MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 24 MAY 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR

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

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

ALSO PRESENT
Nancy Drye
George Poulin, Powelton Village Civic Association
Michael McHale, AP Construction
Polly Koster
Jonathan Broh, JKRP Architects
John Phillips, Powelton Village Civic Association
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Silvia Callegari, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Gabriel Gottlieb
Joel Darrias, Ascent Restoration Consultants
Yossi Cohen, C3CCP
Thomas Chapman, Esq., Blank Rome
Stacy Generack
Eric Camp, Briarwood
Bill Steedle, Graboyes Windows
Lyle Suess, Barton Partners
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
James Wright, Peoples Emergency Center
Lee Berman
Stephen J. Maffei, Abitare Design Studio
Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
Sean McMullan
David Searles, Saylor Gregg
Jeanne Maier, The Franklin Institute
Dan Stanislaw, Saylor Gregg
Kiki Bolender, Bolender Architects
Herb Reid, Maze Group
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
Greg Wilson, Harman Deutsch

DRAFT

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. Mses. Pentz and Stein and Mr. Cluver joined him. Ms. Pentz arrived soon thereafter.

ADDRESS: 3600-30 LANCASTER AVE
Proposal: Demolish mid-block rear ells; construct rear additions
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: AP Construction
Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKRP Architects
History: 1878; William Fennell Row
Individual Designation: 10/9/2015
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The property at 3600-30 Lancaster Avenue is comprised of a block-long row of 16 three and four-story Italianate buildings that have been consolidated into one tax parcel. This application proposes to remove the rear ells on the central buildings and construct a four-story addition at the rear and a five-story addition along N. 36th Street.

The entire row, which was not designated as historic until October 2015, was slated for demolition, but was saved by the former Deputy Mayor and Historical Commission. The staff of the Historical Commission authored and submitted a nomination, which the Historical Commission adopted, saving the buildings from demolition. Since the property was nominated for designation, the property owner has stepped away from the demolition plans and has negotiated with the City Councilwoman, community, and City while seeking a plan that allows for the preservation of the buildings and a financially viable redevelopment of the property. Simultaneously, the property owner has appealed the designation; the case is not yet scheduled before the Court of Common Pleas, but likely will be if this application is not successful. The approval of a redevelopment plan agreeable to all parties would likely preempt that appeal. The applicant submitted a similar development proposal to the Historical Commission in March 2016. It proposed a three-story rear addition, but was rejected by the community and withdrawn before the Historical Commission reviewed it.

The row of buildings would be rehabilitated as a mixed-use, residential and retail development. The rear ells of the mid-block buildings, some with projecting bays, would be removed. The end-block building would be retained in the entireties. The addition would be constructed at the rears of the buildings, with a leg running southeast along 36th Street onto a property not designated as historic, 60 N. 36th Street; the Historical Commission has jurisdiction over the construction proposed for this property because it would be an addition to a designated building. The new construction would clad in brick and aluminum panels and fenestrated with aluminum fixed and casement windows. The front and side facades of the historic buildings would be rehabilitated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review window, door, masonry, and other details of the rehabilitations of the historic buildings, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jonathan Broh and developer Michael McHale represented the application.

Mr. Broh displayed the plans and renderings for proposed development. He stated that they are proposing to retain and rehabilitate the buildings. The ground floors will be used as retail

spaces. He stated that they are now proposing to building to four stories, not three, at the rears of the historic buildings. He noted that the rears appear to be five stories because of a grade change and the introduction of garden apartments, but they are actually four from the front. He stated that the new building along 36th Street will be five stories and clad in red brick and metal panels. He observed that, owing to the complexity of the project, which will be reviewed by Civic Design and the Zoning Board as well as the Registered Community Organization (RCO), there are certain to be revisions to the design. He explained that they have been working informally with the neighbors, but have not conferred formally with the RCO. Some details with change. He offered to work with the staff on any changes.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the complex would include roof decks. Mr. Broh stated that it would not. It will not grow any taller. He also explained that they will be installing mechanical equipment of the roofs, but any equipment will be screened or not visible from the public right-of-way. He stated that he will work with the staff to ensure that the mechanical equipment is properly screened.

Ms. Gutterman asked why they had added a fifth floor, when the early version of the project did not include an overbuild. Mr. McHale explained that, at the insistence of the community, they had replaced the ground-floor residential units with retail units. To offset the loss of revenue resulting from the community's demand for the retail instead of residential, they had to increase the number of residential units elsewhere on the site. He stated that commercial rents in that area are very low, but the community insisted on the inclusion of retail. He observed that they have been working with the community and, as a result, the project has been revised.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the material for the base of the building. Mr. Broh responded that it would be cast stone or limestone. The bays will be clad in metal panels. Ms. Gutterman asked about the brick. Mr. Broh responded that it would be a real four-inch brick.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the Warren Street properties. Mr. Broh stated that rowhouses line Warren Street. They are not part of the project. He added that the applicant owns the westernmost property on the north side of Warren. It is a vacant lot, but is not part of this project. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the parking. Mr. Broh explained that the parking would be located in the new building and accessed off Warren Street.

Mr. Cluver asked if all floor levels align in the historic buildings. Mr. Broh stated that they do not. He stated that they will include ramps in the new construction to accommodate the changing floor levels. He stated that currently the buildings include labyrinths of stairs. Access will be consolidated into the new construction. The historic sill heights above the floors, 18 to 24 inches, will be respected. Mr. Cluver asked about the double-loaded corridor at the fourth floor and the units toward Lancaster Avenue off that corridor. He counted the number of units, six, that would be lost if they were deleted from the plan. Mr. Broh noted that the westernmost historic building is already four stories.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he would rather see more brick on the major street facades of the new construction. He noted that more metal panels could be used on the lesser facades. Ms. Stein noted that black brick is used near the entrance to the complex. Mr. McCoubrey suggested more red brick.

Mr. Cluver asked about the retail signs shown on the drawings. Mr. Broh responded that they exist and would be retained.

Nancy Drye, a resident of Powelton Village, stated that the community is "deeply interested in this project." She stated that the community organization is not taking a position on the project at this time because it is in negotiations with the developer. She stated that the organization is negotiating a community benefits agreement. She stated that the retail space is very important to the community. She stated that she is glad that the retail space has now been included in the project.

Gabriel Gottlieb reported that he used to live in Powelton Village. He stated that the Historical Commission should require the developer to include retail uses in the new construction along 36th Street.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that his organization is not opposed to the project. He stated that he welcomed the retention of the retail uses along Lancaster. He stated that his organization would defer to the community organization.

Mr. Cluver asked about the removals of the rear ells. He asked if they are historic fabric. Mr. Farnham responded that the rear ells are historic fabric, but they were modified during the rehabilitation in the 1980s. Mr. Cluver asserted that the rear ells are visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Farnham disagreed, countering that they are minimally visible. Mr. Broh added that the current visibility results from the demolition of surrounding buildings. Historically, only the rear ells at the ends of the row were visible. Mr. Cluver asserted that the removals of the ells would not be consistent with the Standards. He claimed that the removals constitute a demolition in the legal sense. Mr. Broh disagreed. He stated that about 40% of the rear ells have been completely rebuilt and include no historic fabric. He stated that 100% of the cladding and other rear-ell elements visible from the exterior are not historic. Ms. Stein noted that, when this project is complete, none of the rears of the historic row will be visible from the street. Mr. Broh stated that there might be limited visibility over one shorter building on Warren, but otherwise no visibility of the rears from the street once the project is complete. Ms. Stein contended that, owing to the lack of visibility, the rears can be removed within the Standards. Mr. Broh noted that they are retaining the rears of the historic buildings at the ends of the rows.

Mr. Cluver asked if the fourth story at the rear of the historic buildings would be visible from Lancaster Avenue. He remarked that he understands the community's desire for retail, but noted that the inclusion of retail has an adverse impact from a preservation perspective. Mr. Broh reported that the fourth story is set back 40 feet from the front facades. The Committee members and applicants discussed whether the fourth story on the new construction at the rears of the Lancaster row would be visible from the street. Mr. Cluver pointed out that the limited visibility of the rears from the public right-of-way makes the removals of the ells acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the rooftop mechanical equipment is not visible from the street, the overbuild at the fourth floor on the historic buildings is removed north of the main corridor, and more red brick is employed on the primary elevations, with the allowance for more metal panels at the rear, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Pentz abstained owing to the fact that she arrived during the review.

ADDRESS: 2951, 2967, 2979, AND 3001R W SCHOOL HOUSE LA
5702, 5710, AND 5714 WISSAHICKON AVE, ALDEN PARK
Proposal: Replace windows; construct swimming pool
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: L3C Alden Park Apartmentstic I LLC
Applicant: Eric Comp, Briarwood Construction LLC
History: 1925; Alden Park; Edwyn Grant Rourke, architect
Individual Designation: 5/7/1981
District Designation: None
Preservation Easement: Yes
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the 7400 windows and construct an in-ground swimming pool at a gated apartment complex set on 38 acres in northwest Philadelphia. It also proposes to construct an entry vestibule at the non-historic health club building, but that aspect of the application has already been approved at the staff level.

This application proposes to replace all 7400 windows in residential units in the complex. The historic windows in the common spaces would be retained. The application extensively documents the investigations of restoring and replacing the steel windows at the apartment complex. The applicant explored restoring the steel windows, which are deteriorated, contain lead paint, and fail water and air infiltration tests. After interviewing numerous window restoration companies, the applicant concluded that no company or group of companies has the capacity to restore 7400 windows within a reasonable timeframe. Moreover, many of the steel windows are beyond repair and would require replacement. The applicant also discovered that the steel window systems are integrated into the masonry window openings and their removal for restoration or replacement would result in damage to the surrounding brick and terra cotta masonry. Therefore, although much more expensive, the applicant has determined that the replacement of the steel windows with aluminum windows is the best option. To avoid damaging the masonry openings, the steel window frames would be left in place and the aluminum windows fitted over them. The new windows would have the same color, profiles, pane configurations, and other details as the historic windows, but would deviate dimensionally, especially at the sills, jambs, and heads, to accommodate the retained steel frames. Unlike buildings in an urban setting, these nine and 12-story buildings in a suburban setting are not typically viewed from a close proximity, but are seen from significant distances. The public will not perceive the minor dimensional deviations of the new windows from the old.

An in-ground pool with surrounding terrace would be installed on the grounds. A simple, code-mandated, see-through metal fence would surround the pool. No historic landscape features would be disturbed for the installation of the pool. The pool would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Although the proposed windows deviate dimensionally from the historic windows in some regards, the applicant has demonstrated that the window plan is the most feasible, given the many extenuating factors.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Preservation consultant Kevin McMahon, consultant Joel Darras, owner's representative Yossi Cohen, site manager Stacy Generack, construction consultant Eric Camp, window distributor Bill Steedle, architect Lyle Suess, and attorney Thomas Chapman represented the application.

Mr. Cluver thanked the applicants for their very thorough and thoughtful application.

Mr. Chapman stated that the overall project represents a $53 million investment. He explained that the property owner began the development of this project with the assumption that the windows would be repaired, not replaced. He observed that they worked very hard to find a company or companies both willing and able to restore 7400 windows. The extant windows have failed. Because they cannot be repaired, they will be replaced. He noted that an attempt was made to repair the windows in the 1990s, but that failed. He stated that his client has studied this project in great detail. Many consultants have been retained to investigate.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the common area windows will be retained and repaired, but all residential area windows will be replaced. Mr. Cohen noted that the common area windows do not need to perform at the level that the residential windows must. Ms. Stein stated that retaining some windows is a good idea from a preservation perspective. She asked about the restoration of the common area windows. Mr. Darras stated that the level of work to the common area windows will vary from window to window and will be impacted by the level of masonry restoration at each window. Where the masonry will be replaced wholesale, the windows will be extensively rehabilitated. Ms. Gutterman asked about lead paint. Mr. Camp responded that they will encapsulate in place when possible.

Ms. Pentz asked about the masonry restoration. Mr. Darras replied that that project is ongoing. The Historical Commission approved it at the staff level and the staff along with the Preservation Alliance, which holds an easement, are reviewing masonry samples. Some, but not all, cast stone is being replaced. Ms. Pentz asked about the impact of leaving the steel frames in place. Will they continue to corrode and cause the masonry to spall? Mr. Darras explained that the masonry and window work will prevent additional water infiltration.

Mr. Cluver asked about the window shop drawings comparing the existing and proposed. He pointed out a flashing detail that appeared not to work. Messrs. Steedle and Suess acknowledged a minor error on the drawings and updated a copy of the drawing by hand for the Committee. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the new frame will be slightly outward of the existing frame. Mr. Steedle agreed, but noted that the glass will remain in the same plane.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the pool fence. The applicants responded that it would be an aluminum, powder-coated, black picket fence. It will not be chain link or solid.

Ms. Stein asked if the old window frames would remain in place or be cut or ground off. Mr. Darras stated that the frames would remain in place and be covered with a separation membrane. The muntins will be cut. Some pieces of the frames will be cut or ground off, but, for the most part, the frames will remain in place.

Mr. Cluver asked about the lintels. Mr. Darras stated that some will be replaced.

Mr. Cluver wondered if leaving the frames in place would result in rust jacking, which would damage the masonry. He noted, however, that removing the frames now might result in even more damage than the rust jacking. Mr. Chapman noted that the consultants have speculated that removing the frames now will result in significant damage. Ms. Pentz suggested that the remaining pieces of the frames should be treated to avoid additional corrosion and damage. Mr. Darras stated that they will be cleaning the remaining frames of rust and applying a corrosion inhibiting coating. Mr. Suess stated that the new frames with panning and other elements will

prevent water from infiltrating and corroding the frames. Others noted that the panning will be scribed to fit each window precisely.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for comments from the public. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia reported that his organization holds a preservation easement on the property. He stated that the organization is not opposed to the window replacement, but will continue to review the details as they are developed.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants if they are proposing to use the exact window that is specified in the application, or is the specified window one possible window of many. Mr. Steedle responded that this window has been custom designed for this project. This is the window that will be installed. He stated that this is the fourth generation of window design development. They have expended significant design time to create the best possible replacement window. Responding again to Mr. Cluver, Mr. Steedle stated that this is not a concept window; this is the window that they will install if approved. It has been custom designed for this project.

Mr. McCoubrey again asked for comments from the public. No one in the audience offered additional comments.

Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee should not base it decision on the claims made about lead paint. He also noted that 20 years since the last maintenance on these windows is a long time. Nonetheless, Mr. Cluver stated that he agreed with the staff that the applicant has demonstrated that the window plan is the most feasible, given the many extenuating factors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the remaining steel frames are coated to prevent rust and galvanic action and a rehabilitation plan is submitted for the common-area windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 1226 PINE ST
Proposal: Construct three-story, rear addition, pilot house, and roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Lee & Karly Berman
Applicant: Stephen Maffei, Abitare Design Studio, LLC
History: 1825
Individual Designation: 11/28/1961
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade and construct a three-story rear addition with roof deck and pilot house on this circa 1825 house in the Washington Square West neighborhood. The rear of the property opens onto Waverly Street. The Architectural Committee reviewed an application for a rear addition that included the removal of the rear roof slope, rear dormer, and rear wall at its April 2016 meeting. At that time, the Committee recommended approval of the restoration of the front façade, and denial of the rear addition as proposed, with the recommendation that the addition should be reduced in size, the entire roof slope and dormer retained, and the addition disengaged from the rear of the house as much as possible. The applicant withdrew the application prior to the Historical Commission meeting, so that it could be revised to reflect comments received by the Committee.

The current proposal for the rear addition would retain the existing rear wall of the historic house as well as the rear roof slope and rear dormer. However, visibility of these historic elements would be blocked by the addition when viewing directly from Waverly Street at the rear. There are several other examples nearby of large rear additions, most notably the property next door at 1228 Pine Street, which the Commission approved in 2004. In that instance, however, the historic building including the rear had been altered prior to the approval of the large rear addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration of the front façade, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the rear addition, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Prospective property owner Lee Berman and architect Stephen Maffei represented the application.

Mr. Maffei explained that the application reflects comments received by the Committee at the April 2016 meeting, where the initial proposal called for the removal of the rear wall, rear roof slope, and rear dormer. He explained that the revised design calls for the existing historic fabric to remain, although visibility of the historic fabric from Waverly Street would be blocked. He noted that the addition has been reduced in size by approximately six feet.

Ms. Pentz opined that the retention of the rear roof slope and rear dormer achieves the Committee's goals, regardless of whether the historic fabric is seen from Waverly Street. She voiced her support for the concept.

Ms. Pentz asked about the rear masonry cornice. Mr. Maffei responded that the rear cornice will remain, but the addition will tied into it at several locations. He noted that those details have not been entirely determined, but the rear cornice will not be removed.

Ms. Pentz asked about the details of the restoration of the front dormer. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff has historic photographs of the dormer and will work with the applicant on the restoration details. Mr. Maffei agreed that he will work with the staff on the details, including the roof of the dormer. He stated that the existing dormer needs repair, and the details of the roof can be worked out with the staff. Ms. Pentz agreed that Mr. Maffei should work with the staff on the restoration of the front dormer.

Mr. Cluver asked about drainage of the terrace. Mr. Maffei responded that there will likely be an internal drain.

Mr. Cluver asked about the retention of the rear exterior wall. Mr. Maffei confirmed that the wall will be retained from basement through third floor, but some of the openings will be modified. Ms. Gutterman stated that she is concerned by the pilot house and roof deck, and the visibility of those from Waverly Street. She commented that the Committee was concerned at the previous meeting about the massing of the addition overwhelming the historic house. Mr. Maffei responded that he reduced the footprint of the addition, but the roof deck was not mentioned as a concern at the previous meeting. Ms. Gutterman responded that the Committee had discussed reducing the massing of the addition. Mr. Maffei responded that he did reduce the massing. Ms. Gutterman responded that he reduced it in depth but not height. Mr. Maffei responded that a reduction in height would result in the loss of one bedroom, and the owner is looking for a four-bedroom house. Ms. Gutterman responded that the owner could have a deck as the third floor.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the Commission discuss the design of the addition itself, and noted that there are numerous materials specified. Mr. Maffei responded that he is open to suggestions regarding materials, but that he chose to bring masonry up to at least the underside of the second floor to create some sort of privacy wall for the yard itself. He stated that the client does not want to use stucco. Ms. Stein asked about the material of the pilot house. Mr. Maffei responded that it would be siding material or stucco. He noted that the third-floor projecting bay should have three windows instead of the two that printed on the drawings. He stated that the pilot house will not be visible from Pine Street or Waverly Street, based on sightline studies. Ms. Stein asked about the side wall material. Mr. Maffei responded that it will likely be stucco, and the back is wood siding. Ms. Stein opined that the mix of materials will look strange, and suggested that the material of the side wall should also be the material of the rear wall. Mr. Berman responded that he would be amenable to stucco if it were a requirement. Mr. Maffei commented that he could bring stucco up the sides, and use a composite material or siding on the bay itself. When asked about the banding, Mr. Maffei responded that there will be a cast stone band above the brick, and a metal trim above the bay. Both would wrap around the sides.

Mr. Cluver commented that the design of the addition still needs further consideration, and suggested that the applicant try to reduce the busyness of the materials and instead treat the addition as more of a consistent volume. Mr. Maffei reiterated that he would be amenable to material suggestions by the Committee, but that his intention of resubmitting the revised design was to get feedback on the massing of the addition. Ms. Stein opined that the revised design is responsive in massing to the Committee's request from the previous meeting, and that she is generally supportive of the new volume of the addition. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that she is troubled by the height of the pilot house. Mr. McCoubrey summarized that the Committee recommends stucco for the volume of the addition, brick for the base which would wrap around, and wood siding rather than metal paneling for the bay. Mr. Maffei asked if he could revise the drawings to reflect the comments regarding materials, and submit those for review by the Commission. Ms. Gutterman responded affirmatively.

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

> **ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the rear cornice is retained and the material choices are revised to reflect the Architectural Committee's advice, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. The motion passed by a vote of 3 to 2.

ADDRESS: 1531 N 16TH ST
Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct four-story addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: BG Capital LLC
Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
History: c. 1885
Individual Designation: 7/1/1982
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the entire historic rear ell and possibly the rear wall of this historic property and to construct a new, deeper and wider addition at the rear and side of the property. The provided documentation implies that the only demolition is of the

historic bay and some non-historic additions; however, the interior plans show that the entire ell will be removed. The application also proposes to demolish a freestanding, non-historic, one-story garage at the rear of the property. The proposed new construction would be clad in brick and feature a cast stone base and cast stone lintels and headers.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the demolition of the one-story garage; denial of demolition of the rear ell and construction of the addition, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition except in cases of hardship and public interest in the preservation ordinance.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Logan Dry represented the application.

Ms. Stein commented that the staff's overview had stated that the rear ell would be demolished, but noted that page A1 of the zoning drawings showed the ell remaining. Ms. Stein asked Ms. DiPasquale if she had any additional information. Ms. DiPasquale replied that she did not. Mr. Dry responded that, from a diagrammatic zoning standpoint, it would appear as though the ell would remain, but that it would actually be demolished. He directed the Committee's attention to the floor plan, which shows the removal of the exterior walls. Ms. Stein responded that this building is individually designated, which is important, and the ell is part of that designation. She noted that the ell is highly visible from two streets and none of the load-bearing masonry of the ell would remain; such a demolition is not something the Committee and Commission would typically approve. Mr. Dry stated that he understood. Ms. Stein stated that applicants should present plans to show how the building could be reused, rather than assuming that it could be demolished.

Ms. Stein asked whether the applicant had a reuse scheme or whether he planned to submit a financial hardship application in support of the demolition. Mr. Dry responded that he and his client had explored retaining and encapsulating the exterior walls, as well as subdividing the lot. He noted that he understood that the Commission's jurisdiction would remain if the lot were subdivided. Mr. Dry opined that the renovation of the exterior wall was expensive, and that it would make the project and property more viable to remove the rear ell's walls. He noted that the existing main block with its gable roof would still be visible. He opined that the building may have had some sort of carriage parking in the front yard historically, and that the proposal, which includes parking in the front yard, might be compatible with its historic use. He suggested that the addition would be set back to the end of the main block to create that parking court. Mr. Dry opined that the current multi-family use of the property was not sufficiently financially viable.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that this property is unique in that it has windows all along its side wall; there was never a party wall condition. He noted that the proposed addition changes that fundamentally. Mr. McCoubrey commented that, although he is not aware of all conditions at the rear along Sydenham Street, there may be a way to increase the number of units along Sydenham rather than encumbering the historic building itself.

Mr. Cluver commented that the proposed design seems to have some odd interior conditions that would not be code-compliant, such as a bedroom with no windows. He stated that the idea of maximizing the site area seems to create a multitude of issues that would not occur if the rear ell was retained. He stated that he views this proposal as a demolition request. Mr. Cluver also noted that he is concerned about the idea of putting two parking spaces on the front lawn.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated his support for the staff recommendation of denial and the comments of the Committee members. He noted his concern over the loss of a substantial amount of historic fabric on an individually-designated property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of the one-story garage; denial of demolition of the rear ell and construction of the addition, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition except in cases of hardship and public interest in the preservation ordinance.

ADDRESS: 1528-30 N SYDENHAM ST
Proposal: Demolish building; construct two three-story buildings
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: D & A Investments
Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
History: c. 1885
Individual Designation: 7/1/1982
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a nineteenth-century carriage house at 1530 N. Sydenham Street and construct two three-story buildings on the site, which includes historically open land at 1528 N. Sydenham Street. The proposed new construction would be clad in fiber cement boards and brick, and feature paired casement windows.

The Historical Commission designated fifteen properties on the 1500-block of N. 16th Street including 1527-29 N. 16th Street with one nomination on 1 July 1982. At the time, the property at 1527-29 N. 16th Street extended from N. 16th Street east to N. Sydenham Street and included what is now known as 1528-30 N. Sydenham Street. A house faces N. 16th and a carriage house facing Sydenham. The house is described in the nomination, but the carriage house is not mentioned or pictured. In fact, none of the carriage houses associated with the houses on the block is mentioned in the nomination. The Historical Commission informed Walter and Frances Barker, the owners of the property, in writing of the designation on 6 July 1982. Frances Barker sold the property on 30 April 1986 and the new owners subdivided it in 1988 into 1527-29 N. 16th, with the house, and 1528-30 N. Sydenham, with the carriage house. The Historical Commission was unaware of the subdivision and did not add the Sydenham address to its Register until the submission of the current application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10 and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition except in cases of hardship and public interest in the preservation ordinance.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Logan Dry represented the application.

Mr. Dry stated that this project differs from the previously-reviewed project at 1531 N. 16th Street in that the owner had not been aware that the properties were designated as historic until they were nearly ready with complete construction documents that included the demolition of the carriage house. He noted that subdivision of the lots went along to the Department of Licenses

& Inspections and Zoning, which were approved with no mention of the properties being historic. It was only upon submission to the Department of Licenses & Inspections for a building permit that the Department alerted the applicant to the fact that the property was designated as historic, Mr. Dry noted.

Mr. Dry opined that the existing carriage house does not retain any character-defining features that should classify it as historic. He directed the Committee's attention to the included photographs. Given the lack of character, Mr. Dry opined that they should be allowed to continue with the by-right multi-family design, including the demolition of the building.

Mr. Dry suggested that he would be willing to consider alternative façade materials or designs, such as a different combination of metal and cement panels, or a more masonry appearance. He opined that Sydenham Street has very little character with which to be compatible.

Mr. Dry suggested that a technical glitch that allowed his client to proceed with their due diligence without recognizing that the property was historic creates a hardship for his client.

Ms. Stein asked Ms. DiPasquale to clarify the Commission's jurisdiction over construction on the two recently-divided lots, one of which features the historic carriage house. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over construction on both sites.

Mr. Dry commented that they would be amenable to an adaptive reuse of the carriage house, and building a new building next to it, but that he believes demolishing the building and constructing two new buildings might be an opportunity to create a new "historic" appearance on the block. He opined that a matching double façade might present an opportunity to set a precedent for the appearance of the block.

Ms. Gutterman asked if Ms. DiPasquale had the nomination. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she did not have the nomination with her at the meeting, and opined that, since it was designated in 1982, she doubted that it would be the caliber of nomination that would be required today. Ms. Gutterman noted that she was curious about the character-defining features of the property. Mr. Dry opined that the brick of the front façade, which is currently painted red, is a replacement brick. He noted that the sides of the building might be historic, but that he believes the front elevation was rebuilt.

Ms. Stein commented that there is an interesting remnant of a cantilevered cornice, and wondered whether the front façade previously featured a large metal cornice. Ms. Gutterman questioned what were described as the character-defining features. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the existing footprint matches the historic footprint, with the bump out at the side and at the rear.

Mr. Cluver noted that his general opinion is that this building looks like it was part of a larger designation, but that he does not see how it is contributing significantly to the historic character of the block in its current state. However, he noted that, since it is designated, its removal should be considered a demolition. He suggested that additional information could be found and an application made to either the Committee on Historic Designation or the Committee on Financial Hardship, but that currently there is not enough information to tell the story. He stated that he does not see that there is any choice but to vote for denial, owing to the fact that it is designated and its removal would be a demolition. He noted, however, that he is sympathetic to some of the arguments.

Mr. Dry asked whether he would need to submit a hardship application. The Committee members suggested that he consult with the staff.

Ms. Pentz commented that mass and shape of the carriage house still exists.

The Committee members discussed photographs included in the packet, but determined that some of them were not of the property in question.

Mr. Farnham noted that the carriage house was designated as part of a larger parcel that included the main house, but was subdivided off without the Historical Commission's knowledge. As a result, the Sydenham was not included on the Register for a while, but was technically designated. Mr. Farnham commented that there are some unanswered questions that the staff will try to clarify before the Historical Commission meeting. He noted that it is unclear whether the carriage house was called out in the nomination or in the designation minutes specifically as historically significant. He suggested that the Committee may want to offer a motion that accounts for both contingencies, if the building is called out specifically as historically significant in the nomination and if it is not. Mr. Farnham clarified that the structure is definitely designated because the Commission designates full parcels, including buildings and their appurtenances. He noted that he sensed doubt among the Committee members as to the historical significance of this building, and suggested that they could choose to take both options into consideration.

Ms. Stein addressed the design of the proposed construction. She noted that sheets Z-1 and A-4 show different front elevation designs, and asked the applicant to precisely define the proposal. Mr. Dry responded that the front elevation is still in flux, and that they are willing to incorporate aspects of other buildings from around the block.

Ms. Stein noted that the Historical Commission allows for two types of applications, final review and review in-concept. If the architectural design details are not finalized, she noted, the application should be proposed as a review in-concept. She noted that, if the applicant was seeking in-concept approval, the Committee would be happy to comment on the design, but if the applicant wanted final approval, the Committee would be reviewing a specific documented design. Mr. Dry responded that the elevation on A-4 is the final construction document. He noted that the proposed elevation is a combination of brick and fiber cement panels, but that they are open to alternative materials, such as all brick with cast stone lintels and headers. Mr. Dry noted that there are some all-brick carriage houses across the street from the structure in question, from which they might take some design cues. Ms. Gutterman directed her fellow Committee members to aerial photographs included in the 1531 N. 16th Street application showing the neighboring carriage houses. She noted that it appears that the house with which the carriage house in question was associated has been demolished. Ms. Gutterman noted that the carriage houses across the street have a more "industrial flavor" to them than the design for the proposed new construction. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the new building become more industrial looking and less residential as a way to capture the flavor of the neighborhood that is still intact.

Ms. Pentz commented, that if the nomination shows evidence that the carriage house was part of the designation, the Commission would have no choice but to protect the existing building; however, if there is no evidence, she opined, that would give the design more freedom.

Mr. Dry questioned whether the applications for 1528 and 1530 Sydenham Street should be submitted separately. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicant may want to consider not

demolishing the building and to rethink options along Sydenham Street. He noted that, with the removal of the garage at 1531 N. 16th Street, there would be a much wider frontage along Sydenham Street. Mr. Dry clarified that legally they are three separate properties. Mr. McCoubrey suggested fundamentally rethinking the design of all three parcels, which would change the thinking of carriage house site as well. Mr. Dry asked whether he should pursue separate applications or whether they should be considered in tandem, noting that 1528-30 Sydenham was recently subdivided into two separate parcels. He questioned whether it would be easier to review the empty lot and carriage house projects at same time or as completely separate applications. Ms. Gutterman responded that that is up to the applicant. Mr. Cluver suggested that they would have to be separate applications, but noted that he would like to see them back to back so they can be treated holistically.

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

Ms. Gutterman stated that the staff should determine whether or not the carriage house is mentioned in the nomination and whether or not the Commission intended to protect the carriage house as historic fabric. She stated that she is still opposed to the application, owing to the proposed design of the new construction, even if the carriage house is not considered historically significant.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to proposed demolition and incompatible design of the new construction, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10 and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition except in cases of hardship and public interest in the preservation ordinance.

ADDRESS: 201 N 21ST ST
Proposal: Replace entry doors at student lobby
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: The Franklin Institute/City of Philadelphia
Applicant: Daniel Stanislaw, JacobsWyper Architects
History: 1930; Franklin Institute; John T. Windrim, architect
Individual Designation: 9/2/1976
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing, non-original door and transom with a new all-glass, ADA-compliant entryway at the ground level of the Franklin Institute. The entryway is situated just south of the main entrance along N. 20st Street. The new configuration would include a pair of glass doors with a large, single-pane transom. The original entrance featured a tripartite door and tripartite transom that continued the proportions and design of the ground-level window openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6. The new entranceway should approximate the configuration of the historic entranceway, but may be adjusted to accommodate accessibility.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects David Searles and Dan Stanislaw, and Jeanne Maier of the Franklin Institute represented the application.

Mr. Searles provided the Committee with updated drawings, which he stated clarify the building profile and the positioning of the door within the existing opening. He emphasized that the new entryway would be placed in the same location as the one that exists. Ms. Gutterman inquired about the incorporation of a frameless glass system as opposed to using a bronze frame around the doors and transom. Mr. Searles responded that the all-glass system appeals to the historic nature of the building.

Mr. Searles explained that the entranceway under consideration and the entranceway opposite the main staircase serve as the two ADA entrances to the museum. He described past changes to the doorway, and noted that to install a tripartite door similar to the original would only allow for a 2'-6" opening that would preclude handicap access. The proposed all-glass door, Mr. Searles continued, would restore the vertical elements prevalent at the building's east elevation and would be more in keeping with the historic nature than the current double doors and tripartite transom.

Mr. Cluver asked whether double doors were necessary for egress capacity. Mr. Searles answered affirmatively and added that the doorway functions as the bus entrance to accommodate large groups of children and other visitors. Mr. Cluver inquired whether the doors were strictly manual or if they contained an automatic operator. Mr. Searles stated that the plan includes installing an automatic opener with the new doors to make them ADA compliant. Mr. Cluver stated that it was his understanding that an entranceway is ADA compliant if an automatic operator opens two leafs simultaneously. In this way, Mr. Cluver noted, the two leafs, which are each smaller than 36 inches, would open the doorway to the required width. Mr. Searles concurred that that was his understanding as well, but added that the existing openings are so narrow that the solution would restrict wheelchairs from entering. Mr. Cluver contended that the entranceway would not be limiting if treated as a double door where both leafs open simultaneously. Mr. Searles agreed.

Mr. Cluver speculated about the original operating pattern of the entranceway's three-door system and whether there would have been a fixed light between two doors. He commented that three 30-inch leafs would allow more people to enter and exit through the openings at a time, although he noted that an automatic operator on a new system would provide other options.

Mr. Searles remarked that in addition to resolving issues related to ADA compliance and egress, the new door system would provide an inviting entrance to the museum. He also indicated that it would provide the opportunity to install discreet, unlit signage at the glass transom, which would be more difficult to execute with mullions.

Mr. Cluver inquired about the configuration of the doors on the other side of the portico entrance. Mr. Searles answered that it is the same configuration. He elaborated that, in speaking with the client, the Franklin Institute would be prepared to replace both entryways flanking the entrance portico to maintain symmetry.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the applicants considered a metal frame door with a shallower profile and inquired about the hardware shown in the drawings, which she stated would be visible through the clear glass entryway. Mr. Searles responded that the hardware should be shown as dashed in the section drawing, because its placement has not been confirmed. He added that the hardware may be placed either at ground level to allow for the least obstruction or overhead.

Ms. Stein asked whether the glass of the proposed entryway would be clear or tinted, and inquired about the existing glass. Mr. Searles answered that the proposed glass would be clear to invite the public into the museum, and he confirmed that the existing glass is lightly tinted. Owing to the success of the conference and education center in the Karabots Pavilion, Mr. Searles continued, the Franklin Institute has been approached by a donor to improve the entry sequence into that space. He added that the organization is also planning an interior restoration of the space just beyond the entranceway.

Ms. Stein inquired about the detailing of the head and jambs, and asked whether any of the original fabric remains that could be preserved or recreated to reinforce the monumentality of the openings. Mr. Searles remarked that none of the existing fabric at either opening is original. What remains, he continued, is a more modern bronze that replicates the color of the historic openings but not the profiles. He stated that he would consider a bronze surround with the glass inset. Ms. Stein commented on the height of the proposed door, which she felt was random relative to the building elevation. She noted that the details of the original tripartite design aligned with the masonry joints. A new installation, Ms. Stein stated, would give the applicant the opportunity to realign the door with the masonry joints to replicate some of the original detailing. Mr. Searles agreed to the suggestion

Ms. Stein asked what hardware is proposed for the all-glass door. Mr. Searles responded that while the drawings are not to that level of development, the hardware is illustrated as a Blumcraft-type hardware in bronze. He elaborated that if he were to use a bronze surround, then he would incorporate bronze hardware but he would defer to the Committee's recommendation on the metal type.

Mr. McCoubrey requested clarification on the configuration of the original assembly. Mr. Searles referenced a historic photograph included in his application that shows the original doors prior to their removal. In examining the photograph and a historic drawing, Mr. Cluver commented the proposed door causes the entrance to appear as a large void, whereas the original door, with its three leafs and six-pane transom, maintained the building's scale. He stated that, while he understands the need for wider leafs to allow for egress, the loss of scale is troubling. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that the frameless system is of a different vocabulary. He felt that the muntins offer both scale and solidity to the opening. He stated his preference for an approach that includes a bronze system that replicates the six-light transom, although Mr. McCoubrey felt double doors would be acceptable in place of the tripartite door of the original design. Mr. Searles argued that the design would be similar to the existing doorway, with the addition of a central mullion in the transom. Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Gutterman countered that the frames would contain a thinner profile and lighten the entrance. Mr. Cluver added that the doors could potentially be glass if the transom was framed with six panes.

Mr. Searles expressed concern over relying solely on automatic door operators, if they were to adopt the original tripartite design. He discussed the possibility of the system breaking and the probable delay in repairing the operators. With such high visitation and broken operators, Mr. Searles continued, the entranceway would be inaccessible for a period of time.

Ms. Gutterman advocated for a study to be completed to investigate the options regarding graphics at the transom, the height of the transom bar and number of panes, and the appearance of the door frames. She remarked that the details of the building call for having both the transom and doors frame and stated her opposition to an all-glass system. Given the type and volume of visitation, Ms. Gutterman elaborated, a framed door would be more successful and durable. Mr. Searles argued that a framed design would be much like the existing entryway.

Ms. Gutterman countered that a new design could minimize the frame to approximately one inch thickness to reduce bulk. Mr. Searles noted that he would defer to the client and added that the client would likely prefer to automate the existing doors if the design were to be so similar to the existing entranceway. He added that the proposed design makes the space more inviting and maintains ADA accessibility.

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

Ms. Stein recommended that in the future the applicants submit multiple options to allow the applicants and Committee to more easily resolve the proposed graphics and door design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 317 SPRUCE ST
Proposal: Demolish rear dormer and roof; construct addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Margaret Petri
Applicant: Sean McMullan
History: 1815; storefront added in early 20th century; storefront removed 1958
Individual Designation: 4/30/1957
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear slope and dormer of this house and construct an addition. This addition would demolish character-defining elements of this important, early, individually-designated house. Owing to its location at a corner, most aspects of the house including the rear dormer and roof are highly visible from the public right-of-way. A rear addition behind the existing rear ell may satisfy the Standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kiki Bollender and property owner Sean McMullan represented the application.

Ms. Bollender explained that the applicant cannot construct an addition at the rear of the rear ell as Mr. Baron suggested. Such a plan is not feasible. She reminded the Committee that the rear dormer is not original. Mr. McMullan stated that his father built the dormer in 1954. He said that they would retain the chimney and include a reveal at the top and on the side that would show where the old roofline had been. He said that, if necessary, they could set the addition back farther from the side façade of the building. Ms. Bollender said that Mr. McMullan is a builder himself and know what he can and cannot build. Mr. McMullan said that the addition would be like a new rear dormer and would allow an additional bedroom for his family. He said that this house belonged to his parents, but that his family is now living there as well.

Ms. Stein commented that the house is individually designated in addition to being located in a district. She asserted that the proposed construction would constitute a full-fledged addition rather than merely a dormer. Because the building sits on a corner, the addition would be highly visible to the public rom the side and rear. She said that the Commission has not typically allowed overbuilds on top of the main blocks of houses. In fact, the Committee has already

recommended denial of such an overbuild at this meeting. Ms. Bolender asked if the visibility was the reason for recommending denial. She also asked if setting the addition back farther from the side façade would make it more acceptable. Mr. McCoubrey noted that that the addition changes the original massing of the house and the relationship between the main building and the ell. Mr. McCoubrey said that, while the dormer might have been rebuilt, this building likely had a rear dormer originally, given the size of the building and the dormer on the front. He said that an addition at the rear would be more acceptable. Ms. Pentz noted that, even if it did not have a dormer originally, the lack of a dormer, particularly on a corner building would have been significant in and of itself. Ms. Gutterman asked if the dormer was altered after the building was designated. Mr. McMullan said that he thought that it was altered around 1954. Mr. Baron observed that the Commission was established in 1955. While acknowledging that a rear addition might be more expensive, he noted that the lot is very large and seems to have sufficient room for an addition, probably within existing "as of right" zoning.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, but none was offered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 1501-05 FAIRMOUNT AVE
Proposal: Construct addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Mark J. Kreider
Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch
History: 1930; Overseas Motor Works; Samuel Brian Baylinson, architect
Individual Designation: 2/13/2015
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition on and adjacent to a one-story Art Deco commercial structure. The addition would be three stories in height on the historic building and four stories adjacent to the historic building, on what is now a surface parking lot. The addition would be set back 13'-7" from the Fairmount Avenue façade and 15'-7" from the 15th Street façade, slightly more than the dimensions of a tower at the corner of the historic building. The addition would be clad in a silver-gray metal panels at the three street facades and stuccoed at the west façade. The one-story Art Deco building would be rehabilitated with storefronts based on historic photographs.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. The addition would overwhelm the historic building, destroying spatial relationships that characterize the property. The addition is not compatible with the historic property in size, scale and proportion, and massing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Rustin Ohler and Greg Wilson and developer Herb Reid represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked how the new addition would be supported. Mr. Ohler explained that there would be a new line of columns inside the structure with new footings and foundations that would rise up from the basement and support the addition above the historic building. Mr. Cluver noted that the walls of the addition appear to be skewed and did not follow the lines of the

existing exterior walls. Mr. Ohler said concurred and explained that the addition was designed to open up the line of sight towards the tower. Mr. Cluver noted that the addition appears taller than allowed by existing zoning. Mr. Ohler said that they would seek a variance from the allowable 55 foot height limit, but noted that there are several other nearby developments that exceed the allowable height. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the proposed addition overwhelms the scale and massing of the existing building. Ms. Stein agreed and said that the addition should sit on the vacant portion of the lot to the north. Ms. Gutterman agreed but said that she could see some overbuild on the old structure, but that the addition should be set back more and smaller than proposed. She suggested that it should be set back at least one more bay of the historic building. Mr. McCoubrey opined that any addition should be set back much farther from Fairmount Avenue. He said it should not engage the original building a significant amount.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance said he agreed with the Committee's comments and also suggested that the applicant should reconsider the materials of the addition to make them more compatible.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. The addition would overwhelm the historic building, destroying spatial relationships that characterize the property. The addition is not compatible with the historic property in size, scale and proportion, and massing.

ADDRESS: 1132-40 N FRONT ST
Proposal: Construct addition and stair tower, replace and add windows and doors
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Franklin Properties
Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch Architects
History: 1864; enlarged 1880; J.A. Doughtery's Sons Distillery Bonded Warehouse
Individual Designation: Not designated, but under consideration for designation
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition and stair tower, and replace and add windows and doors. The property is not yet designated as historic, but a nomination is pending for the property. The nomination will be considered by the Committee on Historic Designation on June 15 and the Historical Commission on July 8. The property was recently sold. The Historical Commission notified the former owner of the pending nomination, but not the current owner. The current owner became aware of the nomination when he applied for a building permit to rehabilitate the building.

The four-story building was built as part of a large industrial complex known as J.A. Doughtery's Sons Distillery in two phases in 1864 and 1880. The building faces N. Front Street to the east. The Market-Frankford elevated line runs along N. Front Street, very close to the building in question, and block most views of the upper floors. The building backs up to a vacant lot along N. Hope Street to the west. Historically, a structure of similar height facing N. Hope Street stood against the rear wall of the subject building; that structure has been demolished, leaving a vacant lot. All of the openings in the rear wall have been infilled and would have been interior openings historically.

The application proposes to construct a one-story rooftop addition clad in stucco and occupying the entirety of the roof. It also proposes to construct a five-story stair tower along the south wall of the building. The main entrance to the building would be located at what was historically the rear party-wall façade, which faces the vacant lot along Hope Street. New door and window openings would be cut and doors and windows added at the Hope Street and south facades. At the Front Street façade, the six ground-floor arched openings, which have been infilled to varying degrees, would be reopened for windows. Historically, four were door openings and two were window openings. Historic window sills would be retained at the two window openings. Panels up to the sill heights would be installed in the four door openings. Paired windows would be installed in all six openings. Panels would be installed in the transoms. At the upper floors, the windows would be replaced with square-head one-over-one windows. The historic windows were arched, six-over-six windows. The brick facades would be repointed.

Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations stipulates that:

> The Commission, its committees, and staff may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.

The former owner of the property was notified of the Commission's intent to consider designation on April 28. The current owner and developer learned of the Commission's plans upon the submission of a building permit application on May 9. The owner/developer of this property has demonstrated that substantial development plans were in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation. While the proposed rehabilitation may not satisfy a strict reading of the Standards in every regard, it would preserve the character-defining features of the vacant building, returning it to active use and improving its appearance, especially if more appropriate windows are installed at the Front Street façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the ground-floor Front Street windows, transoms, and panels approximate the appearance of the historic windows and doors and the upper-floor Front Street windows are arched six-over-six windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Rustin Ohler and Greg Wilson represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Rules & Regulations authorizes the Commission, its committees, and staff to take into account development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications. He noted that the Rules & Regulations do not provide any guidance as to how such plans should be considered. He stated that, if this building had been designated prior to the development of the proposed project, the staff would have recommended that the addition should be set back from the front façade. However, in light of the fact that the redevelopment project was substantially underway prior to the notice of the consideration of a nomination, that plans were developed, finances committed, and contracts signed, the staff considers the proposed design a reasonable compromise. The proposal would preserve the character-defining features of the vacant building, returning it to active use and improving its appearance. Denying such an application would likely result in appeal, the outcome of which is unpredictable. He also noted that the elevated train, which runs very close to the front façade of the building, blocks views of the upper front façade. Mr.

Farnham concluded that the project satisfies the primary goal of the nomination; it protects the building from demolition.

Ms. Stein stated that the addition looks very tall for one story. The drawings show about 15 feet of stucco above the historic roofline. She stated that the design is awkward; there is too much space above the window heads, to the parapet. Mr. Ohler stated that he look into the possibility of reducing the parapet height. He noted that the height results from the roof pitch. The building's roof has one slope, to the rear. Mr. Cluver suggested an articulation to the parapet, to reduce its scale and sense of tallness. Mr. Cluver asked about the zoning height limitation. Mr. Ohler responded that the zoning classification is CMX-3, which has no height limit.

Mr. Ohler explained that he determined that the property was not designated as historic when he began to develop the plans for the rehabilitation of the building last year. He stated that the former owner was not notified until 28 April 2016, many months after he was at work on the redevelopment scheme. Mr. Ohler observed that the new owner was not notified of the consideration of the nomination and did not learn about it until he applied for a building permit on 9 May 2016. Mr. Ohler stated that the owner has a zoning permit for the project and construction documents are completed. He stated that the owner is willing to consider the staff's suggestions for the front façade and to consider reducing the height of the parapet, but has a project that is ready for building permitting.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the windows proposed in the current plan. Mr. Olher stated that they were planning to install vinyl windows. He noted that the staff is suggesting revising the Front Street windows. The upper floor windows as proposed are square-head windows in arched openings. He explained that the staff is suggesting arched, six-over-six windows. Mr. Ohler asked if the staff was suggesting a material. Mr. Farnham replied that the staff recommendation did not stipulate a material. He stated that the staff is suggesting windows that replicate the exterior appearance of the historic windows.

Ms. Pentz asked about the proposal for the Front Street ground-floor façade. Mr. Ohler stated that they are proposing to remove infill and install paired windows over panels in door openings and paired windows in window openings. Mr. Ohler stated that the submitted plans do not represent the staff recommendations.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the neighboring buildings. Mr. Ohler stated that a building stands to the north across a narrow, gated alley. Townhouses stand to the south, with small rear yards and fences about five or so feet south of the building in question. The elevated railroad stands directly in front of the building.

Ms. Pentz stated that, owing to the facts that the development was planned before the Commission's jurisdiction began and that the elevated blocks many views of the building, the Committee can and should recommend approval of this project. However, the height of the parapet should be reduced. Mr. Ohler again agreed to reduce the height of the parapet, if possible.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment. No one offered comments.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the windows in the addition should be differentiated from those in the historic section of the building. She also suggested reducing the scale of the parapet, perhaps with scoring in the stucco. She also noted that the mechanical equipment should not be visible.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the materials and color choices for the addition. Ms. Gutterman opined that the dark color made it look heavier. Mr. McCoubrey suggested a lighter material than stucco, perhaps metal panels.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the ground-floor Front Street windows, transoms, and panels approximate the appearance of the historic windows and doors in wood; the upper-floor Front Street windows in the historic building are wood arched six-over-six windows; the windows in the addition are differentiated from but compatible with the windows in the historic building; the height of the parapet of the addition is reduced; and the color of the addition is lighter than proposed and differentiated from but compatible with the color of the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.
No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably

adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations
The Commission, its committees, and staff may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.

DRAFT