

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

**TUESDAY, 17 DECEMBER 2013
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
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Andrew Kamins, Conservatory Group USA
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners
Lorraine Litvinas
Kara Litvinas
Patricia Dowden, 524 Delancey Street
Philip Alperson, 321 S. 6th Street
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Thomas W. Brown, 519 Delancey Street
Sheila T. Brown, 519 Delancey Street
Arthur W. Etchells III, 315 S. 6th Street
Joan Kleinbard, 319 S. 6th Street
Jonathan Kleinbard, 319 S. 6th Street
Shimshon Zakin, Atrium Design Group
Lorna Katz, Society Hill Civic Association
Caritina Mills, YCH Architects
Mark Travis
Paul Boni, Boni Law
Liz Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
Bill Rosenblum, Whidden Silver, Inc.
Jeremy LeCompte, Harman Deutsch Architects
Andrew Jones, Santander Bank

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 2109 AND 2111 WALNUT ST AND 2108 AND 2112-14 SANSOM ST

Project: Demolish non-contributing building, renovate buildings, construct nine townhouses

Review Requested: Final approval

Owner: Andrew Kamins/Conservatory Group USA

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 1950

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the redevelopment of a large parcel at the intersection of Van Pelt and Walnut Streets. The new parcel will consolidate several smaller parcels with varied improvements upon them and different classifications in the inventory of the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The consolidated parcel will include 2108, 2110 and 2112-14 Sansom Streets as well as 2109 and 2111 Walnut Streets. Carriage houses stand on the parcels on Sansom Street. The properties at 2108 and 2112-14 are classified as Contributing to the historic district; 2110 is Non-contributing. The parcels on Walnut Street are occupied by a one-story commercial building and a surface parking lot, which are classified as Non-contributing. The application proposes the demolition of the Non-contributing commercial building and the construction of nine townhouses, in addition to the rehabilitation of the carriage houses on Sansom Street.

Unlike the previous submission in July 2013, this application proposes updating the facades of the existing carriage house buildings, including the replacement of all existing windows with new metal clad wood windows with profiles to match existing. The drawings submitted for the Architectural Committee meeting did not depict windows with the appropriate pane configurations and other details, however the staff met with the applicants prior to the meeting to discuss these details, and the applicant revised the plans to reflect the staff's recommendations. Some of these changes included the retention of the wood frames for the arched windows along Sansom Street, the use of casement windows to replicate hay loft doors, and the use of simulated divided light windows with appropriate pane configurations for the corner property at 2114 Sansom. The submitted plans also called for the opening of the transoms and replacement of the front and side doors of 2114 Sansom with flat doors, but the applicant has since altered their drawings to depict appropriate paneled doors, per staff suggestions. Due to staff concerns over the potential widening of the side door of 2114 Sansom, the applicant conducted exploratory demolition on the interior of the door frame, and amended their proposal to use a 30-inch wide door that will not require the cutting of any historic brick. The proposed replacement door is a paneled door with transom, similar to that on the Sansom Street façade.

Other significant updates include the replacement of the second floor windows on the non-historic portion of 2110 Sansom Street with sliding doors and the installation of a Juliet balcony railing, as well as the replacement of an existing overhead garage door with vehicle and pedestrian access gates. The application also proposes the replacement of two metal, overhead garage doors on the historic carriage houses at 2108 and 2112 with new metal overhead garage doors. The staff recommended replacing the metal overhead garage doors with carriage-style doors, and the applicant complied. However, the application also proposes to recess the carriage door at 2108 Sansom Street by several feet to accommodate an entrance

into the unit. The staff did not feel that this setback was in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and asked the applicant to explore alternative placements.

The submitted application also proposed removing the applied wood banding/trim from the historic facades, and changing the paint color scheme. During the meeting with the staff, the staff recommended retaining the red paint scheme, as it indicates the underlying brick material for the historic Sansom Street properties. The applicant was amenable to this change, and updated the plans to reflect a more subtle red color.

The proposed new construction townhouses along Van Pelt and Walnut Streets are contemporary in style and would not replicate the historic Second-Empire townhouses that once stood on the site facing Walnut. The townhouses would be oriented towards the west and face Van Pelt Street, not Walnut, as the historic townhouses once did. They would be five stories tall, as opposed to the previously proposed four stories. Parking would be accessed from Sansom and located at the rear of the townhouses. The facades of the proposed new construction are composed of brick, cast stone, and fiber cement panel veneers that resemble limestone/sandstone and brownstone in color and scale.

The height and materials of the proposed new construction are appropriate to the district, as is the placement of garages at the rear of the properties. The orientation of the townhouse at the corner of Van Pelt and Walnut Street, which was the primary issue raised at the July 2013 Historical Commission meeting, remains somewhat problematic. Although the placement of a door along the Walnut Street façade is an improvement, the proposed façade lacks the ground floor fenestration recommended previously by the Historical Commission.

Excerpts from the July 2013 Historical Commission meeting minutes read as follows:

"Ms. Merriman opined that the redesign of the Walnut Street elevation was not successful. She asked Mr. Leighton to explain the design changes. She specifically asked him to explain why the corner house could not be oriented towards Walnut Street. Mr. Leighton explained that the project is conceived as a Van Pelt address project. He stated that they would like all of the houses to have the same address... Ms. Merriman asked if the placement of the corner house was based on symmetry and circulation. Mr. Leighton stated that it was more than circulation; it was also the project identity. He noted that keeping the houses uniform is important to the scale and feel of the development. Ms. Merriman noted that typically residential properties at corners throughout the district have entrances along their long facades. Mr. Thomas concurred and stated that the pattern is not only seen in individually designed houses, but also in speculative row developments. He noted that having a corner house that engages both streets is a benefit to the district. He noted that there is no reason why the house could not have a Van Pelt address and still fully engage Walnut Street, even if the entrance was kept on Van Pelt. Mr. Thomas stated that the proposed floor-to-ceiling windows along Walnut Street are not appropriate. He noted that the future owner would likely want more privacy and request that those windows be blocked or reduced in size. Mr. Thomas noted that the blank bay window, as proposed for Walnut Street, is very common in the side elevation of houses with very narrow side-yards. He explained that the bays are mostly blank for practical reasons owing to the proximity of the two houses, which is not the case along Walnut Street. Mr. Thomas stated that the interior rooms of the house could benefit from more windows in the bay. He also noted that Walnut Street is south-facing which would ensure good light in this corner house. Mr. Thomas strongly encouraged more fenestration in the Walnut Street elevation and noted that the main

entrance can remain on Van Pelt Street. He stated that the revised façade is still too blank and needs more refinement. He suggested looking at infill redevelopment-era houses in Society Hill to better understand how a corner house should address both streets successfully.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the solution to the corner house was developed 250 years ago in Society Hill. He explained that corner houses in the Georgian period had the main entrance along their long façade and centered directly below the gable with windows on either side on all floors. He stated that the solution to the corner house is more fenestration along the long façade. Mr. Thomas stated that the Walnut Street elevation could have two bays instead of punched windows. He reiterated that the south-facing rooms along Walnut Street would benefit tremendously from the light...

Mr. Thomas suggested that the bonus room could also be transformed into a commercial space. He encouraged the applicant to consider a mixed-use space. Mr. Leighton stated that they had already considered that option and that a small professional office with an appointment only business may be a good solution for this corner house. Mr. Kamins agreed that it would be a good solution, yet he expressed his hesitation on detracting from the residential character of the development. He reiterated that the development is foremost a residential townhouse development. He pointed out that a mixed-use development is a different business model, which lenders are hesitant to finance...

Mr. Schaaf asked if they had considered two houses facing Walnut Street, rather than one house facing Van Pelt Street. Mr. Schaaf noted that Van Pelt and Sansom Streets are small secondary streets and that Walnut is one of the primary streets of the city. He opined that two houses that fully addressed Walnut Street would greatly enhance the project. Mr. Leighton answered that they were approaching the project as a whole, and that two houses on Walnut would fragment the project. He also stated that the houses on Walnut would be much smaller than the proposed Van Pelt Street houses. Mr. Schaaf agreed that the houses would be smaller, but stated that they could be made taller...Mr. Schaaf noted that the current proposal presents a secondary elevation on Walnut Street. He contended that, if the project were to have two smaller houses facing Walnut, they could create a grand gesture on Walnut Street. Mr. Leighton stated that a single house facing Van Pelt could also create a grand gesture. Mr. Schaaf agreed, but reiterated that he would prefer two houses and a better scale..."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that additional consideration is given to the carriage door at 2108 Sansom Street and to the pedestrian experience along Walnut Street, with the staff to review details of the proposed windows, doors, and paint color for the historic Sansom Street properties, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Eric Leighton and developer Andrew Kamins represented the application.

Since the project had been reviewed previously, Ms. Hawkins requested that the applicant limit discussion to any proposed changes that differ from the previous application. Mr. Leighton presented the proposed changes to the Sansom Street properties, discussing the changes to window and door configurations made according to staff recommendations. Mr. Leighton then directed attention to the proposed setback for the carriage door and entrance at 2108 Sansom Street. Ms. Hawkins suggested that, rather than a setback, the entrance be moved to the west wall of the property, and the vehicular and pedestrian access gates at 2110 be switched and set

back from the street to create a safe pedestrian entrance into the property. Mr. Leighton and Mr. Kamins noted that this placement might present legal and property rights questions as well as marketing challenges, as the entrance would no longer be on within the property lines of 2108 Sansom. Mr. Leighton opined that another option for access into the unit would be to cut one of the arched windows on the main façade down to ground level. He noted that this would require confirming the width of the window to ensure a minimum 30-inch door would be feasible, as they had no desire to widen the opening, which is notable for its arched top. Mr. Cluver noted that this would not be desirable, as the symmetry of the façade is one of its most pronounced features. Mr. Baron countered that he believes that at least one of the first-floor window openings was originally a door opening. He suggested that the applicants determine whether one of the openings had been a doorway and, if it was, then restore it.

Mr. Cluver and Ms. Stein noted that the double sliding doors on the second floor of 2110 Sansom, though non-contributing, seemed out of place in the overall streetscape, and recommended that the applicant create a tripartite opening. Ms. Gutterman noted that this would benefit the owner in the event that one of these glass panels breaks; the very large panes would be expensive to replace. The applicant was amenable to this change.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the Committee turn its attention to the proposed new construction, specifically the Walnut Street façade. Mr. Leighton presented the changes to the façade, noting the location of the new recessed entrance, and the programmatic changes to the interior. He noted that the main living spaces would be present on the upper floors, and that the light from these floors would illuminate the street below. Ms. Hawkins stated that the pedestrian experience was still lacking, with the monotony of the brick façade at street level broken only by one entrance and the fenestration at the corner. She noted that this was not in keeping with the vibrancy of Walnut Street. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that enlarging the windows at the stairway was a way to bring additional glazing to the Walnut Street façade. He noted that the currently proposed portholes accentuate the expansiveness of the surrounding brick. Ms. Hawkins agreed, noting that circular openings in brick require details that are not depicted in the architectural renderings.

Ms. Hawkins then welcomed public input. Tammy Heilman and Patsy Sauri, neighbors at 126 and 124 S. Van Pelt Street, respectively, introduced themselves. They noted that they are extremely concerned with this project, and the impact it will have on the character of their street and the influx of light and air into their homes. They stated that they have met with Mr. Leighton and Mr. Kamins previously, but remain concerned with the scale of the proposed development. They suggested that the developer cede some of his property to widen Van Pelt Street during construction, at the same time that the sewers are installed for the new properties. A Committee member noted that the historic carriage standing at the corner would preclude widening the street. Ms. Hawkins stated that streets issues were beyond the purview of the Committee. No other members of the public offered comments.

Ms. Hawkins then asked Mr. Baron if he would like to elaborate on his earlier comment. Mr. Baron noted that, historically, carriage houses had both carriage doors and a pedestrian entrance. He opined that perhaps the reason the building has been stuccoed and painted is because one of the existing arched windows was once a door, and the stucco had been applied to cover infilled brick. He suggested that the applicant explore the interior of the property to determine whether there were any indications of a previous door in one of the current window openings.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the Committee approve the rehabilitation of the Sansom Street properties, with the staff to review details, provided that the carriage door of 2108 Sansom is located at the historic plane, and to deny the entire proposed new construction along Van Pelt and Walnut Streets. His fellow Committee members did not agree with the suggestion.

Ms. Gutterman then suggested that the Committee approve the rehabilitation of the Sansom Street properties, under the same conditions as proffered by Mr. Cluver, but also suggested the approval of the new construction, provided that the Walnut Street façade be revised, with additional emphasis on improving the pedestrian experience. The Committee members agreed with her suggestion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the historic carriage houses are restored as discussed, the carriage door of 2108 Sansom is located in the historic plane, and the Walnut Street façade is revised to improve the pedestrian experience, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 113 AND 121 CHURCH ST

Project: Construct seven townhouses with parking

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: A2Z Development LLC

Applicant: Shimshon Zakin, Atrium Design Group LLC

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to build seven townhouses on a lot that was undeveloped at the time of the designation of the historic district. The Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction only over this lot because it is an undeveloped site. The staff finds that the proposed structures are differentiated from surrounding structures but compatible in terms of scale, massing, and rhythms. The color of the exterior cladding is not red brick, but there are other materials like grey granite on the block and the district as a whole includes many varied cladding materials. These buildings are not part of an existing row and they are seen separately from other structures. For these reasons, the staff finds the materials compatible as well. The placement of parking at the back is very positive for the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Shimshon Zakin represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the architect to describe the various materials proposed for the exterior. Mr. Zakin explained that the main material would be grey brick. The base would be limestone. The projections would be clad in white-colored metal. He said that the planters would be constructed of white marble to recall the light stone of the arcades on the adjacent warehouses. The pergola at the top would be white wood and the side wall facing east would be black brick. He wanted all

the tones to be in the range of black white and grey. Mr. Cluver said that he thought the planters should be in a more durable material than marble, perhaps granite. The Committee members agreed that that the proposed building is compatible with the surrounding streetscape and historic district and satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the proposed building is compatible with the surrounding streetscape and historic district, thereby satisfying Standard 9, and suggested that the planters should be a durable material like granite, not marble.

ADDRESS: 317 S 06TH ST

Project: Construct rooftop addition, roof decks, and pilot houses; restore façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cypress Court Condominium

Applicant: Jenny Wan, YCH Architect

History: 1920; c. 1970 shopfront altered to residential and pent eave cornice removed

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a mansard-roof addition on top of this three-story structure. A pilothouse and roof deck would be added onto that at the fifth floor. The curved top parapet and mission-style pent eave would be restored to the façade, which would help to hide some of the addition. The new additions would be visible from 6th Street and from Delancey Street. The staff recommends that the addition should be set back to the point where it is inconspicuous from the street and the deck placed at the fourth-floor level in front and/or behind the addition. A mock-up should be erected and a site visit conducted to determine an inconspicuous placement of the addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration of the parapet and pent eave, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the addition, pilot house, and roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Rooftop Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Caritina Mills and developer Mark Travis represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the mock-up on the building that showed the extent of visibility from Cypress, Delancey and 6th Streets. The architect explained that the pilot house on the roof would be set back 24 feet 8 inches from the front façade and 16 feet from the rear. Mr. Cluver opined that a mansard directly behind a parapet was awkward and inappropriate. He asserted that a mansard is not typical of this Mission Revival style architecture. He also thought that snow and ice would build up in the space between the mansard and the parapet, creating water infiltration problems. Mr. Cluver also objected to boarding up a window from the interior at the rear of the building. He did, however, prefer boarding up in the interior to the removal of the window and infilling of the opening. Mr. McCoubrey, Ms. Gutterman, Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro all asserted that the additions were too large, too conspicuous from the street, and out of character with the architecture of the building. Ms. Gutterman questioned the visibility from Delancey Street. The Committee members voiced support for the restoration of the façade

and suggested that a modified addition reduced in scale and set back from the façade so as to be inconspicuous might be acceptable.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment.

Arthur W. Etchells III, who owns the property at 315 S. 6th Street, contended that the addition was far too large and out of character with the existing building.

Joan Kleinbard, who owns 319 S. 6th Street, asserted that the addition would be highly visible from the street and therefore inappropriate for the streetscape.

Philip Alperson, who owns 321 S. 6th Street, objected to the proposed addition as and claimed that it would be visible from the sides as well as the front.

Attorney Paul Boni, who stated that he represents the Krausers, owners of 535 Delancey Street, said that the additions are too large and intrusive. He stated that his clients are opposed to any addition that rises above the neighboring roofs.

Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that her organization had discussed this project at its public zoning meeting. She objected to the additions, which would be highly visible from the street. She claimed that storm water would run off this structure onto surrounding buildings, damaging them.

The applicant, Mr. Travis, said that he had appeared before the zoning committee of the Society Hill Civic Association. He said that the new building would be the same height as 323 S. 6th Street and only three feet above the height of the ridge of the adjacent building. He said that he was offering to restore the front façade based on the historic photograph. He said the space between the mansard and the parapet would be about 20 inches wide and would be a trough sufficient to deal with the water runoff. He said he has received “pushback” but not “feedback” from the neighbors.

Ms. Hawkins recommended that the applicants consider redesigning the addition with a setback and perhaps lowering it such that it would not be visible from 6th Street. She suggested moving any deck access to a less visible location as well.

Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the Committee should recommend denial

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

ADDRESS: 17 LONGFORD ST

Project: Move building to site in historic district

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Gina Grothe and Barbara J. Marzulli

Applicant: Liz Zimmers, Zimmers Associates

History: Vacant lot at time of district designation; house demolished after fire in 1997

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Greenbelt Knoll Historic District, 6/9/2006

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to move a one-story house to a vacant lot located within the boundaries of the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District. The lot was vacant at the time of the designation of the historic district; therefore, the Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction only over this lot. Remaining on the vacant lot is part of the former foundation, wood fence posts, concrete rear patio, and a wood retaining wall. Parts of these elements will be incorporated into the new design, with the addition of an open porch and one-car parking space. Like the houses in the district, the house that would be moved to the site is a simple, one-story, Mid-Century Modern house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Liz Zimmers represented the application.

Mr. Cluver and Ms. Hawkins requested background information on the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District, noting that this application is the first they have reviewed for this particular historic district. Mr. Farnham provided the brief overview of the architecturally Modernist and socially progressive housing development in Northeast Philadelphia. He stated that it is especially important as the first racially integrated neighborhood by design in Philadelphia. He noted that the developer, Morris Milgram, was nationally prominent in the open housing movement.

Ms. Zimmers clarified that the house proposed to be moved to this vacant lot is coming from New Jersey, and was previously used at the stadium complex in South Philadelphia. The sound technician who used it as a work area at the stadium complex had it moved to New Jersey to use for the storage of antiques. He then sold the building to the owners of the vacant lot at 17 Longford Street, who purchased it with the intent to move it to the vacant lot. Ms. Zimmers confirmed that it is a double-wide mobile home.

Ms. Hawkins asked if this subject building is compatible with the existing buildings in the historic district. Mr. Farnham responded that it is surprisingly similar, being a simple one-story house that is Modernist in appearance. He noted that some of the houses in the district have been altered over time, and that this house looks similar in appearance to those in the district that have been modified.

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

ADDRESS: 542-44 N 04TH ST

Project: Construct roof decks and pilot houses; replace windows and doors; add ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Spring Garden Associates

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: 1902; Integrity Title Insurance Company; Paul and Seymour Davis, architects; 1912 addition

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate bank building for commercial and residential use.

The application proposes to replace most of the windows in the building. The new windows would be aluminum-clad units. The first-floor replacement windows would not replicate the historic window configuration, which are unusual. The historic windows have upper and lower transoms with a large, single-light window in the middle; the proposed windows are paired double-hungs with upper transoms and wide center mullions. The second-floor double-hungs would be replaced with aluminum-clad units to match, but the details of the old and new are not provided. The north and east façade are highly visible; the south and west facades are not.

The application proposes to retain the second-floor single-light and double-hung windows with curved glass at the corner of the building. The single-light windows are an illegal condition and should be replaced with the appropriate double-hung windows with curved glass. The designation photographs show the original windows in place; the single-light windows were installed after designation without the Commission's approval.

The application proposes to replace the corner doors in kind, but the doors shown in the drawing do not match the doors seen in the photographs included with the application. A new door system is also proposed at the non-historic entry on Green Street. It is based on the design for the replacement windows. The new door system should be based on the historic window configuration for the opening.

The application proposes to add window wells and enlarge basement window openings. No details are provided. The railings for the wells are not depicted on the elevation drawings.

The application proposes an accessibility ramp for the non-historic entry on Green Street. The cheek of the ramp would be faced in brick, but should be faced in a material that replicates the color and texture of the masonry base of the historic building.

Six pilothouses with decks are proposed for the roof. Despite the claims of the sight-line studies in the application, which only simulate straight-on views from directly across the street, the staff contends that some of the pilot houses will be highly conspicuous from the street. The two pilothouses closest to N. 4th Street should be deleted from the design. The remaining pilothouses, which are unnecessarily large boxes, should be reduced in size to the minimum structures necessary for roof access. They should have pitched roofs and cover the stairs only where head-height is needed. The deck railings should be transparent metal pickets, not solid walls.

The application proposes to add mechanical equipment to the roof, some of which would be located near the 4th and Green facades. The applicants should demonstrate that the equipment will not be visible from the street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jeremy LeCompte and developer John Burman represented the application.

Mr. LeCompte stated that, where possible, they would like to replace the windows in-kind and in style. He stated that they prefer to install aluminum-clad wood windows, but are open to suggestions for alternate materials. He stated that they would like to change the window configuration at the first floor, where the current windows are fixed. He stated that residential dwelling units proposed for the first floor require operable windows; therefore, they are proposing to install double-hung sash windows to provide the required light and air. He stated that they could maintain the historic windows at the commercial space, but there are three openings that would need to be operable for the residential space. He indicated the three locations on the drawings. Ms. Gutterman asked if the lower section of the existing historic window could be made operable to meet the residential needs. Mr. LeCompte stated that he could look into that possibility. Mr. Cluver asked if they proposed to retain the metal grills on the first-floor windows. Mr. LeCompte stated that they plan to remove the grills. Ms. Gutterman asked if the grills are historic. Ms. Coté located a photograph from 1908 showing the grills in place. Ms. Gutterman stated that the grills are original and should remain. She suggested that the top and bottom sections of the first-floor windows be made operable with hoppers, while maintaining the historic configuration of the window.

Mr. LeCompte stated that they now propose to maintain the existing entrance doors.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the window wells. Mr. LeCompte stated that the window wells exist and that they propose to reopening some infilled windows and putting flush metal grates over the wells. He stated that the stairwell would need a handrail and one currently exists.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed pilothouses would occupy a large portion of the roof. Mr. LeCompte stated that their size is determined by the interior stair layout. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the stairs could be joined to reduce the number of pilot houses. Mr. LeCompte stated that the roof access points are limited due to the roof truss layout and they would like to provide a separate access for each unit. He stated that he could alter the form of the pilothouses and give some pitch to their roofs to make them less visible. Mr. Cluver suggested using one pilothouse to access the deck from a common stair shared by all the units. Ms. Gutterman suggested review of a mock up to determine the degrees to which the pilothouses are visible and should be scaled back.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization agrees with the staff recommendation and suggested that the pilothouses be redesigned.

Mr. Baron suggested that the ramp would be more compatible with the building if it was clad in a stone material that matches the base of the building. He also suggested that the illegal single-light curved windows should be replaced with the appropriate one-over-one. Mr. LeCompte

stated that he was unaware of the illegal condition and that he was concerned about the cost of restoring the curved windows.

Ms. Hawkins advised the applicant to look into the suggestions that the Committee has made and make revisions to the proposal either prior to the Historical Commission meeting or for resubmission.

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

ADDRESS: 1616-26 WALNUT ST

Project: Renovate interior for commercial banking; New exterior signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Leo Addimando

Applicant: Bill Rosenblum, Whidden Silver, Inc.

History: 1929; 1616 Walnut Street Building; Tilden, Register & Pepper, architects

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to attach new signage for Santander Bank to the exterior front façade. This proposed signage includes one internally illuminated channel letter sign centered above the front windows; one internally illuminated canopy sign above the main entrance door; and one bronze plaque with Santander brand mark on the façade between the entrance door and windows. The Preservation Alliance holds a façade easement on this building.

The internally illuminated channel letters sign above the windows is attached to a bronze clad support beam secured with three inch square bronze plate. The sign is approximately 12'-6" in length, leaving a minimum of three inch reveal of glazing around the top and sides of the lettering and logo. The capital "S" in the sign is approximately 1'-7" in height, which satisfies the previously approved letter height limit for this façade.

The internally illuminated canopy sign above the front entrance door has a red background with white logo and security down lighting. The canopy is approximately 4'-10" in length and approximately 1'-1" in height. It projects approximately 12 inches over the property line. It is unclear whether the entire canopy would be illuminated, or solely the white letters.

The bronze plaque would replace an existing, similar bronze plaque.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the window sign and plaque, pursuant to the Commission's earlier approvals; no recommendation on the canopy sign until additional information is provided.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. William Rosenblum and Andrea Jones represented the application.

Ms. Coté noted that the design of the canopy is not completely defined. Mr. Rosenblum stated that the bank would like a completely illuminated canopy sign at the door. He stated that, as proposed, it would project 12 inches but that the projection could be reduced. He stated that the red color is their brand mark. He stated that the canopy would be a canvas material that would glow with the internal illumination. Mr. Cluver stated that the drawings indicate that the canopy will be acrylic.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the previous Historical Commission approval included a canopy. Ms. Coté replied that the previous approval included an awning over the door, not an illuminated canopy. Ms. Hawkins opined that the current proposal differs too much from the awning that was previously approved. She stated that a light box is now proposed even though the Commission approved a non-illuminated canvas awning. Mr. Cluver stated that there is ample street lighting in this location and there is no need for lighted signs.

Mr. Leech stated that the Preservation Alliance holds an easement on the building and has not approved and is not likely to approve the internally illuminated canopy. He stated that two signage configurations have been approved by the Alliance; one with freestanding letters and the other with a black, specifically black, canvas awning over the door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the window sign and plaque, pursuant to the Commission's earlier approvals; denial of the canopy, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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.