

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

**MONDAY, 2 FEBRUARY 2015  
ROOM 578, CITY HALL  
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

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

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

**ALSO PRESENT**

Stephen Maffei, Abitare  
Logan Dry, Abitare  
Chris Dardis, Vitetta  
Peter Mastrogiacomo, Grayson Sky  
Jesse Greenberg, Grayson Sky  
Gregory and Sandra Clemens  
Lisa Hines, Black & Poole  
Eric Oskey, Moto Design  
Julie Hagopian, Moto Design  
Ed Barnhart, Always by Design  
Nicole Marquis, Hip City Veg  
Eileen Quigley, Esq., Ballard Spahr  
Rick Prigg, MLS Studios, LLC  
Paul Boni, Esq., Boni Law  
Robert Peters

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. Mes. Gutterman and Stein and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, and McCoubrey joined her. Ms. Hawkins noted that the meeting had originally been scheduled for Tuesday, 27 January 2015, but was postponed to this date because all City offices were closed on 27 January 2015, owing to the weather forecast.

**ADDRESS: 418 AND 420 WOOD ST**

Project: Rehabilitate building; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William Nadu

Applicant: Logan Dry, Abitare Design Studio

History: 1750; addition, c. 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to modify a building that has been altered several times. The original c. 1750 house had its roof and dormer removed and an Italianate third floor and cornice added about 1855. In the twentieth century, a large garage door was inserted in the front facade and large workshop addition constructed at the rear. The adjacent building at 420 Wood was demolished for the construction of the bridge and the lot on which it stood was narrowed to a sliver. This application proposes to demolish the one-story rear structure and construct additions on the historic building and a house at the rear. An addition to the historic building would be constructed on the sliver of a lot and a mansard fourth story with roof deck would be constructed on the historic building. The garage opening in the historic building would be reconfigured.

A four-story structure in a contemporary style would be constructed along 5<sup>th</sup> Street, behind the historic building. The Commission enjoys full jurisdiction over this new construction because the site is not considered undeveloped; the non-historic rear addition to the historic building stood on the site. The house would be differentiated from the old but would be compatible in basic massing and rhythm of openings. It would have its own identity, which is appropriate in a building that is neither an addition nor part of a row or intact streetscape.

The staff suggests that the mansard proposed is awkwardly tall and should be reduced in height, allowing more of the deck railing to read as cresting. Although the Standards would not typically permit such a visible rooftop addition, an argument can be made that the essence of the history of this particular building is one of change and alteration and therefore the proposal is compliant with the Standards.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Stephen Maffei and Logan Dry represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the height and proportions of the mansard that would be added to the old building and included on the new addition. She asked if the height of the mansard could be reduced. She noted that the mansard hides a roof deck behind it and suggested that the height of the mansard could be lowered and that of the deck railing increased. Mr. Dry said that the mansard could be lowered and the railing could be raised. Ms. Hawkins said that the top floor appeared not to be a mansard, but instead a vertical wall clad in metal.

Mr. Cluver asked about the division between the old building and proposed addition. Mr. Dry said that they would use an I beam like that found over the existing garage to create the slot between the historic building and the new addition. He said that they proposed an abstracted

cornice on the addition to be respectful of the massing of the existing building, but also to differentiate the new construction from the old building. Mr. Cluver disapproved of the cornice and the use of the I beam to separate old and new. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Hawkins opined that the resulting building would be an awkward conglomeration of styles. They did not like the four-over-four windows or the Italianate cornice with the mansard. Ms. Stein claimed that there was no precedent for a mansard in this district and asserted that a highly visible rooftop addition on this structure was inappropriate. She noted her concern about precedent.

Mr. Baron explained that he had discussed the windows at length with the applicant. He explained that the second story, which dates to the mid eighteenth century would have had very small paned windows and plank frames; the third-story windows would have originally had a thin ogee molding and either two-over-two or four-over-four windows. The choice of the four-over-four windows was an attempt to create some uniformity while achieving the smaller scale of the earlier multi-pane windows. Disagreeing with the Committee, Mr. Baron asserted that Second Empire mansards do usually sit over bracketed cornices of this type. He also noted that the Commission has approved several mansard additions on highly altered buildings. He gave two examples of historic mansards in the Old City Historic District. He explained that the building in question is currently a mix of styles, but that this design was an attempt to give it some coherence. He remarked that an earlier iteration of the design with a contemporary addition, which was taller and unrelated to the historic building, overwhelmed the historic building.

Mr. Cluver suggested that a fourth-floor addition might be appropriate, but only if the existing cornice was moved up from its current position to the top of the enlarged building. He also suggested that the new addition should have a brick façade. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro deemed a mansard addition appropriate, but contended that it should be much less tall and not have the notch in the back.

Ms. Hawkins and Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey suggested that the addition should be more frankly contemporary and follow the design of the new house proposed for the rear lot rather than taking its stylistic cues from the existing house to which it would be attached. Mr. Cluver suggested that any new addition on the historic building should be set back from the front façade of the historic building. Mr. Baron explained that the applicants had shown him an earlier design for the addition that included a front yard at the corner. Mr. Baron commented that he had rejected that proposal and had recommended that the addition extend to the sidewalk at the corner. Ms. Hawkins agreed with that approach. Mr. Cluver suggested allowing some addition at the fourth floor, though not necessarily a mansard.

Ms. Hawkins called for public comment, of which there was none.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if he would like to withdraw his application or accept a recommendation of denial. Mr. Maffei withdrew his application.

**ADDRESS: 1333 WAGNER AVE**

Project: Construct ADA ramp and addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Free Library of Philadelphia, City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Christopher Dardis, Vitetta

History: 1917; Logan Branch of the Free Library; Philip H. Johnson, architect

Individual Designation: 6/12/2009

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct an ADA ramp and addition to the Logan branch of the Free Library. The ramp would be located at the front of the building, to the side of the monumental stair, and would be clad in granite with a wrought-iron railing. The addition would be located at the northeast (side/rear) corner of the building, and would house an elevator, egress stair, and bathroom, and would provide ADA access to the basement. The addition would be clad in brick and would enclose three window openings. The application also proposes new entrance doors and basement windows that replicate the historic elements.

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

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Gutterman recused from the review, owing to her employment at the architectural firm representing the application. Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Chris Dardis represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked if consideration was given to locating the ADA ramp somewhere other than the front of the building. Mr. Dardis responded that there was internal discussion regarding this question, and it was determined that the ramp could not be placed in another location that would allow for convenient public access. Mr. Cluver opined that the new elevator could have a front door and back door configuration, which could allow for ground level access into the proposed addition. Mr. Dardis responded that this option was not considered.

Ms. Hawkins asked about raising the landing height at the front entrance. Mr. Dardis confirmed that they propose to add one step to the monumental stair. Ms. Hawkins requested that Mr. Dardis note this on the drawings, and provide a detail of how the monumental stair will be modified. Ms. Hawkins asked about the column bases. Mr. Dardis responded that the granite column base is six inches in height, which is the same height as the proposed new step.

Ms. Stein asked why the ramp is proposed for the left side of the front of the building as opposed to the right side of the front of the building. Mr. Dardis responded that there is one less basement window on the left side of the front of the building.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the ramp is problematic because it modifies the historic portico and monumental stair, and railings will likely need to be altered as well. She explained that there needs to be a balance between access for all people into the building, and an acceptable level of alterations to historic fabric. She suggested that the applicant investigate alternative schemes that do not greatly modify historic fabric. Mr. Cluver added that, while front door access is always preferred, he does not want to start with the ramp in the front until all options have been explored. Mr. McCoubrey added that a front door entrance is important, owing to security concerns, but all options need to be explored as this proposal is a fairly radical intervention.

Mr. Cluver noted that the chosen location of the proposed addition is the best option. He asked if the family restroom is a requirement. Mr. Dardis responded that it is a requirement from the client. He explained that there is currently a bathroom in the main room of the library that is proposed for removal in order to restore the original Carnegie design. Ms. Stein asked if the addition can be smaller. Mr. Dardis responded that consideration was given to replicating the existing northwest addition, but the elevator equipment and second means of egress resulted in a larger addition. Ms. Hawkins asked about the existing basement egress stair. Mr. Dardis responded that it is not a legal means of egress, and altering that egress stair to make it a legal means of egress would result in a modification to the foundation of the monumental stair, owing to width issues. Mr. Cluver started to sketch potential designs that would stay within the same relative footprint as the proposed addition, but allow for an at-grade entry. Ms. Hawkins opined that the proposed addition had a dead façade, conceding that the internal uses do not allow for much in terms of windows and light. She stated that an entrance at this façade would be welcoming.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, with a suggestion to further investigate options for providing access through the proposed addition.

**ADDRESS: 59 N 02ND ST**

Project: Modify storefront; replace sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 59 North 2nd Street LP

Applicant: Jesse Greenberg

History: 1885

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to modify a storefront and replace a sign at a first-floor commercial space located within the Old City Historic District. The proposed sign would be attached to an existing sign, and would have non-illuminated letters that project one inch from the panel. The remainder of the buff-brick, first-floor façade would be covered with wood at the vertical columns flanking the storefront and with stainless steel-tiles under the windows.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the sign and painting of cornice; denial of the wood and tile cladding, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Signage salesmen Jesse Greenberg and Peter Mastrogiacomo represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked for more information regarding the proposed tile. Mr. Greenberg responded that it would be stainless steel squares mounted onto HardieBacker, and then anchored to the existing brick under the windows. He explained that the stainless steel tile works well with Economy Restaurant Supply's new branding. The wood paneling would screw into mortar joints so as to not damage the brick. The brick sill will be capped. Ms. Gutterman responded that moisture will enter through the anchor, resulting in harm to the building. Ms. Hawkins noted that

it is optimistic to think they would hit all mortar joints when going through a piece of plywood. Mr. Greenberg commented that there are three buildings in total within the immediate vicinity that they wish to eventually brand in a similar manner.

Mr. Cluver asked about the existing buff brick. Ms. Broadbent responded that it is not original to the building, but was there at the time of designation. Ms. Hawkins commented that the brick appears to be from the 1920s, and suggested that the brick should be cleaned.

Ms. Hawkins and Ms. Gutterman stated their approval of the sign, but not the other proposed modifications. Ms. Gutterman explained that she understands the desire to create an identity, but suggested that it can be achieved with the sign.

Ms. Hawkins suggested replacing the front door. She explained that a stainless steel door, with a very small window in it, could look like a restaurant kitchen door and would help with branding while minimizing expenses.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the sign and the painting of the cornice, with the staff to review details; but denial of the remainder of the application including the covering of the brick, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 17 LONGFORD ST**

Project: Construct house

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Sandra Clemens

Applicant: Sandra Clemens

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Greenbelt Knoll Historic District, Non-contributing, 6/9/2006

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a one-story house on a vacant lot located within the boundaries of the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District. The lot was vacant at the time of the designation of the historic district; therefore, the Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction only over this lot. Like the houses in the district, the house that would be constructed on the site is a simple, one-story, Mid-Century Modern house with vertical wood siding.

**STAFF COMMENT:** The proposed house is compatible with the historic district, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Gregory and Sandra Clemens represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the type of proposed windows. Ms. Clemens responded that the windows will be vinyl owing to insulation and maintenance. Ms. Hawkins responded that double glazing is available in a variety of materials. Mr. Cluver commented that vinyl windows are not as durable as commonly believed, and that a fiberglass or clad window will last longer. Ms.

Hawkins noted that the applicant should compare warranties of different windows. Mr. Cluver suggested that the windows are not white vinyl, as it will visually stand out when compared to most other buildings in the district.

Ms. Clemens stated that the siding will be cedar in color but synthetic in material. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicant look at the graining of the synthetic material, which can tend to hold dirt or appear too shiny.

Ms. Stein noted that the architect has drawn the edge of the roof with a very thick trim along the roof, being two feet thick and projecting from the house. She suggested a thinner edge, around eight to twelve inches instead of two feet thick, so as to mimic other roof edges in the district. Ms. Hawkins commented that a thinner edge will allow for a single board to run across, as opposed to little sections of boards with a wider edge.

Ms. Clemens confirmed that the house will be built on site. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that she should ensure that the flat roof is of high quality, as a flat roof with no slope is prone to leaking.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about mitigating the impact to the existing vegetation. Ms. Clemens responded that no trees will be disturbed, but branches will be cleared from the site as needed.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT:** The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the proposed house is compatible with the historic district, pursuant to Standard 9, but suggested that the applicants consider its comments regarding materials and details.

**ADDRESS: 108-12 CUTHBERT ST**

Project: Convert warehouse to residence

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sonia Jordan Lea

Applicant: Julie Hagopian, Moto DesignShop Inc.

History: 1760; Coombs Alley; Henry Harrison Houses; Jacob Cooper and Henry Harrison, carpenters

Individual Designation: 4/9/1957, 1/6/1977

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to renovate an existing warehouse into a single-family dwelling. The application proposes to remove the stucco from the facade, and to cut large windows and two doors into a currently unfenestrated wall. The application also proposes to replace a large existing sliding door with a wider garage door, rebuild the roof, and to remove and/or relocate decorative terra cotta pieces acquired and installed by the owner since the 1980s. The owner who collected the terracotta pieces is in the process of selling the building.

The warehouse building in question was not identified in the Old City Historic District Inventory, and was consolidated as part of 108-112 Cuthbert in 2003, the same year in which the District was designated. 108-110 Cuthbert was identified in the inventory as a parking lot and determined Non-contributing. The Henry Harrison Houses on former Coombs Alley (now

Cuthbert Street) at 112 to 118 Cuthbert Street were individually designated in 1957, and are considered Significant within the Old City Historic District. This application is limited to the warehouse building, now known as 108 Cuthbert Street, which is being sold to Sonia Jordan Lea. No work is proposed to the eighteenth-century house at 112 Cuthbert Street.

Brief historic map and deed research conducted by the staff indicates that the warehouse building was historically associated with the Nathan Trotter & Company, whose main buildings located at 36 and 38 N. Front Street were constructed in 1833. Founded as a metal-importing business in the late eighteenth century, Nathan Trotter & Company evolved into the largest manufacturer of tin and tin alloys in North America. The warehouse at 108 Cuthbert was once part of the Trotter property. Although the exact date of construction is unknown, the existing warehouse was present by the time of the 1858-60 Hexamer & Locher atlas. The front facade of the existing building contains no windows because it was formerly a party wall between this building and two taller warehouse structures, which stood to the north. A 1916 Sanborn map indicates that the building had a dirt floor, and that there was an opening in the wall between the existing building and the former adjoining structure. The lost warehouse structures are visible in an early photograph. A 1950 Sanborn map labels the property as a metal products warehouse, suggesting that it may have continued to be part of the Trotter holdings into the twentieth century.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Eric Oskey and Julie Hagopian represented the application.

Mr. Oskey presented revised drawings to the Committee. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant to explain the modifications made to the design since the original submission. Mr. Oskey explained that the façade changes were made to respond to the requirements for a single-family residence. He noted that the primary changes in the revised application were the reduction in the amount of glazing along the entire façade and the addition of a projecting, concrete entrance bay. The bay, he noted, would project approximately four feet from the existing plane, and would feature vertical linear windows and recesses in the concrete to display some of the architectural artifacts collected by the previous owner. For the remainder of the façade, the design would expose the brick from beneath the existing stucco, as originally proposed, but would feature smaller windows set into slightly recessed planes and surrounded by concrete.

Ms. Hawkins questioned whether the applicant planned to use concrete, or retain or replace the existing stucco in kind. Mr. Oskey responded that they would like the material to be concrete. Ms. Hawkins asked for clarification as to whether the existing masonry would be cut out to install the concrete, and Mr. Oskey responded that it would.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the treatment of the joint between the existing brick and the proposed concrete. Mr. Oskey responded that the joint would be recessed from the brick by approximately three inches.

Ms. Stein asked if the driveway to the building is a public right-of-way. Ms. DiPasquale presented a photograph of the property from Cuthbert Street, and responded that the drive is not public. Mr. Baron commented that a small portion of the front façade of the building is visible from Cuthbert Street, while a small portion of a blank party wall is visible from 2<sup>nd</sup> Street through

a parking lot. Ms. Hawkins asked if the rear of the property is visible, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that it is not. Ms. Hawkins noted that, moving forward, it would be helpful if the applicant submitted an aerial photograph of the property that showed its context.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the application proposed to remove the dormer windows/skylights on the roof. Mr. Oskey responded that the entire roof would be removed and replaced, and that the windows would not be reinstalled. The Committee members expressed confusion over the lack of existing versus proposed drawings. Ms. Hagopian clarified that three new dormers would be installed in different locations than the originals. Ms. Hawkins noted that the proposed windows were not shown in the revised south elevation.

Ms. Stein asked Ms. DiPasquale to explain one of the photographs included in the Committee's packet. Ms. DiPasquale explained that the photograph was taken from Cuthbert Street, with the Significant building at 112 Cuthbert Street just outside the view of the photograph. In the foreground of the photograph, she noted, was a 1980s addition to 112 Cuthbert, and in the background was the stucco wall of 108 Cuthbert Street, which was historically associated with 36-8 N. Front Street. What appeared to be a brick addition at the rear of the building, it was concluded, was in fact a separate building to the south. Mr. Baron noted that some of the west wall of the building is also visible from S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Ms. Hagopian presented a photograph of the property from 2<sup>nd</sup> Street; it showed that a small portion of a blank party wall is visible at the rear of a large parking lot, about 220 feet away.

Ms. Hawkins noted that it is not a good use of the Committee's time to try to figure out what they are looking at. She noted that a significant amount of information that should be presented on the drawings or in the packets is missing, including a better understanding of the materials and view sheds, and that these would be helpful for the Commission meeting.

Mr. Cluver commented that he preferred the original submission, which presented an industrial feel he felt reflected the building's history. The revised proposal with the concrete elements and bay, he opined, diluted what he found to be a more compelling story.

Ms. Stein asked whether the roofline would be altered. Mr. Oskey responded that they are proposing to replace the existing structure, save one large beam, and described the change in roofline. Ms. Stein asked why there was no demolition section to show the roof would be modified.

Ms. Hawkins expressed concern over the lack of clarity and descriptiveness of the submitted drawings, and a lack of existing conditions drawings. She noted that the drawings should indicate all changes to be made, visually or through annotations. She commented that the drawings had no notes indicating the changes in roofline, dormers, changes in heights of walls, or what is existing fabric versus new. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the applicant had confirmed that the stucco could be removed without damaging the brick beneath, or whether the existing brick was in good condition.

Ms. Hawkins opined that there was insufficient information to review this application. Mr. D'Alessandro concurred. Mr. Cluver noted that applicants generally submit existing and proposed drawings, so that the Committee can make a one-to-one comparison between the two.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether there were any openings on the wall, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that the taller portion of the façade had been a party wall between the existing building and a warehouse structure to the north that was demolished many years ago. She noted that maps indicate that there had been an opening in the party wall between the two structures, and that there was an opening in the lower portion of the building as well. She presented an interior photograph indicating that there do not appear to be infilled window openings in the building.

Ms. Stein asked if this structure had been individually designated, and Ms. DiPasquale stated that the warehouse building was not individually designated, but was part of a larger property that included the 1750s building, which was individually designated and is classified as Significant in the historic district inventory.

Ms. Stein commented that she also preferred the original design, which had a more warehouse aesthetic. The revised submission, she noted, included many documents that did not make sense. She expressed concern over the possibility of exposing brick that was not intended to be exposed. Mr. Cluver agreed with Ms. Stein, and noted that, in concept, he supported the idea adding a large number of windows. Ms. Hawkins agreed, noting that she too believed the original design was stronger. Mr. McCoubrey also agreed, noting that elements such as corbelling at the corners that were included in the original submission should be included in the revised submission, and that original elements should be preserved. The Committee members agreed unanimously that they supported the reuse of the building and the addition of windows to the property, but preferred the original submission as it featured a stronger warehouse aesthetic. They also agreed unanimously that the submission as presented lacked clarity, and that existing versus proposed drawings, including floor plans, were necessary.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing incompleteness.

**ADDRESS: 133 S 18TH ST**

Project: Alter storefront; cut windows and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: ADR 18th & Sansom LLC

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr LLP

History: 1850; new façade, c. 1915

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to make numerous alterations to an existing storefront at the corner of 18<sup>th</sup> Street and Moravian Street, a service alley. At the 18<sup>th</sup> Street façade, the application proposes to relocate the entrance for the first-floor commercial space from a shared vestibule through a door perpendicular to the 18<sup>th</sup> Street façade to a new, at-grade entrance in what is now a storefront window. The existing entrance vestibule is not ADA compliant, and the application proposes to infill the existing door opening with a stucco panel, operable window, refrigerated display case and decorative menu board. In place of the existing plate glass

storefront window system, the application proposes to cut down the stone base (referred to as a knee wall on the plans) below the windows and install paneled café doors to match the proposed door. A new transom would be installed in place of the existing transom, and a stucco pier would be installed between the café windows and door.

At the Moravian Street façade, the application proposes to extend the storefront by more than half, replicating the existing entablature and installing new café doors and transoms. Like the 18<sup>th</sup> Street façade, the application proposes to remove the stone knee walls and install paneled café doors. While the application proposes to replicate the existing pilaster, capital, and base at the termination of the proposed storefront extension, it also proposes to demolish the existing pilaster, capital and base, and replace it with a flat stucco column.

Prior to this submission, the staff approved the remainder of changes shown on the Moravian Street façade, including the installation of a 12” projecting exhaust duct in a matte finish, the cutting of a new kitchen door, and the re-opening of an currently infilled window and installation of a fixed window. The staff also approved the replacement of the awnings with new fabric awnings.

Although the existing storefront is not original to the building, the staff contends that it has acquired its own significance. As such, the staff recommends that all elements of the storefront, aside from the non-historic aluminum storefront windows, be retained.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial as presented, but approval of the door cut, and approval of the installation of café windows with no panels within the existing openings, and the cutting of an additional storefront window along Moravian Street, if desired, provided that the stone base and all elements of the pilasters and entablature of the existing storefront are retained, pursuant to Standards 2 and 4.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ed Barnhart, attorney Eileen Quigley, interior designer Lisa Hines, and business owner Nicole Marquis represented the application.

Ms. Quigley noted that the intent of the applicant, Ms. Marquee, is to open the property up to the street and enhance the urban environment and dining experience. Referencing Ms. DiPasquale’s overview, which noted that the drawings showed the removal of the existing pilaster, capital and entablature on Moravian Street, Ms. Quigley responded that it was not an accurate representation of the intentions of the application and that those elements would be retained.

Ms. Quigley reiterated that the intention of the design was to be consistent with other properties on the block, and to open the property up and enliven the streetscape. She noted that Ms. Marquee already has one successful business on this particular block, and is proposing these modifications in order to ensure the longevity of this new space.

Mr. Cluver and Ms. Gutterman commented on the fact that Moravian Street is a service alley with dumpsters and trucks. Ms. Quigley questioned the trash talk and noted that the plans showed that the dumpsters would be relocated. Ms. Hawkins commented that the Committee should focus their discussion on the physical changes to the property.

Ms. Hawkins asked for clarification of the proposed plans for Moravian Street. She asked if, assuming that the existing elements of the pilaster will be retained, the plan was to cut a new opening and duplicate the existing pilaster and entablature. She noted that in drawing ID-305 the awning is shown spanning the existing pilaster, and asked how the applicant proposed to accommodate for the projection of the pilaster. Mr. Barnhart responded that the existing pilaster is nearly co-planar and that the intent is to create a shallow notch in the awning around the pilaster, but that for all intents and purposes it would be a continuous awning. He noted that the existing capital, which is not shown on the drawing, would be above the awning. Ms. Hawkins asked if the base of the pilaster would also be retained, and Mr. Barnhart confirmed that it would. Ms. Hawkins opined that she would prefer to see two separate awnings, as the storefront reads as a system of bays.

Ms. Hawkins questioned how the applicant planned to seamlessly extend and transition between the existing and proposed portions of the storefront entablature. She also noted that the existing material of the pilasters and entablature were not identified in the application. Mr. Barnhart responded that the existing material is a stucco-like material, and that the transition between the existing and new portions would likely be a cold joint. Ms. Hawkins questioned whether the material actually was stucco, and Mr. Barnhart responded that the only stone material is at the base. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the material might be painted stone rather than stucco. Mr. Barnhart stated that it was not stone. Ms. Hawkins commented that she would be hesitant to believe it was not stone unless proven otherwise. Assuming the material is stone, she asked, would the applicant be willing to extend the cornice and replicate the pilaster in stone. The applicant did not respond.

Mr. Cluver commented that the way the storefront currently turns the corner for one bay is a nice feature, although he understood the applicant's desire to extend the storefront. He suggested that rather than replicating the first bay, the applicant could cut an additional window, and make a clear break between the historic storefront and the new window. If a future tenant wished to have a smaller storefront, the window opening could be infilled without impacting the historic storefront system. Mr. Barnhart noted that Mr. Cluver was saying was that, from the interior, the windows would appear as proposed, but from the exterior, there would be a clear distinction between the historic and new windows. The Committee members suggested a punched window.

Mr. Cluver questioned whether the applicant needed to extend the awning the full width of the 18<sup>th</sup> Street façade, and opined that patrons may go to the original recessed doorway. Ms. Hawkins asked whether an awning was even necessary, given the projecting bay above. Ms. Hines noted that the applicants were flexible in terms of the awning configuration.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether any graphics were proposed for the awnings, and Ms. Hines responded that the awnings would be a simple black and white stripe fabric, and the signage for the restaurant would be vinyl lettering adhered to the window. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there was any projecting signage, and Ms. Hines confirmed that there would not be.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the applicant was open to the idea of punching a window opening rather than extending the storefront, and Mr. Barnhart replied that they would be willing to consider that option.

Ms. Gutterman noted that she understood the desire to have the windows open, but asked why the applicant desired to have the windows extend to grade. Ms. Hawkins concurred. Mr. Barnhart noted that the granite below the existing windows is one continuous piece between each set of piers. Their thinking, he continued, was that, by extending the café windows/doors to grade, they could avoid cutting the granite and could store the solid pieces on site for installation at a future date, if desired.

Mr. Baron interjected that the current design, which proposes café doors with panels at both the top and bottom actually decreases the amount of glazing and thus the amount of light on the interior of the building than they would achieve by retaining the base and installing glazed café windows. Ms. Marquee asked Ms. Hines if the glass extended the full height. Ms. Hines responded that they had discussed extending the glazing up, but that the current design showed wood panels above and below. Ms. Hines noted that they would be open to exploring including additional glazing. She acknowledged the glassiness of the existing historic storefront.

Ms. Stein noted that she was concerned about the slope of the sidewalk between Moravian Street and the proposed entrance. She noted that there is a significant pitch between the existing door and the corner, which slopes up possibly four to six inches or more, but the elevation drawing shows no slope. Ms. Stein and Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicants had explored how they would mitigate that slope in order to land someone in a wheelchair at grade inside the building. Ms. Stein noted that, with the operable doors, it is unclear whether people would be entering at grade or not. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the issue of the stone base seemed to be the answer, and that the application needed a section through this area to determine constructability.

Mr. Cluver retracted his previous comment about limiting the 18<sup>th</sup> Street awning to the storefront, and instead supported the current proposal to extend it the full width between the piers. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the existing façade is very strong compositionally, and that a full-width awning is more appropriate to the building.

Mr. Cluver pondered whether, given the symmetry of the building, it might be more appropriate to widen the proposed doorway to the width of the existing entrance vestibule to create symmetrical entries.

Ms. Gutterman asked about what appeared to be a void over the existing entry vestibule. Mr. Barnhart responded that it is spandrel glass, which he assumed was not original to the building. Mr. Barnhart noted that nearly all of the glazing on the first floor of the building has been changed relatively recently; it is non-historic aluminum.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented; but approval of the door on 18<sup>th</sup> Street, full-height glass café windows, a new punched storefront window at least 18 inches east of the historic storefront on Moravian Street, and awnings as proposed for the historic storefront, provided the stone base is retained except at the new door and no awnings are installed over the new storefront window.

**ADDRESS: 1929 SANSOM ST**

Project: Replace clear glass with art glass in ten second-story windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1929 Sansom LP

Applicant: Margaret Saligman, MLS Studios

History: 1926; Warburton Hotel; Arthur L. Harmon, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace 10 wood windows with stained glass windows on the second floor of the 20<sup>th</sup> Street façade of this building. The new stained glass windows will include religious iconography related to the use of the interior space as a chapel. The sash of the stained glass window will be the same size and shape as the original sash and will fit within the existing frames. The original sash have 20 panes of glass divided by wood muntins. The original muntin grid pattern will be replicated in the leaded comes of the stained glass windows. The rounded arched transoms above will be maintained.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the original historic sashes are retained and stored on site, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Artist Rick Prigg represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether it was the intent to remove the existing sash and replace them with new windows, and Mr. Prigg confirmed that it was. Mr. Prigg noted that the current wood muntin pattern makes it difficult to produce any imagery in the windows. The solution they developed was to replicate the sight lines of the muntins with lead comes, and enhance the windows with the addition of decorative medallions. The perimeter of the sash, he confirmed, would be wood to match the existing windows.

Ms. Stein asked whether the arched transoms would remain, and Mr. Prigg confirmed that they would. The arched portions of the windows, he noted, are purely an element of the façade, as they are covered over on the interior.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the applicant was the owner of the building and whether he had the ability to confirm that the windows could be stored on site. Mr. Prigg replied that he is not the owner, but that he could inform the Sisters of Mercy that the retention of the windows was a requirement of the approval. Ms. Hawkins noted that he should also ensure that the windows are numbered so that they could be reinstalled in their proper openings at a later date.

Mr. Cluver opined that the design was an elegant solution, and Ms. Hawkins concurred.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the original historic sash are numbered and stored on site, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**ADDRESS: 5 AWBURY RD**

Project: Legalize garden structures

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chunrong Li

Applicant: Chunrong Li

History: 1872; Jonathan and R.C. Evans House

Individual Designation: 5/7/1981

District Designation: Awbury Arboretum Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize two garden structures at a private property in the Awbury Arboretum Historic District. The district is unique, in that it consists of a private but publicly accessible, landscaped park as well as a series of private residences that are set within the park. One garden structure is a “hoop house” that sits on a long sloping lawn away from the main house. It is a greenhouse framed with pipe and covered with sheets of plastic. The other structure is a “potting shed” that sits below grade with a sloping plastic cover above grade. Aerial photographs indicate that the potting shed existed as a foundation at grade prior to the date of the district designation, but was added to with brick and concrete block and then covered with plastic sheets over a pipe frame since designation. Both structures are minimally visible from the publicly accessible sections of the Arboretum. Photographs with the application indicate that a gazebo has been added to the property without the Historical Commission’s approval since the designation of the historic district, but it is not the subject of this legalization application.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval because the structures are:

- inconspicuous from the publicly accessible sections of the Arboretum,
- similar to greenhouse structures in the publicly accessible sections of the Arboretum,
- temporary in nature, and
- related to cultivation, a principle characteristic of the Arboretum.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Hawkins stated that she was asked to assist with the preparation of the National Register nomination for Awbury Arboretum several years ago, but then did not undertake the work. She stated that she does not believe that she has a conflict in the matter, but would recuse if the applicant requested her recusal. Mr. Boni stated that he did not object to Ms. Hawkins’ participation in the review. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Paul Boni and Robert Peters, the husband of the property owner, represented the application.

Mr. Boni stated that he and his client photographed the views of the garden structures from the public portions of the Arboretum including the meadow. He reported that Erin Cote of the Historical Commission’s staff then visited the Arboretum to verify that the photographs accurately depicted the conditions. She undertook “her own reconnaissance” and took photographs documenting the visibility of the structures from the public parts of the Arboretum. Mr. Boni explained that he walked the property lines separating the property in question from the public parts of the Arboretum and took a photograph every five steps to show that the structures are inconspicuous to the public. “One, two, three, four, five, boom! One, two, three, four, five, boom!” He offered the “walk-by” photographs to the Committee. He concluded that the structures are minimally visible.

At Ms. Stein's request, Mr. Boni pointed out the publicly accessible sections of the Arboretum and the private homes on a map. Ms. Hawkins held up a photograph taken from the Meadow with the hoop house seen at a distance through the vegetation. She asked if that was the best view of the hoop house from the publicly accessible sections of the Arboretum. Mr. Boni stated that it was. He pointed out on the map where he had walked when he took the photographs every five steps. He stated that, to get that view of the hoop house, you "really have to climb through some Crocodile Dundee type stuff." Ms. Hawkins asked if he meant "brush." Mr. Boni replied that he was going to say "bramble," but he does not know what "bramble" means.

Ms. Stein asked about the other structures in the area. Mr. Peters replied that they are surrounding homes, which are historic. Mr. Cluver asked if the roads were public or private. Mr. Peters stated that they are private driveways. He explained that, for example, he and his neighbors split the plowing costs for their private drive. The City does not plow it. Ms. Gutterman stated that she was still confused and asked the applicants to point out the public and private property. Mr. Boni responded that all of the property is privately owned, but the Arboretum is open to the public, while the private homes, which are interspersed with the Arboretum land, are not. He pointed to a map and explained that the Arboretum is depicted in green and the private homes in tan. Mr. Cluver asked about the location of Mr. Sellers' property; he noted that Mr. Sellers submitted a letter objecting to the garden structures. Mr. Peters pointed out Mr. Sellers' property as well as others.

Mr. Boni stated that his clients purchased their property several years ago and are "fans" of the Arboretum. He explained that the Arboretum has many hoop houses, which are a joint venture of Weaver's Way Food Coop and Penn State, and provided his client with information about purchasing and erecting a hoop house. Mr. Boni stated that the Arboretum's own hoop houses are visible from the publicly accessible Meadow.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Boni if a building permit is required to construct a hoop house. Mr. Boni replied that, in his opinion, a building permit is not required to erect a hoop house. He noted a state law signed last year that exempts such structures from building permit requirements. Ms. Hawkins asked if these structures were erected before or after the law was enacted. Mr. Boni replied that they were erected before the law came into being, but contended that that does not imply that a building permit was needed. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Commission should have reviewed the structures regardless of the need for a building permit because they change the appearance of the historic property. Mr. Boni stated that he would rather receive the Commission's approval than fight over whether a permit is required.

Mr. Cluver asked about the original use of the foundation upon which the potting shed was erected. Mr. Peters stated that the foundation was a ruin when he repaired it, but it had been the site of a potting shed since 1899. He stated that he restored the ruin into a functioning potting shed. He added that long-time residents remember it as a function potting shed into the 1970s. He stated that they rebuilt the foundation using the original brick excavated from the site. Some new masonry was employed below grade to stabilize the structure. The roof is new.

Mr. Boni noted that he has additional photographs of the Meadow, which the Committee may wish to view. He asserted that someone picnicking or painting in the meadow for the afternoon would be unaware of the hoop house. Ms. Gutterman countered that the structure is in the front lawn. Mr. Peters contended that Ms. Gutterman did not understand the context. He explained that he brought a copy of Mary Scattergood's memoirs to the meeting with him; she wrote about

her time at the Arboretum from about 1850 to 1900. He reported that his front lawn was filled with cows and sheep historically. He stated that this was not a formal Victorian landscape like Central Park or Prospect Park. It was a farm with sheep, hay fields, vegetable gardens, stables, and greenhouses. He stated that the book of the memoirs included photographs; one depicts his potting shed. He contended that any image of Victorian people playing croquet and drinking tea on these lawns, such as Ms. Gutterman was espousing, is inaccurate. Mr. Peters asserted that his structures should be viewed in this context, their historical context, not through the lens of neighbor, who wants the Arboretum to be something it was not. Ms. Gutterman replied that Mr. Sellers' letter states that the potting shed is in the front yard. Mr. Boni stated that Mr. Sellers' argument is a zoning argument and the potting shed complies with the zoning requirements, which involve distance from the property line.

Mr. Boni offered photographs of the Arboretum hoop houses as well as similar hoop houses at Grumblethorpe, one of the oldest and most important historic houses in Germantown. He claimed that they are visible from the street. Mr. McCoubrey asked if all of the photographs were taken after the leaves had fallen. Mr. Boni replied that they were; all were taken in the last month.

Mr. Cluver noted that the staff recommendation referred to the structures as temporary in nature and asked if they would be removed in the spring or were intended to stand for years. Mr. Boni replied that they can be disassembled and reassembled easily, but the intention is to leave them in place. Mr. McCoubrey asked if they planned to remove the plastic in the warm months. Mr. Peters stated that he did not. He stated that he offered to do that for the building inspector, who replied that the entireties of the structures needed to be removed. Mr. Boni stated that the zoning code defines temporary as less than 180 days. He stated that they could remove and reconstruct the structures every 179 days, but do not want to do so. He said that they are simple pipe and plastic structures. Ms Hawkins stated that the hoop house is temporary like an event tent that is left up forever is temporary. Mr. Boni stated that it is like a camping tent. He asserted that it is easily reversible.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to adopt the staff recommendation with an elaboration and recommend approval because the structures are:

- inconspicuous from the publicly accessible sections of the Arboretum,
- similar to greenhouse structures in the publicly accessible sections of the Arboretum,
- temporary in nature,
- related to cultivation, a principle characteristic of the Arboretum, and
- the potting shed is a reconstruction of the historic potting shed on its foundation.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:25 a.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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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.

Accessibility Guideline, Not Recommended: Altering, damaging, or destroying character-defining features in attempting to comply with accessibility requirements.

Accessibility Guideline, Not Recommended: Making access modifications that do not provide a reasonable balance between independent, safe access and preservation of historic features.

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.