MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 15 DECEMBER 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
Suzanne Pentz
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

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

ALSO PRESENT
Angelina Chan
Patrick Hannigan, Gemini Design Associates
Mauro Guillen
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Chris Carickhoff
Michael Salomone
Henry Friedman
David Feldman
Pinchas Lando, Talmudical Yeshiva of Philadelphia
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker + Partners, Architects
Nona Bergsten, Cecil Baker + Partners, Architects
Jeanne Chang
M. Travis
Jennifer Arnoldi, Martin J. Rosenblum & Associates
Caritina Mills, YCH Architect
Ben Estepani, Moto Designshop
Ann Dinh, Moto Designshop

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Messrs Cluver and D'Alessandro joined him. Ms. Hawkins arrived shortly thereafter to assume the chair.

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 2100 AND 2110 UPLAND WAY
Proposal: Construct residential building
Review Requested: Review and Comment
Owner: Talmudical Yeshiva of Philadelphia
Applicant: Yaakou Wilner, Wynnefield Maintenance
History: vacant lots
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Contributing, pending
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a semi-detached twin residential building on open lots in the pending Overbrook Farms Historic District. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction over the application is Review and Comment.

The building would maintain the traditional setback from the street and would be sited to avoid disrupting views of the adjacent historic building. The building would be three stories in height with stone at the first floor and stucco above, like many of the neighboring buildings. The building would have numerous gables and double-hung windows, again like many of the neighboring buildings. Some materials, such as those of the windows and doors, have not been specified. Windows with exterior muntins, not sandwiched muntins, would be more in keeping with the district.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed development of the site with the building is generally compatible with the historic district, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. School representative Pinchas Lando, attorney Sean Whalen, and architect Dave Feldman represented the application.

Mr. Whalen explained the subdivision of the property and the creation of two additional lots, where the proposed houses will be constructed. He noted that the plan that derived from approximately 18 months of hard work with the Registered Community Organization and the neighbors. He noted that they originally sought to build two stand-alone houses, which would have had by-right zoning, but that the neighbors preferred a twin with a certain setback that would be more conducive to the neighborhood streetscape. Ms. Stein asked if the other parcel would ever be developed. Mr. Whalen explained that there is an agreement to maintain and restore the historic house, and to construct the single twin on the two additional lots. Mr. Cluver asked if all construction on these lots would be complete once the twin is erected, and Mr. Whalen confirmed that it would.

Mr. Cluver noted that the two halves of the twin are slightly staggered, and asked if this was common in the neighborhood. He opined that when he thinks of a twin, he thinks of the facades as being aligned, as opposed to staggered, which he believes is a more contemporary approach to semi-detached housing. Mr. Feldman responded that, given the characteristics of the structures in the neighborhood, the stagger was preferred because it breaks down the massing. He noted that they also incorporated some gable roofs, which are prominent in the area. For the exterior materials, he continued, they are introducing a cultured stone, which will be similar to materials in the district. Ms. Pentz asked if the applicant had any sample materials. Mr. Feldman responded that they did not bring them with them, but could provide them.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicants had any photographs of surrounding buildings, and Mr. Feldman responded that he did not. Mr. Cluver noted that the lack of photographs of neighboring buildings makes understanding the context of the new construction difficult. He noted that, when he thinks of Overbrook Farms, he does not picture the multiplicity of gables proposed, which has more of a feel of a late twentieth or early twenty-first-century development house.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the location of the property line. Mr. Whalen responded that it runs through the middle of the twin. Mr. Feldman noted that the properties widen at the front of the lot and narrow at the rear. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the party wall would have to extend above the roofline. Mr. Feldman responded that the fire wall runs through the attic and separates the properties, but does not have to extend above the roof.

Mr. Cluver concurred with the staff recommendation that the windows have muntins on the exterior, and noted that there are many little details in the design that make it a contemporary development house as opposed to part of a historic development. He noted that the level of detail design will dictate whether the new building is in the character of the historic district. He opined that the batten shutters are an unusual detail, and questioned whether that was typical of the neighborhood.

Ms. Hawkins noted that typically in twins, there is a unifying element that takes the two parts and brings them together, such as a central gable or gambrel. Such a device makes it appear as one large house. She explained that this twin is designed as two individual houses that are joined at a smaller, weaker gable than the prominent gables that are the main focus of the building. She noted that the entrance doors are under the center line of their respective gables, making them appear more individual. Mr. Lando responded that he lives in a twin in the neighborhood and the front of each side is individuated with a gable and prominent porch. Ms. Hawkins replied that photographs of properties in the neighborhood would have been helpful.

Mr. Cluver noted that there are two approaches to joining a twin; one is to have a unifying element, and the other is to acknowledge them as separate entities. However, this design, with a smaller central gable, creates confusion between the two approaches.

Ms. Stein agreed that photographs of the neighborhood would be helpful. She noted this property, which is near a corner, will be viewed as a whole volume. She suggested that the stone should wrap around the entire building, not be limited to the front elevation. Mr. Lando responded that the stone will wrap around the building, not just be on the front façade, because the neighbors preferred that as well. Ms. Stein noted that the drawings do not completely specify the proposed materials. Mr. Feldman noted that they will use stucco and stone.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the height of the proposed construction in relationship to existing buildings in the neighborhood. Mr. Feldman responded that the new building will be about the same height as the nearby buildings.

Mr. McCoubrey thanked the applicants for their attempts at designing a building in the character of the neighborhood. He noted that the question is in the details, and opined that it is important to make the elements such as the columns look real, and not like pasted-on elements. He suggested that wood piers would be appropriate. Mr. Cluver noted that, typically, columns that support an architrave are set so that they align with the architrave, and are not wider than the capital.

Mr. Cluver commented on the rear of the property, noting that the rear gables could be strengthened by aligning the facades so that the gables align with one another.

Mr. Farnham stated that he was the author of the Overbrook Farms district nomination, and is a resident of Pelham, a similar development by Wendell & Smith, the developers of Overbrook Farms. He explained that the designs of the historic twins in both developments vary significantly. He noted that there are some that are very symmetrical, in which the two halves fit together as mirror images, and others, particularly those by Keen & Mead, in which the two halves are almost completely unrelated to one another. He noted that the Keen & Mead twins are shocking to his architectural sensibilities now, and must have been even more so in 1898. Unlike some other neighborhoods, he continued, where the twins are rather regular, in Overbrook Farms, there is a broad spectrum of designs for twins. He noted that the developers Wendell & Smith gave young architects the freedom to experiment. He concluded that proposed design would be compatible with the Overbrook Farms district. Mr. Cluver responded that he feels this building is unresolved; it is close to a symmetrical twin, but not quite symmetrical.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor for public comment, but there was none.

The Committee members determined that the proposed structure is generally compatible with the historic district, but that the details could be refined as suggested, improving the design. They decided not to offer a specific recommendation because the level of review is Review-and-Comment only, but decided that the comments offered during the discussion would suffice.

ADDRESS: 700 PINE ST
Proposal: Construct two-story rear addition with garage and roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Xu Ru Gang
Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
History: 1970
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition with garage and roof deck on this circa 1970 corner property located in the Society Hill Historic District. The building currently has a small two-story rear addition and two roll-up garage doors along S. 7th Street. The proposed alterations would extend the rear addition out to the property line using red brick to match existing, and a new garage door and pedestrian door would be located where the roll-up garage doors are currently located on the side of the building. Windows to match the existing would be located at the second floor of the addition. A roof deck with parapet wall, black metal railing and wood trellis is proposed for the roof of the addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the proposed HVAC units are located to be inconspicuous, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect James Campbell and property owner Angelina Chan represented the application.

Mr. Campbell explained that the existing rear yard lacks light and air, which is why he is proposing to elevate the outdoor area by means of an addition with roof deck. Ms. Hawkins

noted that the existing metal roll-up garage doors are not appropriate to the district; however, she is not in support of the proposed two-bay-wide garage door, even if it would be an improvement over the existing conditions. She stated that she also is not in support of a trellis on a corner property. Mr. Cluver stated that, if a trellis were to be acceptable, it should be moved away from the street edge. Mr. Campbell asked if an awning could be considered. Ms. Hawkins suggested an umbrella or other piece of furniture outside the Commission's jurisdiction would be a better means of providing shade.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the brick arch above the garage door is troubling, and the garage door should not be one large door, but rather two smaller doors. She asked about the HVAC equipment. Mr. Campbell responded that the HVAC units will be tucked up on the high roof. Ms. Hawkins responded that there is plenty of flat roof space available on the new addition, making the units more accessible, and asked why the HVAC units cannot be located there. Mr. Campbell agreed that the units would be more accessible, but that they would be taking up space on the roof deck. Ms. Hawkins responded that the proposed roof deck is very large; some space can be given over to mechanical equipment. Mr. Campbell agreed to place the HVAC units on the flat roof and hide them against the adjacent building.

Mr. Campbell explained that the larger garage door is being proposed because the existing parking spaces with separate entrances are very tight. The very narrow parking entrances are difficult to navigate. Mr. Cluver acknowledged that the smaller entrances may be tight, and suggested that Mr. Campbell bring both designs to the Commission meeting, to show why the two smaller garage doors will not work, should that be the case.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided there is no permanent trellis on the roof deck, the HVAC units are located on the flat roof of the new addition in an inconspicous location, and the proposed single large garage door is changed to two single garage doors with square masonry punched openings instead of the arch, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2116 PINE ST
Proposal: Construct roof deck with pergola
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Mauro Guillen & Sandra Suarez
Applicant: Patrick Hannigan, Gemini Design Associates
History: 1870
Individual Designation: 5/7/1973
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck with pergola on the three-story rear ell of this property at the corner of Pine and S. Van Pelt Streets. The proposed deck would extend nearly the entire width of the rear ell, and would feature a structure covered in shingles that mimics the appearance of the mansard roof of the main block. A pergola would extend the length of the deck on its eastern half.

The staff recently approved the removal of a roof deck and pergola in this same location that was built by a previous owner about 1999. The Historical Commission had approved that deck

in concept with some conditions. Specifically, the applicant was instructed to use steel supports, painted a dark color to mitigate their appearance, and to remove the skirt to reveal the slope of the roof. The applicant never returned for a final review, and the roof deck and pergola were constructed without Historical Commission approval or a building permit. The Historical Commission's staff recently approved an application to remove the illegal deck and pergola to allow for the repair of the roof below the deck. At the time of the roof repair application, the staff informed the contractor that the Historical Commission never granted a final approval for the existing deck and pergola and they could not, therefore, be reinstalled after the roof repair without the Commission's approval and a permit.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the skirt, planters, and pergola are omitted, and the railing is a simple, black, metal picket, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Patrick Hannigan and property owner Mauro Guillen represented the application.

Mr. Hannigan explained that the current owners moved into the building about eight years ago, so they were not the owners at the time when the illegal deck was constructed. They need to replace the deck because the roof below is leaking. He explained that they do not wish to build a larger deck, and are proposing a deck that is roughly the same footprint as the existing deck.

Ms. Pentz stated that the proposed shingled skirt draws attention to the structure. She noted that the previous in-concept approval called for a metal structure rather than wood, and the intention was to reveal the slope of the roof. Ms. Hawkins commented that decks should sit lightly on roofs. Mr. Hannigan responded that he was trying to simply improve upon the current design, which uses wood and hides the slope of the roof. Mr. Cluver suggested a steel structure, and commented that the plantings along the edge of the roof would not be appropriate. Mr. Hannigan responded that the planter keeps the railing farther back from the street. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the staff's recommendation does not explicitly mention a steel structure. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff would defer to the previous in-concept approval by the Commission. Others suggested that a wood structure instead of a metal structure might be appropriate. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that the visibility of the deck should be minimized, and the skirt should be omitted. Ms. Stein commented that visibility would be reduced if the deck were pulled back away from the street. Mr. Hannigan responded that pulling it back would complicate the structure; the simplest structure would sit directly on the load-bearing wall, not on the roof structure behind it. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee understands the structural aspects, but is advocating for a deck that is inconspicuous from the street.

Ms. Hawkins opined that a pergola is not appropriate, especially for a corner property, and suggested furniture to provide shade, such as an umbrella. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the pergola would eventually lead to roof leaks. Mr. Guillen stated his preference for a pergola. Mr. Hannigan asked if there is any scenario in which a pergola would be acceptable on this roof. Ms. Hawkins stated that her individual opinion is that a pergola is not acceptable on this roof. Mr. Cluver commented that there is a better chance of a pergola being approved if it is moved to the far edge of the roof, away from the street. Ms. Hawkins responded that they need to understand how much of a pergola would be visible from the street, and may need to construct a mock-up and take photographs from down the street to show its visibility or lack thereof.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee must offer a recommendation based on the application submitted, which includes the skirt and pergola. She advised the applicants that they can present more than one option and their case for a pergola to the Commission. She suggested that they look at the previous in-concept approval and consider it in the design, along with the comments from this review. Mr. Cluver summarized that the general footprint is acceptable, and that the applicant should revise the design to reflect comments received by the Committee.

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

ADDRESS: 117 LEAGUE ST
Proposal: Demolish rear, construct four-story addition with roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Einstein Investments LLC
Applicant: Casey Thompson, Morrissey Design LLC
History: 1815
Individual Designation: 6/24/1958
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the façade of the existing three-story main block, demolish the rear ell of the building, and construct a four-story rear addition with roof deck. The majority of the work to the front façade, including the removal of the faux-stone cladding and installation of new wood windows, is approvable at the staff level; however, the application proposes to demolish approximately five feet of the roof slope, as well as the entire rear wall of the main block, and the rear ell. The application proposes to construct a four-story addition set back 3'-6" from the truncated main roof. The existing roof is front-sloping only, and runs for approximately twenty feet; therefore please note that the note on the drawing that the roof would be maintained to the ridge is inaccurate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, but with the recommendation that the entire main block and roof slope be retained, and that an addition limited to three stories with pilot house access to a roof deck would be appropriate.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Michael Salomone and architect Chris Carickhoff represented the application.

Ms. Stein commented that she had difficulty understanding exactly what was being proposed. It appears that they are removing all interior structure, including the floors, and essentially only retaining the brick front façade. Ms. Hawkins noted that the façade would not even be restored, as all of the window heights would be changed, the doors dropped, and the basement windows eliminated. Ms. Hawkins stressed that they are not proposing to retain the front façade, but instead are proposing to reconfigure the façade in a traditional manner.

Mr. Salomone responded that they do not intend to take the façade down. Ms. Gutterman asked if they know the condition of the brick under the faux stone. Mr. Salomone responded that they removed a small section and the brick is in fairly good condition, although it is hard to tell from the small section. Ms. Gutterman asked how much brick the applicant thinks will be salvageable by the time they remove the faux stone. Mr. Salomone responded that he believes nearly all of it will be salvageable. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the faux stone appears to be able to be removed

fairly easily. Mr. Salomone commented that their neighbor just removed faux stone cladding and the brick looks nice.

Ms. Pentz noted that the elevation drawing calls for “existing stone lintels to be repaired,” and asked if such lintels are present. Mr. Carickhoff responded that they assume there are stone lintels like the neighboring property. Ms. Pentz responded that she does not see evidence of stone lintels on this property. Mr. Carickhoff noted that the proposed elevation is based on trying to match the neighboring property.

Ms. Stein noted that this property is individually designated, and asked why the applicant is proposing to replace the entire structure, drop the window heads, essentially reconstructing this building. Mr. Salomone responded that the interior of the building is in poor condition; there is mold, termite damage, and joists that seem structurally unsound. Instead of repairing, he noted, they would rather replace.

Ms. Stein asked why they propose to drop the window heights on the front façade. Mr. Carickhoff responded that the proposed addition is four stories tall, and with a height limit of 38 feet, the only way to get the fourth story is to lower the floor levels. Ms. Hawkins stressed that it is not just the floor levels that are changing, but the window heights and lintels as well. She noted that they are proposing an entirely different proportion and relationship on the front façade than the historic façade. The Committee members opined that they are essentially proposing a new building with old brick. Mr. Carickhoff responded that the reason for lowering the windows is for sill height for egress, but that they could enlarge the openings and keep the top lintel.

Ms. Hawkins reined in the discussion, asking the applicant if the changes to the front façade are driven solely by the desire to have a fourth floor. Mr. Salomone responded that that is correct. Ms. Hawkins asked the Committee members to discuss the appropriateness of the proposed fourth story. Ms. Gutterman asked if the fourth story was just a way to get up to the roof. Mr. Carickhoff responded that it is more than a pilot house; it is an entertainment room as well. Mr. D’Alessandro asked why the roofline cannot extend the full length of the existing roof. Ms. Pentz noted that single slope of the roof is significant in and of itself in the types of structures that exist in this part of the city. She opined that this proposal would destroy that remnant of an important feature of early construction. Mr. Salomone responded that they are not proposing to remove the slope entirely.

Ms. Stein opined that she is having difficulty understanding the existing conditions of the building. Are they proposing to retain party walls or demolish them? How long is the existing gable? It is only shown to 14 feet. What does the gable look like today? Mr. Carickhoff responded that the slope continues up to 20 feet. Mr. D’Alessandro stated that the drawings should show an existing section and proposed section. Ms. Stein opined that it seems the applicant is asking for demolition of 95% of the building, and it is difficult to understand from the drawings the true extent of the proposed demolition and removal of historic fabric, over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

Ms. Pentz questioned the photographs labeled “termite damage,” noting that she does not see any evidence of termites in the photographs.

Ms. Hawkins stated that there are numerous questions and problems with this application. There is a lack of consistent documentation; the existing versus proposed conditions are unclear. If the applicant is proposing to remove all of the structure behind the front wall, the Commission would consider this a demolition, not an alteration. She questioned the adjustment

of window heights for the convenience of adding a floor beyond. Ms. Hawkins noted that the proposed relationship along the streetscape is problematic, and, while there may be some variety along the street, she is not convinced that moving lintels and infilling brick can be successfully accomplished.

Mr. Salomone asked what would happen if they remove the faux stone and there are no stone lintels. Ms. Hawkins responded that that would be a different application. Ms. Hawkins stated that the application is proposing a radical amount of change but is seriously lacking in information. The other Committee members agreed.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance agreed with the staff's recommendation, noting that this is a piece of early vernacular architecture, little of which is left in South Philadelphia. He noted that he shares the Committee's concerns that so much of the fabric of the building would be removed that it would arguably be a demolition.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested denial owing to lack of documentation. He recommended that the structure should be repaired rather than demolished, and that the applicant should seek a structural report on the building. Ms. Pentz agreed. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee's recommendation of denial should be based on the proposed demolition of a significant portion of the building, changes to the windows and floor elevations, and removal of a portion of the main roof. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and Section 1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

ADDRESS: 2010 WALNUT ST
Proposal: Demolish rear bay, construct seven-story addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Henry Friedman
Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker and Partners
History: 1870
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate an existing four-story brownstone building and to construct a seven-story addition behind it. The application proposes to demolish an historic rear metal-clad bay (called a porch in the submission), and to construct a seven-story addition from the end of the rear ell to the lot line at Chancellor Street. Along the Chancellor Street elevation, the proposed addition would be clad in brick for the first three floors, with the upper floors clad in metal or cementitious panels. The second-floor level would feature a metal Juliette balcony, and floors three through seven would feature balconies with glass railings. The east side elevation, which would be readily visible from Chancellor Street, would be clad in metal or cementitious panels and feature horizontal and vertical slit windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6, and 9. The staff recommends that a free-standing structure of four stories or fewer would be appropriate for this block of Chancellor Street, which features remarkably well maintained and restored residential carriage

houses. The proposed seven stories along Chancellor would be grossly out of scale with its surroundings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Eric Leighton and owner Henry Friedman represented the application.

Mr. Leighton asked Mr. Friedman to introduce his business. Mr. Friedman explained that Renaissance Properties manages 33 apartment-style suites in Rittenhouse Square and Manhattan.

Mr. Leighton clarified that the application called for 37 units, but they are actually applying for 38 units. Mr. Leighton explained that the existing building faces Walnut Street, and that the rear bay, which is 12 feet by 15 feet, is proposed for demolition to facilitate the construction of an addition from the existing building back to Chancellor Street. Mr. Leighton explained the interior plan. Ms. Hawkins asked him to limit the discussion to the exterior alterations to the building. Mr. Leighton responded that they are proposing an addition to the rear to provide additional units, an accessible entrance, elevator service, and a second means of egress for the main building.

Mr. Leighton presented a photograph of the existing bay, opining that he believes it was constructed in three phases, none of which were original to the date of construction of the main building. The shutter hardware, he noted, is visible on the exterior of the main block from the interior of the bay. He opined that there are some structural issues with the bay, including sloping floors, disruption of the foundation by tree roots, and water damage. He noted that the floor structure has not been opened up yet to see the condition of the floor, to check its connection to the building, and whether it meets current standards. Ms. Pentz asked if there are any photographs or written description of the condition of the foundation. Mr. Leighton responded that he has a letter from the engineering firm of O'Donnell & Naccarato.

Mr. Leighton explained that they are proposing a seven-story addition at the rear. He presented photographs of the existing streetscape, noting that there is some variation in the heights of the buildings. He also presented additional perspective renderings from 20th Street. Ms. Hawkins stated that, while she appreciates that the proposed addition would be minimally visible from Walnut Street, Chancellor Street is also a public roadway, and even if it were not, the Historical Commission would still have full jurisdiction over the proposed alterations. Ms. Hawkins asked if Mr. Leighton had any other perspective renderings or drawings that depicted the proposed addition in its context along Chancellor Street. Mr. Leighton responded that he did not.

Mr. Leighton mentioned that the client is pursuing historic preservation tax credits for the interior and exterior of the existing building. Mr. Leighton noted that the interior of the building is remarkably intact. Ms. DiPasquale encouraged Mr. Leighton to explore tax credits sooner rather than later. She noted that she corresponded with Scott Doyle of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) regarding the project, and that he was not yet aware of the project, but believed a seven-story addition at that location would likely not be approved by the National Park Service for tax credits. Ms. DiPasquale recommended that the applicant be in touch with PHMC regarding potential tax credits as soon as possible.

Ms. Hawkins concurred with the staff recommendation that the proposed addition is "way, way, way, way, way too large" for Chancellor Street. She noted that a three-story addition would be ideal, and that four stories might be appropriate, depending on how it was scaled and designed, but seven stories is much too large for Chancellor Street. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, noting that

he would like to see additional documentation of options for lower buildings to determine the exact height of an appropriate addition.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the height of the proposed building. Mr. Leighton responded that, above the 73 feet 6 inches shown, the height would extend to include an elevator overrun and deck pilot house. Ms. Hawkins noted that, at a minimum, the proposed addition would extend to 80 feet in height. Mr. Leighton agreed. Ms. Hawkins opined that, with a parapet, the façade height on Chancellor would be approximately 76 feet high. She stated that 76 feet in a row of buildings scaled at 20-40 feet is exceptionally out of scale and context.

Ms. Hawkins opined that, beyond the height of the building, the openings as designed, in this context, are also problematic. She cited the installation of glass balconies and the verticality of the openings as particularly troubling.

Mr. Cluver commented that he was troubled by the starkness of the Chancellor Street façade and the quickness of the transition between brick and the cementitious or metal panels, noting that it seems out of character with the area.

Ms. Pentz objected to the removal of the potentially historic rear porch or bay. She asked Mr. Leighton to explore the chronology of the construction of the bay. She noted that she read over the report Mr. Leighton provided earlier in the meeting that cited sloping floors. She disputed the findings, noting that if Mr. Leighton believed the porch or bay was constructed in three separate stages, the sloping floor could be the result of a remnant of a sloping roof of an earlier porch, and not a result of settlement.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the adjoining lot was part of the parcel. Mr. Leighton responded that it is a separate parcel. Mr. McCoubrey noted that there are windows in the proposed party wall. Mr. Leighton responded that the horizontal windows are in the proposed stair tower and would be on 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and are intended to provide light on the street. Mr. Leighton explained that the recessed court on the side is where they plan to get light and air to the units.

Ms. Pentz pointed out that on the Walnut Street elevation there is a note that calls for the windows to be restored or replaced in kind, and asked which they actually planned to do. Mr. Leighton responded that they have not yet delved into that portion of the project, but that the entire existing building seems to be in decent, original condition. He noted that they would prefer to make repairs to the existing windows if possible, but if they had to be replaced, they would be looking to replicate them exactly. Ms. Pentz stated that the preference of the Committee would be to restore the original windows.

Mr. Leighton asked for clarification as to whether the Committee felt an addition of three to four stories would be appropriate, or whether he could explore a top-floor setback approximately 16 feet back. Ms. Hawkins responded that that would still make the addition six stories, not three or four. She noted that setbacks may help minimize a project's impact, but that this proposal is twice as large and twice as tall as it should be. She noted that the verticality of the fenestration and detailing of the elevation makes the building look even taller. Looking at the geometry of the façade, she continued, might make four stories appropriate, but with the detailing of the current proposal, three stories might be the maximum. She opined that there is not enough depth to the site to achieve seven stories, even with a setback.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 1957 LOCUST ST
Proposal: Install ADA ramp
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Jeanne Chang
Applicant: Christopher Kelly, Integrity Construction and Development LLC
History: 1860
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an ADA ramp at an existing storefront entrance on S. 20th Street. The ramp would be constructed of concrete and feature a metal vertical picket railing that would run parallel to the façade. Items 2 through 5 identified in the cover letter have been or will be approved at the staff level.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: No recommendation, pending the submission of additional information including the feasibility of locating the ramp on the interior, plans to remove or retain the current marble step, and the potential reversibility of the proposed ramp.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jeanne Chang represented the application.

Ms. Chang explained that the concrete ramp would terminate at the step and that the existing marble step would remain in place.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant had explored the option of an interior ramp, so the store entrance would be at grade on the exterior, therefore being ADA compliant. Ms. Gutterman clarified to the applicant that there would be an interior space requirement to allow for the grade change inside the store. Ms. Chang responded that interior space is limited, and the requirement for an ADA-compliant bathroom further minimizes space. She felt an interior ramp would not be feasible and asked for other recommendations for the ramp design.

Mr. Cluver inquired about the two interior steps shown on the plan, and Ms. Stein asked the applicant to clarify whether a second ramp would be placed in that location as well. Ms. Chang explained that since the ADA compliant bathroom would be accessible from the level of the store entrance, no additional ramp would be required. The upper section of the shop would not be ADA accessible. Ms. Gutterman requested that the applicant identify the handicapped seating area in plan, and Ms. Chang responded that it would be next to the entrance. Mr. Cluver stated that with such limited interior space, an interior ramp would not be possible. He also commented that lowering the exterior to grade would eliminate the existing marble step and would change the historic appearance of the exterior. He concluded that an interior ramp was not appropriate, owing to the lack of space as well as the losses and changes to exterior historic fabric.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if she had contacted the Philadelphia Streets Department. Ms. Chang said she had not. Ms. Hawkins continued by stating that the ramp is a large object in the

public right-of-way, the sidewalk, which needs to remain clear to allow people to walk. An additional level of approval may be necessary from the Streets Department. Ms. Gutterman added that there are typically steps at the ramp to allow people direct entry from the sidewalk, although it could affect the turning radius at the top of the ramp and would need to be investigated. She noted that examples of these types of ramps exist at several stores within the neighborhood.

Mr. McCoubrey raised the issue of door operability and the need for automatic doors. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Cluver noted that both doors would need to open, and the push-button would need to be placed at the bottom of the ramp.

Ms. Chang stated that she understands there is an exemption clause if ADA compliance becomes a hardship. She said she would like the store to be accessible to everyone and is willing to take extra measures ensure the store is ADA compliant. However, cost is a concern. She then mentioned that no other stores on the block are handicap accessible. Ms. Gutterman responded that Ms. Chang would need to work with the Accessibility Advisory Board.

Ms. Hawkins inquired about the height of the step, and Ms. Chang replied that it is approximately seven inches. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Cluver stated that a ramp can be a maximum of thirty inches before it is required to have vertical pickets at the railing. They commented that the applicant could install a ramp with a four-inch curb or one that includes a high and low rail, both of which would eliminate the need for the vertical pickets.

Ms. Stein asked whether the service area identified in the plan was part of the applicant's property. Ms. Chang replied that it functions as trash storage but, as a tenant of the building, she did not know who accessed the alley. Ms. Stein posited whether the ramp could be placed within the alley, allowing handicap access to the side of the store and eliminated any alterations to the storefront. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Chang commented that the alley is likely accessed and used as trash storage by a number of building tenants. Ms. Hawkins recommended that Ms. Chang contact Pennsylvania's Accessibility Advisory Board with a hardship claim, because of the difficulty in resolving design issues related to ADA compliance. Ms. Gutterman also recommended that Ms. Chang contact the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

Ms. Stein expressed concern over the planters at the storefront and whether they would be fastened into historic material. Ms. Chang clarified that they were free-standing and would not be attached to the building. Ms. Hawkins commented that Ms. Chang would need to consider whether or not the planters impeded access to the ramp and landing.

Ms. Hawkins then stated that she would like Ms. Chang to gather more information and gain a better understanding of each component that would be necessary to achieve ADA compliance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the concept of an exterior ramp, provided it is without pickets on the guardrail and is executed in such a way that makes it reversible without adversely impacting the existing marble step, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 1834 AND 1836 PINE ST
Proposal: Enclose open porch at side, replace rear door, rebuild rear wall, install roll-down door
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Martin J. Rosenblum

Applicant: Martin J. Rosenblum, Martin J. Rosenblum AIA & Associates
History: 1845
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the existing 9'-wide sliding wood gate facing Waverly Street with a steel security roll down model, and to replace the adjacent wood door with a steel security door. The existing failing brick masonry wall with stone coping that contains the wood door would also be reconstructed to original specifications. At the current rear porch, this application proposes to demolish the existing concrete pad and stoop and pour a new slab that slopes toward Waverly Street. New cement stucco-faced infill partitions would be constructed to the north and south open ends of the porch area to form an enclosed storage room. A second steel security door is proposed at the south partition wall, and new lighting would be placed at both door openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the lighting, storage room door, and cement stucco infill partitions, provided the infill below the existing metal lintel is recessed slightly and dark in color; denial of the roll down grate door and steel door fronting Waverly Street; pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jennifer Arnoldi represented the application and stated that she was withdrawing the application at the request of the property owner.

ADDRESS: 2121 WALNUT ST
Proposal: Construct third-story addition with roof deck, reopen door opening and install door
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 2121 Walnut LLC
Applicant: Mark Travis, 2121 Walnut LLC
History: 1928; Eugene Stopper, architect
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The first of this group of two applications proposes to add a third-floor, rooftop addition to the commercial building at the northwest corner of Walnut and Van Pelt Streets in the Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District. The addition would be a stucco color to match the color of the limestone on the front façade. The addition would be set back 18 feet from Walnut Street and two feet from the Van Pelt Street façade. It would be visible from Walnut Street and also from Van Pelt Street to the north because the structure sits proud of the row of houses on that side of the Van Pelt block. The application proposes a deck on the Walnut Street side, which will also be set back from the facades. A parapet partially hides the addition and deck, but is not dimensioned in the application. The staff suggests that the addition is better detailed to be more compatible with the historic building.

The second application proposes to reopen an infilled doorway on the Van Pelt facade. The original door survives inside, behind the infill. The door has two tall vertical panels. The applicant proposes two door options, which are stock four panel doors. He wishes to use a metal or fiberglass door for security, which precludes matching the original. The proposed metal

door is only available in a narrower size, which will result in substantial infill panels to either side.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ADDITION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR DOOR: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Mark Travis and architect Caritina Mills represented the application.

Mr. Travis claimed that the building is not historic because it only dates to the 1920s. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Historical Commission has already determined that it is historic.

The building is located at the corner of Walnut and Van Pelt Streets. Mr. Baron explained that building sits forward of the other buildings on Van Pelt Street, making it very difficult for any rooftop addition to be inconspicuous when viewed from the north along Van Pelt. He pointed out that tall parapet would help to hide the proposed rooftop additions.

On the issue of the proposed rooftop addition and deck, the Committee members had many questions about the height of the existing building parapet, the relationship of the proposed addition and deck railing to the existing parapet, the building materials, and the extent of the application. They asked about the structure of the deck and the deck railing, which was not shown on the elevation drawings. Ms. Hawkins asked why the addition is as tall as it is given the internal ceiling height. Ms. Mills explained that they have added a parapet to the top of the addition to hide the sloping roof. The Committee members recommended removing the parapet to lower overall height and reduce visibility. They asked for a building section to explain the heights of the parapet, railing and roof.

The Committee members then asked about the windows. Mr. Travis explained that the existing windows are metal and that the new windows in the addition would be metal to match. Ms. Gutterman asked about the first-floor windows. Mr. Baron explained that those locations which had been infilled were being reopened and that staff had already administratively approved the proposed casement windows. Ms. Hawkins noted that they were drawn with different proportions than shown in the photographs. She questioned whether they were being modified. Mr. Travis said that the windows above were being retained.

The Committee members asked about what interpreted to be a rear yard. Mr. Travis said that the building has no rear yard. Ms. Hawkins note that most of the meeting had been spent trying to understand the proposal because of the lack of correct information on the drawings. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the space between the chimney and the addition needed to be modified to avoid the creation of an unserviceable space. He asked that the relationship between the addition, the chimney, and the parapet wall be detailed.

Ms. Hawkins asked the Committee members about their opinions of the front deck. Mr. D'Alessandro objected to the idea of a deck on the front portion of the building because plantings and furniture would be placed on the deck and would be visible from Walnut Street. Mr. Cluver concurred. Ms. Gutterman said that this building has no rear ell and therefore the Committee should consider a front deck and its visibility. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the rooftop additions could be minimally visible. Ms. Pentz said that the standard was inconspicuous. Mr. Travis said that he had placed the deck at the front so that the higher addition would have

greater setback from Walnut Street. The Committee members suggested that the plans should show the location of the rooftop mechanical equipment. They opined that the equipment should be invisible from the public right-of-way. The Committee members suggested that the plans and sections and details should be revised to show correct proportions, the location of the roof, the railings, the parapets, and materials. They also suggested that the application would benefit from before and after drawings. They suggested that the Committee should review any revised drawings.

Regarding the door, which was submitted under a separate application, Mr. Travis explained that he wanted a more solid door without panels because he was concerned about security. He asserted that a replica of the historic wood, paneled door would not provide sufficient security. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that he might propose a solid-core door with applied panels. Other Committee members suggested that it was possible to replicate the appearance of the existing historic door in a secure manner.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application for a rooftop addition and deck, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; and denial of the door application, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 318 N LAWRENCE ST
Proposal: Construct one-story addition with roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 318 North Lawrence St
Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop
History: 1920
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition on the small, former express delivery building at the southwest corner of Wood and Lawrence Streets in the Old City Historic District. This addition would be clad with panels and include a deck. It would be much smaller than the three-story structure approved by the Historical Commission for the site in 2004.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Ben Estepani and Ann Dinh represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the relationship of the new construction to the existing parapet wall. He asked that the new walls be set inboard of the parapet so that the parapet is fully expressed. Mr. Estepani explained that it is easier to construct if the new wall sits atop the parapet. The Committee members opined that expressing the parapet is important.

The Committee members asked about the details of the Historical Commission's 2004 approval for this site. Mr. Baron explained that the building had been declared Imminently Dangerous. The application approved at that proposed demolishing and rebuilding the structure with a two-story addition. The building was made safe rather than demolished. The addition that is currently proposed is much smaller than that previously approved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval, provided the walls of the addition are located within, not on, the parapet, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the Commission's 2004 approval.

ADDRESS: 4354 CRESSON ST
Proposal: Remove storefront windows, install windows and door
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Stuart Lacheen
Applicant: Michael Coyle, Rox Construction
History: 1860; Later storefront
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify an existing storefront by removing the large, plate-glass windows and installing residential double-hung windows. The recessed door, which sits at the back of a vestibule, would be brought all the way forward to the front plane of the storefront façade. The applicant should either retain and restore the storefront, or remove all vestiges of the storefront and restore the building to its pre-storefront appearance. The current proposal would create a mixture of historic periods that never existed together. The application also proposes windows for the upper floors of the front façade. The upper floor windows should be uneven "cottage" windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

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

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant is proposing to convert the storefront to a residential appearance. He explained that he suggested that the applicant either restore the storefront to its commercial appearance or entirely remove the storefront and restore the building to its earlier residential appearance. He stated that the applicant elected to propose retaining the storefront to retain the additional square footage of the storefront addition. Mr. Baron contended that this hybrid approach, which proposes to give the storefront a residential appearance does not satisfy the standards, but creates a mixture of historic features that never existed together historically. To satisfy the Standards, the applicant should select one period or another, but not a mix of both. Mr. Baron also noted that the upper-floor windows also should be cottage-type windows, with uneven sized upper and lower sash.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:23 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 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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

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

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

Section 1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.
No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

DRAFT