

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

**TUESDAY, 26 MAY 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
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

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

ALSO PRESENT

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Marissa Parker, Esq., Stradley Ronon
Ed Eimer, Eimer Design
Kevin Towey, Eimer Design
Mary Ellen Weber, Rittenhouse Plaza
Howard Haas, Friends of the Boyd
Rob Bender, Friends of the Boyd
John Gallery
Nancy Mullen Heinzen, Rittenhouse Plaza
Ben Heizen, Rittenhouse Plaza
Gersil Kay, BCI
Rick Gross, 1920 Chestnut Street
Dan Coyle, 1919 Chestnut Street
Maggie Mund, Center City Residents Association
Charles Goodwin, Center City Residents Association
James Pearlstein, Pearl Properties
Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties
Ron Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Jennifer Wright, Daily News
Wendy Forman, 1910 Chestnut Street
Roberta Gross, 1920 Chestnut Street
Fred Fall
Bruce Penzur, 1920 Chestnut Street
James Keller, JR Keller, LLC
Josh Silver
James P. Jennings, Philadelphia Magazine
David Litofsky
Vickie M. Feldman, Friends of the Boyd

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Dan Kelley, MGA Partners
J. Goldwert
Joe Benford, Free Library of Philadelphia
Gabrielle Canno, Canno Design
Christine Bilsky, Canno Design
Leslie McShane Lodwick, Mural Arts Program
Miriam Silberstein
Max Silver, Eighth Silver Property LLC
Bridget Silver, Eighth Silver Property LLC
Bill O'Brien, Esq.
Daniel Greenberg
M. Miller, 1709 North Street
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting Corp.
Matt Garner
Len Davidson, Neon Museum of Philadelphia
Matt Wilkinson, Barzilai Development
Gabriel Deck, GJDesign & Architecture PC
Edward Shim, HLW International
Jack O'Connell, Roseland
Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program
Leo Addimando
David Stafford, City Center Construction
Mary McClenaghan, Barton Partners

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 1900-06 AND 1910 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Rehabilitate facades, alter storefront window, construct tower and connector building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Pearl Properties
Applicant: Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties
History: 1935; Raymond Pace Alexander Building; Frank Hahn, architect
1928; Boyd Theater, Sameric Theater; Hoffman & Henon, architects
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a large development project at 1900-06, 1910, and 1912 Chestnut and 110 and 112 S. 19th Street. The Raymond Pace Alexander Building, the 1900 Chestnut portion of the property at 1900-06 Chestnut Street, and the Boyd Theater, 1910 Chestnut Street, are designated as historic. The remainder of the site, 1902-06 Chestnut Street and 110 and 112 S. 19th Street, has not been designated as historic. The site is not located in a locally designated historic district. The Historical Commission has no authority to regulate any interior sections of any of the buildings. None of the interiors of the buildings are designated as historic.

In March 2014, the Historical Commission found that the building at 1910 Chestnut Street, the Boyd Theater, could not be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted and approved the demolition of all but the headhouse on Chestnut pursuant to the hardship provision in the preservation ordinance. At the same meeting, the Commission approved a construction project that included the retention and restoration of the front vestibule or headhouse portion of the historic theater on Chestnut Street and the erection of an addition along Sansom Street at the rear for a movie theater complex. The Historical Commission's approval of the demolition was predicated solely on a finding that it was not feasible to reuse the historic building, the Boyd Theater. The approval of the demolition was in no way related to the proposed reuse or new construction. The fact that the site would have been redeveloped as a movie theater complex was irrelevant to the hardship decision. Since the approval in March 2014, the property was sold and the current owner has subsequently prepared a new development plan for it. Although a portion of the demolition approved by the Commission in 2014 is currently underway, the current application proposes to retain more of the historic building than proposed in the earlier, approved application. It proposes to retain the Chestnut Street façade, the vestibule or headhouse behind the façade, the lobby behind the vestibule, and some of the easternmost portion of the auditorium, known as the foyer. The approved application only proposed to retain the vestibule or headhouse on Chestnut. Again, the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over any interior sections of the former theater and cannot predicate its decision in this matter on potential impacts to interior sections of the building. From the Historical Commission's perspective, the building consists of an exterior envelope and the structure that supports that envelope. Anything within that envelope, regardless of its historic or aesthetic value, is irrelevant to the Commission.

The development plan includes a tower at the southern end of the site along Sansom Street. The tower would be 27 stories and 320 feet tall. The Historical Commission approved a tower of similar height for the same location on the lot in 2010. The tower would include underground parking accessed from 20th Street, retail at the ground floor, and apartments at the upper floors. The loading dock facilities would be located on Sansom Street. The residential entrance to the apartment tower would be located on 19th Street. The remaining headhouse and lobby section of the Boyd Theater would be used as a restaurant space. The front façade of the Boyd on Chestnut would be rehabilitated, but not restored. A three-story commercial building would be constructed on vacant lots between 1900 and 1910 Chestnut Street. The 1900 Chestnut building would be rehabilitated for commercial use.

At the front limestone façade of the Boyd, the Cinerama marquee would be retained and rehabilitated. A new storefront window and door system would be installed across the historically open entrance vestibule of the theater. The stone scrolls at the entrance would or would not be restored, depending on their conditions when coverings are removed. At the upper story of the Boyd's front façade, the Sameric signage would be removed and the colored glass windows would be replaced with clear glass windows with new frames. The limestone façade would be patched and repaired as required.

At the unornamented, utilitarian, brick east, west, and north façades of the remaining section of the Boyd Theater, new windows would be cut. At the south or Sansom Street façade of the remaining section of the Boyd Theater, a loading dock door and new window would be inserted into the unornamented, utilitarian, brick facade.

At the 1900 Chestnut building, at locations on Chestnut and 19th where the sills had been cut down for larger windows and doors, the sills and window openings would be restored and new windows installed. All windows would be replaced with windows of the same configuration

throughout the building, except at the southernmost bay on 19th Street. At the southernmost bay on 19th Street, the spandrel panels would be removed from the ground-floor window openings; new full-height window systems would be installed in the openings. The façade would be patched and repaired as required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the application, provided:

- the Cinerama marquee is restored;
- the open vestibule of the Boyd is restored to its full depth without the new storefront window and door system;
- the stone scrolls at the Boyd entrance are restored regardless of condition;
- all surviving historic art glass at the Boyd façade is retained and restored, any missing art glass is replicated, and the new window frames match the historic window frames in configuration and appearance;
- the ground-floor window openings and spandrel panels in the southernmost bay on 19th Street at 1900 Chestnut are retained in their historic configurations, not altered;
- all previously altered sills and window openings at 1900 Chestnut are restored; and,
- all replacement windows in 1900 Chestnut match the historic windows in configuration and appearance;

with the staff to review all window, door, masonry, and other details for the Chestnut and 19th Street facades of the historic buildings, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Marissa Parker, architects Ed Eimer and Kevin Towey, and developers James Pearlstein and Reed Slogoff represented the application.

Ms. Parker introduced the project. She noted the closing of the theater in 2002. It has been boarded up since. She stated that her clients are hoping to give a piece of the Boyd back to Philadelphia. She introduced the principals at Eimer Architects and noted that they have a history of undertaking mixed use projects. Ms. Parker introduced the developers, Pearl Properties, and stated that they have experience revitalizing neighborhoods in Philadelphia. She noted their work at the historically designated Granary. She reported that they hope to revitalize the 1900-block of Chestnut Street. Ms. Parker mentioned the historic buildings involved in the project. The building at the corner of 19th and Chestnut was built by Raymond Pace Alexander, a prominent African American attorney. He and his wife, the only African American female attorney in Pennsylvania at the time, had their offices in the building. The Boyd Theater will be incorporated into the project.

Mr. Eimer, one of the architects, introduced the Architectural Committee to the site and the redevelopment plans. He stated that they have been guided by preservation standards and have attempted to design a project that is differentiated from but compatible with the historic buildings at the site. He stated that they have taken size, scale, colors, and materials into consideration as they have attempted to balance differentiation with compatibility. Mr. Eimer directed the Committee to the site plan and pointed out the various aspects of the design. He then discussed the rehabilitation of the front façade of the Boyd. He displayed photographs of the various marquees that the theater had over the years and stated that they are proposing to restore the Cinerama marquee, which partially survives. He noted that the façade was altered for the installation of the Cinerama marquee and observed that they may not be able to restore the scroll mentioned by the staff because the scrolls and the later Cinerama marquee may not be compatible with one another. He stated that they are proposing to rehabilitate that area of the front façade with cast stone; it was altered for the installation of the Cinerama marquee, which

they plan to retain. He stated that they are proposing to remove the non-historic Sameric projecting sign above the marquee. He reported that they would like to install clear glass in the second-floor windows at the Boyd because the space will be used as a restaurant and natural lighting is important.

Mr. Eimer turned to the Sansom Street façade. He stated that there are seven towers over 275 feet tall within a one-and-one-half block radius. All were built after 1960. The proposed tower is set on a pedestal. The tower is set back 25 feet from Sansom Street to maintain the pedestrian scale. The street-level façade is two stories in height and would include 16,000 sf of retail space.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the cladding materials of the tower that was approved for the site in 2010. Mr. Farnham stated that he remembered that the tower was primarily colored glass and steel with a panel system.

Mr. Cluver asked about animating Sansom Street and making it more pedestrian friendly. He asked how the loading dock would impact the pedestrian's experience of the street. Mr. Towey explained that the retail space would occupy all of the Sansom Street façade to the west of the loading dock, which is proposed for the easternmost part of the site along Sansom. Mr. Cluver noted that the main body of the tower is set back 25 feet from the sidewalk at Sansom, but the ends of the tower are closer to the street. Ms. Hawkins asked about the courtyard area above the storefront on Sansom. Mr. Towey explained that the amenity area at the roof level of the storefront area will be open to the sky. The height of the storefront area will be articulated such that it is in keeping with the residentially scaled buildings along Sansom in the area. He stated that the piece of the auditorium along Sansom that will be retained is 65 feet tall. The façade of this amenity area on the roof of the base or pedestal of the tower will be used to bring the scale down from 65 feet to that of the smaller buildings on the street. The space will be open and landscaped. Ms. Hawkins stated that she does not understand the drawings. Mr. Towey explained that portions of the façade of the pedestal above the retail area would be open. The area would have a floor with terraces, but would be open to the sky. Ms. Hawkins asked if the façade in this area could be called a screen wall or frame. Mr. Towey stated that it could be described in that manner. Mr. Eimer stated that the façade would appear like a two-story façade along Sansom. He observed that the old façade was 65 feet tall; this façade will be shorter and more in keeping with the scale of nearby buildings. Ms. Hawkins contended that the drawings lack clarity. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the proposed materials of the base. Mr. Towey responded that the base would be clad with brick as well as stone panels. Ms. Hawkins asked about the arrangement and colors of the materials. Mr. Towey responded that the materials would be arranged and colored as shown in the submitted drawings. He noted that the actual brick might be slightly darker than that depicted. Ms. Stein asked if the design included an Alucobond or metal panels. Mr. Towey replied that there would be some accent panels at the upper levels, but none at the pedestrian level. Ms. Stein asked how the retained loading dock section of the old auditorium would be finished at its west façade, where it would face the new tower. Mr. Towey pointed the Committee to a drawing of the proposed façade for that section. He said that the proposed façade for the west side of the loading dock area would be in keeping with the new building because it faces the new building at an interior courtyard. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the Sansom façade again. Mr. Towey stated that pedestrians will experience the façade of the base on Sansom; the tower will be set up and back. Ms. Hawkins replied that the tower will be experienced from the street. She added that the tower is not completely defined in the drawings. Mr. Towey disagreed and pointed the Committee to a section drawing of the tower that described the terrace area above the retail area.

Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicants to explain the color choices for the tower. Mr. Towey stated that the color palette was driven by the shape of the tower and a desire to differentiate the main part of the tower from the “shoulders” of the tower. The shoulders are more solid and darker. The core is patterned. The color palette includes the darker materials as well as lighter, more vibrant materials.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants if they could provide photographs of the surrounding area that would show how this building fits into its context. Mr. Towey explained that the design of the infill building between 1900 Chestnut and the Boyd is drawn closely from the building that once stood on the site. He displayed a photograph showing the earlier building and explained that its massing and fenestration were very similar to that that they are now proposing for the new building; the old was the inspiration for the new. Mr. Cluver opined that that building was unusual for the area and noted that the developer demolished the building that they are now pointing to as precedent. Mr. Eimer displayed photographs of the residential buildings on Sansom and stated that their scale and proportion were the inspiration for the design of the base of the tower. Ms. Stein asked the architects why they chose a three-story façade on Chestnut between the two two-story historic buildings. She suggested reducing the Chestnut façade of the infill building to two stories. She asked about the use of the third floor. Mr. Eimer replied that it is proposed as office space. The architect responded that the historic buildings on Chestnut adjacent to the Boyd were three stories tall. The two-story buildings are the anomalies.

Mr. Cluver asked about restoring the art glass in the front façade of the Boyd. He contended that the view out from the second-floor windows would not be good if the proposed clear glass was installed; the windows look onto the top of the marquee. He stated that the art glass was a character-defining aspect of the façade. He asked if they had any cogent reasons for abandoning it. Mr. Eimer stated that they want the clear glass for the views out. He claimed that the surviving art glass is dark would create a grey light in the space. Mr. Cluver replied that the art glass could be a prominent feature in a restaurant; he noted that restaurants tend to be inward looking.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the façade materials of Chestnut Street infill building. Mr. Eimer replied that the façade would be masonry. Ms. Gutterman asked whether it would be brick or stone. Mr. Eimer stated that they are still weighing options. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to provide their current thinking on materials. Mr. Eimer stated that they are tending toward brick or terra cotta panels at the moment. Ms. Hawkins asked about the gray and orange colors in the façade drawings. Mr. Eimer explained that the gray would be masonry and the orange accents would be parts of the window systems. He observed that they decided that the color of the façade of the infill building should be different from that of the historic buildings.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she does not understand why they are proposing to alter the windows in the southernmost bay on 19th Street. She also suggested that the window proportions in the drawings of 1900 Chestnut may not be correct. She asserted that all of the windows in 1900 Chestnut should be restored to their original conditions. She asked about the value of altering the windows in the southernmost bay, in light of the fact that they are adjacent to an entrance. She stated that they are not proposing café windows, which might justify the alteration. Ms. Hawkins opined that the art glass at the Boyd front façade should be retained and restored. She also objected to the proposed glass wall that would enclose the vestibule at the Boyd. She stated that the open vestibule is a key feature of the building.

Mr. D'Alessandro objected to the construction of a three-story façade adjacent to the Boyd façade. He suggested that the façade to the east of the Boyd on Chestnut should be reduced in

height to respect the Boyd. Mr. Eimer pointed out to him that the building that historically stood next to the Boyd to the east was three stories tall. The proposed building would recreate the historic setting. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the new façade should respect the Boyd façade regardless of the historic condition. Others disagreed, asserting that the historic condition should be the standard.

Ms. Parker asked for a moment to respond to comments about enclosing the vestibule. She stated that the vestibule was historically open from the Chestnut Street sidewalk back 45 feet into the building. She explained that they are proposing to place a glass wall and door system across the vestibule nine feet back from the sidewalk. She explained that the desire to close off the vestibule stems primarily from safety and security concerns. She noted the problems with the illicit uses of the area in front of the Boyd since it was boarded up. She also noted the desire to convert that space into usable space. Ms. Hawkins replied that one could install a security gate that allowed that space to open sometimes and closed off at other times.

Howard Haas distributed a letter from the Friends of the Boyd to the Architectural Committee. He also provided copies of emails sent to him from members of the Friends of the Boyd regarding the application. Mr. Haas opposed the insertion of the loading dock on Sansom Street, which would create a "hostile" streetscape. He also noted that it would result in alterations to interior spaces which have mirrors and other decorative features. He acknowledged that the Historical Commission does not have authority over any interiors in the building. Mr. Haas stated that he supports the staff recommendations especially as they regard the restoration of the marquee and the art glass. He stated that the vestibule should be left open, not enclosed, and its terrazzo floor should be restored. He stated that he provided photographs of various features that can be used to guide their restoration. He asked all of the members and supporters of the Friends of the Boyd in the audience to raise their hands. Three or four people raised their hands.

Richard Gross stated that he represents a coalition of buildings in the area with 1000 units and 2000 residents including 10 Rittenhouse, the Rittenhouse Plaza, and the William Penn House that oppose the project in its current form. He stated that are not opposed to the redevelopment of the site. He advised that the Commission should apply federal historic preservation standards, which he contended are being violated. He claimed that there are eight standards for such projects, six of which apply in urban settings and should be applied in this case. He paraphrased what he called the standards. First, related new construction must not alter the historic character of a property. A 27-story building in place of a six-story building will alter the character and will overwhelm the historic buildings. Second, new construction should be placed away from or at the side or rear of historic buildings and must avoid obscuring, damaging, or destroying character-defining features of those buildings. The new construction will be between the historic buildings and on top of the location of a historic building that was demolished. Third, a historic building traditionally surrounded by open space must have that space protected. Mr. Gross asserted that the vacant lot to the east of the Boyd is a park and should be preserved. Fourth, contributing buildings must not be isolated from one another. In this case, the historic buildings will be isolated by new construction. Fifth, the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of new construction on the site of a historic building must be compatible with those of the historic building. When visible and in close proximity to historic buildings, the new construction must be subordinate to these buildings. Mr. Gross reminded the Historical Commission that it must be guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He claimed that this project would violate the Standards. Mr. Gross stated that he contacted the developers and asked to meet with them so that an architect of his choice could redesign the project. He reported that the developers never responded to his request. He suggested that the

Commission delay consideration of the application for 90 days to allow his architect to help redesign the project. He asked the Committee to reject the application if the developer is unwilling to delay. He concluded that the project violates the Standards.

Ben Heinzen stated that he represents the Rittenhouse Plaza and presented a letter opposing the application. He stated that two-thirds of the residents of his building would look onto this new building.

Gersil Kay offered the following thoughts:

“The smart lawyer can get around, through, over, above any preservation law, code, standard, or anything. And an architect can get a smart architectural photographer to take a pedestrian design with specifications for low-quality workmanship and materials and make it look like a castle. The point is that the *Inquirer* had a cartoon that showed ISIS tearing down the Boyd. That’s exactly what is being done, this wanton destruction because people can learn from the empirical procedures developed over centuries of trial and error in order to start from the beginning and the green basics which to progress. This means jobs. This means tax revenues. This means improved quality of life. It doesn’t mean building up to the sky just because you can. You need big and little, old and new, construction in order to make civilization interesting. It can’t be all Brasilia, which is new, and it can’t be all something dead that’s not going. We have to keep moving. It’s called progress. But this is not progress. This is destruction for no earthly reason than greed. There is sloth, which is too lazy to do it right. Ignorance that they don’t know that they don’t know. And greed. And these three things we have to fight against. Otherwise, we’ll be back wearing blue and fur skins. We’re going backwards at the rate we’re going. So please, save the Boyd, whatever’s left of it, because it’s one of the most elegant Art Deco theaters in the country and I can show you places all over the United States, larger and smaller than Philadelphia, that saved their theaters because that’s part of civilization.”

Several people clapped at the end of Ms. Kay’s comments.

John Gallery introduced himself as an “interested citizen.” He strongly objected to the design of the three-story building on Chestnut Street, asserting that it is not compatible in numerous regards including materials, color, height, and fenestration and should be completely redesigned. Mr. Gallery distributed a three-page document to the Committee. He observed that the loading docks should be on 20th Street, not Sansom. He pointed out easements on a plan and explained that these easements were designed to allow trucks to drive north on 20th Street and then back onto the property. He asserted that the easements still exist and should be used to provide the loading to the property. He questioned whether one could serve the 19th Street properties from the 20th Street side and then explained that one could serve the eastern side of the complex at 19th Street with a loading dock area that “punched” through the Boyd lobby. He asked the applicants to reconsider the loading and determine whether it would be possible to provide loading services to the entire site from 20th Street through the lobby. Regarding the tower, Mr. Gallery stated that the material and color choices for the tower are not appropriate for this location. The surrounding buildings are simpler, masonry buildings. He concluded that the tower should be redesigned.

Mary Ellen Weber introduced herself as a resident of Rittenhouse Plaza. She stated that she is not opposed to the project generally, but she stated that the developers have treated the neighbors very poorly. She stated that the neighbors want to work with the developers to design the project to “create this wonderful place in our neighborhood that is beautiful, ecologically

friendly, and stately.” She stated that she is saddened that the developers have not provided an opportunity for the neighbors to participate in the design. She acknowledged the developers’ need to make a profit, but stated that the neighbors want to work with them. She asked the developers to commission professional architectural drawings with details for presentation to the neighbors in place of the current, poorly executed drawings. Several people clapped at the end of Ms. Weber’s comments.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they wanted to respond to any of the comments. Ms. Parker replied that they did not wish to respond.

Mr. Cluver asked about the restoration of the marquee. He noted that its appearance differs in the historic photographs provided. He asked if the staff was proposing to restore the marquee to any particular period. Mr. Farnham replied that the staff had not selected one particular point in time for the marquee restoration. He also noted that the staff’s recommendation may not be entirely consistent. The staff had recommended the restoration of the decorative scrolls at the sides of the Boyd entranceway. Mr. Farnham noted, however, that the scrolls may have been altered or removed for the installation of the Cinerama marquee. If the applicants restore the Cinerama marquee, they should restore the areas where the scrolls were located to their appearances during the Cinerama era, and not necessarily restore them to an earlier point. Mr. Farnham concluded that the staff can work with the applicant to ensure that the façade is restored in a coherent manner to reflect one moment in time during the Cinerama era. Mr. Cluver noted that one version of the Cinerama marquee may be more conducive to new signage than the other version. Mr. Towey agreed with Mr. Cluver.

Ms. Gutterman offered a motion proposing approval of the application, provided:

- the Cinerama marquee is restored to a point in time that allows for new signage;
- the open vestibule of the Boyd is restored to its full depth without the new storefront window and door system and an alternative security system is considered;
- the side walls at the Boyd entrance are restored to the point in time of the Cinerama marquee;
- all surviving historic art glass and metalwork at the Boyd façade is retained and restored, any missing art glass and metalwork is replicated, and the new window frames match the historic window frames in configuration and appearance;
- the ground-floor window openings and spandrel panels in the southernmost bay on 19th Street at 1900 Chestnut are retained in their historic configurations, not altered;
- all previously altered sills and window openings at 1900 Chestnut are restored;
- all replacement windows in 1900 Chestnut match the historic windows in configuration and appearance; and,
- the architect consider materials, colors, and massing for the new construction that are more in keeping with the historic character of the neighborhood;

with the staff to review all window, door, masonry, and other details for the Chestnut and 19th Street facades of the historic buildings, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

Mr. Cluver stated that he would vote against the motion because issues of contextuality have not been addressed. He noted, however, that if the motion is considered it should include a requirement to retain and restore the terrazzo floor in the vestibule. Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Hawkins agreed to the amendment to the motion. Mr. Cluver stated that he does not understand the design of the loading dock area, which is too utilitarian. He stated that the loading dock façade conflicts with “the desire to create a pedestrian experience along Sansom Street.”

Others noted that the loading dock section of the complex is a remnant of the rear of the historic building, which was utilitarian. Mr. Cluver contended that the tower and Chestnut Street facades are not sufficiently “contextual.” Ms. Gutterman responded that she proposed the restudy of the tower and Chestnut facades in her motion. Several Committee members observed that requiring study does not ensure that the new construction will be redesigned. Ms. Hawkins asserted that Ms. Gutterman should be clear about the requirement for redesign in her motion. Ms. Gutterman opined that “what is presented does not go with the neighborhood and therefore it needs to be further studied before it can be approved.” Ms. Hawkins cautioned that the Committee must make a recommendation for approval or denial of the application that was submitted and not merely make suggestions for additional study. Ms. Gutterman responded that “I am recommending denial of the new construction.” Ms. Hawkins questioned her, asking whether she was making a motion to recommend denial for some or all of the new construction. Ms. Hawkins advised her to be specific. Ms. Gutterman stated that “I’m actually recommending denial of the materials proposed for the new construction.” Several Committee members responded that denial of the materials only left the recommendation on all other aspects of the new construction undefined. They asked Ms. Gutterman again to be precise. Ms. Gutterman then withdrew her motion. Ms. Hawkins withdrew her second.

Ms. Hawkins opined that the plans for the new construction are incomplete and do not allow the Committee to fully evaluate the proposal. She stated that the materials for the Chestnut Street façade are not fully defined. She stated that the window design for Chestnut Street is not compatible with the streetscape. She stated that she approved of the storefront spaces along Sansom Street, but was confused by the plans for the area above the storefronts. She stated that she does not understand how the tower intersects with the base. She stated that the loading dock seems like an afterthought.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented.

ADDRESS: 715-17 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Construct 32-story residential tower on adjacent lot

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 715-717 Chestnut Associates LLC

Applicant: Andrew Olen, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1888, Commonwealth Title & Trust, Willis Hale, architect

1923, altered for the Integrity Trust Company, Paul Cret, architect

Individual Designation: 3/14/1990

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application is unusual, in that it proposes to construct a residential tower on an adjacent, vacant lot at 709-13 Chestnut Street, which is not designated as historic, but proposes no changes to the historic building itself at 715-17 Chestnut Street. The Historical Commission arguably has the jurisdiction to review this project because the new residential tower would cantilever out over the historic building, occupying some of the air space above the designated building. A historic building is defined in the preservation ordinance as a building, its site, and appurtenances. The air space above this building is arguably part of the site. The new tower would extend 6’-8” out over the historic building about 15 feet above the roofline and an additional 2’-5” out for a total of 9’-1” at about 100 feet above the roofline. The developer of the tower contends that the extra space provided by the cantilever is needed owing to constraints

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

related to the automated parking garage and elevator core in the tower. The historic property and the adjacent property where the construction will occur are owned by different entities. An easement agreement between the owners governs the use of the air space. Neither property is located in a local historic district.

A second application has been submitted for the historic building at 715-17 Chestnut. It proposes almost exclusively interior work. The one exterior component, some masonry cleaning, will be approved administratively, at the staff level.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission enjoys full jurisdiction to review this application because it proposes an alteration to the site of the historic building at 715-17 Chestnut Street, to the air space, even if the application does not propose to physically alter the building itself in any way.

The staff recommends that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission limit its review to the impact of the cantilevered section of the new building on the historic building. In other words, the review should use as its baseline a building of this size and configuration built straight up on the property line separating 709-13 and 715-17. The Historical Commission would have no jurisdiction over such a building. The review should then entail an assessment of the impact of adding a cantilever to that baseline building that extends to the west 6'-8" and 9'-1". Other aspects of the design of the new building such as the parking entrance should be irrelevant to the Commission's review because the construction site is not designated as historic or in a local district and the new building is not an addition to the historic building.

The staff recommends that the Committee explore whether the cantilever will adversely affect the public perception and understanding of the historic building and whether any additional storm water that might fall on the historic building owing to the tower will be appropriately handled. For example, would setting the cantilevered section back from the sidewalk line limit its impact on the historic building? The staff would recommend denial outright if the cantilever were larger, if the historic building did not have a flat roof, or if the setting were not so densely urban with buildings of various sizes.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Ron Patterson, architect Edward Shim, and developer Jack O'Connell represented the application.

Mr. Patterson stated that the properties are separate parcels, but have been joined for zoning purposes. He noted that there are easements in place that allow for the cantilever, but that also ensure that nothing else can be built above the historic building.

Mr. Shim presented the project to the Committee. The site is located on the 700-block of Chestnut Street, with Ransstead, an alley, at the north. Mr. Shim stated that they need the cantilever because the drive aisle and parking system of the interior parking garage as well as the elevator core dictate the design of the tower. To achieve the most efficient use of the space relative to the corridors leading from the elevator core, they need the space provided by the cantilever, which is 6'-8" out from the property line. The cantilever projects out over the historic building beginning at a point 15'-7" vertically above the top of the parapet of the historic building. About seven or eight floors above the cantilever, the glass façade projects out about two additional feet. Mr. Shim observed that the configuration of the building allows for windows on the east and west facades. He noted that there is an eight-foot side yard requirement for the windows.

Ms. Stein asked if the tower is an addition to a historic building. Mr. Patterson replied that it can be considered a second building on a lot or an addition. Mr. Farnham responded that it was his understanding that there was no internal connection between the historic and new building. He stated that the wall between the two is a party wall that is not breached and, therefore, the tower cannot be considered an addition to the historic building. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Commission does not have full jurisdiction over the new building, but only over the cantilever.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants how they are handling additional storm water runoff. She asked how the party wall between the two buildings is flashed. Mr. Shim stated that they will capture all water running down the tower façade at the cantilever before it runs onto the roof of the historic building and dispose of it. Mr. O'Connell added that the rainwater system on the tower above the historic building will not be seen from the street. Ms. Gutterman replied that the concern is not with the visual impact, but with the potential for significant water and weight on the historic building. Mr. Shim replied that the storm water management system will protect the historic building from any additional storm water resulting from the tower.

Mr. Cluver asked if the cornice that returns on the historic building will be retained and protected. Mr. Shim responded that they will detail the connection of the two buildings to preserve the finished return on the historic building.

Ms. Hawkins asked the Committee to address the cantilever. Mr. Cluver responded that he does not believe that the cantilever will have an adverse impact on the perception of the historic building. Ms. Pentz agreed, and noted that the cantilever is balanced by a similar feature on the east side, obviating any impression that the cantilever is visually weighing down on the historic building. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the tower should be able to be designed without a cantilever. Ms. Gutterman stated that the separation between the historic building and the cantilever is sufficient enough to avoid the impression that the tower is resting on the historic building. Ms. Gutterman stated that she is concerned about storm water and construction accidents. Ms. Hawkins suggested redesigning the tower to avoid the cantilever. She suggested removing one unit per floor. She noted that the tower is 19 feet off the property line at the east, but the east façade can be fenestrated with as little as eight feet of separation between the tower and the property line. Mr. O'Connell noted that shifting the tower east to avoid the cantilever would not work because the elevator core needs to be centered in the building. Ms. Hawkins disagreed.

Ms. Stein asked the applicants to assure the Committee that every precaution to protect the historic building will be taken during construction. Mr. O'Connell stated that they will protect the historic building during construction. He noted that it is in his interest to ensure that it is not harmed.

Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that she did not attend the meeting to comment on this project, which is outside her organization's boundaries, but she would offer a comment nonetheless. She suggested that the Commission require the developer to obtain a bond to insure the historic building against damage. Ms. Hawkins replied that she does not believe that the Commission has the authority to impose such a requirement. Mr. Patterson noted that the site is within the Washington Square West Civic Associations boundaries and his development team has presented the project to that community organization, which did not object.

Patrick Grossi observed that other buildings on this block were recently designated as historic and he encouraged the Committee to protect the character of the block.

Ms. Stein asked if the Committee could opine on the design of the parking entrance on Chestnut, which she found to be disruptive to the street because of its width and openness. She suggested garage access be located at the rear on Ranstead or, at a minimum, a gate installed at Chestnut. Mr. Pattison replied that Ranstead is too narrow for parking. Ms. Hawkins noted that Ms. Stein's comment was a suggestion, but the design of that part of the tower is outside the Commission's purview.

Ms. Gutterman made a motion of denial as presented. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 3 to 4. Ms. Pentz and Stein and Messrs. D'Alessandro and Cluver dissented.

Mr. Cluver made a motion to approve the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. D'Alessandro seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4 to 3. Ms. Hawkins and Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey dissented.

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

ADDRESS: 601 W LEHIGH AVE

Project: Construct ADA addition, renovate interior

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Free Library of Philadelphia (City of Philadelphia)

Applicant: Christopher Dardis, Vitetta

History: 1905; Lehigh Branch of the Free Library; Hewitt & Hewitt, architects

Individual Designation: 4/10/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA entrance addition to this Carnegie Branch Library building. The proposed structure would house an elevator, café, toilet rooms, and a rooftop garden. It would stand on the east side of the library at street level. The application proposes to maintain the existing east elevation of the building. However, the addition would be tied into the building just under the cornice below the clerestory windows and two openings would be cut to provide access between the main level of the library and the addition. The addition would be clad with a glass curtain wall system, order to have a transparent quality, allowing for visibility of the east elevation of the library. The glass will have a ceramic frit pattern.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey recused from the review. Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects James Keller and Stephanie Valentine, and Joe Benford, Deputy Director of the Free Library of Philadelphia, represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed removable canopy on Lehigh Avenue. Mr. Keller responded that it is a temporary canopy that would be used for special events. Ms. Hawkins asked if it has any permanent formwork. Mr. Keller replied that the canopy has not yet been fully conceived or designed and it would be used only occasionally. He stated that it would not be in

place most of the time and could possibly be purchased from a tent company and stored on site. He confirmed that there would be no permanent structure associated with the canopy.

Mr. Cluver asked about the compatibility of the addition. He observed that it is differentiated from the historic building. He questioned the materials, size, scale, proportions, and massing. Mr. Keller stated that their goal is to showcase the existing building and to highlight its handsome features on the east façade, which are presently somewhat obscured. Mr. Keller stated that their intent is to differentiate the base course with a frosted glass to correlate with the granite base of the building. They plan to use the ceramic frit to achieve the UV values required and create a patina and coloration compatible with the terracotta elements on the building. He stated that the glazing is used to correlate to the lines on the building. He stated that the panes of glass use the same proportional system as the terracotta on the building. He stated that the elements with color are colored because of the many comments and requests of the community and neighborhood for vibrant colors. He stated that the floor levels will be clad in Trespa Meteon green bands and the elevator core is Trespa Meteon orange.

Ms. Stein stated that she likes the glass and how the addition meets the building and is set back from the corner underneath the cornice line. She opined that the articulation of the glass with multiple frit patterns is a little busy and draws too much attention. She suggested that a simpler frit pattern would be more appropriate. She concurred with Mr. Cluver that the orange elevator core draws too much attention. She suggested that it be a background color or neutral color. She stated that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the interior, but the color draws attention to itself and away from the historic building. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. He opined that, given the purpose of the addition, it should be a more separate structure from the historic building. He suggested that it be pulled away because it is so dramatically different.

Ms. Pentz asked about where it attaches to the building. Mr. Keller stated that the addition will only be attached to the building with a semi-permanent attachment with a pre-compressed sealant system at the vertical joints. He stated that the roof attaches under the cornice below the clerestory.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the reading of the base is not strong. She opined that proportion of the glazing is not the same as the stone. She suggested making the glass clearer as it goes up. She agreed that the orange color should not be above the rooftop.

Patrick Rossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater stated that the addition is fairly sensitive to this recently designated branch library building. He stated that the Alliance's primary concern is the detailing on the glass paneling. He suggested that it is distracting and incompatible with the historic building. Mr. Keller stated that there are two designs for the frit patterns. He stated that one is an abstraction of the window mullions on the historic building and the other is a gesture towards the horizontality of the building.

Ms. Pentz asked if the attachments allow lateral loads on the historic building. Mr. Keller confirmed that they do not. Ms. Stein asked about the base material. Mr. Keller stated that it would be granite if any of the base is exposed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the elevator tower is a neutral color above the roofline, the glass frit pattern is simpler, and a granite base is included if the structure is exposed below the floor line, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 212-18 S 03RD ST

Project: Construct four single-family townhouses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: SLKRC Real Estate LLC

Applicant: Gabrielle Canno, Canno Design

History: 1960

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-contributing 1960s structure and construct four single-family townhouses. Three of the houses would front on 3rd Street and the fourth house would sit at the rear of the property. They would be clad in cast stone, and have double-height windows, a recessed entry, and linear slot windows. These buildings have compatible height, scale and massing with its neighbors. The design features are also compatible with the district as they can be found in some of the Redevelopment Era houses throughout the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Gabriel Canno and Christine Bilsky represented the application.

Ms. Canno distributed updated renderings and additional context photographs to the Committee. She stated that they presented the proposal to the community group and then revised the proposal based on concerns. She stated that the revision includes aligning the parapet height with the neighboring roof.

Mr. Cluver stated that one sees linear windows in the redevelopment era buildings and one sees cast stone, but they are not often seen together. He stated that the development era buildings used brick as a unifying element, which allows the differing fenestration pattern to be more compatible. He stated that this stands out as being very unique and therefore incompatible with the district.

Ms. Stein suggested that the drawings should be better annotated. She stated that the proposed materials are unclear because they are not labeled on the drawings. Ms. Canno stated that the materials are cast stone, black metal panels, and clear glass. She stated that the color of the cast stone is intended to match the cast stone found at the neighboring corner property. She described the color as buff or warm white.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the buildings in Society Hill tend to have bases. She observed that the proposed building comes down directly to the ground. Ms. Canno stated that from the front elevation that there is a partial height wall that separates the street from the recessed entry and that serves as a base. Ms. Hawkins questioned it acting like a base as it is removed from the façade itself. Ms. Canno stated that it acts as a base in that it grounds the building but does not function as a base.

Ms. Stein stated that she thinks that the massing is successful. She agreed with Mr. Cluver that the striated cast stone emphasizes the vertical rather than the horizontal. She suggested that a planer façade would be more compatible with Society Hill.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the vertical striations feel like a reinterpretation of Art Deco. She opined that it does not fit in this context. She stated it may work on a more commercial street which includes Art Deco buildings. She stated that the site plan works really well with one building tucked behind.

Mr. Cluver stated that having the building set back seems counterintuitive to the district. Ms. Canno stated that the first and second floors are set back. She pointed to the context photographs that she had provided and stated that this is something that can be found in the area. She stated that these buildings bridge the gap between the commercial buildings on Walnut Street and the residential area of Society Hill to the south.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the proposal has a grand scale that seems commercial rather than residential. He stated that this results primarily because of the strong vertical emphasis.

Dan Kelly of Bingham Court Homeowners Association stated that the association generally supports the project and they are happy to see the abandoned Salvation Army building being rehabilitated. He stated that the facades are not compatible the area and he suggested that the applicant revise and resubmit the design. He stated that these materials are not consistently found in Society Hill. He opined that the design is very busy. He stated that the applicant did present the proposal to the Society Hill Civic Association two weeks ago.

Joshua Goldberg, a resident on Willings Alley, stated that he lives behind the project site. He stated they recently received the drawings and have not had enough time to discuss the project among the neighbors. He stated that they do support the renovation of the Salvation Army building.

Mr. Cluver stated that the striated cast stone, its color, and its verticality in particular are incompatible with the district.

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

ADDRESS: 240-42 N 02ND ST

Project: Construct 12-unit residential building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 240-42 N. 2nd Street, LLC

Applicant: Dominic Aspite, DVA Services

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a 12-unit 6-story residential building on a vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. The lot was undeveloped at the designation. Therefore, the Commission's jurisdiction is Review and Comment only. The residential building would be clad in a gray brick at the lower two floors and fiber cement panels at the upper floors. The upper four floors would be set back from the street facades for terraces. All stories would have large single-pane windows and be accented by perforated metal panels. The main entrance would be marked by a canopy on New Street.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed building is not compatible with the materials, features, size, scale, and proportions of the surrounding buildings in the historic district. The height, setback, cladding materials, and windows and doors are especially incompatible. The exterior of the building should be completely redesigned to better reflect the character of the district.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Sam Bonimal and architect Kevin Towey represented the application.

Mr. Cluver concurred with the staff comment. He stated that the horizontal banding that is done with the two different colors of brick is particularly incompatible. He stated that he found the articulation of the different colored brick to be arbitrary and inconsistent. He stated that the facades in this district have a rhythm and he does not see a rhythm on the first two stories.

Ms. Stein stated that this district has some 6-story buildings; however, those buildings do not have a base and tower top. She stated that they typically have solid facades. Mr. Towey stated that the historic buildings in this area are of varying scales. Ms. Stein stated that it looks like two different building designs, a base and a tower. She stated that the neighboring buildings have planer facades, where as this building steps back.

Ms. Hawkins stated that Old City is a district with storefronts and buildings above. She stated that this building is different on lower floors but does not read as a storefront and therefore does not fit in with the norm in the district. Mr. Towey stated that he tried to treat the corner and the 2nd Street face with a more commercial feel.

Ms. Gutterman stated the design of the balconies is not in keeping with the district. She suggested that it would be more successful if it did not step back at the third floor.

Ms. Pentz objected to the general massing. She stated that it looks like a building wrapped around a tower, which is alien to the context of the district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the proposed building is not compatible with the materials, features, size, scale, and proportions of the surrounding buildings in the historic district. The height, setback, cladding materials, and windows and doors are especially incompatible. The exterior of the building should be completely redesigned to better reflect the character of the district.

ADDRESS: 101 PINE ST

Project: Replace door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Miriam & Aaron Silberstein

Applicant: Miriam Silberstein

History: 1970

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a new six-panel fiberglass entry door on this circa 1970 townhouse. The front door is set back from the street and is located behind a metal gate. The Society Hill Historic District inventory describes this row of four similar properties as having metal door surrounds with single-leaf metal doors. While the staff agrees that there are

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

many examples of six-panel doors in the Society Hill Historic District, it suggests that a six-panel door is not appropriate for this specific row of buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Homeowner Miriam Silberstein represented the application.

Ms. Silberstein noted that Ms. Broadbent's overview now stated that the staff suggests that a six-panel door is not appropriate for this specific row of buildings. Ms. Broadbent confirmed that she originally had written "for this time period" but changed it to "for this specific row of buildings." Ms. Silberstein asked that Ms. Broadbent agree that a six-panel door is appropriate for a building of this time period. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Committee needs to discuss the specifics of this project at this location. Ms. Silberstein asked if the Committee agrees that a six-panel door is appropriate for a building of this time period. Ms. Hawkins responded that many different types of buildings were constructed during this time period, and that this review should focus on 101 Pine Street.

Ms. Silberstein read from a prepared statement that is summarized below:

A six-panel door at 101 Pine Street does not create a false sense of historical development and is therefore not in violation of Standard 3. This is because there are numerous contributing properties in Society Hill that had six-panel doors historically, and were built in the same time period and in the same contemporary style as 101 Pine Street. 417 Pine Street is an example of a property that had a six-panel door historically that was built in a contemporary style in the 1970s. Additionally, 401-15 S. 6th Street, also known as 536-540 Pine Street, are contemporary row houses built in 1975 that historically had six-panel doors. 408 and 410 S. 6th Street provide additional examples of contemporary homes built in the 1970s that historically had paneled doors. In light of this evidence, there is no basis for concluding that a six-panel door is historically inappropriate for a contributing building in Society Hill built in the 1970s. Six-panel doors are prevalent throughout Society Hill on homes built in every time period. Part of what the Commission must consider is whether the proposed work is consistent with the character of the site and the neighborhood. A six-panel door conforms with both the time period in which the house was built and the neighborhood more generally. To the extent that the applicant is being held to the type of door the building had historically, rather than what is generally historically appropriate, the City has no evidence reflecting that this property had a flat door at the time of construction. The applicant has spoken with Ms. Broadbent about this, and confirmed that there are no architectural drawings or photographs establishing what the door was at the time of construction. At best, the Committee is looking at what the home had in 1999 at the time of designation. Speculation is not evidence, and if the door was not that important at the time of the designation, it is probably not that important of a historic feature. Even if one assumes the property had a flat door, a six-panel door very well could have been installed in the 1970s as it was with other contributing properties in Society Hill. A six-panel door will still allow the property to function as a physical record of its time, place and use in accordance with Standard 3, because it is consistent with other properties built in Society Hill during the same time period. It is important to note that there is nothing significant about this property, and it is not listed as a significant property in the Society Hill Historic District inventory. With respect to Standard 6, which requires replacement of a distinctive feature to match the historic feature, the applicant does not believe the style of the door on this property can be considered distinctive. Houses built in Society Hill in the mid-twentieth century have flat and paneled doors alike, so a flat door is not necessarily reflective of the time period or a particular style that needs to be preserved.

The door is set back from the street and located behind a metal gate, and is not visible when standing on the sidewalk off to the side of the house. In closing, the option of a flat door or a paneled door was available at the time of the construction of the house; other houses in Society Hill built in the same time period and in the same contemporary style as this house have paneled doors, and some had those doors historically; it is not necessarily clear this home had a flat door to begin with, and there is minimal visibility of the door to the public. For these reasons, there is no reasonable basis for denying this application. In advance of this meeting, the applicant spent considerable time and energy combing through the Historic District inventory and surveying properties in the neighborhood, and has come to appreciate just how common six-panel doors are on new and old properties alike in Society Hill. Accordingly, the door the applicant is requesting is 100% consistent with the historical character of the neighborhood and the time period in which the house was built.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Silberstein for the reason behind her interest in a six-panel door. Ms. Silberstein responded that she chose a door that she and her husband like, and that seemed consistent with the neighborhood. She commented that the staff approved a similar door on a neighbor's property that is part of this row, but that door is flat and not paneled. Ms. Hawkins responded that the paneling is the issue at hand. Mr. Cluver asked if the interest in the six-panel door is also of an interior concern. Ms. Silberstein responded that it is just for the exterior. Ms. Hawkins commented that the gate is very open and easy to see through. She opined that a flat door is appropriate for the style of this house. Ms. Silberstein asked for her response to the applicant's point about other contemporary houses that have a six-panel door. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that architecture has many different styles. Mr. Cluver asked for confirmation that the current doors on this row are flat, and that they were flat at the time of the historic district designation in 1999. Ms. Broadbent confirmed this. Mr. Cluver responded that this information provides a compelling, yet not definitive, argument for the original intent behind the design. He added that if there was affirmative proof that this row was built with six-panel doors, he would be more open to the argument, but lacking that and given what it was at the time of designation, he believes that flat was the intent. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. Cluver, and stated that flat doors are common architectural elements in this area.

Ms. Hawkins asked for comments from the audience. There were none.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 6, and added that, at the time of designation, the door was flat. The Committee members unanimously agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 6.

ADDRESS: 251 N 03RD ST

Project: Apply mural to stucco wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Francis Purcell

Applicant: Leslie Lodwick, Philadelphia Mural Arts Advocates

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to paint a mural directly onto the south and east stucco walls of this three-story building located at North 3rd Street and New Street. Both façades were historically connected to buildings that have since been demolished. The staff is generally in support of the mural application; however, it suggests the omission of the brick corbelling and individual bricks that are shown in the current design because they create a false impression of the historic configuration of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the brick detailing is omitted, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mural Arts Program Executive Director Jane Golden and Project Manager Leslie McShane Lodwick represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked for clarification on the staff recommendation in regards to the individual bricks. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff recommendation is for the omission of all bricks, including those in the corbelling and those depicted as individual bricks in the background, because it gives the appearance of a finished brick wall which neither wall was historically. She suggested that the background be a solid color instead. Mr. Cluver asked how the staff viewed the stone base component of the mural, and opined that elimination of the stone base at the corners of the south wall will make for a stronger design. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff did not have a recommendation regarding the stone base. Mr. Cluver commented that these walls were party walls that would not have had corbelling and were not meant to be seen, but that the brickwork creates additional visual interest. Ms. Gutterman opined that the brick corbelling is too ornate and would not have existed on these walls historically, but there would have been some sort of capping if they were built as a finished exterior walls. Mr. McCoubrey opined that only the brick corbelling at the cornice should be changed, but that the remainder of the mural is to be commended. The Committee responded positively to the content of the mural.

Ms. Pentz asked if the brick pilasters on the south (side) wall are actually trompe l'oeil. Ms. Golden confirmed this. Ms. Gutterman noted that there is an offset in the wall, and the mural seems to be attempting to mirror that offset on the other side. Ms. Gutterman asked how the mural accounts for the offset in the wall. She suggested that the mural content may need to be moved in to account for the offset, which may result in the mural being off-center.

Mr. Cluver opined that there is a disconnect between the two murals, although they are not necessarily related to the building on which they are painted. Ms. Lodwick responded that the east mural is the *Allegory of the Waterworks*, recreating sculptures that are in the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Mr. Cluver commented that the artist's other mural at 23rd and Chestnut Streets has a sense of dialogue between the two walls, but these murals appear to be independent of each other. Ms. Golden responded that the artist was thinking about the grandeur of

Philadelphia, and its architecture and sculptures mean a lot to the artist and so he made a connection. She admitted that there is not a great visual connection, but opined that the brick background will act as a means of unifying the two murals.

Mr. Cluver asked about the window and door on the east wall. Ms. Lodwick responded that both exist. The steps leading to the door are part of the mural and do not exist.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Cluver suggesting recommending approval, provided the brick corbelling is changed to a simplified cap element and the stone base is not continued at the corner elements. His fellow Committee members agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the brick corbelling is changed to a simplified cap element and the stone base is not continued at the corner elements, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

ADDRESS: 4127 MAIN ST

Project: Demolish building, construct mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kazimier Sokolowski

Applicant: William 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 an existing two and a half-story stuccoed residential building on Main Street in Manayunk and to construct a four-story mixed-use building with ground floor commercial space and a pilothouse and roof deck in its place. An engineer's report suggests that the building should be demolished, but the Department of Licenses & Inspections has not cited the building as Unsafe or Imminently Dangerous. Moreover, no claim of necessity in the public interest or infeasibility of reuse is proffered in the application.

The proposed new construction is designed to match the commercial properties found at 4227-4235 Main Street, and would be clad in brick and feature a ground floor storefront, arched two-over-two windows with decorative lintels, and an Italianate cornice. 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) and Section PM-704.2 and owing to incompleteness. The application provides no justification for the demolition.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Committee. Attorney William O'Brien and equitable owner Andrew Mulson represented the application.

Mr. O'Brien distributed a set of documents intended to describe the hardship aspect of the application. Ms. Hawkins stated that this is not a hardship application. Mr. O'Brien responded that since there was a reference to hardship in the staff overview and recommendation that he thought it would be appropriate to address some of the questions raised in the hardship

provision. Ms. Hawkins responded that she did not have time to read that amount of paper at this meeting, and that the focus of this meeting should be on the submitted application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant whether he would like to clarify what was submitted. She noted that she read the engineer's report which suggested that the building should be demolished, because there is some evidence of some deterioration, but there's no statement that the building is in any way imminently dangerous or hazardous. Mr. O'Brien responded that the property has been vacant for many years but has not been inspected by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The engineer's report, he commented, speaks for itself. He noted that there are serious structural issues associated with the building, and more importantly, the building is in the flood plain. The reuse of the building, he continued, becomes an extraordinary challenge to satisfy flood plain issues.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the proposed construction has a retail component at the ground floor, but that the proposed retail space would not meet ADA requirements, and asked how the applicant planned to address that issue. Mr. O'Brien responded that that is the Catch-22, in that it is impossible to satisfy both the flood plain and ADA requirements. Owing to the 16-foot wide front of the building, Mr. O'Brien noted, there would not be room for an ADA ramp, and the applicant would have to apply for relief from the ADA provision in Harrisburg. Ms. Gutterman responded that Harrisburg would not provide that relief. Mr. O'Brien noted that the 16-foot wide building with four steps would require a 48-foot ramp. Mr. Cluver clarified that the existing first-floor is already above street-level. Mr. Mulson responded that the current first-floor level is two steps above the sidewalk. He noted that they had a flood survey company evaluate the house using FEMA's maps, and that there is a benchmark on the telephone pole outside the house, which they transposed to the house to determine the first-floor level of the proposed construction. Mr. Mulson noted that L&I would require any "significant renovation" to elevate the first-floor level by one to two feet.

Ms. Pentz commented on the engineer report's statement that the second and third-floor framing is "inadequate to meet current building code requirements," asking what requirements in particular they were referring to, residential, commercial, etc. Mr. Mulson responded that it was in regards to the residential code. He noted that building has had significant flood damage over time, and that the floors and stairs are not properly aligned, and that the roof is bowed. He noted that the properties on either side were developed by Neduscin Properties, which had attempted to acquire this property approximately 10 to 15 years ago as well. Neduscin built large additions and new buildings that dwarf the property in question, and it is the intention of this application to build out to meet those properties at the rear along Station Street.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant seemed to be making several arguments. First, there is a structural or code compliance aspect for which the applicant does not have a letter or decision from the Department of Licenses & Inspections stating that the building is imminently dangerous and in danger of collapsing. Second, the applicant wants to do something better and more in keeping with the commercial aspect of Main Street. Ms. Hawkins noted that, based upon the materials submitted, there is not enough information to make a determination as to the safety and well-being of this building and whether or not it poses a hazard and thus to approve the demolition of the building. If the applicant wishes to apply to demolish the building based on the financial hardship provision, that is a separate application, and the project has not yet gone through that process. Based upon the current information, she concluded, the application is proposing to demolish a historic property and construct a new one in order to achieve a higher and better use. Mr. Mulson and Mr. O'Brien agreed that that summarized the situation.

Mr. O'Brien stated that current code does not allow this structure to be modified. The Committee members objected to this statement. Mr. O'Brien stated that it could not be modified for practical use, and Ms. Hawkins responded that it might not be able to be modified for its highest and best use. Ms. Pentz noted that demolishing the floor does not necessarily mean demolishing the whole building, and that it was possible to raise and demolish floors if the walls are adequately braced. Mr. O'Brien responded that, if the first floor is raised, the second-floor ceiling height becomes six and one-half feet, which is not code compliant. Ms. Hawkins responded that it is an architectural problem, which the applicant's architect could address. Mr. O'Brien responded that there are significant challenges. He noted that his clients are the equitable owners and do not have the standing to request that the Department of Licenses & Inspections inspect the building and make a determination as to structural status. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that there are many methods for correcting structural deficiencies that do not involve demolishing the building.

Mr. Mulson asked whether it would be beneficial to invite the Department of Licenses & Inspections, with the owner's permission, to evaluate the building. Ms. Hawkins responded that Mr. Mulson and his attorney should familiarize themselves with the historic preservation ordinance requirements for demolition and pursue what they see as their best option. Mr. Mulson noted that, if they could get in touch with the Department of Licenses & Inspections prior to the Commission meeting, they could have that determination by the meeting date. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the applicant would like to withdraw the current application or have the Committee make a motion. Mr. O'Brien noted that they are entitled to supplement the application prior to the Commission meeting, and Ms. Hawkins confirmed that they were.

Mr. O'Brien attempted to show cut sheets of the proposed details for the proposed new construction, but Ms. Hawkins responded that those were not necessary until the demolition question had been addressed.

Mr. Cluver expressed concern that, if the additional information is provided at the Commission meeting and the Commission approves the demolition of the property, the Committee would not have had an opportunity to comment on design of the proposed new construction.

Mr. O'Brien asked, if the Commission approves the demolition, whether the staff could provide comments on the proposed new construction. Ms. Hawkins responded that the staff is always available for consultation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) and Section PM-704.2 and owing to incompleteness, and advised that, if the Historical Commission approves the demolition of the building, the Committee should have an opportunity to review the design of the new construction.

ADDRESS: 1704 MELON ST

Project: Construct single-family townhouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Max Silver

Applicant: Max Silver, Eighth Silver Property LLC

History: 1863; demolished 2002

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story, single-family residence with a roofdeck and pilothouse on a currently vacant lot. Two rowhouses were located on the property at the time of designation, but were determined imminently dangerous shortly thereafter. The buildings were demolished and the vacant lots consolidated. The Commission retains full jurisdiction over the property.

The proposed rowhouse would be located on a narrow alley between two recently constructed townhomes. The façade would be clad in brick. The ground floor would feature a front-loading garage and recessed entry, while the upper floors would feature a shallow, paneled bay window and punched, double-hung, one-over-one windows. The floor heights and cornice would generally align with the neighboring properties.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the recessed entry is replaced with an appropriate front door flush with the façade and that glazing is included in garage door, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owners Max and Bridget Silver represented the application. Mr. Silver presented revised drawings depicting a front door.

Mr. Cluver asked why the staff felt the front-loading garage door was acceptable for this application. Ms. DiPasquale responded that given the alley-like nature of the dead-end street and the fact that there are only two other homes currently on the street, both with front-loading garages, which face the rear of a property along Fairmount Avenue, the staff decided that a garage front in this location did not have a negative impact on the district.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the proposed garage was double-wide as opposed to the single-wide garages of the neighboring properties. She commented that she would be more comfortable if it were two single garages as opposed to one double-garage, which creates a dead space along the street frontage. She noted that she appreciated that there was glazing in the garage door, but that it was still overly wide, especially since it would be adjacent to the garage door of the neighboring property. Mr. Silver responded that the proposed garage is 16 feet wide as opposed to the standard 8 to 10 feet. He also noted that they chose to locate the front door adjacent to the front door of the neighboring property in order to mimic the rhythm of traditional rowhouses. Mr. Silver opined that decreasing the size of the door from a double to single door would not drastically change the perception on the street.

Ms. Hawkins commented that one of the main issues was that the front door did not have as much presence as the adjacent properties, which have sidelites and create a more defined entry. Ms. Hawkins noted that the proposed construction needed more of a sense of arrival.

Mr. Cluver commented that another successful component of the adjacent properties lacking in the current proposal is rhythm of bays. He noted that the proposed design has a mixed vocabulary and that the components do not align from floor to floor. While the first and second floors do not generally align perfectly in the typical rowhome, there is still a sense of rhythm. Having a narrower garage door, he continued, could allow for better rhythm of the façade.

Ms. Pentz noted that a significant load would rest on on what is essentially an absent pier to the left of the front door. Mr. Silver responded that perhaps both issues could be addressed by shifting the entrance door to the right to align with the bay above, creating better alignment and a more stable masonry pier. Ms. Pentz agreed, but noted that the garage door would likely have to be narrowed in order to achieve that.

Ms. Gutterman commented that the geometry of the bay should be revisited. She noted that it looks too large for the elevation—the panels look too large, and the bay looks like it is sitting on the door lintel. Mr. Silver responded that that redesign would be possible.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the entrance and garage door were more carriage-house in style than a formal front door would be. Mr. Silver responded that the wainscoted front door was an attempt to create uniformity between the garage and front doors. Ms. Hawkins noted that the elimination of the arched glazing on the garage door would be helpful, as well as the elimination of the beadboard on the front door. She noted that a door with glass above and a single panel below would dress up the door substantially and make it more appropriate as a primary entrance. Mr. Silver responded that they are open to the Committee's suggestions, and would like for their design to be in keeping with the neighboring properties and the historic district.

Ms. Hawkins asked for confirmation that the proposed brick would be full-width brick as opposed to brick veneer. Mr. Silver confirmed that it would be full-width. Ms. Gutterman asked about the other materials on the façade, and Mr. Silver responded that the lintels and sills would be limestone, as would the base. Ms. Stein asked about the material of the bay, and Mr. Silver responded that they bay would be cement board and Azek. The cornice would also be Azek.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the property would be taller or shorter than the neighboring buildings. Mr. Silver responded that they would be very close in height to both properties, but all are on a minor grade.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether there would be any depth to the cornice. Mr. Silver responded that it was planned to be just a fascia board and trim board.

Mr. Cluver commented that the bay should be reduced in height and have its own roof, which would also help with drainage. Ms. Silver agreed, and noted that they could remove the top and bottom paneling to reduce the overall height of the bay.

The Committee voted to recommend denial of the project as presented, but made several recommendations for improvement, including:

- using a single-bay garage door;
- creating better alignment between first and second floor elements, instead of having the bay window straddle the front door and garage door;
- creating a front door with more of a presence to it, perhaps through the use of sidelites or some other element to give it more of a welcoming presence;

- modifying the design of the bay window so that it is elevated from the first floor and does not appear to be resting on the first-floor lintels, and also reducing the bay in height so that it does not breach the cornice;
- limiting the materials to those discussed, brick, limestone, cementitious panels, and a site-painted finish of a cellular PVC material for the bay;
- using front and garage doors that have less of a carriage-house style, but instead have a more true, raised-panel system, and that the garage door have no arched top, but still include glazing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented.

ADDRESS: 2322-32 GREEN ST

Project: Modify previously-approved plan for new construction

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Daniel and Alexandra Greenberg

Applicant: Gabrielle Canno, Canno Design

History: 1948; St. Francis Xavier Convent

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify a previously-approved new construction project on the site of a non-contributing building in the Spring Garden Historic District. The previously approved application proposed seven identical single-family residences on equally sized lots. The revised application proposes to retain the design of the six western properties, the lot sizes of which would each be reduced by one foot, and to increase the size of the eastern lot and to completely modify the design of the property. The proposed new eastern property would feature a white brick façade with arched punched openings and a standing-seam metal mansard roof. While the proposed design features some historic elements, it is differentiated by the choice of materials, the squared-off dormers, and steel and glass entry.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Gabrielle Canno and equitable owner Daniel Greenberg represented the application.

Ms. Canno presented a revised rendering to the Committee, noting that the only modification was the height, which had been modified to align the brick with that of the neighboring property.

Ms. Canno noted that the proposed building is set back the same distance from the sidewalk as the other properties on Green Street. The proposed façade is brick for two stories with slightly arched windows with brick detailing. The proposed windows would be aluminum-clad wood with the primary entrance of steel and glass. The roof would be a standing-seam metal mansard roof with a metal cornice and dormer windows.

Ms. Pentz asked about the context of the arched windows. Ms. Canno responded that there are numerous instances of arched windows along Green Street, particularly for very tall openings on Italianate buildings along the 2100 and 2200 block of Green Street. Ms. Hawkins noted that Italianate windows tend to be two-over-two or two-over-one, but the proposed windows include

many more divisions, and asked Ms. Canno why they proposed those extra divisions. Ms. Canno responded that her client likes the arched windows and greater number of divisions, and also that they were intended to be more consistent with the divisions of the proposed steel entrance. Ms. Gutterman opined that it was awkward for the transom panels to have divided lites over the doorway and over the windows.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the proposed windows were steel casement windows, and Ms. Canno responded that they were not. She noted that only the entrance would be steel, while the remainder of the windows on the façade would be single-hung, uneven-height, aluminum-clad wood windows. Ms. Hawkins noted that the proposed glazing proportion was very unusual because the individual lites would end up being square to slightly horizontal, while traditional lites are more vertical. She opined that the building did not seem to be an “either/or,” and was an interpretation across the board that did not seem to fit in its context. She commented that the design used an Italianate shape with square panes, and that that is what is catching her eye. Ms. Canno responded that they could remove one of the horizontal divisions to create panes with greater vertical proportions, and Ms. Hawkins responded that she was not offering a design solution, but was saying that it is not consistent with the examples Ms. Canno was citing.

Mr. Cluver commented that the design seemed to pull from many different buildings, styles and time periods, but was not a whole of any of them. He noted that, although not particularly familiar with the Spring Garden Historic District, he could not picture any buildings with the exact character of the proposed building. Ms. Canno responded that the intention of the design was not to recreate something that would be found elsewhere on the block, but something that was new but complimentary to other elements that are found on the street. Green Street in particular, she noted, has an extremely wide variety of architecture, and the proposed building would be adding to that wide variety. Mr. Cluver commented that photographs of the block would be very helpful.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the desire for a mansard roof. Ms. Canno responded that the third floor of the previously-approved neighboring property is set back from the first two floors, which have a projecting component, and the intent of this proposed design is to align with the first two floors and have the third floor set back through the use of a mansard. Ms. Canno noted that there are also many buildings with mansard roofs on Green Street. Ms. Hawkins responded that those mansards are on buildings from the 1880s and 1890s.

Ms. Stein asked about the vision for the brick, which she noted was depicted as a stark white. Ms. Canno responded that it would be a mineral-coated red brick, similar to a painted brick, likely in an off-white hue. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the coating would have to be reapplied, and Ms. Canno responded that it would, but that the mineral coating is supposed to last longer than standard paint. Ms. Gutterman commented that the coating would not last forever, and speculated that it would last approximately 10 years and would require maintenance. Mr. Greenberg noted that he would be the owner, and was accepting the maintenance.

Mr. Greenberg noted that he currently lives at 2123 Green Street and loves Green Street. He noted that the intent of the design is to incorporate elements found in the neighborhood, but not to copy or replicate a historic building. He noted that there are a handful of buildings with mansard roofs and a handful with arched windows on his block, even if they are not necessarily on the same buildings.

Ms. Hawkins commented that some significant factors that make this building different than anything else on the street, including the fact that it has a central wide door at street level, rather

than being elevated five or six steps, as most of the other buildings are. She opined that she was most concerned that the overall design is neither of this time or that time, but is trying to bridge and to pick and choose elements, and that the result is that the overall composition is jarring. She noted that there are some lovely gestures and elements, but that as a composition, it does not work well in this place.

Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern that the detailing of the property would result in a constructed design that was different than the renderings. He asked whether the double-hung windows were a Hope's window, and Ms. Canno responded that the central entrance would be metal, like a Hope's window, but that the double-hung windows would be aluminum-clad wood. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the dimensions of the metal versus aluminum clad windows from different manufacturers would be totally different, whereas they are depicted on the renderings as being relatively the same. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that he would like to see real construction details, including the glass sizes, and the dimensions of the frames, meeting rails, and muntins. He commented that the drawings read as though all the windows are metal. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the façade is rendered, but is not what he would consider an actual architectural elevation. Ms. Hawkins noted that the vocabulary of the Hope's system is an early twentieth-century vocabulary, which is different from the double-hung windows in Italianate openings, which date to the late nineteenth century with the mansard roof.

Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the dormer windows seem particularly large in comparison to the delicate windows below. Ms. Canno responded that one of the objectives was to create some modern elements that would set it apart and make it clear that the property was new. One of the ways in which they wanted to do that, she continued, was through the use of a standing-seam roof and squared-off dormer windows. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the mansard looks like an addition to an existing two-story building.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that one element to consider adding is protection over the front door, such as a hood. He noted that this might help make the differentiation between the metal entrance and aluminum-clad windows more understandable.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the size and spacing of the first and second-floor windows, and pondered whether widening them slightly and pairing them up might give a better rhythm to the façade. Ms. Gutterman agreed, and commented that the placement of the dormer windows in relation to the windows below was somewhat disconcerting, and recommended better alignment between all floors.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

ADDRESS: 1709 NORTH ST

Project: Construct single-family townhouse with roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: J&J Properties, LLC

Applicant: Matt Gardner, Sr., Buckingham Drafting & Design

History: 1875; demolished 2015

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story, single-family residence on a recently vacant lot. In February of this year, the foundation of the former rowhouse was undermined by adjacent new construction, and the property was determined imminently dangerous. The Historical Commission staff approved the demolition of the property with the stipulation that an identical structure be reconstructed within one year. Had a true reconstruction been proposed, the staff could have approved it administratively.

The proposed façade of the construction resembles the former building in nearly all materials and features, except that it features a front-loading garage door rather than two double-hung windows. The massing of the structure is also different. The former structure was three stories in height with a two-story rear addition with a deck. The proposed new construction is a continuous three-story building with a pilothouse and roof deck.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided there is no front-loading garage, and the railing of the roof deck is pulled back so that it is invisible from North Street, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Mike Mullen, contractor Matt Gardener, and attorney Vincent Morrison represented the application.

Mr. Gardener noted that the main difference between the proposed house and the building that was demolished is that they would like to add a garage. He noted that many of the other buildings along that block have garage-fronts, and the proposed garage door is designed to match those doors.

Ms. Pentz questioned the doubly-rendered wall on the drawing. Mr. Gardener responded that it is the existing party wall. Ms. Pentz asked for clarification about the party wall, and Mr. Mullen responded that the party wall between the demolished property and the existing adjacent building had to be underpinned and is extant.

Regarding the roofdeck railing, Mr. Gardener opined that it would not be visible owing to the width of the street. Ms. Hawkins responded that the view from an angle would also need to be evaluated, not just the view from directly across the street. Ms. DiPasquale commented that there is a gap between this property and the neighboring new construction. Mr. Gardener responded that they could pull the railing back.

Mr. Morrison noted that all but the immediately adjacent properties have garage fronts along this block, and that they would like to mimic those garage fronts exactly. Mr. Morrison noted that the adjacent property, which does not have a garage front, has a motorcycle chained to the front railing.

Mr. Cluver contended that he is not in favor of garage fronts, but that almost the entire block appears to have garage fronts. Mr. McCoubrey commented that this block appears to have been re-clad in the post-War period.

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

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the Committee recommend of approval as submitted. Mr. Cluver agreed, but the other Committee members did not.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided there is no front-loading garage, and the railing of the roof deck is pulled back so that it is invisible from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1200 MARKET ST

Project: Repair PSFS signage with LED lighting

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Twelfth Street Hotel Associates, L.P.

Applicant: Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting Group

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

Individual Designation: 1/30/1968

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the neon tube lighting from the monumental PSFS sign at the top of the PSFS building on Market Street and replace it with LED lighting mounted in boxes with acrylic faces. The applicant claims that the new lighting will be indistinguishable from the old from the ground. The applicant contends that the existing sign has deteriorated, but has not provided details regarding its restoration. The applicant should provide information about the costs to repair and maintain the existing neon sign versus the cost to install and maintain a new LED sign. Both the building and the sign are extremely significant and the sign should be restored with neon if feasible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, unless the applicant demonstrates that restoration of the sign with neon tubing is not feasible, pursuant to Standard 6, which stipulates that: "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." The applicant should demonstrate whether it is possible or feasible to replace the neon tubing in kind before the replacement of the neon with LED lighting is considered.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton, hotel representative Danny Smith, and sign company representatives Patrick Hoban and Kevin Hoban represented the application.

Mr. Baron presented a letter from the applicant stating that it is initially less expensive to restore the neon sign than replace it with LED, but that the costs of ongoing maintenance and operation are more expensive for the neon than LED. Mr. Baron noted that, since it is feasible to restore

the neon sign, it should be restored, as the neon itself is an artifact and is substantially different from the plastic-face box sign that would replace it.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the box applied in front of the F shown in the application materials was just the mock-up or whether the plane of the LEDs would be in front of the plane of the current neon sign. The applicant confirmed that the plane of the LEDs would be at the plane of the neon. Mr. Baron clarified that it would no longer be a channel.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the purpose of replacing the lighting. Mr. Smith responded that Loews Hotels took over the property in 1999, and wanted to keep the sign lit. Over the past 15 years, he noted, Philadelphia Sign has provided maintenance to the sign, but the electrical system has deteriorated, the neon is difficult to acquire, and, when a letter goes out, it takes weeks to get a replacement part, and maintenance is difficult. He further noted that Loews is committed to keeping the sign lit with the red letters, but contends that it cannot maintain the neon. As a result, the hotel company is proposing to convert it to LED, which would align more closely with the company's sustainability initiatives. He noted that the company is investing \$1 million per hotel to ensure that each is operating efficiently, including through the use of energy-efficient lighting.

Ms. Stein asked how many times a year, or how many times over the 15 years, the letters have gone out. Ms. Hamilton responded that there have been approximately 16 service calls in the past two years. Mr. Hoban responded that they typically receive about one service call per month.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the neon tubing is original. Mr. Hoban responded that the original neon tubing was lost long ago; the tubing has been replaced as needed. Mr. Smith noted that the channel has been modified in some areas in order to keep the sign lit.

Mr. Cluver noted that the neon clearly needs to be replaced; the question at hand is whether it should be replaced in-kind or replaced with a modern equivalent. He noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards call for replacement in-kind "where possible."

Ms. Hamilton asked the representatives from Philadelphia Sign to speak about the current maintenance issues. Mr. Hoban responded that one of the primary issues with servicing the letters is accessing the components, which are at the top of a skyscraper; access of the west facing sign is particularly difficult. Ms. Pentz asked whether this issue of access would be remedied with the LED system. Mr. Hoban responded that the LED system lasts substantially longer, thereby requiring less maintenance, and, although access would be the same, the LED system would be modular and easier to maintain. He reiterated Mr. Smith's comment that the neon components are getting harder to acquire, while LED is becoming increasingly popular and available. He noted that they are down to one neon supplier, as opposed to numerous LED suppliers, and that it can take weeks to get neon parts. Another benefit of LED, he continued, is that, once installed, it can be left alone for a long time, while neon parts continuously burn out owing to their high voltage. He noted that neon is 9,000-15,000 volts while LED is significantly more energy efficient at 12 volts. Visually, Mr. Hoban noted, the sign would look the same from the ground.

Ms. Hamilton asked Mr. Hoban to explain the safety issues associated with maintaining the neon sign. Mr. Hoban responded that OSHA recently reviewed the maintenance of the neon sign, and wants full scaffolding to be erected when maintenance occurs. Ms. Gutterman noted that scaffolding would be required no matter what the material of the sign. Mr. Hoban responded

that the full scaffolding would be necessary for the initial installation of the LED signage, but not for maintenance. He noted that the new design of the LED system takes into consideration the modules and power supply for easier maintenance. Mr. Hoban noted that the neon signage was not designed to be serviced per today's codes and standards.

Ms. Hawkins questioned why it would not be possible to redesign a neon sign to be more serviceable by putting the components that require the most service in a more accessible location. Ms. Gutterman also asked whether the transformers could be relocated. Mr. Hoban responded that the transformers could be relocated but the neon tubes could not. Ms. Hawkins asked how often the neon tubes are failing. Mr. Hoban responded that approximately half of the service calls are for repair to the neon. Ms. Hawkins asked how long it would take for the neon to fail if it were to be installed today. Mr. Hoban responded that it is difficult to tell. Ms. Gutterman asked how often they would need to access the neon tubes if they relocated the transformers. Mr. Hoban responded that it could be once a year, or four times a year, but that there were a number of factors at play.

Ms. Pentz commented that the Standards are clear that the applicant should repair rather than replace, and part of the significance of architectural history is the history of technology of systems like this sign. She noted that this sign is a major landmark. Mr. Smith responded that Loews is committed to keeping the letters, but would like to replace the system.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that one of his concerns was that the neon tubing is three-dimensional, while the LED signage would be strips that may lose their visibility obliquely. He asked how much the LED illumination actually represents the neon. Mr. Hoban responded that there are photographs of the mock-up at night in the application materials. Looking at the images, Mr. Cluver commented that he agreed that the mock-up looks the same as the neon when viewed straight on, but that the concern over the oblique view is valid, and that the photographs do not depict the oblique view. He provided the example from several years ago regarding the replacement of the lights on Boathouse Row. At that time, he noted, the applicant had proposed LED replacements which they said would look identical, but upon installation, do not. Mr. Cluver noted that he had initially been in favor of the LED replacement for the PSFS sign, but upon further consideration, believes there is too much uncertainty, particularly regarding the oblique view.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that there have been 16 separate service calls, just to keep the sign operable. He questioned whether the applicant had ever asked for full-tube replacement rather than incremental repairs. Mr. Smith responded that Loews looked into that years prior, but was not willing to put that much of an investment into the sign. Ms. Pentz asked about the cost of repair. Mr. Baron responded that a letter regarding the cost was being circulated around the table.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that, if the neon system is to remain, it is clear that it would need a major overhaul to replace all of the components so it would have a new useful life. Mr. Smith agreed, but noted that with the LED system, the transformers would be gone, and the letters would be polished and cleaned.

Ms. Hamilton noted that the point they tried to make in the application was that the neon is not a neon art sign, but simply a system for lighting the channel. The original drawings showed two options, one for neon, and one for incandescent—the architects were not wed to neon technology, it was just available, so they selected it over the incandescent option.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Neon sign expert Len Davidson described his experience with neon signs, and distributed a letter to the Committee. Mr. Davidson opined that the sign suffers from demolition by neglect, and has been compromised terribly. He noted that, over time, the number of tubes has been reduced from four or six lines to two lines, and now is down to mostly one tube per letter because it has not been serviced properly. Mr. Davidson described the ways in which the sign had been compromised over the years, particularly in terms of the number and lengths of jumps that have been installed and the distance from the transformers. Mr. Cluver conceded that it is a jerry-rigged repair job, and asked that they move on. Mr. Davidson responded that his point was that the jerry-rigging is designed to fail, and has been failing. With proper loading and maintenance, he continued, the costs would decrease. At the Center for Architecture, he noted, they have numerous vintage neon signs which are run at least eight hours a day, each on separate wiring, and it costs around \$40 to \$50 per month to run the signs. In all the time that he has maintained the signs at the Center, he continued, he has had one bad tube and one bad transformer that he had to service. Mr. Davidson went on to describe numerous other projects he has worked on and the number of times he has had to repair them.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether it was fair to say that neon signs such as the PSFS sign are serviceable. Mr. Cluver asked whether they would be serviceable 15 years from now. Mr. Davidson responded that the parts are easy to obtain, despite the fact that there are fewer suppliers. Mr. Smith disagreed.

Ms. Hamilton opined that everyone could agree that Loews has been an excellent steward of this building, and that, although they are under no obligation to keep the sign lit, they have and would like to continue to do so.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance expressed his appreciation that Loews has kept the sign lit, noting that this is undeniably one of the most important buildings in the City of Philadelphia, if not the United States. He noted that, although he can appreciate the long-term maintenance and sustainability issues, his preference, and the preference of the preservation community at large, is to see every effort made to restore the neon in a way that is not financially disastrous. He noted that it seemed it would be more difficult, but not impossible, to restore the neon. He continued that, although they did their best to make the LED resemble the neon, it is not an exact match; it has a different quality of light, different texture, and different depth. He questioned the suggestion in the application to change the color of the signage from time to time to correspond to events. Mr. Smith responded that the LED system would enable them to change the color of the sign for different events in Philadelphia.

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

ADDRESS: 1818-20 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Alter storefront, install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Boyds Realty Partnership

Applicant: Morris Clarke, DAS Architects, Inc.

History: 1907; Bair Funeral Home; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 8/6/1981

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several changes to the front façade of the Boyd's clothing store on Chestnut Street.

A very large fabric canopy at the entrance, awnings at the upper windows, and two banner signs would be removed. The fabric canopy at the entrance would be replaced with a small, simple glass and metal canopy. The banner signs would be replaced by a single non-illuminated blade sign.

To overcome safety and accessibility problems with the main entrance, the sidewalk would be replaced with a sidewalk that gently rises up to the entrance sill level. There is currently a step up to the sill level. The main doors, which are cumbersome and apparently not original, would be removed and new frameless glass doors installed slightly behind the plane of the existing doors. The setback of the doors is required to meet landing size and door swing requirements for egress. The decorative historic door frames would be retained in place. The non-historic interior vestibule would be replaced with a more transparent, less obtrusive vestibule.

Decorative metal framing would be added to the exterior of the storefront windows. The new framing would hide defects in the glass of the storefront windows, which cannot be easily or economically replaced because they are very large sheets of glass installed directly into the storefront columns without frames.

A decorative film would be applied to the interior of the windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the removal of the doors and the addition of decorative metal window frames; approval of all other aspects of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Baron to point out the film on the architectural drawings. Mr. Baron directed him to the drawing and commented that the film was acceptable because it would be placed on the inside of the glass. Ms. Gutterman asked about the reason for removing the canvas awning and the method of attaching the new canopy. Ms. Gutterman stated that she did not understand from the drawings the means of supporting the canopy. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that it was proposed to be supported by rods extending into the transom area. Ms. Gutterman objected to installing a ramp on the sidewalk on Chestnut Street. Ms. Pentz asked about the structural system at the doorway, from which the canopy would hang. Ms. Gutterman replied that the architectural drawings do not provide information about the means of support.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if they are proposing a ramp or a sloped path. Ms. Gutterman stated that the ramp would project six-and-one-half feet out onto the sidewalk on Chestnut Street. She opined that it would be a tripping hazard. Ms. Hawkins agreed.

Ms. Hawkins asked for comments from the audience, but there were none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the removal of the doors, the decorative metal window frames, the ramp on Chestnut Street because it would be a tripping hazard, and the canopy as presented owing to a lack of information about its attachment mechanism.

ADDRESS: 1530-34 LOCUST ST

Project: Renovate roof top area, install entrance doors, canopy, signage and ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Papermill JV LP and Papermill JV GP LLC

Applicant: Mary McClenaghan, Barton Partners Architects Planners Inc

History: 1921; The Versailles; Frederick Webber, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make rooftop additions and modify the entryway of this apartment building.

A large cooling tower would be located at the southeast corner of the roof. While the cooling tower would not be invisible from the street in this location, the proposed location is the best location from a visibility standpoint. The application proposes to add several rooftop amenities including a deck with two trellises, a dog walk and a fitness area surrounded by five-foot high fencing, a grilling area, and a sky-bridge between two wings of the building. This bridge will not be seen from the public right-of-way. Railings at historic balconies will be augmented in height to comply with the current code.

On the ground floor the application proposes to install new lobby windows with privacy screening, a new door, and ramps with railings for accessibility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the trellises are deleted, the privacy screening at the lobby windows is installed in the interior, and ramping in the interior of the lobby instead of at the sidewalk is explored, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roof Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Leo Addimando, contractor David Stafford, and architect Mary McClenaghan represented the application.

Mr. Addimando stated that this apartment building has not been significantly renovated since it was constructed. He explained that his company purchased the property several months ago and is undertaking an extensive and expensive renovation. Part of this work will include fixing cracked terra cotta and removing paint on the lower granite portion of the building, as suggested by Mr. Baron.

Mr. Addimando explained that his team has explored various options for the ADA ramp location. A ramp in the interior would significantly disrupt the lobby. He stated that the proposed ramp is subtle and symmetrical. It will be parallel to the building so as to not create a tripping hazard. There is an existing entrance to the PATCO line just to the east, resulting in an already-obstructed sidewalk. Ms. Gutterman commented that she lives nearby and knows that this is a very congested area as people access the PATCO station. She opined that the proposed ramp would basically encroach on the public right-of-way. Mr. Cluver suggested that the western half of the ramp be eliminated, leaving only the eastern half facing the PATCO entrance. Mr. Addimando responded that he is willing to delete one half of the ramp.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the doors are historic. Mr. Addimando responded that they are not original to the building. Mr. Baron noted that the doors have an ornamental grillwork, but the applicants are under the impression that this grillwork is not historic. There is a remote possibility that it is salvaged ironwork that was fitted to the newer doors, but there is no evidence to support this assumption. Mr. Addimando stated that he can prove that the grillwork is not historic, and asked the Committee to require its retention only if it is shown to be original. Ms. Hawkins responded that it does not need to be retained if it can be demonstrated that it is not part of the historic fabric.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the support for the canopy above the door. Ms. McClenaghan responded that it will be tied back to a steel structure behind the front façade, and holes will be drilled through the stone to anchor to this structure. Baron asked about the system for managing water runoff. Ms. McClenaghan responded that instead of having an exposed system, storm water will be routed through an internal system running to the basement. Mr. Cluver asked about lighting of the canopy. Ms. McClenaghan responded that there will be recessed lighting under the canopy.

Ms. Pentz asked about the raising of the balcony railings. Mr. Stafford responded that they will add onto the existing railing in kind. Mr. Cluver commented that the building code allows for an eight inch gap between balusters at the top, and noted that it may be possible to put a single rail across the top with just a few points of vertical support. He suggested that the applicants explore the building code as it relates to railings.

Mr. Addimando summarized the proposed rooftop amenities. There will be a deck that is set back roughly 4'-7" on all sides. The railing is a code-minimum height around most of the perimeter. It will be higher in two areas, those being an outdoor fitness area and a dog walking area. There will be a trellis along 16th Street, and a cooling tower which can be screened if desired. The proposed railing is glass and minimally visible. There will be a bridge connecting two sections of the building, which is not visible from any public right-of-way. Ms. Hawkins asked if the deck setback is measured from the outside edge of the cornice, or if it is from the inside wall of the parapet. Ms. McClenaghan responded that it is measured from the outside edge of the parapet. Mr. Addimando commented that the roof has been built up over time, with a slope up to the parapet. This will be leveled off, which will be almost to the top of the parapet. Ms. Hawkins commented that glass railings tend to catch the sun and draw attention. Mr. Cluver suggested a metal railing. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the staff review a mockup of the railing placement. Ms. Gutterman asked about material for the privacy screening around the fitness and dog walk areas. Mr. Addimando responded that they are open to suggestions for the material. Ms. Gutterman suggested metal. Ms. Gutterman asked about the reason for the trellises. Mr. Addimando responded that they provide some shade, and explained that they use heavy umbrellas at another building and those umbrellas become a hazard when there are

strong winds. Ms. Gutterman suggested they consider a canopy or awnings that are retractable, rather than a trellis.

Ms. Hawkins asked for comments from the audience. There were none.

Mr. McCoubrey complimented the applicants on the documentation comprising the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she objects to the exterior ramp on Locust Street, but is in support of the rest of the application.

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

- the trellises are deleted or replaced with awnings or other appropriate sunscreens,
- the privacy screening at the lobby is installed in the interior, not exterior,
- all railings at the rooftop are metal painted to match the background, not glass
- the ramp at the Locust Street entrance is a single ramp running east with the minimum landing, not a double ramp,
- the balcony railing extensions have as few new pickets as allowed by code, and
- the metal scrollwork at the front door and sidelights is reinstalled on the new doors if it is determined to be original,

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

ADDRESS: 2022-24 CHANCELLOR ST

Project: Install garage door in fixed window opening, repaint masonry

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2022 Chancellor Street LLC

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, GJDesign & Architecture PC

History: 1890

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several changes to a carriage house. The front façade, which was painted turquoise without the Historical Commission's approval, would be painted a brick red color with black highlights. Removing the paint is a better option. Several windows and doors would be replaced. The carriage house appears to have been altered many times and it is unclear whether all of the window openings are original. For those openings that may be original, the original door and window configurations are unknown. At the rear, on a service alley, several windows would be replaced including a round window, which would be replaced with a square one. It is unknown whether the round window is historic or a later alteration. Also at the rear, a garage opening would be cut into the façade where an arch-top window now exists. The building already has one garage as well as two infilled garage openings. A garage opening at the front is now fenestrated and a garage opening at the rear is infilled with masonry. The owners prefer not to reuse the existing infilled garage openings because they open into the main section of the ground floor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the new garage opening and the alteration of any historic window openings; denial of the painting unless the removal of the paint is shown to be infeasible; approval of the window and door replacement, provided the new windows and doors are historically appropriate, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Gabriel Deck and developer Matt Wilkinson represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that there is an argument for allowing the new garage opening because the rear street is truly a service alley. Mr. Baron displayed a photograph of the round window.

Mr. Deck stated that he met with Mr. Baron several times. He asserted that the project will have significant preservation benefits that would significantly outweigh the downside of the garage cut. He stated that the garage opening would be cut in a section of the building that faces a service alley at a great distance from any primary street. He noted that the location of the proposed opening is the only feasible location when the interior layout of the building is taken into account. Neither of the two infilled garage openings can be feasibly reopened and used because they both open into the main section of the house. Ms. Hawkins asked if the service alley is a public street. Mr. Wilkinson noted that it is a public right-of-way, but observed that there are many garages on it already. Ms. Hawkins replied that there are garages on many streets.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the façade where the garage is proposed. Mr. Deck explained that there is currently an arched window in the façade where the garage opening would be cut. He stated that the window would be lost, but the arched brickwork above the window would be retained.

Mr. Cluver asked if they planned to retain the existing garage, which is adjacent to the location for which the new garage is proposed. Mr. Deck acknowledged that they do plan to retain the existing garage and add a second garage. Ms. Pentz asked why the existing garage cannot be used. Mr. Deck replied that it can and will be used. He noted that Ms. Pentz was confusing the existing garage with the two infilled garage openings in the building. He explained that the carriage house had two large original openings, one in the front façade and one in the rear. Carriages would enter in one and exit through the other. Both have been infilled. He explained that they cannot reactivate either of those as a garage entrance because they are in the center of the house and the main living space of the house would need to be turned over to garage use to reuse them. He informed the Committee that the existing garage and the proposed garage are in a different section of the building, a small wing away from the living space. He stated that the proposed location for the garage is the only feasible location for a garage. He showed the floor plans to the Committee and pointed out an existing stair, which must be maintained. He asserted that using the historic openings would be impossible, given the manner in which this property has been configured. He stated that the proposed location for the garage is at the end of a small wing that is already divided from the living space by the existing garage. Mr. Deck added that the only stair to the basement also dictates the location of the proposed garage. He reported that the only basement in the building is in the area under the wing with the existing and proposed garage and the stair down to that basement limits the location of the second garage. Ms. Hawkins stated that she is opposed to the new garage because the building already has one garage and because the architect has chosen not to reopen one of the two existing carriage house openings. Ms. Pentz and Ms. Cluver agreed.

Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed windows. Mr. Deck stated that they are proposing to restore an opening that is now boarded. Mr. Cluver questioned the designs of the proposed windows and doors. Mr. Deck replied that they are willing to amend the designs based on the Committee's recommendations. Mr. Baron suggested removing the muntins. Mr. Cluver

suggested more consistency between the various windows. Mr. Deck stated that he is willing to work with the staff to refine the details.

Ms. Pentz asked if the applicants would be willing to try to remove the paint and expose the original brick rather than adding another layer of paint, albeit in a more appropriate color. Mr. Wilkinson replied that most of the buildings on the block are painted and they would like for their building to blend in with the others. He noted that, regardless of what they do, they cannot remove the turquoise paint on the entirety of the building because it is divided into condominium units and they only control one unit. Ms. Hawkins reminded them that the building was painted illegally. Mr. Wilkinson stated that his firm is the new owner of the unit and was unaware of the illegal paint until the matter was raised by the staff. He stated that they will correct the paint on their unit, but have no control over the adjacent unit. Ms. Hawkins noted that the owner of this unit is only responsible for this unit, but the paint could be removed more cheaply from both units simultaneously if the owners shared the cost.

Ms. Hawkins asked for comments from the audience. There were none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the new garage opening and the alteration of any historic window openings; denial of the painting unless the removal of the paint is shown to be infeasible; and approval of the remainder of the application including the window and door replacement, provided the new windows and doors are historically appropriate, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:38 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.