularly in a south facing wall such as this one.

Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Cluver noted that the floor plans did not seem consistent with the stair tower being used by multiple residents. Mr. Carickhoff and Mr. Mulson responded that an additional wall would be added internally so the entrance to Unit 5 would be off of the stair.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether an ADA-accessible unit would be required given the number of units. Mr. Carickhoff responded that the proposed number of units does not result in the requirement of an accessible unit.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the engineer's report had recommended demolishing the whole building. Mr. Mulson responded that the report had found some structural issues, and that some of the structural members in the building are deficient, but that they planned to brace and maintain the front façade.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicant explore a way to get an operable window to the front unit, Unit 3. Mr. Mulson responded that they are currently proposing a balcony between the living room of Unit 3 and the exterior wall which would allow a resident to access the third-floor windows. Ms. Stein noted that to do so would require that the applicant insert a beam and spandrel behind second-floor window, which would be visible from the street. Mr. Carickhoff responded that they are currently proposing a metal deck to create as small of a profile as possible. Ms. Hawkins asked whether this design would maintain fire separation between residential and commercial use. Mr. Mulson responded that the building would have full fire suppression, and that they would have to explore that issue further.

Ms. Hawkins encouraged the applicants to capture the space behind the exterior wall within the units, which would expand the size of the units. Ms. Stein suggested that, with the roof change to maintain the front slope, the commercial unit could be one-and-one-half stories tall, and the entrance to Unit 3 could be at the mezzanine on the stair, allowing Unit 3 to occupy the current third floor without interrupting the windows. She noted that doing so would eliminate the second floor of Unit 3, but Ms. Hawkins pointed out that it may be able to gain a roof deck. Mr. Carickhoff expressed concern over the internal configuration. Ms. Gutterman noted that Unit 3 may become a studio with a loft space as opposed to a traditional one bedroom.

Mr. O'Brien asked whether the Committee members took issue with the current front façade proposal to eliminate the basement window, and replace the two double-hung first-floor windows with a single plate glass window and transom. Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. DiPasquale whether she knew what the building looked like originally, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that it likely had one or two double-hung windows. Mr. Cluver opined that as long as the storefront stayed within the existing opening, the installation of a plate glass window with transom would be a natural evolution in the building's history. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the drawings appeared to show an expanded window.

Ms. Stein stated that, for the next review, the application should include existing conditions drawings in addition to proposed drawings, so they can be reviewed side by side. Ms. Hawkins agreed, and noted that the drawings should also depict the conditions of the neighboring properties, since part of the argument is that the proposed design will fit in with the adjacent buildings.

Mr. McCoubrey confirmed that the Committee members would accept the removal of the rear slope, as long as the front slope was maintained. Ms. DiPasquale asked whether they would accept an addition rising straight up from the ridge line. Mr. Cluver responded that the neighboring buildings should be used as the context. Ms. Gutterman noted that the addition should not be closer to Main Street than any of the adjacent properties. Ms. DiPasquale noted that upper floors of the renovated buildings that match the building in question do not step up until the point where the main block of the historic buildings would have ended. Mr. Mulson noted that they would prefer to step the building up from a point that would match the neighboring non-historic buildings, which would make the project more feasible. Mr. Mulson opined that stepping the addition forward would create symmetry. Ms. Gutterman responded that it would not actually create symmetry, and that the upper floors of the building Mr. Mulson was referencing sits forward of the ridge line of the building in question, which is exactly what the Committee has rejected. Ms. Gutterman noted that the applicants should study the ridge, and the massing in relationship to the other buildings, and whether it would be better to have a Main Street deck like the matching adjacent historic properties. Ms. Gutterman opined that, at a minimum, the front slope of the roof should be maintained, and that she did not see an exact point where they could say that it would be acceptable for the addition to step up, but that it warrants additional study.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant should submit the following additional drawings in order to expedite future reviews: a section through the street with the line-of-sight depicted to understand the massing to passersby, with the neighboring buildings dashed in; a perspective view from the street showing the planes of the building and how the massing relates to the neighboring buildings; current and proposed (before and after) drawings.

Mr. Mulson asked if there is an absolute line in the sand from which the building can step up. Ms. Hawkins responded that, based on the discussion, the ridge line or a little bit behind.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) and Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 219-29 S 18TH ST

Project: Convert three blind openings to openings

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

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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Designers Elizabeth Wotring and Caitlin Rotkiske represented the application.

Ms. Wotring distributed a section drawing showing the proposed opening, limestone sill and retained brick.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the applicant was proposing to point the brick returns at the opening to match the existing brick, and whether they had sourced matching brick. Ms. Wotring replied that they planned to salvage the existing brick.

Ms. Stein asked about the purpose of the openings, as there did not seem to be a reason for altering this historic building. Ms. Wotring responded that she did not know. Ms. DiPasquale noted that Jay Tackett, the architect for whom the applicants work, had indicated that a potential tenant desired outdoor space.

Ms. Hawkins expressed concern about the use of a fire stair as a “hang out location,” and the accompanying fire code issues. Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Stein agreed, noting that they would hate to see this alteration unless there was a compelling code-related reason.

Ms. Stein asked the area that would be exposed behind the openings, and noted that this would be an alteration that would be highly visible from a public right-of-way.

Ms. D'Alessandro noted that nothing is supposed to be located within a fire stair. Mr. Cluver commented that that does not stop people from using fire stairs.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that, on the other levels, the opening is protected by a full screen and railing. Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the proposed sill. Ms. Wotring responded that it would be 18 to 20 inches in height. Ms. Hawkins noted that that would require a supplemental rail, which was not depicted on their drawings, and as a result, the Committee did not have the full design before them.

Mr. Cluver opined that he did not object to the openings, but that the details are undercooked. It is not clear what would be visible in the openings, how the lighting is handled, the railings, etc...

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

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

ADDRESS: 4146-48 PARKSIDE AVE

Project: Construct apartment building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Parkside Historic Preservation Corp.

Applicant: Francis Cuthbertson, CKG Architects

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, 12/11/2009

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an apartment building on a vacant lot on Parkside Avenue in the Parkside Historic District. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to Review and Comment because the site is considered undeveloped. The proposed building is comparable to neighboring buildings in terms of its height and massing. The staff considers the projecting brick and glass stair tower to be incompatible with the historic district. Façade materials include cast stone, EIFS, stucco, brick, and asphalt shingles.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed building is appropriate to the district in terms of height, massing, scale, rhythm and placement on the lot; however, the choice of multiple materials and the projecting stairs warrant further consideration.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Francis Cuthbertson represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she prepared the information for the Parkside Historic District nomination, but does not feel that it presents a conflict for this review, unless there are objections. There were no objections.

Ms. Hawkins opined that the height, defined roofline, articulation above the roof, and variation in materials are all part of the architectural vocabulary of this historic district, but she agrees with the staff comment regarding the reconsideration of the central stair tower. Mr. Cuthbertson responded that he understands the concern, and considered relocating it to the side, but it did not work internally. Ms. Hawkins commented that there is room for some projection on the front of this building, but it could be in the form of bays that do not extend to the ground, and do not interrupt the roofline. Ms. Stein commented that the building with the projecting stair tower reads like an English church. Ms. Hawkins commented that changing the design so that it is flush would work better, and would provide the opportunity to do a bay element on either side, so that the stair element does not become the focus of attention. She suggested that the applicant look to twins further up the street that have two bays that sit over the porch. Ms. Stein commented that units with bay windows may be attractive to prospective tenants. Ms. Gutterman asked how entry into the stair tower works. Mr. Cluver commented that there may be a discrepancy in the drawings regarding this detail. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the doorway omits the arch, and it becomes more of a porch in front of the stair where one can go to either side so that it is not so single-sided. Ms. Hawkins summarized that the goal is to draw less attention to the stair.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Hawkins commented that part of the Parkside Historic District architectural vocabulary is a continuous front porch, or at least the suggestion of what was a front porch on nearly all buildings. Ms. Stein commented that a porch or recess on the first floor would help the scale of the building. Mr. Cuthbertson responded that he considered a small balcony on the third story, which could perhaps act as the recess, but it posed a problem with the floor plan and square footage. Mr. Cluver commented that sometimes porches were filled in over time, and maybe this building could maintain the look of a porch that has been filled in as a way of capturing square footage. Ms. Hawkins responded that it could be something more transparent and less masonry, and suggested the applicant look to examples down the street and around the corner on Viola Street. Mr. Cuthbertson asked about the balcony idea, which would be a recessed element on the third story that would be above the porch line of the neighboring property. Ms. Gutterman responded that it would be the addition of another element to the elevation and may look awkward.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the windows are too large and lack the hierarchy of windows found on other buildings in the historic district. Mr. Cluver commented that part of the problem is that there are six stories going in where the neighboring buildings have five stories with the same height. Ms. Hawkins commented that the scale of the windows should be reconsidered, and suggested that the windows are made narrower.

Ms. Stein commented that EIFS is a poor choice for a cornice that needs a more durable material. She suggested cast stone, metal or AZEK as a last resort.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicant will need to provide side and rear elevation drawings for review by the Historical Commission. Mr. Cuthbertson responded that he will have those ready for review by the Historical Commission, and plans to incorporate comments from this review to the extent that the developer will allow. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant have additional information about materials at the time of the review by the Historical Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the applicant should consider the suggestions offered during the review of this project.

ADDRESS: 219 S SARTAIN ST

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Patrick Starr

Applicant: Patrick Starr

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes no work, but is apparently intended to legalize five vinyl windows in the front façade of this three-story rowhouse at 219 S. Sartain Street.

In 2012, the current applicant reported to the Historical Commission that his neighbor at 209 S. Sartain Street was replacing her windows with inappropriate windows. The Historical Commission investigated and requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue a violation for the installation of windows at 209. In response to the violation, the owner of 209 S.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Sartain installed the historically appropriate windows, clearing the violation. During the review of those windows, the owner of 209 inquired about other inappropriate windows on the block. The Historical Commission investigated her claims and requested violations for inappropriate windows at 211 and 217 S. Sartain. The violation for 211 S. Sartain remains outstanding. The owner of 217 S. Sartain applied to the Historical Commission for legalization of his illegal windows. The Commission denied the legalization application, but suspended enforcement of the violation for four years to give the owner time to install the appropriate windows. During the review of the 217 S. Sartain application, the owner of 217 inquired about inappropriate windows at 219 S. Sartain, the subject of this application. The Historical Commission investigated and requested a violation for inappropriate windows at 219 S. Sartain on 3 June 2014, which the Department issued on 6 June.

After receiving the violation for the windows at 219 S. Sartain, the property owner appealed it to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board considered the appeal (#23311) on 19 August 2014 and determined that it was not ripe for consideration because the property owner had not exhausted his administrative remedies; he had not submitted an application to the Historical Commission for review. Following the Board's ruling, the property owner failed to submit an application addressing the windows to the Historical Commission and, eventually, the violation was referred to Municipal Court for enforcement. The enforcement proceeding apparently prompted the owner to submit the current application.

The application consists of a cover letter and building permit application form, in which the Brief Description of Work section reads: "None. There is no work. The only work I did was completed subject to a permit from the Philadelphia Historical Commission in 2006." The Historical Commission did approve a building permit application for this owner and property in 2006. It was unrelated to the front façade windows. The current application includes no photographs, architectural drawings, or other materials documenting the current windows. The application could be considered incomplete, but rejecting it as incomplete will not lead to a final resolution of the matter.

In his cover letter, the applicant claims that the windows were installed in 2000, before he purchased the property. Deed records indicate that the current owner purchased the property on 7 July 2000. The property owner appears to believe that he cannot be cited for unpermitted work undertaken by a former owner. However, a property owner is responsible for the state of his property even if the illegal alteration occurred under earlier ownership. Whether or not the current property owner undertook the illegal work is irrelevant to the Historical Commission's enforcement. A change in ownership does not erase non-compliant conditions. If it did, the City of Philadelphia would be rendered unable to enforce any aspects of the building and zoning codes. Moreover, there is no statute of limitations on enforcement for unpermitted construction work in Philadelphia.

In his cover letter, the property owner contends that the Historical Commission failed to schedule a review of the matter after the Board rejected his appeal of the violation. However, the onus to apply to the Historical Commission for a review of the matter was on the property owner and the Commission's staff advised him as such. The Historical Commission is reactive. It does not schedule reviews unilaterally for property owners, but reacts to building permit applications submitted to it. The property owner had an obligation to submit a permit application if he wanted to seek a resolution to the matter through the Commission. The Board may have contributed to the confusion in this regard. Its official decision on the appeal was "Remanded to Historical Commission." However, remand, to send back to a lower court with instructions for

additional review, was not an appropriate action because the Historical Commission had never reviewed the matter and had no record on which to base a second review.

Finally, in his cover letter, the property owner claims that the Historical Commission is breaking the law by requesting and then enforcing the violation. It is not. The claim is baseless. The property owner implies that the Historical Commission's staff is acting fraudulently because it knows that the current owner did not install the windows and, yet, is pursuing enforcement. The staff is aware of the owner's claim that he did not install the windows, but the staff does not know who installed the windows or when they were installed. However, as noted earlier, whether the current owner installed the windows or not is irrelevant. A property owner is responsible for the state of his property regardless of who altered it or when it was altered. The staff would pursue the violation even with ironclad evidence that the current owner did not install the windows. Photographs show that the inappropriate windows were installed after designation. Therefore, in that they were installed without an approval and permit, they are illegal.

As noted earlier, the Historical Commission reviewed an application to legalize inappropriate windows at 211 S. Sartain in 2014 (minute attached). The circumstances in that case were very similar to those presented here. In that case, the Historical Commission denied the application because the windows did not satisfy Standard 6, but suspended enforcement of the violation for four years to allow the owner an opportunity to replace the windows. The Commission should follow that clear precedent and take the same action in this case.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the application to legalize the front façade windows at 219 S. Sartain Street, pursuant to Standard 6, but suspension of enforcement for a period of four years, by which time the appropriate windows must be approved by the Historical Commission and installed, with the staff to review details.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Patrick Starr represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent read an abbreviated version of the overview. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Architectural Committee's jurisdiction is limited to whether the proposed change is appropriate to the building. Other circumstances, including whether the windows were in place at the time of the purchase of the house, are in the purview of the Historical Commission. The way the Committee reviews applications for work that has already been done is as if the work has not been done and is instead being proposed. Mr. Starr responded that he did not want to attend this meeting because he is aware of the Committee's purview and he understands that he has no case here, which is why he appealed the violation to the Board License & Inspection Review, which is what the Notice of Violation told him to do. Then the Historical Commission insisted that he come back here and start at the Architectural Committee, which he knows is a useless exercise. He stated that he has been extremely frustrated by this process. Ms. Hawkins responded that she understands, and the Committee will try to get Mr. Starr through this part of the process as quickly as possible. Mr. Starr noted that he was one of the advocates for this law back in the 1980s. Ms. Hawkins thanked him, and asked the Committee if there were any questions. Ms. Gutterman commented that the Committee cannot legalize vinyl windows.

Mr. Starr responded that he knows what the Committee has to do, but his question is of the policy of this Commission. He stated that he was singled out, not because of any action of his own, but by the actions of others. He stated that there is no truth to the statement provided in the overview, and he wants that to be on the record. He continued that each of the property owners on his block who installed inappropriate windows did it themselves. He stated that the

property owners referenced in the overview actively removed windows that were historic, and that he intervened in at least one case and told the property owner to stop, and told the property owner that it is a historically-certified block. He noted that that property owner, to his knowledge, still retained the historic windows in their basement, where they remain to this day because the Commission has been unable to enforce the ordinance in this city. Mr. Starr stated that his friends have pointed out that he is the person who is suffering, owing to a lack of enforcement by the Commission in 1999, or whenever the vinyl windows on his property were installed. He noted that it was a time when no notice was required to a purchaser that a property was historically certified, and he has the MLS listing that does not state that his property is historically certified. He stated that he ran into Randal Baron in the neighborhood one day, which is when Mr. Baron told him that his home is historically designated, and that it slipped by him. Mr. Starr stated that he was surprised, because it is a typical trinity, and he did not realize it would be historically certified, because it had vinyl windows that he never would have installed himself. Mr. Starr stated that he has made subsequent changes to his property, under an approved permit, and suggested that the Committee go on record stating that there is no truth to the idea that his case is comparable to the actions of the other property owners that are mentioned in the overview. He stated that he knows that the Committee cannot approve vinyl windows, but that the statement in the overview is factually not true.

Ms. Hawkins responded that this Committee did not provide that recommendation, and that it was the full Commission that provided it. Mr. Starr responded that the Committee could comment on the circumstances, and observed that we are all human beings and citizens. Ms. Hawkins responded that the human beings and citizens who volunteer their time on the Committee every month do not know all of the facts of this case. She commented that she does not believe that MLS listings had a box to check regarding historic designation at the time that this property was purchased by Mr. Starr. Mr. Starr responded that his engineer's report from June of 2000 clearly states that the property has vinyl windows, and he submitted all of his documentation to the Board License & Inspection Review, but it was pushed away and he was remanded back to the Architectural Committee. Ms. Hawkins responded that she understands, but the Committee must review all applications as if the action were going to occur, so the question before the Committee is whether vinyl windows are appropriate for this building. She restated that it is the limit of the Committee's jurisdiction, and while she appreciates that Mr. Starr has a lot of documentation, such decisions are in the Commission's purview, not the Committee's.

Mr. Starr stated that the Commission singled him out, and it does not single out every other owner of a historic building, and there are historic buildings all over the city that do not have all of their historic elements correctly in place. Ms. Hawkins responded that she is a member of the Commission and explained that as the Commission's staff becomes aware of various violations across the city, those property owners are brought to the Commission to address their violations. This means that there have been other property owners who have been similarly found after the fact to have done something that is not appropriate, so she does not believe that Mr. Starr is unique in this situation. Mr. Starr responded that he did not do anything, other than attempt to restore his home.

Ms. Hawkins restated that the Committee's jurisdiction is limited to whether or not the proposed change is appropriate for this building. Mr. Starr responded that he understands, but to be clear, he sought approval from the staff for subsequent changes to his home and he would do no less. He stated that he never would have installed vinyl windows, as they are not his taste or preference. He continued that to be dragged to this meeting, fifteen years later for something that he did not do, is his point. He stated that it makes him question the jurisdiction of the

Commission, and he has indicated to his Councilperson that this is an unfair application of the law. He stated that the Committee cannot justify that he would be singled out.

Ms. Hawkins responded that she understands, but the Committee must act on what is before it. Ms. Broadbent commented that violations were issued for inappropriate windows at 209, 211, 217 and 219 S. Sartain Street, in the interest of applying the same standards to each property on the historically designated block. Mr. Starr responded that all of those property owners actually removed the historic windows. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Commission will get to hear their stories.

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

ADDRESS: 416 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Apply stucco to rear facades

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jason Nusbaum

Applicant: Jason Nusbaum

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to apply stucco to the brick facades of the rear ell and rear main block of this rowhouse located within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The rear of this property is minimally visible from Addison Street, an alley that runs perpendicular to S. Van Pelt Street and is a designated street in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The brick at the rear of this building is in very poor condition. The first-story window in the rear of the rear ell is a large non-historic window. The second-story window has been infilled. There are other rowhouses on this block that have stucco covering their rear façades, including 420 S. Van Pelt, which was approved by the Historical Commission as part of a larger rehabilitation project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, owing to the alterations, poor condition of the brick, and the minimal public visibility.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property manager Natalie Ludwig represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she understands that the brick is in poor condition, and asked if there is a moisture problem inside. Ms. Ludwig responded that there is both a moisture issue and an insulation issue. The contractor indicated to the applicant that stucco may add an extra layer to assist with moisture concerns. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the extent of the damaged brick, and Ms. Hawkins asked about the specific location of the stucco. Ms. Ludwig directed the Committee to the drawing in the packet which shows the walls that would receive a stucco application. She also noted that there are neighboring properties with stucco on the rear walls. Ms. Stein asked if the stucco would be cement-based. Ms. Ludwig responded that she believes it will be cement-based, but she will confirm. Ms. Gutterman asked if they will put lath on the brick first, and Ms. Ludwig responded that she believes so. Ms. Gutterman commented that details are needed to show how the stucco is going to meet the windows, roof coping and bargeboard. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff can work with the applicant on the details.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. Cluver warned that if the stucco is not done with the proper detailing, the problem can be made worse. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the roof or gutter may be failing. Ms. Gutterman responded that the issue appears to be soft brick, and noted that consideration must be given to where the stucco stops in relation to the grade, owing to moisture concerns.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stucco is cement-based, with the staff to review details including the stucco detailing at the roofline, window and door openings, and neighboring properties.

ADDRESS: 699 N BROAD ST

Project: Restore facades; excavate basement for terrace

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Divine Intervention Hotel L.P.

Applicant: William Alesker, Alesker & Dundon Architects, LLC.

History: 1893; Lorraine Apartments, Divine Lorraine; Willis Hale, architect

Individual Designation: 5/13/2005

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate the Divine Lorraine Hotel, which has been vacant for many years. The main and rear buildings would be renovated for commercial use at the lower floors and residential use above. The application proposes the cleaning and repair of the brick facades; the infilling and parging of areas where terra cotta statues are missing; the installation of aluminum-clad windows; the installation of a Sarnafil rubber roof; and the modification of balcony railings to make them code compliant. A new stair and rear entryway would be constructed between the buildings. On the south side of the building, an area would be excavated to create a sunken plaza. At this sunken plaza, the basement windows in both buildings would be cut down to create doorways. The proposal for the new doorways at the basement level of the back building should be clarified; it is unclear how the basement windows would be incorporated into the new doors and it appears that some brick infill may be added to the windows to create a transom. In addition, a careful review of window divisions and muntins needs to be undertaken by the staff to verify that the new window configurations will match the historic configurations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the missing terra cotta statues are replicated and the basement door design for the back building is clarified, with the staff to review details including masonry repair and window and door details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect William Alesker and developer Eric Blumenfeld represented the application.

Although not part of the staff recommendation, Mr. Baron stated that it is his personal opinion that the windows at the lower floors should be wood instead of the proposed aluminum clad. Ms. Gutterman asked him whether he thought that wood windows should be installed at all facades of the lower floors. Mr. Baron responded: "That's for you guys to decide." Mr. Blumenfeld explained that he has worked passionately for years to find a way to rehabilitate this building, but that he must be very careful with regard to the expenses. He stated that he will need to work very hard to control costs for this project to be successful. Wood windows may not be feasible.

Mr. Blumenfeld stated that he needs to find a way to make the basement space usable. He stated that they are therefore proposing to excavate to make the basement more usable. He stated that the renovation of the Divine Lorraine is a key to the rehabilitation of N. Broad Street. He asked the Committee to be generous in light of the challenges this project faces and the benefits it could provide to the entire area. He stated that he would do as much restoration work as possible because this building is his passion, but he will be limited by his budget. He asked the Committee not to tie his hands too tightly and make this project impossible.

Mr. Alesker stated that he will work with the staff on the window configurations. He displayed historic photographs showing the historic window configurations.

The Committee discussed the question of replicating the statues that were removed by vandals from the upper floors. Mr. Alesker noted that he believes that six of the 16 terra cotta figures have been removed, and that there are four different types of figures on the building. The Committee members thought that it was important to recreate the figures, but that a substitute material such as glass fiber reinforced material or fiberglass could be acceptable. They thought it would also be acceptable to use one common figural design, in order to save money.

Ms. Gutterman asked where they would be installing the stucco around the new base of the building. Mr. Alesker pointed out on the plans where the stucco would be installed. He stated that concrete would be poured to stabilize the foundation and then a stucco cladding installed on the concrete. It would be entirely below grade. Ms. Hawkins inquired about the design for the new railing around the sunken plaza. Mr. Alesker explained that some of the new plaza would be bordered by a new building to be constructed on the adjacent lot. A low metal railing would be installed around the remaining sunken area.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicants would accept Mr. Baron's suggestion to install wood windows and doors at the lower two floors and aluminum-clad windows above. She stated that the cornice line above the second floor is a logical place to make the change from wood to aluminum clad. Mr. Baron explained that the applicants are proposing aluminum-clad windows and doors throughout the building, but he is suggesting wood windows and doors at the lower floors. Mr. Alesker responded that they would need to determine whether the wood windows and doors would fit within their budget. Mr. Blumenfeld reminded the Committee that strict requirements might render the project infeasible.

Ms. Gutterman asked about other aspects of the project. Mr. Alesker pointed out the proposed ADA entrance from Fairmount Avenue. He explained that the basement extends out beyond the foundation in this area. They are proposing to remove some of the cap or decking that creates the basement ceiling and install the ADA access. He pointed out the interior elevator and stair that will take people up and down. The new exterior material will be limestone. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the limestone wrap the corner. Mr. Blumenfeld agreed, but noted that the National Park Service has requested that all new elements are differentiated from the original elements. Ms. Gutterman explained that the contrast could be in finish on the material rather than in the material itself. Ms. Hawkins stated that it was not a requirement, but a suggestion. Mr. Cluver stated that the Standards use the term differentiate rather than contrast.

Mr. Baron returned the conversation to the window materials. He stated that he was requesting that wood windows be installed in the two lower floors, but he stated that he would approve clad windows at the basement level. He stated that he would even approve clad windows for the first two floors for the east façade. He stated that he would only require wood windows on the south, north, and west facades at the first two floors.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the missing caryatids should be replaced, but could be replaced in an alternate material. Also, a single mold would be acceptable. Mr. Blumenfeld stated that he was concerned about cost, but would replace the missing statues if he can afford it. Mr. Blumenfeld facetiously suggested replicating them with murals.

Ms. Gutterman recommended against the use of caulk in cracks in masonry because of its limited lifespan.

Ms. Stein inquired about the placement of mechanical equipment. Mr. Alesker explained that the cooling tower and emergency generator will sit on the roof of the rear building with a substantial setback of approximately 12 feet. There will be some pipes and vents in the roof on the main building; however, they will be colored the same as the roof to make them inconspicuous. Mr. Alesker stated that they would try to locate the vents on flat sections and away from facades, but the mechanicals have not been completely designed yet.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the monitor on the roof, which is seen in historic photographs. Mr. Alesker explained that that monitor no longer exists and that he would be covering that area with the rubber roof.

Mr. Cluver commented on the addition of guardrails on the existing balcony rails. He suggested that they should have the minimum number of vertical elements allowed by code. Mr. Cluver asked about the door details. Mr. Alesker stated that they are based on historic photographs. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Baron to confirm the details at a later point.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the sign on the roof. Mr. Alesker stated that it would be restored with neon.

Mr. Baron noted the staff's question about the first-floor and basement windows on the rear building, in particular the possible addition of brick lintels in places that they do not currently exist. Mr. Alesker reported that the basement windows have been altered and infilled. Ms. Hawkins stated that, if the basement windows are being extended downward with the excavation of the basement area, then the windows should read as a single opening. Mr. Alesker stated that he would gladly design them as Ms. Hawkins suggested, but he reminded the Committee that they have to please both the National Park Service and the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Ms. Gutterman stated that brick should not be added where it did not exist. Mr. Alesker stated that he does not intend to add any brick that was not there originally.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the multi-light window that does not match any other window appears to have been a revolving door. She suggested something simpler than the multi-light window in the former door opening. She stated that Mr. Baron can assist with identifying appropriate window configurations.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the window frames would be replaced. Mr. Alesker stated that they would be replaced. Few if any survive in serviceable condition. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the windows would be installed in the same locations as they were originally. Mr. Alesker stated that they would be installed in the original locations.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that wood windows, instead of the proposed aluminum-clad windows, should be installed in all first and second-floor openings in main building. Ms. Hawkins suggested that making such a requirement for the three street facades and allowing the clad

windows in the east façade, between the main and rear buildings, would be sufficient. Ms. Gutterman disagreed and insisted on wood windows in all four facades at the first two floors. The applicants again noted that they would consider wood windows for those floors, but had significant concerns about the economics. They asked again that the Committee suggest rather than require the more expensive upgrades. Mr. Blumenfeld stated that he would undertake all of the restoration that the budget allowed, but was concerned that strict requirements might prevent him from undertaking the project. He also noted the parallel National Park Service review. Ms. Gutterman insisted on the wood windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details based on historical evidence including photographs, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10, with the following provisions:

- replacing the missing terra cotta statues, perhaps with an alternate material and with a single mold, is considered,
- the design of the basement doors for the rear building is refined, perhaps with metal panels,
- installing limestone instead of stucco at the newly exposed base of the building is considered,
- wood windows are installed at the first and second floors of the main building,
- all windows are restored to their original sizes,
- the sign is restored with neon as proposed, and,
- mechanical equipment is minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

ADDRESS: 19-25 S 12TH ST

Project: Install exterior lighting and signage; construct bridge to adjacent building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Stephen Girard Estate Trustees

Applicant: Alexandra Brinkman Wilson, BLT Architects

History: 1896; Stephen Girard Building; James H. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 12/12/2008

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The Commission recently approved an application for the rehabilitation of this building. The current application proposes work that was withdrawn from the earlier application before it was approved.

The application proposes flat non-illuminated signs for the east and west facades hung outside the glass. On the north and south facades, the signs would be illuminated projecting signs attached through the mortar joints.

The application proposes light fixtures attached to the cornices at levels 3, 5, and 13. Although they are on L brackets, the mounting also includes screws into the horizontal surfaces of the cornices. No information about the fixtures has been provided.

The proposed bridge would spring from the east façade and span a narrow alley, connecting the historic building to a building to the east. Most of the cornice would be preserved, but some would be cut away.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the illuminated signs are not back-lit plastic faced box signs, and that the lighting is attached only to vertical surfaces, with the staff to review light fixtures and other details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton, lighting consultant Rochelle Spahn, architect Alexandra Brinkman Wilson, and developer Charles Norman represented the application.

On the issue of signage, Ms. Gutterman asked whether they would be back lit. Ms. Brinkman responded that the signs will be edge-lit and the faces will be an acrylic.

Ms. Brinkman noted that that the lighting fixtures on the building would be 3½" high and 3" wide. She stated that they intend to operate the lighting as white and can modify the intensity of the lights by zone. Mr. Cluver expressed a concern that the lighting rendering shows a hot spot in the center of the building that deemphasizes the second-floor colonnade. Ms. Spahn responded that that is only because the columns are being side-lit as they did not want to add fixtures off the face of the building. She noted that they can deemphasize the lighting on the shaft of the building if necessary. On the question of the attachments into horizontal surfaces, Ms. Spahn responded that they are proposing the same design they used to light the buildings along S. Broad Street, which the Commission approved.

On the question of the bridge, Ms Hawkins asked if they had identified a real user or use for the bridge. Mr. Norman said that they had not as of yet, but they were preparing for that eventuality. Mr. McCoubrey noted that it is very difficult to justify the damage to the historic fabric without a real use. Mr. Norman responded that he would withdraw that part of the application at this time.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the signage and lighting, provided that the signs do not have backlit faces and the lights are controllable at each level to eliminate "hot spots," with the staff to review the attachments of lights to limit water penetration, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 2026 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Rehabilitate façade; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: A. Charles Peruto, Jr.

Applicant: A. Charles Peruto

History: 1900

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes to convert a former carriage house into a residential building. The Historical Commission approved in-concept an earlier application, with the provision that the staff determined that the decks and additions would be inconspicuous. The current application differs significantly from the application approved in concept.

The application proposes building a two-story rooftop addition set back 40 feet from the front façade. Although the staff determined that the additions proposed in the in-concept application would be inconspicuous, the current application includes an additional deck at the fourth floor, which may render the addition more prominent. The roof of the carriage house, which was

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

previously going to be preserved to a distance of 16 feet back from the front façade, is now depicted inconsistently in the architectural plans. It is implied that the entire roof would be demolished to construct a new cross gambrel roof. The front façade would be rebuilt with a design that is only partially based on the evidence. At the front façade, existing historic fabric would be removed and Tudor style elements with no basis in history would be installed. The staff would recommend approval of a design in which all rooftop additions are inconspicuous from the street, removal of historic fabric is limited, and the front façade is restored to its historic appearance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, 10 and the Roof Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The owner Charles Peruto III and architect Robert D'Alonzo represented the application.

The applicants presented a revised drawing at the meeting. Mr. Baron explained that he had visited the property and found that there is currently a rooftop addition or dormer, which does not appear to be original but can be seen on the left side of the roof. On the right side of the roof, there is a cricket that has been built on top of the roof to shed water away from the party wall. Mr. Baron noted that the plans call for demolishing both of these elements and building a new cross-gable roof which would shed water toward the front of the building. He further noted that removal of some of the asphalt shingles revealed that the front gable was covered in cedar shingles. The original plan called for a new brick façade to be built in front of the historic brick façade. The new elevation assumes the retention and restoration of the exposed front wall. Mr. Baron noted that it was still unclear what fabric would be demolished and what would remain. The windows and door had been revised on the new elevation. The design of the windows and doors was improved, but still not historically accurate. Mr. Baron pointed out that the architect is proposing to widen the front door opening, although it is not noted. It remained unclear whether the newly-proposed upper-floor deck would be visible or not. The Committee members stated that a mockup should be built and viewed by staff before the next review. The drawings had no materials noted or directions to determine what was actually proposed. The Committee members asked the architect to create scaled, annotated drawings of existing and proposed conditions. They asked that, before the application is reviewed again by the Committee, the staff reviews a mock-up to determine the visibility of the rear additions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, 10 and the Roof Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 48 S 02ND ST

Project: Rebuild front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Honzig Inc.

Applicant: Megan Fitzpatrick, Ambit Architecture

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rebuild the brick front façade of this commercial building in new brick. The building has suffered some settlement over the years and the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued an order to repair the façade. An engineer

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

designed a plan to make the façade safe without reconstruction, but with star bolts and internal straps, which was approved by the Commission's staff. The tenant, who would fund the project, is concerned that the straps would not look aesthetically pleasing. Note that the drawing shows 9-over-9 windows. The correct 6-over-6 wood windows have been replaced without a permit with vinyl windows. The wood 6-over-6 windows should be reinstalled.

The staff approved the reconstruction of another building façade on the unit block of S. 2nd Street because the facade was in much worse condition than this facade and because the engineer on that project determined that it could not be made safe. In that case, the brick façade is being carefully deconstructed and the historic bricks are being salvaged and reused. New bricks never precisely replicate historic bricks.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ben Galbraith represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Galbraith if the owner had changed his mind about the reconstruction now that he was aware that the straps would be interior to the structure. Mr. Galbraith responded that the owner would still prefer to rebuild the façade because of concerns about its long-term durability. He noted that the internal wythe of brick is soft and that there is some concern about it holding the new connector ties. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that previously the engineer was willing to say it was safe, and asked what had changed. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that a pull test could be conducted in several locations to determine if there is a problem.

Mr. Baron stated that all old, double-wythe walls used softer brick on the inside. Mr. Baron added that, if the engineer finds that the wall is no longer strong enough, then it should be rebuilt using the salvaged, harder, face bricks, as is being done down the street. Ms Hawkins noted that the demolition of this façade would remove the very fabric that the Commission is seeking to preserve. She inquired about the illegal windows. Mr. Galbraith said that the windows have been drawn incorrectly, but that they will agree to replace them with six-over-six wood windows.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested a motion of denial, pursuant to Standard 6, noting that a pull test should be done and additional anchors added if necessary. If the wall is found to be irreparable, then it should be rebuilt using the salvaged original face brick, with the staff to review details.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6. Additionally, they recommended that a pull test be conducted, and additional anchors added if necessary. If an engineer determines that the wall cannot be repaired, then it should be rebuilt using the salvaged, original face brick, with the staff to review details. The windows should be replaced with wood six-over-six sash, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

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

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