

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

**TUESDAY, 28 MARCH 2017
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
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

Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC
Gordon Parker
Amy Heilig
Michael Gordon
Roland Kassis, Domani Developers
James Bush, JB Studio Architects
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ian Toner, Toner Architects
Sara Suonk, Toner Architects
Dan Ghosh, Ivy Realty
Dione Hosler, BLTa
Kevin Aires, BLTa
Samuel Weiner
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
Gerard Galster, Magella
Drew DeWitt, Ivy Realty
Melissa Romero, Curbed Philly
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Eric Blumenfeld, EBRM
Christopher Cordaro
Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Schade
Ruthie Embree
George Thomas, Civic Visions
Nnadozie Ibeh, Associate Vice President of Project Delivery Group Temple
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Maryellen Wikoff, Jacobs

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MARCH 2017
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Leonardo Diaz, Jacobs
Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects
James Savard, Core Realty, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 2410 CYPRESS ST

Proposal: Construct two-story rooftop addition; reface building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Parker Gordon

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC

History: 1970

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rooftop addition with deck and pilot house, and construct a two-story angled bay on the rear of this non-contributing residence in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. The front entrance of the building is accessed via a walkway from Delancey Place, and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The existing garage entrance would be widened and a new garage door with glass would be installed. The addition would be clad in fiber cement panels with a deck and glass railing. A small deck with glass railing is proposed for the top of the new projecting bay. This block of Cypress Street is an alley-like street with numerous garages.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Timothy Kerner and property owners Amy Heilig and Gordon Parker represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the use of glass for the deck railings, commenting that glass can be reflective and highly noticeable. Mr. Kerner responded that the idea was to minimize the visibility of the railings by using glass, which would allow light to come through. Ms. Gutterman suggested a simple metal railing instead. Ms. Gutterman asked about the placement of mechanical equipment. Mr. Kerner responded that the proposal is to install mechanical units on the roof of the pilot house. Ms. Gutterman asked if the units can be located somewhere other than the pilot house roof. Mr. Kerner responded that the alternative is to place the units on the deck. He noted that the pilot house is set back quite far from the street. Ms. Gutterman responded that allowing mechanical equipment on a pilot house sets a precedent. Mr. Cluver asked about the height relative to the properties on either side. Mr. Kerner responded that the height of the apparent edge is 41'-6". The property to the left on Cypress Street is 49 feet tall. The difference of the height of the property to the right is approximately six inches. He agreed that the pilot house and glass railing are higher. Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff has concerns about a deck on the front of the house, despite the building's non-contributing status. Ms.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MARCH 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Broadbent responded that it is technically the rear of the building, because the entrance is through a courtyard accessed via Delancey Place. She also noted the alley-like context of this block of Cypress Street. Mr. Kerner explained that the houses to the right all have Delancey Place addresses, but this property has two addresses, with a tax address of 2410 Cypress Street. Ms. Stein asked if the courtyard is publically accessible. Mr. Kerner responded that it is not gated, but he was unsure of its status, as even Cypress Street is not considered a public street. He explained that the first 10 feet of Cypress Street moving outward along the houses is private property, and the remaining width is not on the city maps.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the glass railings are changed to metal railings, and no mechanical units are placed on the pilot house roof, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1733 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct ADA ramp, decks, and pilot house; install HVAC equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1733 Spring Garden LLC

Applicant: Paul Kreamer

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA ramp, two roof decks with pilot house, and install HVAC equipment on this corner property. The ADA ramp would be located at the side of the property and would be concealed by an existing brick wall. A new entrance for the ramp would be cut into an existing non-historic addition. In September of 2015, the Commission approved an elevator for this building which required a new entrance at this addition, after a proposed ADA ramp, which terminated substantially higher than the current proposed ramp, was recommended for denial by the Committee. The proposed roof decks and pilot house are located on mansard roofs. Mechanical units are proposed for both the upper and lower roof, located just outside of the roof deck perimeter, close to the edges of the roofs. At the first-floor rear of the building, two kitchen exhaust fans are proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the ADA ramp; approval of the exhaust fans provided they are changed to be flush with the wall, the color of red brick, and both located on the rear wall of the addition; denial of the roof decks, pilot house and rooftop mechanical equipment as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the staff recommendation regarding the exhaust fans. Ms. Broadbent responded that she is not an expert on ventilation equipment, and noted that Randy Baron had suggested fans on the interior with a flush exterior vent to minimize the appearance on the exterior. Ms. Gutterman responded that it depends on many variables, and a commercial kitchen may not allow for it. She suggested that the staff ask the applicant for information about other possible options. Mr. Cluver commented that the proposed location is the best place for

the fans. Ms. Broadbent commented that the staff was interested to know if both fans could be located on the rear wall of the addition. Mr. Cluver commented that it may be possible to make the fans more discreet, but there may be limitations. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that there is a door that is not being used on the rear of the building, and that possibly the exhaust could be located where that door is. He asked why the applicant needs two fans. Mr. Cluver commented that there is not enough information about use and need of the kitchen to know what the options are for exhausting. He commented that, if it is a commercial kitchen, it will need kitchen exhaust fans, and the proposed location is the right location for those fans. He suggested that the staff can review the details, including the exact location of the fans. Ms. Broadbent commented that she will request a clarification on the kitchen plan in time for the Commission meeting.

Mr. Cluver asked about the staff recommendation regarding the roof decks and pilot house. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff considers both mansard roofs to be character-defining features of the building, and noted that it is a corner property, so visibility of the decks from the public right-of-way would likely be of concern.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there is another location for the mechanical equipment. Ms. DiPasquale, who spoke with the architect about the project previously, commented that the rear yard will be used for daycare. She suggested that the mechanical equipment could be located on the roof, closer to the party wall, if the decks are eliminated from the proposal. Mr. Cluver stated that the mechanical equipment could be approved if put in a more discreet location on the roof.

Mr. Cluver asked about the new door that is labeled only as a metal door. He opined that it may not be in keeping with the character of the building, and that the existing doors on the rear of the building should inform the design of the new door for the ramp. He asked that the door design be clarified for the Commission review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the ADA ramp; approval of the concept of exhaust fans on the rear addition, provided they are made as discreet as possible; denial of the roof decks and pilot house; denial of the rooftop mechanical equipment as proposed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 2223 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2223 Mount Vernon LLC

Applicant: Michael Gordon

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 12/5/1974

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 pilot house and roof deck on the main block of this Spring Garden property. The proposed pilot house is squared and is taller at the front than the back of the building, creating a greater possibility for visibility from the street. The pilot house would be clad in a horizontal siding, but the material is not specified. The proposed deck is pulled eight feet back from the front façade, and would feature a vertical picket railing, also of

an unspecified material. Given the alley between this property and the neighboring property, the staff believes that the railing will be visible from Mount Vernon Street.

The application also proposes to cut a sliding door into the masonry wall of the rear wall and to construct a deck on the roof of a second-story bay at the rear. The rear of the property is visible from N. 23rd Street. There is one existing double-hung window opening.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of a deck on the main block, but approval of a deck on the rear ell, provided the pilot house is revised to slope towards the rear of the building, following the angle of the stairs, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Michael Gordon represented the application.

Mr. Gordon apologized that his architect was not present, but was stuck in traffic. He noted that the architect had additional plans that clarified some of the materials and provided additional details on the construction plans.

Ms. Gutterman asked if Mr. Gordon would accept a deck on the rear ell as opposed to the main block. Mr. Gordon responded that he would like a deck on the main block roof, and opined that the deck would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there would be any requirement to extend the chimney, owing to the construction of a deck. Mr. Gordon replied that the chimney is non-functional and would not need to be extended.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that, typically, the Roofs Guideline that guide the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission call for a deck to be on the rear of the property, not the main roof of the house. He suggested that, if the deck is on the rear, the pilot house could be reduced in size. Mr. Gordon responded that they are hoping to install the pilot house over the existing skylight, which would be on the main block of the building. He asked if the pilot house could be located on the main block of the building, or whether it would also have to be located on the rear ell. Ms. DiPasquale noted that, with its underlying structure, a deck on the rear ell would likely rise to nearly the same height as the roof of the main block, and that the views would be similar except for what would be obstructed by the pilot house.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the proposed deck on the roof of the rear bay. Mr. Gordon noted that that was not highlighted as part of the original application to the Architectural Committee, but that the staff subsequently noticed the proposed door and deck when an application was submitted for a staff-level approval of interior alterations. Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern over the cutting of historic fabric and the visibility of the proposed alteration. Mr. Gordon noted that neighboring properties have similar features. Ms. Gutterman noted that those may pre-date the designations of the properties. Mr. Gordon noted that his architect has additional details about the bay-window deck.

Ms. Stein asked if there is any mechanical equipment that will be located on the roof. Mr. Gordon responded negatively. Mr. Cluver asked if all of the mechanical equipment is in the backyard. Mr. Gordon responded that the building currently has window air conditioning. Ms.

DiPasquale noted that the staff typically reviews mechanical equipment applications administratively and ensures that the equipment locations are inconspicuous.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the drawings also include masonry alterations at the second and third floors. Mr. Gordon noted that the staff noticed these proposed alterations when he submitted an application for the interior alterations; he stated that he would like to incorporate them as part of the application before the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. Mr. Gordon noted that his architect can provide the details. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that those elements would need to be addressed in any recommendation. Ms. DiPasquale opined that the majority of the side wall alterations would not be visible from the public right-of-way, but that the rear bay would be visible. Ms. Gutterman asked if the alley permitted views of the side wall where there is a proposal to infill some openings and to cut new openings. Ms. DiPasquale responded that it would likely be possible to see one new opening obliquely, but that there would not be a straight-on view. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the size of the opening is not known. Ms. DiPasquale replied that the width is shown on the drawings, but not the height.

Ms. DiPasquale asked if the applicant had identified the proposed cladding material for the pilot house. Mr. Gordon responded negatively.

Mr. Cluver noted that the drawings propose closing a window in the second-floor bathroom but cutting a louver in the masonry wall. He suggested that it would be preferable to install the louver in the existing opening rather than cut a new opening.

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

The Architectural Committee noted that additional information is needed on the siding of the pilot house and the deck railing, and that the roof deck railing should be painted metal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the deck on the main block, but approval of a deck on the rear ell, provided the pilot house is sloped following the angle of the stairs, and the railing is painted metal, pursuant to the Roofs Guidelines; and denial of the sliding door and balcony at the third-floor rear bay window.

ADDRESS: 1523-25 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Legalize skylights; install glazed entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1511 N Front Street Associates

Applicant: Hilary Regan

History: 1849; Second Associate Presbyterian Church, Third United Presbyterian Church

Individual Designation: 7/10/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of 20 of skylights in the gable roof of this former church building. Considerable rehabilitation work is underway, including the replacement of windows and interior alterations, which were approved at the staff level. While the Historical Commission staff approved the replacement of the roofing material, skylights were

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MARCH 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

installed during construction without the Historical Commission's review or approval. The skylights are not visible from directly in front of the building, but are visible from various locations along N. Front Street.

The application also proposes to install a modern glazed entry system. The doorway was significantly altered prior to designation with the installation of a steel beam across the opening. The applicant does not propose to remove the grandfathered steel beam or infill above, but does propose a new window and door system below the beam. The system would feature glazing within metal panels that do not replicate the configuration of the historic doors in materials or dimensions. The Historical Commission staff previously approved an entry scheme with large wood doors that more closely replicate the original doors that could be pinned open as needed, with a secondary glazed system behind to allow for the desired light.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the skylights, provided the interior framing of the skylights is painted grey or black to appear less conspicuous from the public right-of-way, but denial of the proposed entrance, pursuant to Standard 2 and 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property developer Roland Kassis and architect James Bush represented the application.

Ms. Stein questioned the visibility of the skylights and the extent of this property's boundaries. Mr. Kassis responded that he owns the adjacent properties, which are zoned CMX-2.5, which allows for buildings up to 60 feet in height. Ms. DiPasquale asked Mr. Kassis whether he planned to build upon the lot to the south of the court in front of the church building. Mr. Kassis responded that he does not plan to build on that lot in order to allow views of the property.

Mr. Cluver noted that he understands the desire for skylights on a deep building like this, and that he appreciates the staff's recommendation to alter the skylights in some way to make them blend in with the roof, but that the skylights will emit light at night. He asked what purpose the skylights serve. Mr. Kassis explained that he has done a considerable amount of rehabilitation work on properties in Fishtown on buildings that are not designated as historic, and that he always installs skylights. He noted that people do not want to be in buildings that are not well-lit. He explained that, during construction on this building, he realized that the upper floor was dark, and so he instructed his workers to install some skylights.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there are multiple floors inside the building. Mr. Bush responded affirmatively, noting that that is a key point. He explained that historically, the main religious space was double-height with a perimeter mezzanine, but as part of the building's current adaptive reuse into office space, they have installed an additional floor. This floor, he noted, intersects the middle of the upper-floor windows. Mr. Cluver questioned the amount of light on each floor. Mr. Kassis explained that they left the gable trusses open to allow additional light on the third floor. He noted that he paid a lot of money for the building, and needs the upper floors to be profitable, and that tenants will want light. Mr. Kassis opined that no other developer would have touched the building. Mr. Bush distributed a sheet with photographs of other historic properties, at the Navy Yard and the Second Bank, which have skylights.

Ms. Stein asked if Mr. Kassis owned the property when it was designated. Mr. Kassis responded that he was not the owner at designation, but purchased the property with the

understanding that it was designated. He noted that, when this building was constructed, the EI was not there, so no one would have seen the roof from above.

Mr. Kassis noted that it is a challenging property to make work, but that they are trying their best. He explained that he is in favor of preserving buildings, noting that he just purchased additional properties that were part of the Otis Elevator complex, but that it can be hard to make historic properties work. He opined that there should be some lenience to make large, historic buildings more feasible.

Mr. D'Alessandro opined that there are just too many skylights. Mr. Cluver asked how much the second row of skylights actually contributes to the light on the interior. Mr. Kassis responded that the interior will be broken up into offices, so the skylights will be the only natural light for some offices. Mr. Kassis opined that the roof of the property will not be visible once the adjacent properties are developed.

Ms. Pentz questioned the location of the skylights in relationship to the roof trusses. Mr. Bush responded that the trusses are between the skylights. Ms. DiPasquale presented a photograph of the interior roof structure. Mr. Kassis reiterated that he paid an exorbitant amount of money for the property, but was only able to get a loan of \$250,000 to rehabilitate the property. As such, he noted, he could not have afforded to cut the roof trusses. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that he would not have recommended approval of the skylights if they had not yet been installed. Mr. McCoubrey asked Ms. DiPasquale if she believed the skylights would be easily reversed. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she does not believe they would be easy to remove, but that they could be removed without damaging any historic fabric. Mr. Cluver noted that the photograph of the interior indicates that the skylights were installed within the horizontal and vertical structural elements of the roof, which is a positive.

Ms. Gutterman noted that there is some concern over the reflectivity of the glass. Ms. DiPasquale noted that that is what stood out to her personally. Ms. Gutterman noted that there are various options for glazing and inner layers of the glazing or shading coefficients that could have helped reduce the conspicuousness of the skylights.

Ms. Gutterman asked to address the changes to the entry. Mr. Kassis noted that the historic door was a large wooden door. Mr. Bush explained that the existing door is a roll-up metal door, and that he used a historic photograph of the building to design an outer door system that was approved at the staff level. He noted that they have always planned for a glazed entrance system behind that wooden door. Mr. Bush explained that, since they had to appear before the Historical Commission to legalize the skylights anyways, they decided to use the opportunity to look at the door as well. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any consideration given to replicating the layout of the approved door but with glass panels, as opposed to the current proposal, which is far more modern. Mr. Bush responded that, unfortunately, it was not possible to get the egress capacity with those dimensions. Ms. Gutterman asked how tall the proposed doors are. Mr. Bush responded that they are proposed to be seven feet in height.

Ms. Stein noted that the height of the doors also differs from what was there historically. She questioned the blank panel over the doors. Ms. DiPasquale responded that that is above the steel beam that was installed prior to designation, and that the doors approved at the staff level are essentially a truncated version of the original doors, not the full-height doors. The beam is an existing, grandfathered condition, and may be retained, Ms. DiPasquale noted.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that there are buildings along Bankers Row with big heavy doors that are retained but pinned open, with the doors for everyday use behind. Mr. Bush responded that that was the original idea. Mr. D'Alessandro asked why they did not want to implement that idea. Mr. Kassis noted that the wood doors would essentially become shutters if they are pinned open.

Mr. Kassis expressed his openness to a compromise, noting that it would be costly to remove the skylights. Mr. Bush asked, if the issue with the skylights is reflectivity, whether there is some sort of coating or film that could be applied to the skylights to reduce the reflectivity. Ms. Gutterman responded that she believes there is a way to address that concern about the reflectivity of the glass, but still give light inside. Mr. Kassis opined that, without the skylights, the space would feel like a dungeon.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that the skylights are a relatively low profile and will be minimally visible in the future, but that if there is something that could be done to cut the reflectivity or glare from the glass, he would accept them. He noted that the door is a different question.

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

Ms. Gutterman noted that the proportions of the door bother her. Mr. Cluver agreed, noting that the proportions do not seem to match the historic photograph. Mr. Bush responded that the steel beam that was inserted for the roll-up door disrupts the rhythm of the entrance opening. It is an existing, legal condition that will be retained and needs to be accommodated.

Ms. Pentz asked if there has been a change in floor level. Mr. Kassis responded that the floor slopes down in the interior.

Ms. DiPasquale presented the staff-approved door and entrance drawing. Ms. Gutterman noted that the proportions are more vertical and in keeping with the historic doors. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant utilize the proportions of that drawing and interpret it in wood and glass. The proposed entrance, she noted, looks too squat. She suggested that the proportions be elongated through the elimination or alteration of mullions. Mr. Kassis agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the skylights, provided a film or coating is applied to them to reduce reflectivity, with the staff to review details; denial of the door as presented, with the suggestion that a glazed system more in keeping with the proportions of the original doors may be acceptable.

ADDRESS: 1600-06 CHRISTIAN ST

Proposal: Replace stained glass windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: MLK Real Estate Associates

Applicant: Christopher Stromberg, S2 Design

History: 1906; First African Baptist Church; Watson & Huckel, architect

Individual Designation: 10/9/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the majority of the stained glass windows of this former church building with operable, clear glass windows. The proposed windows are aluminum-clad double-hungs in a matte black finish. The Gothic arched windows will feature fixed Gothic arched transoms above the double-hungs. The application proposes to retain the existing primary windows on both the Christian and 16th Street elevations and to install new custom storm windows in place of the existing plexiglass storms.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the windows, provided that the stained single stained glass windows at the second-floor level of the towers on the Christian Street elevation are retained.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Cluver questioned the heaviness of the frames shown in the renderings as opposed to the delicacy of the drawings. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she believes they appear thicker in the renderings than they actually would be, and that hopefully the scaled drawings are more accurate. Mr. Cluver noted that that would be something important to consider during a review of details, because stained glass windows are very delicate. He stated the chunkiness of the details is his biggest concern with the windows. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the applicants are proposing to retain the existing frames for most of the windows and to tuck the sub-frames behind those frames. Ms. Gutterman responded that the dimensions of the sash in the renderings appear too heavy. Mr. Cluver opined that a metal window, as opposed to an aluminum-clad wood window, may have more refined proportions.

Mr. Cluver opined that the proportions of the sash of the pointed arch windows are very horizontal. Ms. DiPasquale explained that the proposed window manufacturer is not able to create a single-hung window that eliminates the need for a transom, and that the windows will be three parts as opposed to two. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the transom would relatively align with the spring point of the arch.

Mr. Cluver expressed his understanding of the need for the windows to be replaced, but explained that he is not in favor of all of the heavy elements cutting the windows into pieces. Ms. Stein noted that the rendering may not accurately depict the size of the elements. Ms. DiPasquale agreed, noting that the windows are very large and that she has trouble believing that the window members would be as thick as they are rendered.

Mr. Cluver opined that the matte black color of the windows and frames makes all of the details disappear, and suggested that perhaps a charcoal grey would be better. Ms. DiPasquale

responded that she has approved matte black aluminum-clad basement windows. Mr. Cluver replied that, in that case, he would keep all of the windows the same color, but reiterated his concern about the thickness of the window elements. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Gutterman agreed.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. DiPasquale about the design of the storm windows. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she has only seen the drawings presented to the Committee, but noted that they would be custom metal storm windows with vertical members that align with the frame of the existing windows and as many of the horizontal members as possible. Mr. Cluver noted that one of the dangers with storm windows is trapped heat and how that can deform the lead coming. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the windows are already suffering from that problem, and that she believes the applicants are planning to vent the new storm windows in some way. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that he has installed one-inch vents in storm windows to let air out. Mr. Cluver commented that it is also important to let moisture out through some sort of weep holes.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the additional work shown on the drawings. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff has already approved some segments of the project.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the applicant seeks slimmer window elements, the storm windows are glass not Plexiglas, and the stained glass windows at the second-floor level of the towers on Christian Street are retained, with the staff to details.

ADDRESS: 423 CATHARINE ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cole & Arianna Lewko

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1832

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. However, the staff would recommend approval of an addition like that approved by the Commission in 2007.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear two-story addition with roof deck. The two-and-a-half story house, built in 1832, retains its original configuration, which includes the main block with a gabled roof and a small rear ell. The addition, which would be visible from Fulton Street, would extend approximately 19 feet from the existing rear wall of the main block; the existing rear wall of the main block and two walls of the existing rear ell would be demolished. Only the east or party wall of the rear ell would be retained. The rear of the building is currently stuccoed, and the addition would be similarly stuccoed. Wood six-over-six double-hung sash windows are proposed at the addition. The roof slope would not be altered, but the existing rear dormer would be cut down to allow for deck access. In May 2007, the Commission approved a smaller rear addition provided that segments of the walls to be demolished were

retained as indicators of the historic walls. That application proposed to demolish parts of the ell's west wall but to retain its rear wall.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Ian Toner and Sara Suonk represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Keller to explain the extent of the addition approved in 2007. Ms. Keller clarified that the previous application proposed to extend the rear wall of the ell to enclose the negative space between the ell and main block. She stated that she had a copy of the full application and offered it to Ms. Gutterman.

Ms. Pentz asked whether the 2007 application had been submitted by a different owner. Ms. Keller confirmed that it had been made by the previous owner.

Ms. Stein commented that when she reviewed the application, she found the new application to be compatible with the original structure, because the addition would remain below the roofline and no alterations seemed to be proposed above the roofline. Ms. Stein asked Ms. Keller to confirm that she is correct. Ms. Keller responded that the applicant is proposing a roof deck on top of the addition, but it would remain below the roofline, as Ms. Stein noted. Mr. Cluver inquired about the configuration and location of the dormer and how it will be converted. Mr. Toner stated that he would lower the window sill to convert the window to a door, but the shape and character of the dormer would not change.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to display photographs of the building. Mr. Toner answered that he included photographs on the last page of the submission, and an arrow identifies the building. Ms. Keller stated that she had more photographs of the rear and offered them to the Committee. Mr. Toner stated that, on the previous page of the submission, he included a plan of the block that shows the property and addition in context with the neighboring buildings.

Ms. Stein asked if it would be possible to revise the plan to retain a fragment of the rear wall rather than removing the entire back wall from party wall to party wall. Mr. Toner affirmed that the request would most likely be possible. Ms. Stein noted that it was one of the comments from the staff.

Mr. Cluver opined that the rear ells of the buildings allow a fair amount of light into the main block. Construction across the full lot, he continued, narrows the space between buildings, and neighboring property owners may begin to request extending their own ells across the lot if they lose the benefit of added light. In looking at the amount of space between the second-story window and eave line, Mr. Cluver also questioned whether the deck would remain below the cornice line of the roof. Mr. Toner responded that he is not intending to raise the line where the shingles terminate. Instead, he added, that existing termination line will serve as the transition to the roof deck surface. Mr. Toner explained that he would propose a fiberglass roof membrane to maintain a low profile and to avoid a wood deck on the roof. The membrane, he continued, would be lapped under several rows of shingles to keep the shingles as close to their existing location as possible. He further clarified that the rear contains a gutter but no fascia or detailing under the roof edge. He added that the new roof surface would not affect the location of the roof edge.

Mr. McCoubrey observed that the proposal is very much predicated on achieving the alterations without affecting the main slope of the roof. Mr. Toner replied that the roof over the addition may need to be dropped 4 to 6 inches, adding that the details have not yet been finalized. He commented that he would not want to have water entering through the door resulting from a lack of willingness to lose 2 inches of ceiling height. In terms of construction, he noted, the drawing is very schematic.

Ms. Stein inquired whether the building code requires that the party walls extend up the two sides of the deck and observed that the solid party wall converts to a metal picket rail at the rear wall. Mr. Toner answered that it is not a code requirement and that there are ways of getting around a solid wall. He indicated that the owner was concerned about privacy on the deck and that the solid walls would be easier to waterproof than the railings, which bolt through the building. With past applications, he continued, the Commission has requested that decks include picket rails. Mr. Toner commented that he encouraged the client to incorporate the picket railing at the rear wall, but that he would propose solid walls at the sides. Ms. Stein suggested that the railing return at the sides to minimize the appearance of the projecting wings.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the dormer would be altered. Mr. Toner replied that the dormer would remain, though the window would be replaced with a door. Mr. D'Alessandro clarified that the dormer would be cut down at the base to allow for access.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the visibility of the rear of the property. Ms. Keller answered that the rear is visible from Fulton Street, which runs behind the property. Mr. Cluver observed on the site plan that the street at the rear contains many additions and garages and is not a pristine row that would be disrupted. Ms. Keller clarified that there are some fronts of houses, but that the street contains many decks and garages, as Mr. Cluver noted. Mr. Toner noted that there is newer construction on the opposite side of Fulton Street. Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the property extends from Catharine Street to Fulton Street, and Mr. Toner affirmed that the property extends from street to street.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the addition remains below the eave line of the existing roof, that the dormer width is maintained, and that the door is created by lowering the sill, and that the railing of the rear deck turns back at the side walls a minimum of 4 feet from the rear wall.

ADDRESS: 1511 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and deck; restore façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1511 Lombard Street LLC,

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, SgRA Architecture, PC

History: 1850

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 to restore the front façade of this rowhouse by removing a non-historic parapet and reconstructing the historic cornice, the marble stoop, and doorway. At the rear, the application proposes significant changes to a rear ell that has been modified from its historic condition with stucco and a large non-historic window in the gable. This rear ell is visible to the public from Addison and Hicks Street, which are small alleys. The proposed changes include removing parts of the side wall and roof of the ell and constructing an addition beside and above the ell. The addition will not subsume the entirety of the rear ell, but will leave exposed the northernmost section of the historic ell. A deck and pilot house would be constructed on top of the addition to the ell. The deck and pilot house would not be visible from Lombard Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Stuart Rosenberg and developer Samuel Weiner represented the application.

The Architectural Committee members decided to consider the two applications, for 1511 and 1513 Lombard Street, separately, beginning with 1511 Lombard Street. Mr. Baron explained that, although the staff typically does not recommend in favor of filling in rear side yards, in this particular case the side yard faces the back yard of buildings facing 15th Street. Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Rosenberg to describe the connection of the rear roof to the addition. He said that the addition roofing should sit below the roof of the main block of the building. Mr. Rosenberg said that this would be the case. Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff had checked to make sure that the stairhouse would not be visible from Lombard Street. Mr. Baron said that he had not looked at a mock-up. Mr. Rosenberg said that they could provide a mockup for approval.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the mechanical equipment and stairhouse are not visible from Lombard Street, with the staff to review details and a mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1513 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and deck; reconstruct façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1513 Lombard Street LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, SgRA Architecture, PC

History: 1850

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 to reconstruct the front façade of this rowhouse by removing the front wall and reconstructing the brick wall, historic cornice, marble stoop, and doorway. The building has lost about 30% of its façade because it had a two-story bay added about 1900, removed in the mid 20th century and in-filled with non-matching brick. At the rear, the application proposes significant changes to a rear ell that has been modified from its historic condition with stucco and a large non-historic window in the gable. This rear ell is visible to the public from Addison and Hicks Street, which are small alleys. The proposed changes include removing parts of the side wall and roof of the ell and constructing an addition beside and above the ell. The addition will not subsume the entirety of the rear ell, but will leave exposed the northernmost section of the historic ell. A deck and pilot house would be constructed on top of the addition to the ell. The deck and pilot house would not be visible from Lombard Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Stuart Rosenberg and developer Samuel Weiner represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the application is similar to that for 1511 Lombard except that, in this case, the front façade would be demolished and rebuilt using new brick because of the extensive alterations to the existing façade. Mr. Cluver expressed his concern with demolishing the existing façade because the two facades are constructed together with no joint between them and read as a single development unit. He opined that it would be better to retain the existing façade, remove the mismatched infill and add in bricks to match the existing. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the edges of the infilled center portion are in the location of the former window jambs. It was pointed out that the infill of the sills is visible. Mr. Cluver asked if the brick to the left of the infill area is new brick because it looks darker. Mr. Baron said that he thought that it is actually old brick but it has aged differently because of the water from the downspout. Mr. D'Alessandro thought it may be difficult to find matching brick and spoke in favor of full façade replacement. Mr. Rosenberg said that they intend to install new marble lintels and sills.

Mr. Baron noted that, although the staff typically does not recommend in favor of filling in rear side yards, in this particular case the side yard of the adjacent paired non-contributing property has already been in-filled.

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

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would recommend denial of the removal of the existing façade but approval of the remainder of the project. Mr. Cluver agreed. Mr. Rosenberg suggested

retaining and restoring the existing façade rather than removing and reconstructing it to avoid a Committee recommendation of denial. Ms. Gutterman responded that the Committee must vote on the application as submitted, but suggested that Mr. Rosenberg could revise the application to propose the restoration when it comes before the Commission. Mr. Rosenberg asked the Committee to reconsider his reconstruction proposal. He said that the reconstruction would look better. Ms. Stein opined that the remaining original brick should be retained and restored, not replaced.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 2 to recommend denial of the removal of the existing brick façade, but approval of an application with the restoration of the existing façade, provided the mechanical equipment and stairhouse are not visible from Lombard Street, with the staff to review details and a mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz dissented.

ADDRESS: 352 N 16TH ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition; restore façade; replace windows; install canopy

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ivy Callowhill Property, LLC

Applicant: Dione Hosler, BLT Architects

History: 1908; C.C. Knight & Co., Middishade Clothing Factory; Watson & Huckel, architect

Individual Designation: 4/29/1987

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate this former factory building from an office use to a residential use. The application proposes a modest rooftop penthouse to serve as a function room for the building. The windows will be replaced with new aluminum units to match the original designs. The application includes no details regarding brick moldings or other details. The plans indicate that the cornice, parapet, and southernmost entry portal on the 16th Street façade will be restored; however, few details are provided. A wide metal awning is proposed at the entrance on Callowhill Street. It would span and cover the architectural ornament at the doorway.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the canopy is redesigned to reveal the architectural ornament at the doorway, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architects Dione Hosler and Kevin Aires and developer Drew DeWitt represented the application.

Mr. Baron pointed out the historic rendering, which was used to determine the details for the reconstructed elements. He noted that the windows have been previously replaced, but noted that some original wood frames do exist and can provide details for the new aluminum windows. Mr. Aires pointed out that they wish to enclose the balconies of the Philadelphia fire stair with glass. He said that 16th Street openings would receive three-sided fabric awnings. Mr. Baron claimed that the Callowhill Street canopy would obscure views of the decorative brackets. Mr. Cluver suggested the Callowhill Street canopy should sit within the two brackets. Ms. Gutterman claimed that, as designed, the canopy would cut into the cast-stone ornament. Ms. Stein agreed that the canopy should sit within the brackets. Mr. Baron asked Mr. Aires if they are proposing to

cut out the brick jambs and widen the brick opening at the canopy. Mr. Aires said that he is proposing to alter the jambs. The Committee members were accepting of the widening of the brick opening but asked that the canopy not exceed the 6'-6" widened opening. The new canopy would extend out 5'-6" over the sidewalk. Mr. Aires said that the canopy would announce the opening. Mr. McCoubrey said that the cast stone ornament already highlights the entrance.

Mr. Aires said that they will be removing a non-historic elevator penthouse. In response to Ms. Gutterman, Mr. Aires said that they will not be adding height to any rooftop element. Mr. McCoubrey said that he has no concern about the proposed rooftop event room.

Mr. Cluver expressed concern with the difference between the proposed north and south doors of the 16th Street façade. He thought that the two doors should match. Mr. Baron pointed out that we have the historic plans to inform the design for the new doors. He asked whether the new doors should not have a frame and a panel at the bottom. Mr. Cluver said that, if they cannot install double doors to meet code, he would prefer that they install frankly modern doors. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that, at a minimum, the transom should match the historic full width design. Mr. DeWitt, the developer, asked if the Committee is recommending a single-leaf door. Mr. Cluver noted that the application proposes a single-leaf door. Mr. Baron asked Mr. Cluver if he would support the double doors if the opening is large enough for double doors that meet code. Mr. Cluver replied affirmatively, as long as both entrances on the façade with the decorative cast-stone are all treated equally.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, provided:

- the canopy on Callowhill Street is redesigned to fit within the masonry opening;
- the entries on 16th and Callowhill Streets are either single doors of a reasonable width with sidelights and glass design or double doors with either a modern glass design or a more traditional design under a traditional full width transom; and,
- the rooftop additions are not increased in height.

ADDRESS: 858 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Install signage, mechanical equipment, and ramp, rehabilitate façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Holy Ghost I LP

Applicant: Michael Schade, AOS Architects

History: 1908; Metropolitan Opera House; William H. McElfatrick, architect

Individual Designation: 6/29/1971

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate this former opera house for use as a music venue. The Philadelphia Opera House was originally developed by Oscar Hammerstein. Over the years it has also served as a movie theater, sports venue, and most recently as a church. The building has deteriorated, losing its cornice, parapet, balustrades and areas of its original cream-colored brick cladding. The developer seeks to restore many of these lost features. The cornice but not original parapet would be restored. Balustrades would be restored at the inset balconies. Additional metal railings would be installed behind the balustrades to meet the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MARCH 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

building code. Doors, windows, and storefronts will also be recreated from historic photographs and evidence found on the building. The application proposes to recreate some very large signs including a rooftop sign and a three-story high corner blade sign that were installed on the building in the 1930s. Non-historic signage including LED sign boards is also proposed. The application also proposes some new elements including rooftop cooling towers and a ramp at the rear or west façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the missing historic parapet at the Broad Street façade is reconstructed, perhaps in a substitute material, to block views of the large cooling tower, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Developers Eric Blumenfeld and Christopher Cordaro and architects Ruthie Embrie and Michael Schade represented the application.

Mr. Baron pointed out that the sidewalk will be regraded on Callowhill Street to provide accessibility.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the locations of the proposed LED signs. Mr. Schade responded that all the signs will be LED technology. He guided the Committee through the architectural drawings for the exterior rehabilitation and signage. He explained that they are proposing to reconstruct the cornice but not the parapet. For the signage, they are using historic photographs to guide the reconstruction. They are proposing four LED signs with the capacity for animation to announce shows. Ms. Gutterman asked about the dimensions of the sign over the box office and if it is actually two signs. Mr. Schade explained that the words “Box Office” would be fixed box letters with plastic faces. The area below would be an LED video screen. Mr. Schade reported that there have been signs in those locations for a long time. Mr. Schade stated that the signs are still conceptual. Mr. Cluver responded that LED is a more aggressive light source. It produces more glare and is capable of moving images. Mr. Schade stated that the four lower signs would be animated LED signs. The restaurant sign would be fixed signage; the images would not change. The bigger letters would be fixed individual bulbs without faces. Mr. McCoubrey suggested perhaps deleting the “football shaped sign” in the center of the facade. Mr. Blumenfeld responded that that sign is seen in more historic photos than the other signs. He stated that they are trying to add life to Broad Street and that sign would promote that goal. He offered that they will try to afford the parapet to help hide the mechanical equipment. The restaurant sign is a place holder for an unidentified tenant. Ms. Gutterman recommended deleting the moveable sign in the area outside of the ladies room. Mr. Blumenfeld was amenable to removing that sign, but argued in favor of retaining the football-shaped sign to create a center for the building. Mr. Baron argued that the football-shaped sign is part of the historical record of the building. Mr. Cluver said that the sign is decorative. He asked about the repair of the façade; it should not be deleted from the reconstruction proposal simply because it does not satisfy our current aesthetic notions.

Mr. Baron suggested that the masonry may need to be coated to create a uniform color, but such a coating could be reviewed and approved at the staff level. He also asked about the mechanical equipment. Mr. Schade said that the two largest rooftop units will be 10-feet tall with the supporting dunnage. One will be located near the Broad Street façade and one near the Carlisle Street façade for even air distribution. Mr. Schade said that they can slide the Broad Street unit further south to hide it behind the pediment. Ms. Pentz asked about the original material of the parapet. Mr. Schade responded that it was brick with piers and panels.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the parapet wall is reconstructed at the north and east façades to hide the mechanical equipment and the sign in the area near the ladies room removed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 1801-35 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct additions and bridge

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Temple University

Applicant: Thomas McCreesh, Temple University

History: 1870; Park Mall houses, Temple University

Individual Designation: 9/24/1986

District Designation: Park Mall Historic District, Contributing, 11/14/1990

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter a building on Liacouras Walk on the campus of Temple University. The building is located within the Park Mall Historic District. The building began life in the 1870s as a row of large townhouses. Temple University began to acquire townhouses in the 1920s as its campus expanded and adaptively reused them for school purposes until early in this century. In 2004, Temple University claimed that it had outgrown the townhouses and the Historical Commission approved the demolitions of all but the front facades of the townhouses under its financial hardship provision and the construction of an institutional building behind the facades. The building constructed behind the facades is one story taller than the historic facades and extends north of the historic facades into what had been an open lot.

Temple University now contends that it has outgrown the building constructed a decade ago and now seeks to enlarge it and connect it with a bridge to a building across Liacouras Walk for the Fox School of Business. The application proposes to construct a second story above the historic facades, a large addition at the north in place of a non-historic portion of the building, and a bridge extending to a nearby building across the sidewalk to the east. The staff reviewed a mock-up of the rooftop addition and determined that such an addition would be conspicuous from Liacouras Walk and surrounding streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. D'Alessandro recused. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Nnadozie Ibeh of Temple University, attorney Neil Sklaroff, architects Leonardo Diaz and Maryellen Wykoff, and preservation consultant George Thomas represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Historical Commission approved a project for this row of townhouses based on financial hardship in 2004. The project entailed demolishing all but the front facades of the buildings and constructing a new building behind them, which was one story taller than the historic mansards. At that time, the Historical Commission ensured that the new construction behind and above the facades would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-

way. Mr. Baron explained that he visited the site to review a mock-up of the proposed additional floor and concluded that it will not be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. He directed the Committee to a photograph of the mock-up in the meeting materials packet.

Mr. Sklaroff summarized changes to the campus. He explained the need for expansion brought about by the success of the Fox School of Business. He explained that the large building on the east side of Liacouras Walk is also being modified and they wish to link the business school buildings on both sides of street.

Mr. Diaz said that the project entails two design challenges: the need for more space and the desire to retain the scale of the core of the campus. He explained that this proposal would expand the building northward into the open lot. He stated that mechanical equipment will not be located on the roof. He remarked that the re-cladding of the rooftop addition will remove the existing EIFS and replace it with glass and terra cotta. He noted that the additional 12-foot tall floor will block ugly views of the mechanical equipment presently visible on other buildings behind the row. He said that Speakman Hall across Liacouras Walk will be re-clad to tie the two structures together. He explained that the proposed bridge would contain a ramp connecting floors of different heights on the two sides of the street. He said that the bridge will be high enough above the walkway to see views under it.

Amy Stein asked if the designers considered a tunnel instead of a bridge. Mr. Diaz said that they had, but there are utility pipes and an easement below the walkway. Mr. Cluver inquired about the extent of the historic district. Mr. Baron said that the district includes the two blocks on the west side of the walkway. He explained that the rowhouses to the north have been converted to shops and an inn. The front facades of the rowhouses to the north have been altered with an elevated with a walkway. Mr. Farnham pointed out that Temple University demolished six rowhouses at 1820 to 1830 Park Mall and Thomas Hall at 1940-48 Park Mall, all within the small historic district, with the Historical Commission's approval in 1998.

Mr. Thomas observed that Temple started to become a residential campus about 2008. Since then, Temple has concentrated its focus in this area of the campus. He said that this project leaves existing fabric alone. The new construction will tie into the existing built environment to coordinate the area visually. Temple recently constructed a new library in this area, making the land around it very valuable.

Ms. Stein observed that she is most concerned with the bridge element. She said that the bridge gives a corporate look to the campus. It is anti-urban and overwhelms the facades of the historic buildings.

Mr. Cluver observed that the proposal has three elements. The first is the addition at the northern end of the building. He said that the proposed addition is an improvement over the 2004 construction. He asserted that the second element, the rooftop addition, is also an improvement over the 2004 design and helped to hide the mechanical equipment on the building to the west. He acknowledged that it would be more conspicuous than the existing one-story addition, but noted that the existing addition can already be seen from the south. The third element, the bridge, is also acceptable, he contended, because the district is limited to the west side of the street. He suggested that the bridge should have a metal base to hide the internal ramp at night. The architect responded that the glass was already opaque.

Mr. Thomas argued that the horizontality of the proposed new floor above the historic facades is very compatible with the rowhouse facades and is reversible.

Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein saying that the bridge design creates an appearance of a hospital rather than an academic institution. He said that, in an academic environment, designers seek to promote interaction; they do not insulate people from the street and the campus. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he approves of the addition because the facades are already artifacts. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the windows and doors in the historic facades do operate. Mr. McCoubrey asked why they are not proposing a larger addition on the north end, given that there is such a demand for space and that land is open. It was explained that Temple would like to preserve some of the open space to the north for a plaza and views. Mr. Ibeh stated that the administrators at Temple struggled to find a balance between promoting the exciting energy at the business school with a bridge connection between the buildings and preserving the pedestrian experience on the walkway.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 1 to recommend denial of the bridge portion of the application, but unanimously to recommend approval of the remainder of the application, provided no mechanical equipment is installed on the roof of the new addition, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Cluver voted against the recommendation of denial of the bridge.

ADDRESS: 1100-02 N DELAWARE AVE

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition, claim of financial hardship

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Core Realty, Inc.

Applicant: James Savard, Core Realty, Inc.

History: 1921; Edward Corner Marine Merchandise Warehouse; A. Raymond Raff, builder

Individual Designation: 10/9/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story addition on a three-story industrial building. The application seeks to justify the construction of the addition that would be highly conspicuous and therefore does not satisfy preservation standards with the claim that the building's condition is so severely compromised that it cannot be feasibly rehabilitated without the income that will be derived from the large addition.

The historic building was designated in October 2015, after the applicant revealed plans to demolish the building. It has been vacant for an extended period of time and suffers from extensive termite damage to its wood structure. As a result, the exterior brick walls are failing; the compromised wood structure is no longer tying the brick walls together and the walls are pulling away from one another. Temporary bracing has been installed around the entire structure to support the exterior walls.

The application proposes to rebuild the internal structure and reattach the restored brick walls to it. It also proposes to construct a three-story addition atop the restored building. The owner

claims that the added income from the additional floors will defray the cost of the expensive structural work. Section 14-1005(5) of the preservation ordinance indicates that the Historical Commission may consider “financial hardship” when reviewing a building permit application for alteration. Section 9.4 of the Rules & Regulations likewise indicates that an applicant may justify an alteration that does not satisfy the standard review criteria with a substantiated claim of financial hardship. The Rules & Regulations indicate that an applicant seeking a hardship exemption for an alteration must demonstrate that the property cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted and, to do so, has an obligation to explore potential reuses for it. The application includes 10-year pro formas for a mixed-use retail and residential renovation with and without the proposed addition. Without the addition, the project will result in a -\$943,480 net value created and an internal rate of return of 3.96%. With the addition, the project will result in a \$320,343 net value created and an internal rate of return of 14.41%.

The application seeks final approval, but the architectural plans are not detailed. The staff suggests that the Committees and Commission consider the hardship petition as a request for final approval, but the architectural segment of the application as a review in concept, meaning that, if the hardship exemption is granted, the project would be reviewed a second time from an architectural perspective once the design is further developed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE: Denial, if the Historical Commission rejects the hardship petition, pursuant to Standard 9; but approval in concept, if the Historical Commission accepts the hardship petition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(5) of the preservation ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP: The application demonstrates that, owing to the structural deficiencies resulting from the termite damage, the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted and, therefore, the hardship exemption should be granted to allow for the three-story addition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(5) of the preservation ordinance.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer James Savard and architect Ryan Lohbauer represented the application.

Mr. Savard distributed a revised rendering of the proposed addition with a lighter color in place of the darker grey for the cladding. He explained that when their intention was to demolish the building when they purchased it in 2005, but changed their plan after it was designated and are now trying to save the building. He explained that they recently retained an engineer to assess the condition of the building, who found that it was in much worse condition than they had initially assumed. He said that they discovered a tremendous termite infestation, which has destroyed the internal wood structure as well as significant brick delamination. Soon after the inspection, the department of Licenses & Inspections cited the property for the problems. He explained that they analyzed the costs to replace the damaged structure and found that it was financially prohibitive. By adding the rooftop addition and doubling the rentable space, they can offset the cost of the rehabilitation. Ms. Gutterman asked what would be left of the original structure. Mr. Savard said that it is their intention to retain the brick walls, although there will have to be some brick replacement because there is currently rust jacking at the lintels. They will retain the ghost signs and reopen the infilled windows, installing appropriate industrial looking windows. The floor structure will be replaced and a new steel “chassis” or structure installed within the building in place of the destroyed wood structure. Ms. Pentz asked how the

building fell to this condition. She asked if the roof was missing. Mr. Savard responded the roof is not missing. He said that when they bought the building in 2005 they applied for and received a demolition permit. They did not maintain the building because they intended to demolish the structure. It was not designated until 2015. Mr. Baron pointed out that the developer plans to redevelop the site to the north with a building in the same architectural vocabulary. Mr. Baron pointed out that this building and the new building will not be physically connected.

Mr. Cluver commented that, separate from the hardship consideration, he has concerns with the proposed conceptual design. He said that the historic building is a masonry building with punched openings, but the addition seems to ignore the rhythm of the building below. He said they do not belong together. He recommended carrying the piers of the historic building up into the new structure and to redesign the addition to look less horizontal and with different windows that relate to the old. He also suggested two stories would be better than three. He understood, however, that the economic reality may necessitate the third floor of the addition.

Ms. Gutterman asked about potential roof additions such as decks, pilot houses, and mechanical equipment. She reminded the applicant that the Committee will need to review the entire proposal for final approval. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Baron about the basis of the designation. Mr. Baron explained that the significance rested on the relationship of the building to the history of the waterfront. The ghost signage is very important. The architecture itself is of lesser significance. Mr. McCoubrey said that another way to approach the design would be to differentiate the new structure even more and make it very lightweight looking in design. Ms. Pentz asked the Committee members if they would normally recommend approval of a three-story addition on a three-story building. Ms. Gutterman said that the addition has to be balanced. Mr. Lohbauer pointed out that this is just a massing study. He stated that he understands that there is a tension between differentiation and compatibility which he will explore when preparing the final submission for the Committee. Mr. Baron pointed out that the proposal does not meet the Standards and could not be recommended for approval without a finding of hardship. Mr. Baron recommended that the Committee could offer a motion accounting for the two possibilities, hardship and no hardship. Mr. McCoubrey noted that he sits on the Committee on Financial Hardship, which will look closely at the financial analysis. Ms. Pentz said that she might consider a taller addition with a smaller footprint. Mr. Lohbauer explained why the floor plan does not work well with setbacks at the addition. Ms. Gutterman suggested considering two stories rather than three. Mr. Savard explained that it is the extra units provided by three floors that tip the scale toward profitability. A two-floor addition does not allow for a profitable project, but a three-floor addition does.

Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Cluver agreed that the massing of a three-story addition would be acceptable with a finding of hardship, but the addition would need to be better designed to be more compatible with the existing structure before a final approval could be granted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application without a finding of hardship, but approval in concept of the application with a finding of hardship, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-1005(5) of the preservation ordinance.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:51 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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