

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

**TUESDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

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

ALSO PRESENT

Gleb Dolgy, R.A. D2 Solutions
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Becky Sitarchuk
Brett Webber
Marcello Ciorlino
T.H. McCalla
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects
Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development
Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture
Tiffany Fasone
Megan Fitzpatrick, Ambit Inc.
David Traub AIA
Jason Birl, Ambit Inc.
Kristin Pool, Ambit Inc.
Charles Peruto, Peruto Development
Stuart Rosenberg
David Patchetsky
Brian Thripleton
Kirk & Cindy Prat
Kate McGlinchey
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
Jim Curry
Mark Fink
John Pringle
Brett Renfer
Mark Merlini, Brickstone
Peter Moriarty

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Mr. D'Alessandro joined him.

ADDRESS: 828-38 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Install ATM in altered storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Korman Communities

Applicant: Richard Seitchick, Joe Freidman Construction Corp.

History: 1925; Benjamin Franklin Hotel; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-original aluminum and glass storefront at the easternmost opening along the building's Chestnut Street façade and to replace it with a new storefront design. The proposed storefront would consist of a metal panel clad canopy over existing stone trim, aluminum panels with a custom graphic powder coated finish, an ATM, and a swing door to allow service access only. The current configuration, with the exception of a recessed entry door, stands in plane with the face of the building. The proposed configuration would recess the entire aluminum panel and door system approximately 2 feet from the main façade. The Preservation Alliance holds a façade easement on the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Gleb Dolgy represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the canopy designed to sit proud of the building could be set back in the same relationship as the existing storefront. Mr. Dolgy replied that the Alliance's Easement Committee asked the same question and answered that he did not know whether there would be a way to reconcile the proposed canopy design with the existing marble surround. The existing surround, he added, is in poor condition. Mr. Dolgy added that he is sensitive to any concerns related to maintaining the historic integrity of the property and is very much willing to redesign the façade, although he asserted that removing the black metal canopy in its entirety would require him to reconceptualize the whole design. Mr. Cluver asked whether the canopy could be set within the stone surround. Mr. Dolgy replied that there certainly are ways to make the two features coexist, but argued that in eliminating the metal paneling to make the two materials work together, he would be attempting to shoehorn one material to make it work with the existing façade. Mr. Dolgy offered that if eliminating the metal paneling, the best route to pursue would be to introduce a fabric awning similar to those existing at the Ben Franklin building. In lieu of the metal paneling, he suggested using a Kawneer storefront system with black anodized 2-inch frames.

Mr. Cluver clarified that the recommendation was to bring the black frame inside the surround. Mr. Dolgy responded that he would present the recommendation to the client. Mr. Cluver noted that the bright red panel concerned him and described the element as a very aggressive design. Although he acknowledged the reasoning behind introducing the black frame to disguise the surround's condition, Mr. Cluver argued that the frame overlaps a portion of the building to the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 13 DECEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

west, making it appear to shift a couple inches. If set within the opening, he contended, the frame would hold a much cleaner relationship to the building. Mr. Dolgy replied that he could create a reveal between the two materials to set them in and provide a contrast. He reiterated that he would present the idea to the client to see how the client would like to proceed.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the stone surround is part of the previous storefront alteration or if it dates to the original building. Ms. Keller answered that, while there is no clear historic image of the entryway, there is a very oblique photograph showing the opening in 1963, and the surround appears to have existed at that time. Ms. Stein inquired whether the surround is stone or terra cotta. Mr. Dolgy replied that the façade is limestone and the trim is marble. Ms. Gutterman observed that the base is granite, the majority of the façade is limestone, and that the material changes to terra cotta. Ms. Gutterman then stated her support for Mr. Cluver's suggestion that the storefront be set back and that no elements cover the historic material of the surround. She also noted that adding an awning is problematic. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the staff considered requiring that the ATM be moved to be in plane with the building's façade rather than allowing it to be recessed. Ms. Keller answered that when the staff reviewed the application, there was no discussion regarding where to place the ATM.

Mr. Cluver noted that, because the existing door is set back, a case could be made to recess the entire entryway, although he cautioned against creating a sleeping area. Mr. Dolgy responded that First Trust has voiced concern over creating a sleeping area, which is why the proposed design contains a minimal recess. Mr. Cluver commented that there should be some shelter for ATM users but not enough to make it conducive to sleeping. Mr. Dolgy suggested that an 18-inch setback may be more desirable.

Mr. Cluver asked the Committee members their thoughts on the proposed color and noted that he would like to see it considerably toned down. Mr. Dolgy stated that their original design to the client included the inverse colors that showed a white background with red lettering. That design, he added, did not align with the current branding philosophy of First Trust. Mr. Cluver countered that First Trust's branding does not align with the historic building and asked that the original design concept be reconsidered. Ms. Stein remarked that the design is akin to placing a billboard on the side of a building, which is inappropriate for a historic structure. She noted that within the entire frame is contained a sign for First Trust Bank and that the red color and logo does not need to be so large. Many ATMs in the city, she continued, have a signage area closer to the size of a door. She reiterated that the proposed signage was a choice and consequently has the appearance of a billboard. She asked that the sign be reduced in size. Mr. Dolgy requested clarification on what Ms. Stein is referring as the sign. Ms. Stein explained that the entire graphic appears as a billboard pasted to the building. If it were reduced in the frame, she added, the graphic would be more complementary to the two adjacent structures. Mr. Dolgy commented that his intent was to work with the existing stone surrounds and maintain those same proportions and to be respectful to the historic design.

Ms. Pentz noted the mention of a canopy in the application and stated that she would prefer that the graphic be placed on a canopy rather than the entire entryway. In its current form, she continued, the design is analogous to a giant Coke machine and is inappropriate. She argued that there is more precedent around the city for canopies. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that he would rather see the graphic on a canopy than an ATM façade in the plane of the building.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the door serves as emergency egress or if it is used for personnel. Mr. Dolgy replied that the limited interior space is not sufficient to house a proper bank branch, so the entry system would serve exclusively as an ATM and the door would allow

for the servicing of the machine. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if another access point for the ATM exists. Mr. Dolgy answered that this model ATM is serviced from the back. Mr. Cluver added that the exterior door would be necessary to prevent people from entering through another tenant's space. Mr. Dolgy noted that the intention was to make the door appear monolithic, as if one solid surface with the rest of the panel. Mr. D'Alessandro made several suggestions to introduce glass and reduce the effect of the solid metal paneling. Mr. Dolgy offered that the transom could be glass, although no renovation at the interior is planned.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia noted that the Alliance's Easement Committee provided conceptual review and proffered many of the suggestions provided by the Architectural Committee. The Easement Committee, he continued, noted the graphic heaviness and requested the design be more modest. According to Mr. Grossi, the Easement Committee also requested that the original surround be restored or replaced in kind, the proposed panel be recessed slightly to maintain the surround, and the frame be made thinner and more consistent with adjacent windows. He also noted the Easement Committee's suggestion that a stone water table be considered to make the design more consistent with adjacent windows.

Mr. Cluver reiterated that two suggestions to resolve the shelter issue had been made: to place the ATM at the plane of the storefront and introduce a canopy, and to recess the entire system. Before making a motion, he asked the Committee members which option is preferable. Ms. Gutterman voiced her concerns about the height of a potential canopy and applying the First Trust logo to it. She indicated that she was more inclined to proceed with recessing the system in the existing façade, maintaining the proportion, and adjusting the color palette to be more neutral.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with the following suggestions:

- inserting the new system within the existing stone surround, and restoring or replacing in kind the stone surround;
- installing the new system at the plane of the façade or no more than two feet recessed from the façade;
- omitting any canopy;
- avoiding creating a billboard;
- greatly reducing the red in the signage and introducing more neutral tones to be more in keeping with the historic building;
- giving the frame being inserted within the surround a thinner profile;
- considering a stone water table.

ADDRESS: 322 DELANCEY ST

Proposal: Demolish rear roof and dormer, construct full-width shed dormer

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: J. Rory Boyle & Laure W. Boyle

Applicant: Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects, PC

History: 1786; Jonathan Evans, house carpenter; 1969

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear roof and dormer and to construct a full-width, metal-roofed shed dormer. The building is listed as significant in the Society Hill Historic District, and the side and rear of the property are partially visible from St. Peter's Way. In addition to the roof alteration, full-height sliding glass door panels would be installed under the shed dormer, and the east-facing windows would be replaced. The application also proposes several first-story alterations, including new paving at the existing side yard and enlarging several existing window openings to install new sliding door assemblies.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Brett Webber represented the application.

Mr. Webber stated that a young family recently acquired the property and intends to use it as a single-family residence. The rooftop, he continued, had been previously developed as the main outdoor space and that a prior modification to the rear shed dormer allowed for its conversion into a storage closet. He added that the building has an existing rear deck which is not to be modified. The proposal, Mr. Webber explained, includes maintaining the east façade and exposing the historic rake of the roof. He clarified that the proposed window replacements at the east façade would be subject to staff review and would be replaced in kind with divided lights. He asserted that the proposed shed dormer is consistent with modifications by accretion evident at a number of residences throughout the historic neighborhood where shed dormers have been extended beyond the ridgeline of the roof. This proposal, Mr. Webber continued, shows an effort to set back the shed dormer from the east façade in such a way as to honor and maintain the historic profile of the east façade, which is the building's main contributing feature. Additionally, Mr. Webber stated, the shed dormer has been detailed to make it consistent with period renovations or additions that have clapboard siding consisting of painted wood. He noted that the south-facing windows are largely not visible from St. Peters Way or Delancey Street and remarked that the mechanical equipment, which is currently visible from the public right-of-way, would be relocated to a new location away from public view. Mr. Webber distributed a massing study to the Committee that showed the property from Delancey Street looking west. He described the study, which showed the volumetric massing of the shed dormer relative to the existing condition at the primary face of the east gable and from St. Peters Way.

Ms. Pentz stated that she found the application problematic, because of the building's significance, and briefly noted its association with the historical figure Jonathan Evans. She remarked that care was obviously taken to retain the dormer during the previous alteration when the roof deck was introduced and argued that a previous alteration does not justify the loss of the dormer. Ms. Stein added that the use of the term "shed dormer" is not descriptive of the feature proposed in the application. She commented that she views the proposed alteration as a roof addition, because it sets back 6 inches, which isn't substantial enough to distinguish the

form as a dormer. She asserted that the proposed design changes the roofline and that the 10- or 12-foot setback of the existing dormer makes it much more subtle.

Mr. Webber responded that he evaluated the potential for increasing the setback of the addition so there would be a more significant adjustment from the ridgeline of the roof and the east face. Currently, he continued, there is a 6-inch offset from the edge of the roof. Given the substantial wall thicknesses, he added, one foot of depth could easily be accommodated.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether Mr. Webber is proposing to remove the original roof structure to install the dormer. Mr. Webber answered that they would cut in and would not remove the framing at the far east portion of the roof. Ms. Gutterman countered that the work would result in the complete loss of original roof structure at the south. Mr. Webber concurred that the roof from the ridgeline toward the rear would be replaced.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the proposed location of the mechanical units and questioned whether they would be more visible, despite the units being moved from the eastern edge, since they would be raised. Mr. Webber replied that they would be elevated, but that he would demonstrate to the staff through the review of mockups that the units would not be visible. Mr. McCoubrey countered that the units would be highly visible from the deck.

Mr. Cluver commented that the mass of the shed dormer also seems visible from Delancey Street. Mr. Webber confirmed that there would be visibility from the street. Mr. Cluver stated his apprehension of the rooftop reconstruction and offered a compromise that would require the sides of the shed dormer to be pulled in four feet. On the west side, he continued, the mechanical units could be placed at the deck level where space would be created by the setback of the dormer. Mr. Webber responded that they are entirely flexible about the placement of the mechanical equipment, adding that there are opportunities to remove the equipment from the roof if necessary.

Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the dormer as proposed is too large and comes up too high to the ridge of the roof.

Mr. Baron noted that the building is very significant and is one of the earlier surviving buildings. The shape of the building, he continued, with the gable roof is a character-defining feature and this is not a good candidate for reconfiguration. He contended that the roof is too important a feature that has visibility. He argued against simply reducing the dormer, stating that the proposed concept would cause a loss of what is important about this building.

Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the application is for removal of the roof and dormer and acknowledged that the dormer is a character-defining feature. He expressed his understanding of the desire to gain more interior space, but asserted that there has already been a fairly sensitive compromise to access a large deck. He added that it would be hard to approve a significant change for modest gain.

Mr. Cluver stated that he does not approve of the sliding-glass doors proposed at the first floor, but acknowledged that they may not be visible from a public right-of-way. He noted that the drawings show the sliding-glass doors replacing the existing doors and windows and also denoted the addition of masonry infill. He asked why the sliding-glass doors would not be installed starting at the south jamb of the existing door opening to avoid brick patching. Mr. Webber answered that it results from a dimensional issue, but it could be accommodated with framing rather than masonry infill.

Mr. D'Alessandro argued against replacing the existing windows and asked that the windows be restored instead. Mr. Webber clarified that the existing windows are replacement sash and indicated that the show sills are rotted. The proposed work, he continued, would be a repair, though it may become a complete replacement.

Mr. Webber indicated that the client's objective would be to honor the historic nature of the house and its significance, but that they are intent on capturing more daylight at the interior. He clarified that the proposed design is not about deck access but more about allowing light and air into the top-floor living space. The clients, he continued, might be interested in seeking a solution which would have a more significant setback and perhaps set down from the roof's ridgeline.

Neighbor Becky Sitarchuk expressed concern about the proposed changes to the roofline, stating that she believed it would affect the character of the home. She also noted concern that the alteration could block her view of the river. Ms. Sitarchuk opposed placing the mechanical equipment on the roof, stating that it would be extremely unsightly and would be noisy if positioned next to her sitting area. Most residents on this block of Delancey Street, she continued, locate their mechanical equipment in a shed or at the side yard where it can be hidden. Ms. Sitarchuk asked for clarification on the metal roof, adding that she did not feel it carried the proper character for a 1786 residence. Mr. Cluver responded that it depends on the nature of the roof. On a low-pitched roof, he clarified, metal can have some advantages. In this case, he noted the details have not been provided. Mr. Webber responded that many standing seam metal roofs exist, but the proposed configuration would be a membrane roof, since it would not be seen from above, and wood be trimmed in weathered metal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 10.

ADDRESS: 2500 S LAMBERT ST

Proposal: Install driveway at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marcello and Paula Cynn Ciorlino

Applicant: John Christinzio, Quest Design Services LLC

History: 1912; John Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove 21 feet of a historic hairpin fence around the rear yard of this corner property in Girard Estate and to install a curb cut and parking pad in the rear yard. The district nomination notes the significance of the green space around the houses in the Girard Estate Historic District. The Historical Commission has denied several similar applications.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owners Marcello and Paula Ciorlino represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 13 DECEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. D'Alessandro asked where the owners park currently. Mr. Ciorlino responded that they currently park on the street, and it is difficult to park in the area.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that this kind of iron work, the hairpin fence, is very special, and is not something that the Committee could recommend changing.

Mr. Cluver noted that this proposal would remove two on-street parking spots, and would privatize the street parking, where there is a higher level of use. Mr. Cluver opined that that is one of his concerns for curb cuts on streets with parking, is that there is a high percentage of time when parking on private property is not being used, whereas curb side parking gets used much more frequently. Mr. Ciorlino responded that he is not trying to set a precedent, but that there are other owners who have private parking spaces. Ms. Gutterman replied that other owners may not have had hairpin fences, or may have completed the work prior to designation. Mr. Ciorlino distributed photographs of neighboring properties with rear-yard parking.

Mr. Ciorlino commented that he would be willing to maintain a portion of the fence.

Mr. Cluver noted that two of the photos Mr. Ciorlino presented show parking, but also the retention of the hairpin fence. Mr. Ciorlino noted that his property has hairpin fencing on the side parallel to the section of the proposed removal.

Mr. Ciorlino noted that he would like to have parking because his father-in-law is 88 and stays with them occasionally, and he has children. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that he could apply for a handicap parking pass. Mr. Ciorlino responded that he does not want to do that.

Ms. Pentz commented that the fence seems to be a significant feature of the property, and she would hate to see it lost. Mr. Ciorlino responded that the fence is pretty much rotted away. Mr. D'Alessandro replied that it could be repaired. Ms. Ciorlino reiterated that the fence looks horrible, and is dented. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the Historical Commission is in the business of restoration, and that there are ways to repair the fence.

Mr. Ciorlino asked if the Committee could provide any recommendations that would allow them to get their desired parking, but retain more of the fence, perhaps by making it operable. He suggested that perhaps the fence could be modified to be on wheels or to open outwards. Mr. Cluver responded that that is something he would have to see in order to approve. He noted that a gate that modifies the fence to allow one car, not two, is more presentable than the current proposal. He noted that he does not know if the revised plan would be approvable.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that it is a highly-visible corner property, and the backyard and the greenery there is also part of the character of the district. Ms. Pentz recalled similar projects in the past for which the Committee recommended denial. Mr. McCoubrey noted that there are some properties in the district that have very deep lots and have parking accessed through service drives. Mr. Ciorlino noted that he has a 25 foot rear yard, and that he is not getting rid of any of the greenery. Ms. Ciorlino noted that they are going to do other things to make the yard look nice. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that "looking nice" is not necessarily one of the Committee's considerations, but rather it is the removal of the original historic fabric of the hairpin fence.

Ms. Gutterman noted that it is difficult to understand how many sections of fence would need to be removed to create the two parking spots. Mr. Ciorlino noted that he would be willing to retain the fence and modify it to make it operable. He opined that doing so would not change the

appearance of the fence. Ms. Gutterman responded that she does not believe that would be possible, as one section of fence would likely need to be split down the middle in order to create the two gates. She noted that she also does not know if the fence is structurally sound enough to be made operable, and that it would need to be modified with vertical, horizontal, and diagonal bars, and wheels, and will not look like the same hairpin fence.

Mr. Ciorlino asked how the other driveways got approved. Ms. Gutterman responded that the driveways may have been there prior to the district designation in 1999, or may be the result of extenuating circumstances, or may have been approved by the full Historical Commission despite the Architectural Committee's advisory recommendation of denial.

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

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

ADDRESS: 336-38 S 6TH ST

Proposal: Construct two four-story single family dwellings on subdivided lot

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: SK Six Developments, LLC

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch Architecture

History: 1981; The Klett Organization, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two, four-story houses on a subdivided lot in place of an existing parking area accessed via Panama Street. The fronts of the two houses would be clad in red brick and feature front-loading garages, and a mansard roof with dormer windows. A roof deck would be enclosed with a metal railing. The pilot houses are not depicted on the elevation drawings. The side walls would be clad in stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided fenestration is added to the garage doors, and that the pilot houses are located at the shared party walls between the buildings, rather than at the sides, to limit the massing and visibility, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler and Ashley May represented the application.

Mr. Ohler clarified that the application is not proposing pilot houses; the stairs shown on the roof plan are open wells; there will be no pilot house to access the roof deck.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the dormer windows appear larger than the windows on the lower floors. Mr. Ohler responded that the intention is that the windows be the same size. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the dormer windows should be smaller, and asked what size they are. Mr. Ohler responded that all of the windows are 42 inches wide. Mr. Ohler noted that, at 22 feet wide, the proposed houses are wider than other houses in the area, which tend to be 16 to 18 feet wide. Mr. D'Alessandro asked how tall the proposed windows were. Mr. Ohler responded that he did not know, but suggested they might be around six feet in height.

Mr. Cluver questioned the pitch of the mansard roof. Mr. Ohler responded that he does not have the exact pitch, but noted that it is an eight-foot setback. Mr. Cluver opined that it appears to be an eight-twelve pitch in the wrong direction.

Ms. Pentz questioned the brick screen and where it would be located. Mr. Ohler responded that the brick screen would be located in line with the second and third-floor windows. He noted that there would be a window behind the screen. Mr. Cluver asked for clarification about that proposed design, noting that he did not see a window depicted behind the screen on the plan. Mr. Ohler apologized, and noted that the plan had not been updated. Mr. Cluver asked if the plan or elevation is correct. Mr. Ohler responded that the elevation is correct, and that he would update the plans prior to the Commission meeting. He noted that during the day time, the screen would read as brick, and at night, it would allow light to pass through. Ms. Gutterman questioned the number of proposed windows, noting that it appears that a wall would be intersecting one of them. Mr. Ohler apologized that the plans were not up to date. Mr. Cluver noted that the light permeating the screen would change the window pattern of the district at night. Ms. Gutterman asked if the patterned brick was proud of the façade. Mr. Ohler responded that it would be flush with the rest of the brick façade. Ms. Gutterman questioned the design and placement of the windows in regard to each other and to the brick screen. Mr. Ohler responded that all of the windows would be in the same plane, and that the regular windows would be set back the depth of the brick.

Mr. Cluver asked what is driving the size of the roof deck. Mr. Ohler responded that the railing has been set back so that it will not be visible from across the street, and then the rest of the roof will be deck. Mr. Cluver responded that the deck will be remarkably visible from the street. Mr. Ohler conceded that the railing would be visible from the side.

Mr. Cluver opined that the transition from brick to stucco on the east elevation is very abrupt, and also highly visible. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the brick should return onto the side elevation. Mr. Ohler responded that they could return the brick, and asked if there was a particular depth that they should carry the return. Mr. Cluver replied that, if the roof were to pitch at a more historically-consistent pitch, it would drive the railing back more, and then the brick could also turn the length of the roof gable. Mr. Ohler noted that the reason they want to maintain the roof pitch as proposed is for the space in the master bedroom on the third floor, but that they can return the brick on the side. Mr. Cluver opined that they are proposing a big bedroom.

Mr. McCoubrey commented on the fenestration of the doors, suggesting that a more conventional door with a single light with a panel below would be more appropriate. Mr. Ohler noted that the staff had recommended adding lights to the garage door as well. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with that recommendation. Mr. Cluver responded that he is torn regarding fenestration in the garage door because most of the other garage doors on the street do not have lights, and opined that he would rather see a nicely paneled door.

Mr. Ohler noted that the owner would like two-over-two windows, and asked if that would be acceptable. Mr. Cluver responded that one-over-one or six-over-six windows would be more appropriate for this district. Other Committee members agreed.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the proposed material of the dormer windows. Mr. Ohler responded that the dormers would be clad in Azek.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the design of the window behind the brick screen. Mr. Ohler responded that the windows would be tilt-sash, double-hung windows to enable cleaning. Ms. Gutterman asked if the windows would be in different planes. Mr. Ohler responded that the windows would all be in the same plane, five inches in from the brick.

Ms. Stein commented that the proposed design is very large in comparison to the adjacent two-story buildings. She expressed concern over the railing at the roof, which is pushed to the face of the façade. She asked how they could minimize the railing. Mr. Ohler responded that he cannot move the stairs to the outside because he needs the garage doors to be along the party walls in order to get the curb cut approved by the Streets Department. He noted that they are not proposing pilot houses owing to the placement of the doors and stairs. Ms. Stein and Ms. Gutterman retorted that that is only necessary if there is a roof deck. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that there does not have to be a roof deck. Ms. Gutterman argued that roof decks are not by-right from a historic preservation perspective. Mr. Ohler responded that he has placed roof decks on actual historic buildings and, when they have had open metal railings, they have generally been approved. He stated that he does not understand the argument against a railing on a new building. A deck or railing on a historic building may potentially alter the historic appearance of the historic building. However, a deck on a new building does not necessarily adversely impact the new building. He asserted that the Committee was wrongly applying a rule meant to protect historic buildings to a non-historic building. Simply seeing a railing does not inherently adversely affect the non-historic building or the historic district. Ms. Gutterman responded that it has to do with visibility from 6th Street, and that a four-story building with a deck will be towering above a two-story building. Mr. Ohler asked whether they could conceal the deck with a parapet. Mr. Cluver responded that the black metal railing is probably the most innocuous of all options. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Cluver opined that, since the views of this property are so open, the issue will be less with the deck itself and more what is going happening on the deck; for instance, highly visible deck furniture. Others suggested that the Committee should not seek to indirectly regulate activities, but should stick to the built environment.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the fourth-floor ceiling height is greater than the other floors, at 9'-9" as opposed to 9'-3". Mr. Ohler responded that all of the floors heights are the same. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that, if the ceiling heights could be slightly reduced, the deck could be lowered and concealed behind a parapet with a small railing, but it would not increase the height of the building from what is currently proposed.

Mr. Cluver noted that he appreciates the sensitivity of not including a pilot house, but expressed concern that in five years or 10 years, there will be an application to the Historical Commission to add a pilot house when the drainage starts to become an issue. Mr. Ohler responded that he has used this design on roughly 50 buildings, and have developed techniques so that clogging is not an issue. He also noted that the Commission would be free to deny a future application for the construction of a pilot house. The Commission should not deny an application today based on a possibility 10 years from now. Mr. Cluver stated that he wants to make sure that there is not a pilot house in the future. Mr. Ohler again suggested that the way to ensure that there is no pilot house in the future is to deny an application for a pilot house in the future, not deny an application for a deck now.

Ms. May asked if the Committee would prefer to not have the brick screening on the front façade. Mr. Cluver and Mr. McCoubrey responded affirmatively. Ms. May noted that she does not like it.

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

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

- solid brick replaces the brick screen;
- the visibility of the deck be reduced;
- the brick returns around the corner so it does not appear as a veneer;
- the front door fenestration be more in keeping with the paneled-door appearance of Society Hill;
- the windows are one-over-one or six-over-six double-hungs;
- the garage door has a paneled look;
- a pilot house is not proposed in the future; and,
- The roof pitch is modified to be closer to a one-to-one pitch.

ADDRESS: 2011 PINE ST

Proposal: Demolish 2-story rear addition; construct 1-story garage with deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Anthony & Benita Checchia

Applicant: Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture

History: 1862

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a shallow two-story rear addition and construct a one-story garage with deck in the rear yard of this mid-block property in the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The rear of the property faces Panama Street, which is considered a service alley on this block. The applicant intends to salvage and reuse components of the existing rear addition, including salvaging the brick from the existing addition for use as part of the garage addition. The proposed red brick garage addition includes a carriage house-style garage door with glazing.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Anthony Bruttaniti and property owner Tiffany Fasone represented the application.

Mr. Bruttaniti stated that the existing two-story rear addition is compromised. He distributed an engineer's report that describes the condition. He explained that the goal is to remove the glass doors and windows and install them back in the original house, and the rear addition brick will be salvaged for reuse for the new garage addition. Ms. Pentz commented that the engineer's report states that the addition is settling, but questioned if it can be stabilized and retained instead of being removed. Mr. Bruttaniti responded that it would be too costly to take this approach, and noted that it is clearly a later addition. Ms. Broadbent added that the addition is not original to the building, and while an exact date of construction is not known, it is not original to the 1862 construction. She noted that it is a very shallow six-foot section. Ms. Stein opined that it is acceptable to go from a two-story non-original addition to a one-story new addition. She asked if the brick on the neighboring property is the same as the brick on the subject property. Mr. Bruttaniti responded that he does not know for sure, but it is very similar in appearance. Ms.

Stein stated that the brick will need to match, and the matching is more important than the salvaging and reuse of the brick. Ms. Broadbent confirmed that the staff can review a brick sample on site. Mr. Cluver commented that the second-floor plan has a discrepancy that should be addressed. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the garage door have square lights rather than the segmental arch.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed roof deck. Mr. Bruttaniti responded that the proposed deck is on the fourth floor and is set back so that it will not be seen from the public right-of-way. Ms. Gutterman responded that a proposed deck needs to be shown in elevation and section. Ms. Stein noted that the deck is drawn on the existing floor plan, not the proposed floor plan, and does not show on the elevation drawing. Mr. Bruttaniti responded that he did not draw it on the elevation because it is set back such that one does not see it. Ms. Stein commented that information regarding the railing needs to be provided. Ms. Gutterman stated that she is confused about the location of the proposed deck. She pointed out that the roof is sloped at the location of the deck, and stated that the deck will be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Bruttaniti pointed out the deck at this location on the neighboring property. Ms. Gutterman responded that it may be a pre-existing condition or was not approved. She asked about access to the proposed deck.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the fourth-floor deck, but approval of the remainder of the application, provided the brick matches the surrounding brick, the garage door lights are changed to square tops rather than arched, the discrepancy in the second-floor plan is addressed, and the metal railings are shown on that plan, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 520 DELANCEY ST

Proposal: Construct shed dormer and deck at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Matt Phillips

Applicant: Megan Fitzpatrick, Ambit Inc.

History: 1820; 1968

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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 construct a large dormer and deck at the rear of this mid-block property located in the Society Hill Historic District. The dormer would be cut from the rear roof slope, allowing access to the proposed deck on the heavily-altered rear ell. The original centered rear dormer was removed and replaced with a skylight in 1969, at which time a skylight in the proposed location of the new dormer was also removed. The installation of the deck includes the removal of an existing roof slope on the rear ell. The rear of the property is not visible from any public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Megan Fitzpatrick and Jason Birl represented the application.

Mr. Birl explained that the intention is to remove the existing rear ell roof and replace it with a flat roof with deck on top of it. Ms. Stein commented that this is a very modest addition that is in

scale with house and not visible from the public right-of-way. She asked about the treatment of the balustrade. Mr. Birl responded that the rear ell is a modest stucco box, and the idea is to integrate the deck to make the rear more visually interesting. He explained that one can see through the railing, but the rails are tighter than typical spacing. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the cement board cladding on the inside of the railing. Ms. Fitzpatrick responded that it is where the condenser is against the railing at one side, but could be omitted. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the cement board is acceptable.

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

ADDRESS: 222 FITZWATER ST

Proposal: Construct rear third-floor addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 222 Fitzwater LLC

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch Architecture

History: 1800

Individual Designation: 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of a rear roof and dormer and the construction of a third-floor addition on the main block and rear ell of this early building. The application proposes appropriate front windows, but an inappropriate two-panel front door and rear windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Mr. Baron showed photographs of the existing rear dormer as well as the rear ell. He stated that the rear ell seemed to date from considerably later than the rest of the house. He explained that there is limited visibility of this rear roof from a small street south of the building. Mr. Ohler stated that the small street is now private and used for parking. The Committee members asked Mr. Ohler how much of the rear roof would be demolished. He responded that the rear dormer would be demolished for the new passageway, but that it would not be visible from a public street. Much of the rear roof would be retained but covered with a new roof. Committee members opined that this was unclear in the drawings. Mr. McCoubrey commented that he was not comfortable with the demolition of the rear dormer, describing it as a character-defining feature. Mr. Ohler noted that it is not as elaborate as the front dormer. Mr. Baron asked if the passageway could be constructed to the side of the dormer, which would retain the dormer. Mr. Ohler responded that he could not answer that without further study. Mr. Ohler commented that the addition would sit on the footprint of the existing ell, there would be no pilothouse, and it would not be visible from a public right-of-way. The Committee members asked about the front door and transom. Mr. Ohler stated that the transom will be retained and that he will work with staff on approval of new windows, shutters and doors. Mr. D'Alessandro expressed a preference for retaining original materials in the windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: By a vote of 3 to 2, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the new work is not visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details. Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Gutterman dissented.

ADDRESS: 125 CHRISTIAN ST

Proposal: Reconstruct storefront, construct rear deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alex Aberle

Applicant: Jason Birl, Ambit Inc.

History: 1820

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct a storefront and add a rear deck. A pressed tin storefront was installed on the Greek Revival corner house about 1900. The application proposes to restore and/or reconstruct the storefront; however, the extent of retention and replacement is unclear. On the gable end façade of the main block, the application proposes to cut two long windows, removing a substantial amount of original brickwork. On the rear ell, the plans call for the construction of a deck. Much of the rear roof will be demolished for the installation of the lower deck and a connecting corridor that will extend from the rear roof to the deck.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jason Birl and Kristin Pool represented the application.

Mr. Cluver requested drawings of existing conditions, noting that the proposed work is difficult to decipher using the current drawings. Mr. Baron commented that the staff also thought the drawings were incomplete, but decided that there was enough shown to determine that the proposed work does not meet the Standards. He stated that the demolition of the roof, addition of the storefront, and the cutting of the windows into the end wall do not meet the Standards. Ms. Pentz noted that the drawings call for the complete rebuilding of the gable end wall. Mr. Birl stated that the building is in poor condition but the new owners are hoping to rehabilitate the building in the character of others in the neighborhood. He stated that an engineer had looked at the wall and determined that it would be better to rebuild the wall from the third floor up. He stated that they wish to rebuild the wall using existing brick, and would create windows to add light to the room as part of the rebuilding. Mr. Birl proposed to replace the storefront in PVC. Ms. Pentz asked if the chimney would be reconstructed. Mr. Birl confirmed that it would. Mr. Cluver commented that the chimney would be extending through the proposed window. It was noted that the chimney is shown in a different position on the elevation than on the plans.

The Committee members expressed their opposition to the cutting of windows into the gable end wall. Mr. Baron commented that this project could have benefited greatly from a meeting with the staff in advance of the submission. He continued that the staff could have supported the idea of a deck on the rear ell if it did not involve cutting into the roof. Similarly, the storefront could be restored, but not with the removal of original metalwork and replacement in PVC. He summarized that in its present form the staff does not support any aspect of the proposal. Mr. McCoubrey expressed disapproval of the connector to the deck from the rear roof slope. He

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 13 DECEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

stated that it does not meet the Standards. Ms. Gutterman asked about the amount of demolition on the rear ell. Mr. Birl responded that everything above the eave would be demolished. He stated that this will be done to keep the deck lower in relation to the street. Ms. Gutterman stated that the drawings should be revised to clarify the extent of demolition.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 2000 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Install rear elevator addition and decks with doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2000 Delancey Place Condominium Association

Applicant: A. Charles Peruto, 2000 Delancey Place Condominium Association

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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 to add an elevator and decks on the south façade of this townhouse. The Historical Commission approved the renovation of this building in November 2008. At that time, the owner restored the symmetrical rear façade and original entry portico and added a garage with deck located away from the restored façade. A decision was made at that time not to install an elevator as the interior was being rehabilitated. Now, the condominium units have been sold and several owners would like an elevator. This application would demolish the restored portico and add decks with doors.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Charles Peruto represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the rear portico and the restored symmetrical rear façade. Mr. Peruto stated that three of the four property owners have requested an elevator because their conditions have changed since buying the units. The first-floor owner has developed a heart condition. The second-floor owner has taken in an elderly mother. The third-floor owner has a leg condition. There are eight or nine steps between the ground and the first floor. Mr. Cluver commented that the elevator will only go to the landings but not to the living floors. Mr. Peruto responded that this is true, but the owners will then install interior chair lifts on the stairs to take them the remaining seven or eight steps up to their units. He stated that the location inside where the elevators were to go was infilled during the 2009 renovation with plumbing and electrical equipment. The Committee members commented on the uniqueness and high visibility of the façade. They commented that the demolition of the restored portico and covering of the windows would greatly damage the character of the façade. They stated that the balconies are a separate issue that also adversely impacts the character of the façade. Mr. Peruto stated that the owners understand that this request is a long shot but asked if there were other designs that could improve the proposal. Ms. Gutterman stated that the argument for the elevator is greatly weakened because the unit owners will have to install chairlifts in any case. She stated that the answer is to add more chair lifts on the inside. She stated that this facade on a corner is simply

too visible. A discussion ensued as to whether the elevator could fit a wheelchair. Mr. Peruto stated that none of the owners are proposing to use a wheelchair at this time.

Mr. McCoubrey called for public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 2108-10 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Revise approved application to include additional demolition of carriage house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2110 Walnut Street Development LLC

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker + Partners

History: 1868; E.B. Warren House; Furness & Hewitt, attributed; 1920

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: The Historical Commission approved an application to construct large additions at 2108-2110 Walnut Street. This application calls for revision to the approved design of the rear carriage house of 2108 Walnut Street. The previously approved application proposed the demolition of the east wall of the carriage house facing Chancellor Street, with the retention and restoration of the roof and cupola. The gambrel roof features an ornate cupola and three-part dormer facing north. The applicant now seeks approval to demolish all of these wooden elements because they would be difficult to support with the demolition of the east wall and because they are seeking to build the larger structure with fireproof construction. Had the approved application revealed the extent of the demolition, the Commission would likely have denied it as a demolition in the legal sense.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5 and Section 14-1005(6)(d).

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Eric Leighton represented the application.

Mr. Leighton explained that they propose to construct this building with fireproof construction as required by code. Ms. Stein commented that she was concerned that this was originally presented as an alteration to an historic building, instead of a gutting and facadectomy. She stated that they must have known of the need for additional demolition at the time that they presented the larger project. Mr. Cluver asked the architects if they reviewed this project in terms of new construction, or if they looked at the code for existing construction. He stated that this information can be found in Section 101001.1 of the code. He read from the code, where it states that an addition to an existing building does not need to comply with other aspects of the code, except that required within the chapter. Mr. Leighton responded that they had looked at it only in terms of new construction, because the new building is so much larger than the historic building. He stated that they would investigate the possibilities in the code under Additions to an Existing Building. Ms. Stein suggested that Mr. Leighton look into separating that portion of the building from the larger building with fire-rated partitions.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. David Traub of Save Our Sites asked if the south façade was being preserved. Mr. Leighton stated that it will be preserved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 13 DECEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5 and Section 14-1005(6)(d).

ADDRESS: 141-43 N 04TH ST AND 319 CHERRY ST

Proposal: Construct additions and six-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: J.G. Traver Inc.

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: 1780

Individual Designation: 4/26/1966

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

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

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission has recently reviewed applications for the development of this property. The property includes two eighteenth-century structures facing 4th Street, an eighteenth-century school building behind the buildings facing 4th Street, one-story, nineteenth-century, industrial additions wrapping around the school building, and a surface parking lot at the corner of Cherry and Orianna Streets. In May 2016, the Commission approved in concept a project to construct a long tall building on the vacant lot at Cherry and Orianna Streets, with the conditions that the new construction on the parking lot be limited to four-stories in height and that the additions around and on the school building were reduced to allow the school building to be clearly discerned.

The current application proposes the construction of an addition on top of and at the south side of the historic school building. The addition on top would be two stories in height with glazed walls. The application also proposes a six-story building for the lot at Cherry and Orianna Streets, ignoring the Commission's earlier limitation of the building to four stories in height.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of May 2016.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stuart Rosenberg and Herb Pratt represented the application.

Mr. Rosenberg showed a photograph to demonstrate the variety of buildings around the site, and noted in particular some of the taller buildings. He stated that they were approved for a four-story building, but would now like to propose six-story building. He stated that they have met with neighbors to hear their concerns. He showed a photograph of the school building, and stated that the building now has no historic value because of the stucco covering the rear walls and the change to the roof. He stated that they propose to restore the north wall of the school with windows. He stated that they now propose a six-story building with a raised first floor, similar to the five-story building to the north on Orianna Street. He stated that the two-story addition on the school would be an all-glass "jewel box" so as not to compete with the architecture of the school.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that the proposed new building would be 65 feet in height and the building on Orianna to the north is approximately 55 feet in height. Mr. Cluver commented that that would lead to more compressed upper floors. Mr. Baron was asked to clarify what had been approved in-concept by the Commission. Mr. Baron responded that the Commission approved a

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 13 DECEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

concept of four-story townhouses on Orianna Street and the reduction of construction on and around the school to allow that building to read more clearly. The Commission did not specify a height limit in feet. Mr. Rosenberg showed a drawing by architect Ryan Lohbauer, saying that that was approved by the Commission. Mr. Baron responded that the Commission did not approve that design, but rather a revision to that concept which lowered the floors of the new construction and asked for a reduction of construction on the school, for which a drawing was never provided.

Ms. Stein opined that the new design overwhelms the block and the school and is inappropriate. Mr. McCoubrey emphasized that the buildings coming up above the gable of the church overwhelms the block. Mr. Cluver opined that any new construction on the school should sit below the eave of the church. He stated that the new building should not exceed five stories. Ms. Gutterman agreed that this proposal is too much for the site. Mr. Cluver commented that the design approach of the jewel box and the random fenestration of the new building seem inappropriate to the district and the existing buildings. Ms. Pentz asked about the history of the school building. She stated that the school building needs to be protected as the centerpiece of the development.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Edward Abitol, a neighbor at 115 N. Orianna Street, presented a petition against the project, commenting that the building on Orianna Street would overwhelm the existing houses on the street. He opined that it will be a safety hazard on this narrow street. He commented that the school house should be restored instead of being overwhelmed with new construction. He clarified that his building has no roof deck. Rick Snyderman commented that there are many single-family houses around this site. He commented that this is a stable neighborhood which could be damaged by this architecture. He stated that despite objections at the neighborhood meeting, it resulted in no changes to the proposal. Job Itzkowitz commented that the neighbors have serious reservations and that any decision should be delayed to allow for a subsequent meeting with the neighbors and developer. Janet Kalter commented that the street is only seven feet wide with a narrow sidewalk on one side. David Pachevski, a neighbor at 315 Cherry Street, which is adjacent to this site, voiced his dissatisfaction with the proposal. Carol Hobb, a neighbor at 115 N. Orianna Street, reported that she has worked in commercial real estate for 30 years and commented that the schoolhouse should be celebrated and restored, not hidden by this development.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of May 2016.

ADDRESS: 703-07 N 8TH ST

Proposal: Replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Friends Housing Collaborative

Applicant: Paul Stone, Emerald Windows Inc.

History: 1851

Individual Designation: 4/24/1962

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The Friends Housing Collaborative owns several historically designated buildings on the 700 blocks of N. 8th and Franklin Streets that have been consolidated into one larger

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 13 DECEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

complex. Several years ago, the Collaborative installed vinyl windows in several buildings in the complex without a permit. To correct the non-compliant condition, the organization is replacing the windows in wood over several years. This application proposes the installation of wood six-over-six windows in a twin house formerly known as 705 and 707 N. 8th Street, which is part of the larger complex. Many of the other buildings in this row of nearly identical twins on N. 8th Street have six-over-six windows. However, an insurance survey indicates that 707 N. 8th Street originally had two-over-two and four-over-four windows on its front facade. The owner would like the row of twins to have a uniform appearance, all with six-over-six windows, and is therefore applying for approval of the six-over-six windows despite the insurance survey. Moreover, the owner has already purchased the six-over-six windows based on advice from the staff that was later contradicted by the insurance survey.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

Ms. Gutterman asked if the insurance survey for 707 mentioned in the overview might be incorrect. Mr. Baron responded that the insurance survey appears to date to the construction of the buildings. He explained that, although the buildings in this row appear to be identical, there are some differences including the door surround details. The buildings were built during the transition from Greek Revival to Italianate. Mr. Baron stated that several but not all insurance surveys for the row indicate six-over-six windows. The row appears to have had a mix of six-over-six and other windows. Ms. Pentz asked if the building was part of a compound. Mr. Baron replied that a storefront was cut into 705 and then later removed. The windows at the first floor of 705 are non-historic openings created when the storefront was removed. Mr. Baron explained that the building is a twin. The insurance survey for the 707 half of the building indicates the two-over-two and four-over-four windows. Mr. Cluver asked if the other insurance surveys for the row indicated six-over-six windows. Mr. Baron replied that surveys for most of the other buildings specify six-over-six. He read from the survey for 707. Ms. Gutterman asked if there is precedent for allowing six-over-six where there were four-over-four, if the six-over-six would be appropriate except for the survey. Mr. Baron stated that he did not know. Mr. Cluver asked about the windows at the time of designation. Mr. Baron responded that one cannot tell from the designation photograph because it is taken from too oblique an angle. Mr. Baron said that he “made up a little schedule about each of the ones in the row”; three have no information; one with six-over-six; one with two-over-two and six-over-six; and one with four-over-four. Ms. Pentz asked if the owner’s intent is to achieve consistency. Mr. Baron stated that the desire was consistency. Mr. Cluver commented that the buildings are fairly consistent in appearance; the differences are limited. Mr. Baron said that some of the cornices have dentils, some do not.

Mr. Farnham stated that he would speak in the absence of the applicant and offered additional information not yet provided to the Committee. He reported that the property owner has already purchased the windows. The property owner purchased six-over-six windows because the staff had informed the window provider that six-over-six windows would be the appropriate windows for the infilled storefront section of 705 N. 8th Street; the window provider extrapolated from that advice that six-over-six windows were appropriate for the entire building. Ms. Stein asked Mr. Farnham what the staff’s default recommendation would have been if there were no insurance surveys. Mr. Farnham responded that Mr. Baron is the expert, but offered his opinion that, because this row of buildings was constructed during the transition from Greek Revival to Italianate, either six-over-six or two-over-two and four-over-four windows would be appropriate. However, we have the insurance survey that specifies what windows were installed in these

openings. Ms. Stein asked if the buildings were owned individually in 1854 and then consolidated at a later time. Mr. Baron stated that George Duffield owned several originally and may have been the developer. They were later consolidated by a Quaker housing organization. Ms. Stein asked if the buildings were designated as a group or individually. Mr. Baron responded that they were designated individually but simultaneously, and owned as a group. Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff was recommending that six-over-six were appropriate for 705, but two-over-two and four-over-four were appropriate for 707. Mr. Baron disagreed, stating that the both sides of the twin should be consistent with two-over-two and four-over-four. Ms. Gutterman noted that an insurance survey exists for only one, but Mr. Baron is suggesting that it should be applied to both 705 and 707. She asked Mr. Baron why he advised the window provider to install six-over-six in the infilled storefront openings in light of the survey.

Mr. Cluver asked for information on the building at 703. Mr. Baron stated that 703 had two-over-two windows with 1-1/8" wide muntins. The upper floor openings have been built down. He noted that there is no surviving survey for 703. Mr. Cluver supported the approval of the six-over-six windows, owing to the circumstances. He stated that he appreciates the insurance survey, but there is some ambiguity about 705. Ms. Gutterman agreed. Mr. McCoubrey made the case that the original variety in these buildings has value and should be preserved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval by a vote of 4 to 1. Mr. McCoubrey dissented.

ADDRESS: 701-39 MARKET ST

Proposal: Install canopy with signage
Review Requested: Review In Concept
Owner: Independence Center Realty LP
Applicant: Mark Merlini, Brickstone Realty
History: 1859; Lit Brothers Store; various buildings, 1859-1906
Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 6/30/1970
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes a canopy at the main entranceway to the Lits Brother Store, which is located at about the midpoint of the 700-block of Market Street, on the north side of the street. A large canvas canopy stood at the main entranceway until recently, but it has been removed. In October 2016, the Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept application proposing four schemes to update the entranceway with a canopy or a so-called "immersive threshold." The Committee offered comments on the proposed designs, preferring the canopy to the immersion threshold. The application was withdrawn before the Historical Commission meeting for additional study and revision.

The current in-concept application proposes two options, a "lower height canopy" and a mid-height canopy." The application does not include architectural drawings or specifications, so the details about the proposals are limited. For example, no information about dimensions or materials is provided. Both versions of the canopy appear to stand in front of the building on piers, rather than attached to it. They have video display screens in the piers and underside of roof. A large Lit Brothers sign in historic script would hang from the front of the canopy. The lower height canopy extends up to the transom level. The mid-height canopy extends up to the base of the storefront cornice.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept of both options, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Architectural Committee's comments of October 2016.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Mark Merlini, architects John Pringle and Peter Moriarty, and designer Brett Renfrew represented the application.

Mr. Farnham stated that this application requests an in-concept review and explained that staff's recommendation of approval is a recommendation of approval of the concept only, with the understanding that numerous details would be worked out during a final review. He acknowledged that numerous aspects of the design remain to be defined, but observed that that is the character of an in-concept application. An in-concept application is a mechanism for the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission to provide advice to an applicant, but cannot result in a building permit. A final approval is a prerequisite for a building permit.

Mr. Cluver asked about the heights to the undersides of the two canopies above the sidewalk. Mr. Pringle stated that the heights to the undersides of the two canopies are about 12 and 14 feet. Mr. Cluver stated that the scale of the lower canopy looks appropriate, but he wanted to be certain that it was higher enough above the sidewalk. Mr. Moriarty stated that the lower canopy looks to be an appropriate height when one is close to the building, but may appear too small from farther away. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the transom windows relative to the two canopies. Mr. Moriarty explained that the shorter canopy would reveal the transoms above it; the taller canopy would stand in front of the transoms. He opined that the taller canopy would be better located relative to the transoms.

Mr. Moriarty explained that the canopy will be completely independent and freestanding. It will not attach to the building. He stated that it may be removed in 15 years, just as the earlier canopy was eventually removed. It will be completely free of the historic fabric. Ms. Gutterman asked about the cladding material. Mr. Moriarty explained that it will be metal, probably aluminum made to look like bronze.

Mr. Pringle clarified that the height to the bottom of the shorter canopy would be 11'-9". Mr. Moriarty stated that they would be satisfied with either canopy, the taller or shorter. Ms. Pentz responded that she would approve of either canopy.

Mr. Moriarty explained that the canopy will have animated panels. He stated that the panels will look like architectural panels when they are turned off. The animated panels will continue inside the building. The panels will grab people at the sidewalk and pull them into the building. Ms. Pentz stated that she agreed with the concept. Mr. Moriarty stated that they still need to consider the budget for the canopy as well as the needs of the primary tenant. At this point, they are only seeking feedback on the general concept. The Committee members stated they liked the Lits Brothers sign in the historic script.

Mr. Cluver stated that he has a preference for the shorter canopy because it fits more "cleanly" with the building. He suggested cladding the outsides of the piers in metal rather than in the animated panels and confining the animated panels to the inside of the canopy. He suggested animated panels, not solid panels, for the insides of the piers. Mr. Renfrew asked about the street-facing sections of the piers. It was concluded that the inward-facing sides of the piers could be animated panels while the outward-facing and street-facing sections of the piers would be metal. Ms. Stein asked about the dimensions of the Lits Brothers sign. She stated that it looks too big. Ms. Gutterman agreed. She also suggested that the primary tenant's signage,

Five Below, could be worked into the piers. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the piers could be more slender. The Committee members agreed that many of the details still needed to be considered. Mr. Moriarty stated that they are still considering many options.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of both options, with a preference for the shorter canopy, more solid piers, video screens retained within the interior of the canopy area, and appropriately scaled signage.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish.

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.