

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

**TUESDAY, 25 AUGUST 2015
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Jared Brey, PlanPhilly
Greg Diehl, Old City District
Jon Stavin, PMC Property Group
Carolina Pena, YCH Architects
Jason Birl, Ambit Architecture
Mary Anne Hunter
Dan Vicencio, Danilo C. Vicencio Architect
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners
Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development
Michael Fierle, Cecil Baker & Partners
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker & Partners
Chris Carickhoff, Morrissey Design
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Andrew Mulson, Baker Street Partners
Steve Olszewski
James Jennings, Philadelphia Magazine
Janet Kalter
Joe Schiavo
Rich Thom
John Edwards, Varenhorst
Kheon Benjamin, Robert H. Wise Management Co., Inc.
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing
Stephen Vanderhorst, Vanderhorst
Rob Shulman, Reidenbach & Assocs.
Michael Alhadad
John Grasseley, Arden Theater
Brad Begelman, BCMI Real Estate
Tomas Hanna
Ashley May, Deborah Anderson

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 AUGUST 2015
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Michael Alhadad

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 4127 MAIN ST

Project: Demolish part of building; renovate front façade; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kazimier Sokolowski

Applicant: William J. O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear of a small three-story residential property on Main Street in Manayunk, and to construct a four-story addition straight up from the ridge line of the existing building. The application proposes to retain the front façade and front slope of the gable roof, to install appropriate windows in the upper floors, and to combine and expand the first-floor window openings to create a storefront window matching that of the neighboring building. At the ridge line, the addition would step up an additional two stories. The addition would be clad in stucco and feature plate and casement window openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the addition does not step up until the end of the existing main block (or approximately 30 feet), pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Committee. Architect Chris Carickhoff and equitable owners Andrew Mulson and Steve Olszewski represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to respond to the staff recommendation. Mr. Carickhoff responded that they had incorporated the suggestions offered during the discussion at the previous Architectural Committee review including maintaining the front slope of the roof and eliminating the floor plates that would have disrupted the front windows. He noted that they converted the commercial space into one and one-half stories, and in doing so, lost a residential unit. Mr. Carickhoff recognized that the Committee previously recommended that the applicants explore ADA accessibility, but noted that they had not yet been able to do so. Mr. Mulson reiterated that they felt that they had addressed all of the concerns presented during the previous Architectural Committee review.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to address the relationship of the proposed addition relative to the adjacent buildings and their relationship to the street. Mr. Cluver noted that this was the staff's primary concern, and that the intention was that the mass of the addition align with the mass of the additions to the adjacent properties. Mr. Mulson responded that the proposed addition would create a stepping effect relative to the upper floors of the adjacent buildings. He noted that they could not be set back to align with the adjacent property owing to egress and fire code requirements. He noted that Ms. DiPasquale had asked if the top unit could be pushed back into the space proposed as a balcony, but that this would be impossible because it would

create too great a travel distance to a fire stair. Mr. McCoubrey asked why Units 3 and 4 were different. Mr. Carickhoff responded that they differed owing to the travel distance to the single fire stair.

Mr. Cluver asked Ms. DiPasquale about the genesis of the staff recommendation for a 30-foot setback, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that that is approximately the length of the existing main block, as well as the setback for the additions of the other similar properties. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the upper-floor additions of the identical neighboring historic properties were set back to that depth, while the upper floors that step forward are on top of new construction.

Ms. Hawkins asked the staff how they are defining demolition in regards to this property. Ms. DiPasquale responded that, with the retention of the front façade and front slope of the roof, the staff is considering the proposal an alteration as opposed to a demolition.

Ms. Gutterman noted that Architectural Committee had previously recommended that the addition be set forward no further than the ridge, but that it might need to be set back more than that, depending on the massing. She noted that the rendering of the proposed massing of the addition at the ridge still seems to overpower the front of the building, and asked if there is any way to pull back further. Mr. Mulson responded that they pulled the addition back as far as possible, but to do so more would compromise the viability of the project. He noted that they eliminated the roof deck and pilot house entirely.

Mr. Mulson noted that the adjacent historic property, and another to the north, were incorporated into a larger new construction project approximately 15 years ago. The property in question was intended to be part of that development, but the owner at the time refused to sell.

Mr. Cluver noted that the drawing and rendering differ in terms of the height of the single window on the fourth-floor.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the color of the stucco on the upper-floor addition should match the adjacent properties, but not be the same as the front façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided the stucco color of the upper floors match the adjacent properties and differ from the front façade, and the fourth-floor window at the south elevation is corrected as suggested, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2108 AND 2110 WALNUT ST

Project: Construct 5-story addition and 9-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2110 Walnut Street Development LLC

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners

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

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a ten-story condominium building on a currently vacant lot, and to substantially alter the adjacent four-story Second Empire brownstone building. The two buildings would be internally connected, and the consolidation of the parcels would provide the Commission full jurisdiction over the entire site. The project was previously reviewed conceptually by the Architectural Committee, which commented that the massing of the previously-proposed seven-story building was too large and that the proposed façade was incompatible with the row of historic buildings. The Committee also noted that the massing overwhelmed the Chancellor Street elevation and recommended additional setbacks. The current application adds an additional three stories and penthouse to the proposal. The application proposes a four-story glass and metal addition on top of the historic building at 2108 Walnut Street, and a ten-story corrugated metal, glass, and stone-veneer building on the vacant lot. The new construction on the vacant lot would occupy the entire lot from Walnut Street through to Chancellor Street, where it would feature a brick façade with enormous ground-floor louvers and Juliette balconies above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton, and owner Tim Shaaban represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the Architectural Committee had expressed concerns about massing during the earlier conceptual review, but the proposed building is now taller. Mr. Baker responded that it has become taller, but was also pulled in. He noted that it is a by-right scheme. Mr. Baker opined that, when his firm was brought onto the project, they added a Walnut Street elevation more in keeping with the buildings to the east and west without being derivative. He noted that they want the building to look different than the neighboring buildings, and that it is expensive real estate. He noted that they have not taken it to the top of the FAR, and that, if the developer wanted to, he could build exclusively on the vacant lot and build up much higher. Their intention, he continued, is to take the comments of the Committee and mold them into a scheme that is sensitive to the historic fabric. He noted that the current proposal pulls the height of the building to the middle of the site and gives the owner the FAR that he needs.

Mr. Shaaban commented that, during the previous conceptual review, the Committee suggested that the Chancellor Street setback be increased, and that they did so, which is why the building increased in height by one floor.

Mr. Leighton presented new cladding materials, including a grey stone for the front elevation, as opposed to the brown/red submitted in the Architectural Committee's packets.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the Chancellor Street elevation. Mr. Shaaban responded that the new building setback is proposed at the ridge of the historic carriage house.

Mr. Cluver commented that the existing cornice and roof lines along Walnut Street are strong, and that the proposed building has picked up on the cornice line, but altered the roofline on the street. He noted that the massing of the proposed building is not in keeping with the character of the block, which is very cohesive and includes variations within a tradition. This approach, he noted, goes outside of that tradition entirely. Philosophical debates aside, he commented, when one looks at the proposed building, it does not seem to fit with its context, particularly on this street, in terms of its massing and fenestration pattern. Mr. Baker argued that the regularity and the fact that they are choosing a natural stone façade do keep with the principles established to the east and west without being derivative. Mr. Baker noted that they want the building to look like it is from the twenty-first century in terms of scale, rhythm, and rigor. The storefront intrusion on the Furness building is unfortunate, but they accept that it is part of the history of 2108 Walnut Street. Mr. Cluver responded that, if they were to suggest a restoration of the first-floor front façade of 2108, it could certainly be considered. Ms. DiPasquale interjected that a restoration of the storefront area at 2108 Walnut could be approved at the staff level.

Ms. Pentz asked for clarification of the proposed treatment of the mansard at 2108 Walnut. Mr. Leighton responded that the plane of the proposed stone façade at 2110 would align with the adjacent buildings, ending at the bottom of the adjacent mansards, at which point it would step to just behind the top of the mansard. Mr. Leighton noted that part of the party wall on 2108 Walnut will be exposed due to the setback of 2110.

Mr. Cluver opined that a roof-top terrace along Walnut Street is inconsistent with the Commission's position on roof decks on the main blocks of historic buildings.

Mr. Cluver questioned the treatment of the Chancellor Street parking access and the carriage house doors. Mr. Leighton responded that the carriage house doorway would be the vehicle entrance, and the design of the doors would take cues from neighboring historic buildings. Mr. Cluver clarified, and Mr. Leighton confirmed, that the applicants would respect the masonry opening, retain the arch, and that the door would resemble a historic carriage house door pattern.

Mr. Baker asked the Committee to work with him, noting that they could construct a new building on the vacant lot without the Commission's approval. He asked the Committee what things he could do to improve the design, but also get his client the FAR he wants. Mr. Baker noted he could change the color of the stone, play with planes, or undertake other revisions.

Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the Walnut Street elevation appears too commercial, that the openings are too large and spatially do not look like residential windows. He opined that the framing of the "dormers" stands out as overly square and does not fit the rhythm of the adjacent mansards. He noted that the color proposed originally for the façade was better than the grey proposed at the meeting. Mr. Baker responded that the Committee should know that if they go to the alternate scheme and build solely on the vacant lot, the building would have nothing resembling the mansard.

Ms. Hawkins responded to Mr. Baker, noting that he seemed to be threatening the Committee with a scheme they have not seen. She stated that the Committee is responsible for managing the historic building to which the applicants are proposing significant alterations. She noted that

at the conceptual review, the Committee made it clear that the massing was too large, and now it is even larger.

Mr. Shaaban noted that he would be happy to explore setting back the fourth floor on top of the historic building at 2108 Walnut, despite the loss of floor space.

Ms. Hawkins asked the Committee members if they could provide the applicants with specific advice. Ms. Gutterman recommended setting the new Walnut Street facade back to the ridge of the historic building, eliminating the balcony on the front of the building, or at minimum, making the railing invisible from the street. She opined that she was more comfortable with the relationship of the massing at the rear along Chancellor, but that the Walnut Street elevation proposed too much building for the site. She noted that grey is a stark contrast to the brownstone or sandstone of the adjacent buildings, and that the material coloring should be warm, such as a limestone. Mr. Baker responded that he could live with limestone.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that he took issue with the “big glassy thing” popping up from Walnut Street, and that the proposed addition should be set back so that it appears to be a different building. He noted that pushing the dining area on Level 5 back to align with the terrace wall might help. He stated that the height of the adjacent mansards should be respected. Mr. Cluver expressed concern over roof terraces visible from Walnut Street.

Ms. Pentz agreed with Mr. D’Alessandro that in general, the Walnut Street elevation seemed too commercial, and that it should be softened. She opined that, for her, the most troublesome portion of the façade is the fourth-story rectangular window frames that seem to loom over the building without much relationship to the adjacent mansards. She noted that she could not suggest what should be done, but that an effort should be made to modify those elements to bring more of a residential scale to the façade.

Mr. Baron noted that he had met with numerous applicants previously regarding the development of the site, and urged the Committee not to let zoning determine the massing. He stated that the preservation and zoning reviews are entirely separate and distinct and the Architectural Committee does not need to accept a particular massing of the addition merely because it meets the zoning limitations. He noted that they may be able to building to this height because they have combined the floor area for the historic building and vacant lot. Once combined, he noted, the Commission has full jurisdiction over the entire site. If the applicant were to propose a building only on the vacant lot, without the additional floor area of the adjacent historic building, it is not clear what height would be allowed by zoning. Therefore, it is important not to take zoning as the given.

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

Mr. Baker questioned whether the issue with the terraces was with the railings or with the fact that the occupants would be able to be seen. Ms. Hawkins responded that terraces and decks become storehouses of furniture, umbrellas, grills, and other object and that these elements should not be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Baker responded that there are numerous examples of terraces overlooking Philadelphia’s main streets, including his landmark building at 5th and Walnut. He stated that his firm attracts a certain type of clientele in part owing to the fact that he provides outdoor space in the city. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Commission was limited to Review-and-Comment jurisdiction for the project at 5th and Walnut; it does not provide any precedent. She noted that nearly every unit in the currently proposed building has outdoor space, and that the applicants could reconfigure the space to accommodate outdoor space for

every tenant. Mr. Baker reiterated that his clientele wants more terraces because that they are largely coming from the suburbs. The outdoor space provides a marketing advantage.

Ms. Hawkins expressed concern that the project has become much larger in terms of massing since the previous conceptual review. She noted that, in particular, she was concerned by the massing on Walnut Street. She stated that the mass of the addition should be set back farther. She opined that the addition in height needs to feel like a separate volume rather than a protrusion on the historic building. She further noted that the coloration of the front elevation of 2110 Walnut Street should be in the warm tones, and that the proposed window openings were too large, mostly in width, compared to the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Cluver reiterated that he was strongly against the proposed rooftop terrace on 2108 Walnut. Ms. Hawkins agreed, but opined that there should be no visible terraces all the way across both buildings. If they were hidden well enough, they may be acceptable. Mr. Shaaban noted that he would be willing to move the dining room back, and change the color to warm tones.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 1733 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Add exterior stairs and doors, ADA ramp, and elevator

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1733 Spring Garden St LLC

Applicant: Dale You, 1733 Spring Garden St LLC

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make several alterations to an existing four-story building at the corner of 18th and Spring Garden Streets. On the Spring Garden Street elevation, the application proposes to create a new basement access through a new exterior stairway cut from an existing concrete pad. The application proposes to restore one currently infilled basement window on the Spring Garden Street side and to cut a door straight down from the other basement window and create an arched transom to fill the top of the historic window opening. The stairway would be surrounded by a new retaining wall with a black metal handrail, and would be additionally concealed by a metal picket fence installed along the front of the existing elevated concrete pad. The fence would be designed to resemble that shown in a historic photograph of the property.

Along the 18th Street elevation, the application proposes to increase the height of a small, non-historic addition, and to add a door and large stairway on the west side of the addition. On the inside of a historic wall and fence, the application proposes to install a new ramp, which would terminate in a new door cut in the north face of the non-historic addition. The ramp would be partially, but not completely, concealed by the historic wall.

The application also proposes to install an elevator shaft, which would penetrate the flat roof portion of the rear ell 3'6" above the roof surface and be clad in brick. It would not disrupt the mansard roof.

The application further proposes to replace a door on the carriage house, which faces into a courtyard between the house and the carriage house, but does not provide details of the proposed replacement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the basement stairway and replacement of the basement windows with appropriate wood windows, and approval of the ramp and elevator shaft, provided the elevator shaft is clad in stucco or matte-finished metal; denial of the stair access on the west side of the non-historic addition along the 18th Street elevation, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Hawkins recused. Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Carolina Pena represented the application.

Mr. Cluver noted that there seem to be three major components to the application: the work at the front; the work related to the accessible entry; and the carriage house door. Mr. Cluver asked if there had been a basement-level entry previously on the front façade. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she believed it was only a garden with a fence.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the reason for the proposed stairway. Ms. Pena responded that the owner intends to use the basement as a separate commercial unit. Mr. McCoubrey asked if it was required for egress, noting that there are already two stairways shown in the plans. Ms. Pena responded that the existing stairs do not lead to the exterior. Ms. Gutterman noted that the proposed stairway seems to lead into a unit, not a hallway. Ms. Pena responded that, if the whole basement is one commercial space, the stairway does not need to be enclosed.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there is a reason that the proposed ramp goes up rather than down, which would decrease visibility from 18th Street. Ms. Pena responded that they thought it would be better if people entered at the first-floor level. Mr. Cluver noted that it would be best if the people could enter at grade. He noted that there is already a proposed elevator with doors on both sides, which encourages having a door on the street at grade level, so people can go up half a level to the first floor or down half a level to the basement. He noted that it would require adding a stop to the elevator, but would eliminate the entire ramp, the stair on the sidewalk, and the addition to the non-historic addition. Ms. Pena responded that she had not thought of that, and would discuss that option with the owner.

Mr. Cluver clarified the proposed work to the Spring Garden elevation, noting that there would be the stair with a handrail, guardrail, then a non-descript concrete pad of approximately 6 feet, and then a fence along the edge of the pad. Ms. Pena noted that they were considering installing a garden between the proposed fence and guardrail to shield the new stair. Mr. Cluver noted that the garden and fence would make a big difference in terms of the acceptability of the proposed stairway. Ms. DiPasquale asked whether the applicants proposed to continue the fence around the corner from Spring Garden onto 18th Street. Ms. Pena responded that they did not intend to do so, but could consider it, perhaps with a gate.

Mr. Cluver questioned the proposed carriage house door. Ms. Pena distributed drawings of the carriage house and proposed door. She noted that it is an existing opening. Mr. Cluver noted that the style of the door depicted in the drawings does not fit with the style of the building. Ms. Pena responded that the doors depicted in the drawings are doors they found inside the building that they were trying to make work for the opening. Ms. Gutterman noted that the doors should be simplified to have fewer panels. Mr. Cluver noted that the same would be true for the door to the ADA entrance. He observed that the applicants could work with the staff to design a door in keeping with the style of the building.

Mr. Cluver commented on the location of the proposed elevator. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the whole building had to be made accessible, and Ms. Pena responded that, since it was a commercial property, it was not required to have accessibility throughout, but that the owner wanted to have the elevator for the convenience. Mr. Cluver noted that there may be issues with the Department of Licenses & Inspections in terms of the accessibility requirements, and made it clear that any comments the applicants received during this review were based on the information presented. If changes need to be made, he noted, the applicant would need to propose a revised design.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of basement stairway, provided the front 6'-6" between the fence and stair are developed into a garden; denial of the ramp as well as the side stair, with the recommendation that the applicant consider an entry at grade; approval of doors into the carriage house, but with a revised design more in keeping with the style of the building; and approval of the elevator shaft, provided the shaft is clad in stucco or matte metal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 218-26 ARCH ST

Project: Construct 10-story mixed-use building with parking

Review Requested: Review and Comment for site; Final Approval for Little Boy's Court

Owner: 218 Arch Street Associates, LP

Applicant: John B. Edwards, Varenhorst, PC

History: vacant lot and Little Boy's Court

Individual Designation: None

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

Little Boy's Court, Historic Street Paving Thematic District, Significant, 12/9/1998

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a large mixed-use building on a parking lot on the south side of the 200-block of Arch Street. The property is classified as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. The properties at 218 and 220 Arch Street were individually designated as historic, but those designations were rescinded in 2006. The property includes a section of Littleboy's Court, a small, private street that runs between Arch and Cuthbert Streets. Littleboy's Court may be the only original, surviving cobblestone street in the city and is listed as significant in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application in June 2015, but that application was withdrawn prior to the July Historical Commission meeting to allow the applicant to confer with the neighbors. The current application has been modified from that reviewed in June 2015.

The current application proposes a ten-story structure with a five-story red brick color façade on Arch Street. The building steps up from five to ten stories as it steps back from Arch Street. The building would include ground floor retail and a large entryway on Arch Street to interior parking. The building has industrial-style punched windows throughout the upper floors. Materials have not been noted on the drawings, but appear to be brick of various colors with limestone trim, as is suggested in the cover letter. A detailed plan has been provided regarding work to Littleboy's Court.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 AUGUST 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STAFF RECOMMENDATION OR COMMENT: Denial of the proposed building; despite the revisions to the design proposed in June 2015, the current design is incompatible with the historic district in height, massing, and scale. Approval of the design for Littleboy's Court, with the staff to review details for the restoration of the street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Attorney Tony Forte, developer Jonathan Stavín, and architect Stephen Varenhorst represented the application.

Mr. Forte stated that he understands that the Historical Commission, not the Architectural Committee, will decide whether the Commission enjoys plenary or review-and-comment jurisdiction in this matter. He explained that, in a dispute over a zoning permit for a different owner, the court approved a zoning envelope for the new construction of nine stories with a five-story section along Arch Street. He stated that the court order allowed for the Historical Commission's review and comment on the project.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to clarify in what ways, if any, this proposal differs from that zoning envelope. Mr. Varenhorst showed an image indicating the approved envelope as well as the current proposal. The current design proposed 10 stories rather than nine, but would stay within the total height specified in the court-approved design. He explained that a central private courtyard had been removed from the approved design. However, setbacks at the outside corners have retained roughly the same square footage of open space, while benefitting the surrounding neighbors. He contended that this change makes the building seem less massive. In response to questions, Mr. Varenhorst explained that they have retained the industrial windows, which were criticized during the last review, because they are featured on surrounding industrial buildings. The smaller windows that were suggested are features of smaller residential buildings; this is a large building. On the subject of materials, Mr. Varenhorst said that all of the brick would be thin and panelized, red on the front, tan on Littleboys' Way, and grey at the upper sections. The storefronts and the windows would be aluminum. Mr. Varenhorst said that the muntins of the industrial windows would be internal grids. The Committee members suggested that the muntins should be external to the glass, as they are shown in the rendering. Mr. Varenhorst said that they have had good results with internal muntins and offered to bring a sample of the proposed window to the Commission meeting. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Varenhorst about the extent of demolition of Littleboy's Way. He explained that all of the unrestored street would be removed and restored using the salvaged river stones where feasible. The Belgian Block is not the original material. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the staff had an opinion about the archeological potential of the site. Mr. Baron replied that he did not.

Ms. Hawkins called for public comment. Old City resident Joe Schiavo said that he had been party to the aforementioned lawsuit. He asked about the height of mechanicals on the roof. Mr. Varenhorst said that the elevator override would extend 10 feet above the roofline with a screen eight feet above the roofline for a total height of 117'-10". Janet Kalter commented that she thinks that the size and scale of the building is still much too large for Old City. Patrick Rossi of the Preservation Alliance explained that his organization had been a party to the lawsuit as well. He contended that the proposed structure is too large, even if it does fit the approved zoning envelope. He did grant that the neighborhood does have some very large industrial buildings. Richard Thom explained that he had been the architect for the partial restoration of Littleboy's Court. He opined that the Historical Commission does have full jurisdiction over this project, owing to the section of Littleboy's Court that runs across the parcel. He asserted that the façade on Arch Street should be more compatible with the district. He said that none of the adjacent neighbors had been contacted about meeting with the developer. John Grassi of the Arden

Theater said that his building has a loading dock and 6 parking spaces on Littleboy's Court and he is concerned with access to those areas during and following this construction. Robert Schulman representing Cuthbert Condos expressed the same concern. Ms. Hawkins explained that the concern about parking and access is not within the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission and should perhaps be taken up with the Streets Department.

Mr. Forte asked the Committee to address the staff concern about a cornice. The Committee members suggested that the Arch Street façade should have more articulation and depth particularly at the location of the cornice. They suggested that adding a cornice would improve the design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9, with the staff to review details including the parking gate on Arch Street and the need for archeology, provided the following revisions are made:

1. a cornice or other articulation is added at the cornice line of the Arch Street façade,
2. muntins are installed on the outside of the glass of all the windows, and
3. all terraces, privacy fences, and railings are setback and no higher than the parapets.

ADDRESS: 1516 GREEN ST

Project: Construct residential building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: AHA Development LLC

Applicant: Dan Vicencio, Danilo C. Vicencio Architect

History: historic building demolished, 2014

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a six-unit building on the site of a former Italianate rowhouse. In 2012, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a permit without the Historical Commission's review to demolish the rear ell of the rowhouse and construct a wider rear addition to accommodate more units. The Department revoked the permit and forwarded the application to the Historical Commission for its review. The Commission denied the application. The Department of Licenses & Inspections then cited the property as dangerous. Owing to the determination, the staff approved a permit to demolish and rebuild the structure to match its original design, but with modifications to its rear ell. The applicant did not construct that design and now presents a revised proposal. Because the proposed building would have six units, two units must be accessible. The original structure not only sat up on a berm with stone retaining wall, but also had six steps. The application proposes to remove the existing berm and retaining wall and reconstruct a likeness of the former building at a lower level without steps. This would put the building at variance with the rest of the structures on the block, which all have retaining walls and sit higher. Although the applicant cites the ADA requirements to justify this deviation from the original design, it may be driven by the desire for more units.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Danilo Vincencio and developer Michael Alhadad represented the proposal.

Mr. Alhadad explained that he has as-of-right zoning for 6 units. He said that the Commission delayed him in his development of the building. He said that Elizabeth Baldwin at Department of Licenses & Inspections instructed him that accessible units are required on the first floor when there are more than three units in a new construction residential building.

Ms. Pentz commented that the proposal completely changes the relationship of this building compared to the rest of the block. Mr. Vincencio explained that they could stretch the building so that it could match its previous height. The Committee members tried to compare the design for the new building with that of the old, but found the information insufficient. They questioned whether the retaining wall should be kept. Mr. Vincencio opined that, in that case, not much of the first floor would be visible from the street. The Committee members also discussed a lift rather than a ramp. They asked for a scaled drawing showing the house in its context before the demolition compared to the proposed building at its new height. They requested photographs of the stone retaining wall and wanted information about the material. They found the application to be incomplete. Mr. Alhadad withdrew the application. He stated that he would submit a new application with the additional information.

ADDRESS: 526 N 22ND ST

Project: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 526 N 22nd Street LLC

Applicant: Chris Hammel, Deborah Anderson

History: 1859; new front façade, 1986

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 a one-story addition on top of an existing two-story rear ell. The additional story will be minimally visible from Spring Garden Street, when looking across the gas station and parking lot located at the corner of North 22nd and Spring Garden Streets. Visibility of the proposed addition will be partially or mostly obstructed by the existing three-story rear ell of the adjacent property to the south. The proposed addition will be clad in stucco and feature a sliding door opening onto a small deck at the rear.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Ashley May represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked about visibility from the public right-of-way. Ms. May responded that there is limited visibility from Spring Garden Street, but there is greater visibility from a very small section of Brandywine Street to the north.

Ms. Pentz asked about the fire-retardant plywood that is called out in the drawings. Ms. May responded that it will not be visible, and it is the plywood that is being used to separate floors two and three.

Ms. May stated that the front façade windows and door will be replaced, and the rear stucco will be removed and reinstalled. Ms. Broadbent commented that the drawings do not call for window and door replacement, so Ms. May would need to revise the drawings to show this, or submit for

the proposal to be reviewed by the staff separately from this application. Ms. Hawkins commented that it would be best to revise the drawings, and to discuss the window and door replacement with the staff prior to the revision.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the material of the deck railings. Ms. May responded that it will be a PVC material, and that the second floor deck railing will also be replaced, despite the note on the drawings that it will remain. Ms. Hawkins commented that the note should be revised, and suggested a black metal railing instead, which could be aluminum and very simple in style.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the material of the sliding door at the rear deck. Ms. May responded that it will be a sliding glass door, but she was unsure of the material. Ms. Hawkins suggested aluminum instead of vinyl for the sliding glass door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review window, door, metal railing and stucco details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 306 CYPRESS ST

Project: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Matthew & Alexis Eichenlaub

Applicant: Chris Hammel, Deborah Anderson

History: 1809

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story addition on top of an existing two-story rear addition. The additional story will be visible from Three Bears Park, to the west of the building, and would block visibility of several window openings on other buildings when looking east from Three Bears Park. The addition will connect to the main block at a point just below the rear cornice. The proposed addition will be clad in stucco, with one window on the rear, presumably to match the existing rear window on the second floor. The staff suggests that the application requires additional information, including a plan of the third floor and more detailed drawings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Ashley May represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent explained that the existing rear ell was added in the late nineteenth century, and the Commission approved the existing partial second-story stucco portion in 2003, which is visible from Three Bears Park.

Ms. Hawkins asked if Ms. May had any additional drawings. Ms. May responded that she did not. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee has to review what is presented at this time, which is lacking floor plans, context, a site plan, a good understanding of the elevations, and more information about how the addition will sit relative to the cornice line of the building.

Ms. Gutterman asked about visibility from Three Bears Park. Ms. Broadbent directed the Committee to a photograph supplied by the applicant of the view from Three Bears Park, but explained that the visibility was greater when she viewed it on site. She also pointed out the windows on other properties that would be blocked from view by the new construction. Ms. May commented that the property next door has a third-story addition. Ms. Hawkins asked for additional photographs to show context and visibility.

Mr. Cluver indicated that he supports the staff recommendation. Ms. May asked if she could withdraw the application. Ms. Hawkins responded that she may withdraw the application, but that she would start over again with a review by the Committee at another meeting. Ms. May asked if she could continue on with a review by the Commission, if she were to have all of the missing materials provided by that time. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Commission would have to approve it essentially without a review by the Committee, since the Committee's recommendation will indicate that there was not enough information provided at the time of the review. Ms. May indicated that she may withdraw the application, and Ms. Hawkins instructed her to put that request in writing to the staff.

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

ADDRESS: 1627 MOUNT VERNON ST

Project: Construct residential building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Tomas Hanna

Applicant: Kristin Pool, Ambit Architecture

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a duplex on a vacant lot in the Spring Garden Historic District. The Commission's jurisdiction is likely Review-and-Comment because the site appears to be undeveloped; however, a remnant of the former building related to a shared alleyway entrance stands at the edge of the lot and may be sufficient to consider the site developed. Before considering the merits of the design, the Historical Commission will need to determine whether it considers this site developed or undeveloped and therefore whether its jurisdiction is Full or Review-and-Comment.

A limestone base and brick veneer, the color of which is not specified, are proposed as front façade materials. The building is comparable to the other rowhouses on the block in terms of its height. The staff considers the design of the front façade to be incompatible with the historic district in terms of rhythm, scale of openings, and proportions, and there is a lack of information about the entryway and cornice.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed building is appropriate to the district in terms of height and massing; however, the design of the front façade warrants further consideration.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jason Birl and property owner Tomas Hanna represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins left the meeting. Mr. Birl explained that Mr. Hanna's parents will be living on the first floor unit, and so the entrance is being designed with accessibility in mind. He explained that they are trying to decide whether to use a ramp or a series of shallow steps. The entrance will be at grade. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the entrance has no structure at the party wall. Mr. Birl responded that they will be framing across. He handed out a rendering of the front façade.

Mr. Birl explained that the second and third-floor cutout is an attempt to bring in more light and air into the unit, and to provide a balcony as outdoor space, since there will be no front stoop.

Mr. Birl stated that the goal is to be compatible with the neighborhood through the use of materials, including limestone and red brick. He noted that the windows are metal clad, but he is open to suggestions about material and color. He stated that the Spring Garden Civic Association, operating out of the corner property on this block, has used similar low-maintenance window materials. Mr. McCoubrey opined that black is not a good choice for the windows. Mr. Birl responded that they are open to color suggestions, and have discussed the use of deep blue that is found on the neighboring property's trim.

Ms. Gutterman opined that this building is not picking up on details from surrounding buildings, because it is lacking details. Mr. Cluver opined that the street has a strong rhythm, and the proposed building is a distinct element that does not relate to the rhythm or fenestration pattern of the street. Several Committee members commented on the lack of a cornice. Mr. Birl responded that the block is not as cohesive as one may think, and there is a mix of arched-top openings and square-top openings. Ms. Gutterman responded that there is still an issue of the cornice, punched openings, size of the openings and rhythm. She noted that the cornices on the block are not all the same, but all of the buildings have a cornice. Mr. Birl responded that they have discussed the addition of a cornice. Mr. Cluver opined that the setback on the front façade may not work well with a cornice. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the recess looks like a gash out of the façade, and stated his preference for punched openings.

Ms. Pentz offered a different opinion, and stated that the building is compatible in terms of color and height, and does not need a cornice. She opined that the building does not need to emulate historic elements.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the exposed section of party wall. Mr. Birl responded that they are considering three options, those being a cleaner stucco, a green wall, or some material such as wood that could bring some warmth to the design.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the shared passageway between the two properties. Mr. Birl responded that it will get cut away and removed.

Mr. Cluver asked about visibility of the rear of the building. Mr. Birl confirmed that the rear is not visible from a public right-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the applicant should consider the suggestions offered during the review of this project.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:00 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.