MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 21 JUNE 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR

PRESENT
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Rudy D'Alessandro
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
Philip E. Scott, KSK Architects
Gail Harrity, Philadelphia Museum of Art
Nicole White, Philadelphia Museum of Art
Robyn Willner
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Joe Schiavo
Janet Kalter
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Joseph Scorsone
Job Itzkowitz
Bruce Fulmer
Lynne Calamia, ASMH
Stephen Maffei, Abitare Design Studio
Stephen Labov, Shovel Ready Projects
Jose J. Hernandez, JKRP Architects
Steven Sergi, JKRP Architects
Francis Graff, MFD Developers
David Rubin, Land Collective
Alfred Dragani, dMAS
Katie McGonigle, dMAS
A. Robert Torres, Studio Torres
Ben Weintraub
Stuart Lacheen
Patricia Gherovici
Sean-Michel Rabate
Taylor Stevenson
Mark Travis
Dwayne Blackwell
Angela Blackwell
Paul Thompson

DRAFT

Marcos Balum, Mural Arts Program
Ambrose Liu, Mural Arts Program
Philip Asbury, Mural Arts Program

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Stein and Mr. D'Alessandro joined him.

ADDRESS: 2600 BENJAMIN FRANKLIN PKY, PHILADELPHIA MUSEUM OF ART
Proposal: Install artwork
Review Requested: In Concept
Owner: City of Philadelphia
Applicant: Philip E. Scott, KSK
History: 1928; Philadelphia Museum of Art; Horace Trumbauer, architect
Individual Designation: 6/29/1971
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to permanently install a site-specific artwork named Skyspace by internationally prominent artist James Turrell near the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Turrell works with light and space to create artworks that engage viewers with the limits and wonder of human perception. His artworks have been shown at hundreds of major museums and galleries throughout the world including the National Gallery of Australia, Israel Museum, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., Centre Georges Pompidou, Venice Biennale, Neues Museum Weimar, Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden at the Smithsonian Institute, Tokyo Metropolitan Museum of Art, Museé des beaux-arts de Montréal, Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, Museum of Modern Art and Whitney Museum of American Art in New York, Guggenheim Bilbao, Getty Museum in Los Angeles, and Louisiana Museum of Modern Art in Humlebaek, Denmark, to name a few. Turrell has said: "My work is more about your seeing than it is about my seeing, although it is a product of my seeing. I'm also interested in the sense of presence of space; that is space where you feel a presence, almost an entity — that physical feeling and power that space can give."

The proposed site is within Fairmount Park, to the west of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, on the rock promontory known as the North Plateau, which overlooks the Fairmount Waterworks and the Schuylkill River. The Museum and the Waterworks are both designated as historic, but boundaries for the early designations are not defined. Fairmount Park as a whole is not designated as historic.

Skyspace will be an open elliptical structure accommodating approximately 24 people on a perimeter stone bench with a high back that provides a sense of enclosure. Conceived as a pavilion, the structure will feature steel tube columns supporting an elliptical canopy with an aperture framing views of the sky. At dawn and dusk, an array of changing colored lights will project up onto the underside of the canopy. The work is intended to be a contemporary, twenty-first-century response to the two similarly scaled and sited pavilions already on the ridge above the Waterworks. The Skyspace canopy will align with the eave of the 1870s Mercury Pavilion to the south. Skyspace will provide a starting point for travel through the park, up the Schuylkill,

Wissahickon, and Cresheim Creek to Turrell's installation at the Chestnut Hill Friends Meeting House, which opened in 2013.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff is split on this application. Some argue that Skyspace will disrupt iconic views of the Waterworks and Museum and suggest that, to comply with preservation standards, the work of art should be located less conspicuously, perhaps near the Museum's parking garage. Others contend that, as a work of art intended to inflect seeing, not merely a mundane piece of mechanical equipment, a maintenance shed, or a Rocky statue, the Turrell work can disrupt views while complying with the intent of the preservation ordinance, compelling viewers to think deeply about light and space, and perhaps history and preservation.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Gutterman recused, owing to her firm's work with the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Philip E. Scott and Philadelphia Museum of Art representatives Gail Harrity and Nicole White represented the application.

Ms. Harrity stated that the Philadelphia Museum of Art is pleased to be working with world-renowned artist James Turrell and architect Philip E. Scott. She noted that the museum views the project as a wonderful opportunity for the City of Philadelphia to construct a Skyspace installation. It also presents an opportunity, Ms. Harrity continued, to collaborate with the Department of Parks & Recreation to create a second Turrell installation in Philadelphia, which would, in the eyes of the donor and many involved in the project, link two spectacular Turrell installations within the city. James Turrell's projects, she added, have drawn both art enthusiasts and international visitors. Ms. Harrity remarked that it is her belief that the project will have a positive impact on the museum, art community, and the City of Philadelphia.

Mr. Scott commented on the process to date and the collaboration with the Department of Parks and Recreation, adding that they have worked through a number of concerns, including the scale of the installation. He stated that in reducing its size, the installation will have a lower seating capacity and will be closer in scale to the two existing pavilions located near the site. Mr. Scott added that the verticality of the piece will not overwhelm the site, since the installation will be embedded into the plateau, which will require some rock removal. He directed the Committee members to photographs of the site and noted that, to date, many changes have occurred to the landscape at the installation's proposed location. Mr. Scott distributed historic photographs to show the evolution of the site and noted that the location of the proposed installation is where he believes an Italianate water tower once stood. The nearby Mercury Pavilion, he noted, still exists. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the date of the pavilion, and Mr. Scott confirmed that it was installed around 1870, which would have been after the construction of the Fairmount Water Works. Mr. Scott added that the Mercury Pavilion once served as a resting point halfway to the crest of the hill. He commented that the hill has been significantly lowered over time. Through several photographs, Mr. Scott showed that the base of the former water tower aligned with the base of the Mercury Pavilion, and a ravine, which remains intact, separated the two structures. He added that it appeared that the tower had been embedded in an excavated area of the hill, and that the present landscape has been excavated to the base of the two structures.

The current structure, Mr. Scott stated, is based on the geometry of an ellipse. He commented that James Turrell had certain requirements for the installation, including how the sky is framed, the angle at which the observer sits, and the angle of the observer's view through the oculus to the sky. While not rigidly defined, Mr. Scott continued, there is a limit in the degrees and angles needed to achieve the desired experience. Consequently, he stated, the building lays out itself

in order to meet such requirements. He added that the proposed design is a solution acceptable to the artist, and he asserted that he believes it is a reasonable addition to the art museum's landscape. The installation, Mr. Scott noted, would be fully accessible and would be illuminated from below for part of the night. He clarified that the effect occurs at daybreak and sunset, so during those times the piece will be active. He commented that he and the artist have not resolved whether the installation will be subtly lit or completely dark for the remainder of the night. Mr. D'Alessandro asked when the main building turns on its lights. Ms. Harrity responded that the automated lighting system differs depending on the season, though she believed their timing corresponds to dusk. Mr. D'Alessandro replied that both would come on at approximately the same time and asked if a light study had been completed. Ms. Harrity responded that the lighting at the museum is on throughout the night. She added that the coloration of the installation has not been fully determined.

Ms. Stein stated her appreciation for the artwork and commented that the adjustments made, such as reducing the scale, are critical to their review. She added that the piece is quite large and the seating diameter is the size of the Committee's meeting room. With the canopy, Ms. Stein noted, the installation would extend another ten feet. She inquired whether the installation is considered to be a permanent addition or temporary structure with a specific lifespan. Mr. Scott responded that it is permanent and that the canopy will consist of a durable material. Ms. Stein suggested carbon fiber as a long-term material and asked whether the canopy would be opaque or transparent. Mr. Scott replied that it would be opaque and that the underside would be reflective. Ms. Stein asked about the lower light ring suspended approximately eight feet below the canopy structure and commented that the columns would have a lighter frame if the ring could be eliminated or integrated into another area. Mr. Scott responded that he does not know enough about the specifics of the lighting to know if the suggestion is feasible. He added that the artist has been extremely flexible with the design, and Mr. Scott would be willing to inquire about the change.

Mr. McCoubrey asked why the site was chosen and what it contributes to the installation. Ms. Harrity replied that several alternative sites were considered, but this site was the artist's preference and one the museum felt best supported the work. She added that it is a historic landscape that has evolved over the years, and its continued evolution is appreciated by all those involved in the project. She stated that the project has the enthusiastic support of the Department of Parks and Recreation. Mr. Scott remarked that the site is a dramatic location for the installation. He noted that its high visibility from passing trains and cars on the Schuylkill Expressway appeals to the artist. He also stated that it would have an analogous experience for visitors to the other pavilions along the ridge.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the color of the installation's roof and noted that those elements could be recessive relative to the underside. Mr. Scott and Ms. Harrity replied that the roof color could be discussed with the artist, and Ms. Harrity named several other Skyspace installations in Asia and Europe. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the context of the other installations and if they were sited near historic structures. Ms. Harrity responded that they vary, but stated that the other Skyspace is in the Chestnut Hill Meeting House. She added that one in Japan is situated in a historic park-like setting with other structures, as is one in Crystal Bridges, Arkansas, which is located on a ridge. One at Rice University, she continued, is an open-air installation at the central courtyard of the campus. This proposed installation, she noted, would be in alignment with some of those existing Skyspace structures. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that it is his impression that the structures are appreciated most when individuals are in the actual space. Ms. Harrity responded that the experience within it is transforming. Mr. D'Alessandro contended that the experience would not be lost if the structure was located elsewhere. Ms. Harrity argued

DRAFT

that it would be a loss without the proposed location and that the dramatic nature of each location is important to the artist. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the structure's lighting and appearance at night may draw attention to one small point at the museum's grounds rather than to the overall landscape when currently viewed from the expressway. Mr. Scott argued that the installation's lighting has infinite levels of control and could be dimmed at night to a subtle glow to make the structure recede.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the concept, provided that the canopy roof is a slightly darker color and the lighting is studied to ensure that it is not overly bright, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. D'Alessandro dissented.

ADDRESS: 2012 AND 2014 RITTENHOUSE SQ
Proposal: Demolish buildings; construct three-story building
Review Requested: Review In Concept
Owner: Robyn Willner
Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC
History: 1950; BP #31167-B, 8-25-1950
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 in-concept to convert two existing two-story houses constructed in the 1950 into a three-story, single-family residence. The applicant is simultaneously seeking reclassification of the existing buildings from contributing to non-contributing in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, arguing that the buildings are inconsistent with the architectural character, scale, spatial hierarchy, and social unity of the district. The proposed new construction would be three stories in height, with a brick façade, limestone detailing, and a standing-seam metal mansard roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the Historical Commission reclassifies the properties as non-contributing, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tim Kerner and owner Robyn Willner represented the application.

Mr. Kerner stated that the idea behind the project is to build something that will be appropriate for the district. He commented that the district nomination focuses heavily on the spatial hierarchy of the district, which is described as smaller houses on the periphery of the district with larger houses centered on Rittenhouse Square. He suggested that the proposed new construction would enhance that spatial hierarchy in a way that is absent with the two existing houses. He noted that the block is particularly interesting owing to the variety of buildings, some of which are stables that formerly served properties along Spruce Street. However, he continued, houses on this block, formerly known as Murray Street, predate the houses on Spruce Street, so there is a residential history of this street. He noted that thinking of this block as a service street to Spruce Street is only something that occurred briefly in history, so the idea that Rittenhouse Square Street that has its own presence is backed by the spatial hierarchy of the district as well as this street having its own identity.

Mr. Kerner suggested that the intent of the project is not to build an enormous house, the proposed new construction is approximately 2,700 square feet, but to create a new building that is consistent with the character of the neighborhood. He noted that the nomination describes the general character of houses in Rittenhouse Square as being of a more conservative nature than areas such as North Philadelphia. Mr. Kerner described the proposed construction as attempting to be compatible with the district, but also present itself as a contemporary structure. He noted the use of a contemporary interpretation of Neoclassical styling, as well as the central vertical window as gestures to a twenty-first-century design aesthetic.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the discrepancy between the drawings and the rendering in the submission. Mr. Kerner responded that the drawings, which show muntins in the windows, are the more recent and accurate. Mr. Kerner noted that the rendering is shown more for the coloring and materials. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the base, lintels, sills, belt course, and panel between the windows were all proposed as limestone. Mr. Kerner responded affirmatively.

Ms. Stein questioned the finish of the proposed metal roofing. Mr. Kerner responded that he planned for it to be a grey, painted material, although that has not been fully explored.

Ms. Stein questioned the floor to floor height, noting that the floor heights appear much greater than the neighboring property. She noted that the property appears to be elevated more from the sidewalk than the current buildings or adjacent properties. Mr. Kerner responded that the basement is relatively low, so they intended to raise the first floor approximately one foot higher than the existing first floor level. He noted that the adjacent property at 2010 Rittenhouse Square Street has a garage entrance and a lower front door. Mr. Kerner explained that the proposed ceiling height at that the first floor is 10’-6”, the second floor is 10’-0”, and the third is 9’-6”. He noted that the total height remains under the zoning limitation of 38 feet.

Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the front façade would have a cornice, noting that there is a band shown between the top of the brick and the bottom of the metal roof. Mr. Kerner responded that it would be a metal band, perhaps with some sort of limestone corbel. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether there would be some sort of gutter system. Mr. Kerner responded that he is not sure a gutter would be necessary, but that he could design a gutter within the metal band.

Ms. Stein opined that conceptually, if the application for reclassification is approved, the proposed design is compatible in scale and context with the rest of the block. However, she noted, the placement of the first floor at four to five feet above grade did not seem appropriate or in context with the block. She encouraged the applicant to look at other properties on the block, and to lower the cornice height and the first-floor height so they are better aligned with nearby properties. Mr. Kerner asked if Ms. Stein was suggesting that he excavate the basement. Ms. Stein asked if there is currently a basement. Mr. Kerner responded that there is currently a low basement that is less than seven feet to the underside of the joists. Ms. Stein asked about the code minimum height. Mr. Kerner responded that the code minimum is 7’-6”, and the proposed basement height is 8’-0”. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the proposed design includes livable space in the basement. Mr. Kerner responded that there will be an office and den in the proposed plans.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that the horizontal band at the juncture of second and third floor argues with the nice Neoclassical door surround, noting that door surrounds typically existed in

isolation. He expressed his preference that the band be limited to a lintel over the window. Mr. Kerner responded that he likes the band, because it is different than what one might typically see.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the return of the building at the west elevation. Mr. Kerner responded that there is an existing brick wall that could be retained, although he is not sure whether it makes sense to retain that wall or not. Ms. Gutterman noted that that elevation is not shown in the drawings. Mr. Kerner responded that it is a blank brick wall. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the limestone band would return onto that elevation or just stop. Ms. Gutterman noted that the corner would be visible from the street, and suggested that the staff review the appearance of at least the first six feet of that elevation.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the proposed materials are real brick and real stone. Mr. Kerner responded affirmatively.

Ms. Stein expressed confusion over the appearance of an alleyway along the west side of the property that appears in the drawings but not in the rendering or photographs. It was determined that a narrow easement exists between the property and the adjacent property to the west that is not visible from the angle of the photographs. Mr. Kerner agreed that the limestone band should return at least eight inches onto the wall, unless it makes more sense to retain the existing wall. He suggested that that masonry wall does not have any significance, but noted that it may be less costly to retain the wall than to remove it.

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

Ms. DiPasquale noted that the project is in-concept, so the Architectural Committee would have an opportunity to review the project for final approval. Mr. Kerner asked if it would it be possible for the staff to review the final design for approval if the site is reclassified as non-contributing. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff has the authority to approve any application for a non-contributing site including complete demolition, but, in this case, the applicant should raise the issue with the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 July. The Commission may authorize the staff to review the final plans for approval.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee recommend approval of the application in concept with conditions, with the staff to review details. The other Committee members responded that it made no sense to authorize the staff to review the details of an in-concept application, when such applications must be submitted again to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission for final approval. The Committee members suggested that there was enough detail for a final approval at this time and perhaps a second review was not necessary.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the Historical Commission reclassifies the property from contributing to non-contributing; and provided the decorative band between the first and second floors, the metal band above the second floor, and the return of the front façade into the alley façade are studied, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 44-48 AND 50 N 03RD ST
Proposal: Construct ten five-story buildings
Review Requested: Review and Comment
Owner: Burton Cohan and Ellen Kret
Applicant: George Konel, JKRP Architects
History: vacant lot
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story mixed-use building along N. 3rd Street, with nine new townhomes on an interior court accessed through a driveway portal in the N. 3rd Street facade. The proposed N. 3rd Street elevation would feature a ground-floor commercial space clad in cast stone with large aluminum storefront windows. The upper floors would be clad in brick with metal panel details and Juliette balconies at the upper three floors. The townhomes along the interior court would be four stories in height with large central pilot house suites. The fronts of the townhouses would face onto a pedestrian walkway and would feature a mixture of brick, metal and wood panels, and metal bays. The rears of the properties would feature brick bases with garage doors, and upper floors clad in metal panels, wood cladding, and vinyl siding.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed new construction is generally compatible with the Old City Historic District in terms of scale, massing, fenestration, and materials.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jose Hernandez represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that it would be preferable for the masonry to continue across the openings of the entire base of the N. 3rd Street elevation. He objected to the breaks in the masonry over the driveway and entranceway and noted that there is a consistent base/top relationship for properties in the area.

Mr. McCoubrey recommended eliminating wood from the façade, stating that wood was not a material used historically except in locations such as bay windows. He recommended replacing the wood on the N. 3rd Street elevation by simplifying the design to carry the brick across the spans where wood is currently proposed. He suggested that, with those modifications, the overall width and articulation of the building would resemble nearby structures. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.

Ms. Gutterman questioned whether there is brick on the 3rd Street façade, or if it is proposed to be constructed with metal panels. Mr. Hernandez responded that the 3rd Street elevation features a window system with metal panels, surrounded by brick.

Ms. Stein questioned the use of the open space to the north and south of the property, and whether there are any easements. Mr. Hernandez responded that the space to the north is on a separate parcel and is a walkway that connects to the rear parking of the adjacent property. To the south is a separate, vacant lot, currently used as a parking lot. Ms. Stein asked whether it is a remnant lot that would be left for future development for a different developer. Mr. Hernandez responded affirmatively, noting that the lot is approximately 35-40 feet wide. Ms. Stein clarified that all car and pedestrian access for the proposed new construction would be self contained.

Mr. Hernandez confirmed this, noting that the pedestrian access to the townhouses is to the north, and is essentially a private, open air gate system that will allow residents to walk through to the fronts of the townhomes parallel to the open space to the north. Vehicle access is provided through the portal to the south.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether there is a gate across the vehicle entrance. Mr. Hernandez responded that there is not. He noted that the gate for the pedestrian opening would likely be wrought iron.

Mr. McCoubrey extended his comment about the use of wood on the N. 3rd Street elevation to the entire building. He suggested that continuing the tan metal panels would be preferable to wood.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Neighbor Neil McLaughlin questioned the north elevation, noting that it is currently a gated entrance and that he is not sure who owns it or has access to it. He commented that the entrance seems to lead to the Arch Street Meeting House, and questioned whether the Meeting House has been part of the discussion. He noted that the rendering of the north elevation showing people ambling down alley is inaccurate, as the gate is locked. Mr. Hernandez stated that the walkway with the pedestrians in the rendering is not part of the property in question or this project.

Mr. McLaughlin further questioned the use of the south side of the building, asking whether it is access for cars. Mr. Hernandez responded that there is a portal at the south along 3rd Street that provides vehicular access to the garages of the townhomes behind. Mr. McLaughlin asked where the vehicles go. Mr. Hernandez responded that the vehicles go to private, individual garages. Mr. McLaughlin questioned the appearance of that elevation. Ms. DiPasquale presented the elevation on the screen, and Mr. Hernandez described the materials, which include a brick base with garages, with a mixture of metal panels, and wood vinyl siding above. Mr. McLaughlin questioned the amount of turnaround space for the cars. Mr. Hernandez responded that the designed turnaround space is just over the required 22 feet.

Neighbor Joe Schiavo questioned whether or not this project is proposed to be by-right with regard to zoning. He noted that single-family homes are prohibited in this area, and questioned whether these units would have a condominium association or be individual lots. Mr. Hernandez responded that it is a planned-unit development, which basically follows a condominium use format. He noted that the proposed 3rd Street building is mixed-use, with limited ground-floor commercial space. He responded that he believes it to be a by-right project, but that the plan is currently being reviewed by the City's Zoning Unit. Committee members observed that parking and zoning are outside the Commission's purview.

Mr. Schiavo questioned the location of the vinyl siding. Mr. Hernandez responded that the rear of the property features a vinyl board and batten system. Owing to the proximity to the other buildings, he continued, they wanted to use a lighter material, and vinyl afforded them a broader color palette than some of the metal panel options.

Lynne Calamia, director of the Arch Street Meeting House, commented that the path shown in the rendering of the north elevation is closed to pedestrian travel and has a locked gate. Ms. Calamia asked how the construction would impact the existing brick wall shown in that rendering. Mr. Hernandez responded that he is waiting on the survey to determine exactly where the wall is located, but he does not anticipate altering the wall in any way. He commented that they may want to dress it up on the inside if it is located on the property in question, and it

may need to be capped properly. He noted that the wall does offer privacy for the new residents and the adjacent property owners, as well as light and air for the residents. Ms. Stein clarified that there would be no change to the fencing that exists on either the north or south sides of the parcel, as those are not owned by the developer of this project. Mr. Hernandez responded affirmatively, noting that the locked gate is part of the brick wall system, and if it is on the other property, they will not touch it.

Job Itzkowitz of the Old City District and Mark Keener of the RBA Group stated that they were authorized by the board of the Old City District to testify in a manner consistent with the Vision2026 planning document they just completed, but noted that the board has not taken a position of approval or non-approval of the project. Mr. Itzkowitz noted that their primary concerns from a building perspective have to do with the frontage on 3rd Street. He stated that 3rd Street is one of the primary commercial corridors in the district, and that the proposed building does not contribute in the same way the old warehouse buildings contribute to the commercial corridors of the district. He noted that there are large commercial spaces along the block, and complained that this project does not have adequate commercial space owing to the ingress and egress for the ten units.

Mr. Keener noted that the character of ground floor retail is important to the character of the street. He opined that that the plans feature only a tiny bit of retail, and are a "capricious representation" of what is actually happening. He noted that, in plan, the ground floor space is occupied primarily by an elevator lobby, and only tiny bit of what may become retail or commercial space. He stated that, ultimately, the design is out of character with and not respecting the quality of the street. He noted that the Old City master plan and a recent ordinance passed requires ground-floor frontage to contain commerce, and opined that this proposal does not meet the spirit of either. Mr. Itzkowitz commented that they not here to testify about use, but that the historic buildings are what enabled the area to develop in the way it did, and this project should be more consistent with the rest of the street.

Joseph Scorsone, the owner of the adjacent vacant lot at 40-42 N. 3rd Street and building at 38 N. 3rd Street opined that the proposed construction does not look like it belongs on the block at all. He noted that when he rehabilitated the building at 38 N. 3rd, he was required to replace elements to match the historic elements.

Ms. Stein opined that the plans are difficult to read, and questioned whether the blue unit is intended for retail or is an elevator lobby. Mr. Hernandez responded that, owing to the height of the building, the property is required to have an elevator and two means of egress, so the area shown in blue is an elevator lobby. He clarified that there is a pedestrian walkway to the right, vehicular drive on the left along the 3rd Street elevation, and a small elevator lobby with private entrance, and then an entrance to the proposed commercial space. He noted that there is approximately 545 square feet of available commercial space, adding that this would not be adequate for a retail store, but would be suitable for a small office or gallery use.

Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee and members of the public that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over this property is limited. The Historical Commission has the authority to review this application at a public meeting, and to allow for public comment on the application, but the Historical Commission does not have the authority to approve or deny this application, only to comment on it, owing to the fact that this property was a vacant lot at the time of designation. He noted that the preservation ordinance only gives the Historical Commission the authority to comment on new construction on vacant lots in historic districts. He stated that this Committee cannot recommend denial or approval, but can only offer comments

to the applicant. Furthermore, he noted, the Commission has no jurisdiction over the use or configuration of interior spaces, so there would be no mechanism for the Historical Commission to compel an owner to use an interior space for any particular use. In cases where the Historical Commission has full jurisdiction, he noted, the Commission can compel an owner to configure the exterior to have a particular appearance, but cannot compel that owner to use the interior in any particular way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee commented that the new construction is generally compatible with the Old City Historic District in terms of scale and massing, but recommended the following: the elevation facing N. 3rd Street should be revised to appear more industrial as opposed to residential; the masonry should continue across the entire base of the N. 3rd Street elevation; and the wood and vinyl cladding throughout the project should be reconsidered.

ADDRESS: 10-18 CALLOWHILL ST
Proposal: Demolish building, construct five townhouses
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 1729-49 East Moyamensing, LLC
Applicant: Stephen Maffei, Abitare Design Studio
History: 1960; fruit and vegetable warehouse
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a one-story, non-contributing building and to construct five four-story, single-family dwellings with roof decks and pilot houses. Given that a structure occupied the site at the time of designation, the Commission has full jurisdiction over this project. The townhouses feature front-loading garages, recessed entries, and are clad in brick veneer, cement panel, and composite wood panels with a four-foot high cast stone base at all exposed sides of the townhouses.

It should be noted that the proposed development is part of a larger block that holds high archaeological potential. That potential may be slimmer for this particular location, as historic maps indicate that the majority of the proposed construction area once featured masonry buildings which covered all but a small portion of the southeastern edge of the site, and likely disturbed any archaeological materials. Moreover, it appears that the proposed townhouses do not have basements.

A similar application to this one, submitted by a different architect and applicant, was reviewed by the Committee in March 2015. During that review, the Committee recommended that the front-loading garages be reduced in number or eliminated, that the parapet wall be reduced in height, that the pilot houses are clad in a material used elsewhere on the building, and that the minimal stone base be increased in height. That application was withdrawn prior to review by the Historical Commission.

The staff contends that although the proposed design would be incompatible in the heart of the Old City Historic District, given its location at the edge of the district and its proximity to large-scale development along the waterfront, the proposed construction is acceptable for this site. The staff suggests reconsidering the fenestration on the two sections of the buildings where the windows are horizontal rather than vertical.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stephen Maffei represented the application.

Mr. Maffei explained that he looked into doing internal garages, but decided that the site did not allow for it. As a concession, he added windows to the garage doors. He noted that the project has received by-right zoning approval. He commented that he is amenable to changing the horizontal windows to be more vertical.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the building materials. Mr. Maffei responded that the building materials include cast stone for a large part of the base, gray brick, cementitious panels, and composite wood siding. He commented that the cast stone is a buff color, rather than white as it appears in the rendering. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the wood panels. Mr. Maffei responded that it is a product called Resysta, a durable material made from rice husks, rock salt, and mineral oil that can be stained. Mr. McCoubrey opined that wood should not be used on a façade in what is otherwise a masonry city. Mr. Maffei asked if a metal panel would be more appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he would much prefer a metal panel to a wood siding. Mr. Maffei explained that he used wood because he thought that having wood garage doors would be a nice feature, and he wanted to carry that element up through the building. He stated that he is open to using a metal panel instead. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that masonry would look better than a panelized system. Mr. Maffei responded that there is masonry along the entire ground plane of the building, but he is open to changing the cladding between the windows to a metal panel. He opined that using brick would make the building appear bulky and massive. Ms. Stein commented that the cast stone and metal panels should not be white. Mr. Maffei confirmed that it will be a buff color. Ms. Stein commented that the cast stone should return at least eight inches at the corners, rather than an immediate switch to stucco.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the location of the mechanical units. Mr. Maffei responded that it is to be determined, but likely there would be one in the yard, and possibly one on the pilot house roof. Ms. Gutterman responded negatively to the location on the pilot house roof.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the roof deck setback area. Mr. Maffei responded that the area is a five-foot setback required by zoning, which is not required on the sides. Ms. Gutterman asked about the rail going across the parapet. Mr. Maffei responded that it is a decorative element. Ms. Gutterman opined that it may look awkward.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the pilot houses could be reduced in height. Mr. Maffei responded that it is approximately an eight-foot ceiling in the pilot house, which is only used for roof access and does not contain any program. Ms. Gutterman asked if he can slope the pilot houses where the steps go down. Mr. Maffei responded that he can taper the pilot houses where the steps are going down.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Joe Schiavo, a resident of Old City, commented that his question is on behalf of the Central Delaware Advocacy Group, to which he serves as Vice Chair. He asked if the zoning permit was issued prior to the implementation of the new prohibition of single-family dwellings in CMX-3. Mr. Maffei responded that the project received zoning approval on 10 May 2016. Mr. Schiavo was surprised. He asked if these are individual properties. Mr. Maffei responded that they will be fee simple townhomes. He noted that it is currently one contiguous parcel that has been subdivided and approved by City Planning. Mr.

Schiavo stated that he is still surprised, and stated that there is supposed to be a citywide regulation prohibiting single-family townhomes by-right in CMX-3 zoned parcels.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the size of the garage doors. Mr. Maffei responded that they are eight feet in width by ten feet in height, which includes the 24 inch transom above the door itself.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the pilot houses are sloped; metal paneling is used instead of wood paneling; the cast stone is buff or beige in color; the horizontal fenestration is oriented to be vertical; the materials on the main facades return at least eight inches at the corners; and the mechanical equipment is not visible from a public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 57 N 02ND ST
Proposal: Modify storefront, construct second-story addition and roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: David Rubin
Applicant: David Rubin, El See, LLC
History: 1960
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify a storefront and construct a second-story addition and roof deck on this one-story non-contributing building located within the Old City Historic District. The new storefront would include additional glazing and exposed brick, above which a zinc panel system would be installed. The roof deck would be located at the front of the existing building, with the new addition set back to a distance that would render it minimally visible from North 2nd Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The proposed design is not compatible with other structures in the district in massing, rhythm, and materials.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Alfred Dragani and owner David Rubin represented the application.

Mr. Dragani explained that they are trying to use very subtle signage appropriate to a professional business. They are reopening a window to the left of the door and exposing the brick. Mr. Rubin said that they are creating a welcoming presence on the street. He wants to have a planted cornice as an expression of his landscape design firm. The applicants brought renderings of two different designs, both of which differed from the one originally submitted only in the area above the openings of the storefront. Both designs would reopen a window at the storefront, remove stucco and have at least some operable windows. Alternate A would include a cornice-like structure with decorative brackets constructed of recycled wood. Alternate B would retain part of the zinc screen of the originally submitted design, but fold part of it over to create an awning over the doorway. The rest of the area above the storefront would consist of recycled wood in a flat panel. Mr. Rubin explained that he purchased the property last October and is eager to open his office because it is draining him financially at the moment.

The Committee members expressed a preference for Alternate A, but with some modifications.

Ms. Stein said that it would be important to express the entablature that exists over most storefronts in Old City, but she objects to the use of the wood. She thought that the setback second-floor façade was appropriate because it will likely not be visible. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey agreed that wood is not appropriate, but opined that zinc could be used for the new cornice. It was agreed that the new cornice should be setback slightly from the façade and actually form a planter. Mr. D'Alessandro asked what the owner would do if the brick was damaged under the stucco. The architect explained that much of the area under the stucco will be removed for a window. If the brick was not salvageable that they could replace damaged brick and paint it black.

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

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested supporting the staff's recommendation of denial. Mr. Rubin asked if he would potentially be able to obtain an approval from the Commission if he modified the design. Ms. Gutterman asked suggested recommending denial of the design as originally submitted, but approval of a revised design A1 based on Alternate A. It includes the punched openings at the first floor, the replacement of the wood elements with zinc, the replacement of damaged brick with new brick painted black, and a setback planter. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Baron asked for a clarification of the planes of the different elements. The Committee members clarified that cornice should be setback and the planter offset so that it reads separately from the cornice element.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the original design, but approval of a revised design A1 based on Alternate A that includes the punched openings at the first floor, replacement of the wood elements with zinc, replacement of damaged brick with new brick painted black, and a setback planter, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1515-17 GREEN ST
Proposal: Construct three-story building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Seth J. Schwarzman and Lynn Buono
Applicant: Frank Graff, MFD Developers
History: vacant lot
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story building at 1517 Green Street. The lot is described in the inventory of the Spring Garden Historic District as a vacant lot, but not mistakenly classified. At the time of the designation of the historic district, and since about the middle of the nineteenth century, when the adjacent buildings were constructed, the lot has been open and consolidated with the property at 1515 Green Street, serving apparently as a yard. A zoning permit for the subdivision of the properties was issued in 2015. Since the lot was part of a property with a building standing on it at the time of designation, the Historical Commission enjoys full or plenary jurisdiction over this application, not the more limited review-and-comment jurisdiction.

The proposed building would be clad in brick and feature two-over-two windows and other Italianate details to match the adjacent property to the east. The property would not have a rear ell, but would be built out to the full width of the site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the design details are modified to indicate that this is not an historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9. The new building should not precisely replicate the adjacent historic building; it should not create a false sense of historical development.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Frank Graff represented the application.

The Committee members inquired about materials for the lintels and sills. Mr. Graff responded that they will be limestone. Ms. Stein asked about the retaining wall at the street. Mr. Graff explained that the intention is to rebuild the wall with new brick with a new set of steps with brick risers and limestone treads. Ms. Stein said that the wall should be indicated on drawings and rebuilt with the salvaged bricks and full stone steps. Mr. Graff agreed. He explained that the garden area will be planted but also have some hardscape. The Committee members asked if there would any decks not shown on the plans. Mr. Graff presented a new plan with decks set back from the façade about 12 feet. He also showed that the condensers will also be set back from the facade.

Mr. McCoubrey called for public comment, but there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided architectural drawings of the masonry retaining wall are provided showing it reconstructed with salvaged brick and limestone stairs; the decks are set back at least 12 feet from the front façade to be inconspicuous; and any mechanical equipment is not visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details including a deck mock-up, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

ADDRESS: 200 S BROAD ST
Proposal: Create ADA entranceway at existing window
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Bellevue Associates
Applicant: Robert Torres, Studio Torres, LTD
History: 1902; Bellevue Stratford Hotel; Hewitt Brothers, architects
Individual Designation: 8/2/1973
District Designation: None
Preservation Easement: Yes
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert an existing window into an ADA-accessible entryway at the building's Walnut Street façade. The new entryway would allow ADA access at the interior from a passenger elevator. Although the conversion would not change the width of the opening, it would require the removal of masonry below the sill and the installation of a new transom and double-door system. The application also proposes to install a new awning at the converted opening.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Robert Torres represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Torres to explain his project including the material choices. Mr. Torres said that he is seeking to provide ADA access for many parts of the building; currently there is only ADA access on the south façade at the hotel entrance. He explained that he and his client decided that providing ADA access at the Walnut Street façade was more easily achievable than at the Broad Street façade. Therefore, he is proposing to cut down a window on Walnut Street, to convert it to a door for ADA access. A stained glass panel would be retained. The window sash would be reconstructed and fixed in place above the door. An area of granite beneath the window would be removed and new painted wood or metal doors would be installed.

Mses. Stein and Gutterman recommended that the ADA door be moved to the window closer to the main side door in order to make clear that it is the access for the main entry. They asked that the plans be revised to show details such as touchpad hardware, framing, and the finish of the cut stone jamb. Mr. McCoubrey recommended taller doors aligned with the meeting rail of the adjacent window. He also suggested that they avoid adding an additional transom window. He suggested that the doors should have a taller kick panel. The Committee members also commented that the doors should be metal to match the other doors on the façade.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance reported that the Alliance holds an easement on the property. He explained that the Alliance's Design Committee has not yet had a chance to review this proposal, but will do so in the future.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, owing to insufficient information, but approval, provided the new ADA door is located one bay east, closer to the main door; the jamb design is submitted; the doors are metal to match the other doors on the façade; and the doors are taller with no additional transom, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2013 LOCUST ST
Proposal: Construct roof deck and elevator shaft
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Benjamin Weinraub
Applicant: Benjamin Weinraub
History: 1887
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and elevator shaft on this circa 1890 residential property located within the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The roof deck with glass railing would be located on a rear mansard roof, and would be accessed via a new spiral staircase at the rear, which would result in the modification of a rear dormer into a door to access the new staircase. Six-foot high panels are proposed for the south side of the deck to provide shade and reduce noise from an existing HVAC unit. An existing rear chimney would be reduced in height. The elevator shaft would be located on the South Woodstock Street side of the building, and would result in the removal or covering over of four windows in addition to a

portion of the rear mansard roof. The elevator shaft would be clad in metal to match an existing rear addition.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Benjamin Weintraub represented the application.

Mr. Weintraub asked for an explanation of the Standards cited in the staff recommendation. Mr. Baron explained Standards 9 and 10 in particular and noted that all of the Standards are available online. Mr. Weintraub explained that he wished to retrofit the building with an elevator so that he and his family could age in place. He said that he is not modifying the footprint and all of his changes are to secondary facades along a service alley. He read from the Commission's Rules & Regulations regarding alterations to secondary facades. He said that his proposed roof deck would create modern living while avoiding any pilothouse. The deck would be accessed from a spiral stair on an addition. He showed photographs of Woodstock Street and said that the changes would only be really visible from Chancellor and Woodstock Streets. He pointed out that nearby carriage houses have been converted to residential use.

Ms. Stein explained that Mr. Weintraub owns an exceptionally beautiful corner property, which will allow these changes to be highly visible. She said that she does not support the application. She recommended finding an interior location for an elevator. Mr. Weintraub said that it is a multi-family residence and an interior location would involve removal of approximately 30 square feet per unit, causing a disturbance to long term tenants. Also, with an interior elevator, one would need to climb nine steps to the first floor to get to the elevator. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the proposed alterations would inappropriately change the historic facades. Ms. Gutterman asserted that Woodstock and Chancellor Streets are more than service alleys. She also objected to the removal of the chimney, the windows, and the section of mansard. She asked how much of the first-floor unit would be disturbed if the new elevator were to be entered through the side gate. Mr. Weintraub replied that an eating area would be lost and he would be forced to renovate the tenant's kitchen. Mr. Weintraub contended that the Committee was not being consistent with the Planning Commission's Rowhouse Manual.

Mr. Weintraub asked about the objection to the proposed deck. Ms. Gutterman replied decks can be successfully accommodated on some historic houses, but not others. Decks on historic houses are not by right. If this house were located at the middle of the block, it would be easier to hide the alterations. Mr. Weintraub asked why the Commission had approved decks on several other corner houses, such as the one at 20th and Delancey. Ms. Gutterman noted that that particular deck was extremely controversial. She also noted that the Commission sometimes disagrees with the Architecture Committee.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. There was none.

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

ADDRESS: 418 S 17TH ST
Proposal: Construct two-stories over one-story building with roof deck and pilot house
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Dwayne Blackwell
Applicant: Marlon Travis
History: 1960
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story addition on an existing single-story house corner house. The new structure would be clad in Trespa material. Much of the façade lacks windows. The enlarged building would have a roof deck with a stair house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The enlarged house would not be compatible with its streetscape in materials, rhythm, and scale of the openings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Mark Travis, owners Dwayne and Angela Blackwell, and architect Taylor Stevenson represented the property.

The applicants distributed a revised proposal, which showed the primary wall material changed to brick, the bay lowered to align with the parapet, and the windows elongated with muntins. A bargeboard had been added at the tops of the facades. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the building will cover the full lot, replacing the white portion of the building at the rear with brick. The architect said that it will. He further explained that the building will have a 42 inch parapet which will hide the deck railing and mechanical equipment. There will be a stone horizontal band to separate the existing from the new matching brick. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about what appears to be a double transom over the rear door. The architect said that that was originally to be decorative Trespa panels, but would now be a single glass transom. Mr. McCoubrey inquired into the butt-glazed corner of the bay. He said he thought it was an expensive gesture for a bay that has such a minimal projection of only 1'-6". Ms. Gutterman recommended a post at the corner. She also recommended reducing the height of the stairhouse. The Committee members objected to the use of Trespa and recommended brick panels on the spandrel panels on the short façade and metal panels on the bay. They thought that wood was not an appropriate material. They also said that the windows should not have muntins.

Mr. McCoubrey called for public comment.

Patricia Gherovici introduced herself as a neighbor. She said that this block is often visited by tourists. The neighbors had met several times about this proposal and found the materials incompatible and the design jarring. Her husband Sean-Michel Rabate agreed that the facade is too tall compared to its neighbors to the west. He submitted a letter from another neighbor, Adam Douberly of 1705 Lombard Street, who also contended that the materials needed to be revised and the design made more compatible with the rest of the row.

Mr. McCoubrey asked how the height of the top of the parapet compares with that of the cornice of the neighbor to the west. The architect explained that the parapet is taller than the cornice height, but not taller than the roof ridge of the row to the west. The Committee members opined that the drawings need to show the cornice line of the rest of the row and the parapet needed to be lowered to be more in line with those cornices. Mr. Baron noted that a lower cornice will

make the deck and mechanical equipment more visible. Ms. Gutterman said that the deck and mechanical equipment should be placed such that they are inconspicuous from the street. She said that this relationship needed to be studied and adjusted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval, with the staff to review details, with the following revisions:

1. the Trespa is replaced with brick and metal,
2. the addition is clad in brick,
3. the height of the pilot house is reduced,
4. a stone band separates the new and old brick,
5. the deck is inconspicuous,
6. the mechanical equipment is not visible from the public right-of-way,
7. there is only one transom above the rear door,
8. the parapet is lowered to align with the neighboring cornices, and
9. the windows do not have muntins.

ADDRESS: 4354 CRESSON ST
Proposal: Construct rear addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Stula Real Estate LP
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 construct a three-story rear addition, raising the rear slope of the roof of the main block to increase headroom. The rear of the main block is not visible from the public right-of-way, but the back portion of an existing one-story rear addition is visible from the public right-of-way across a very large, private parking lot.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The staff recommends retaining the rear roof slope of the main block and locating any addition behind the main block, below its cornice line.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Stuart Lacheen and contractor Michael Coyle represented the application.

The Committee and applicants discussed the visibility of the rear of the building from the public right-of-way. The applicants explained that, after conferring with the staff, they are now willing to redesign the addition so that it will be located below the cornice at the rear of the main block of the building. Ms. Stein said that such an addition may be acceptable. Mr. Lacheen proposed having the addition slope upward from the rear roof eave to allow for headroom in the new third floor. The Committee members cautioned that it would be difficult to drain storm water off the roof of such an addition. Mr. Coyle then suggested that they could restrict the addition to a second floor on the rear ell with a deck above, allowing the eave to be well above the new roof. Everyone agreed that this was the better option.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval of a revised application to construct a single-story addition and deck on top of the existing single-story rear ell, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 1722 PINE ST
Proposal: Rehabilitate building per passive house standards
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Paul Thompson and Laura Blau
Applicant: Laura Blau, BluPath Design Inc
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 execute a deep energy retrofit of a four-story, four-unit historic property within the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. By retrofitting the property, the applicant ultimately seeks EnerPHit certification, a retrofit standard of the International Passive House Association. At the 13 May 2016 meeting of the Historical Commission, by a vote of 5 to 4, the Commission approved the installation of new wood shutters and Passive House certified windows at the front façade, provided that the windows replicate the appearance of the original six-over-six double-hung sash. However, the Commission denied the proposed EIFS over-insulation of the brick rear ell. This application proposes again to over-insulate the brick rear ell with an EIFS system. Additionally, work to the rear would include installing new Passive House certified windows, installing awnings at the south windows, replacing deck railings, installing a new cornice, and renovating the existing fire escape.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9 and the Historical Commission's denial of 13 May 2016.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner and architect Paul Thompson represented the application.

Mr. Thompson explained that the Historical Commission's 13 May 2016 decision included an approval for work at the Pine Street façade and denial of the proposed work at the rear. He stated that he would like to clarify some of the issues surrounding the contentious rainscreen EIFS system, the passive house certified windows at the rear, and the fire escape. The general concept, he continued, is to modernize the rowhouse and make it energy efficient, while renovations to the first-floor interior and basement would allow Mr. Thompson and his wife to reside in the space. Mr. Thompson stated that the EIFS on the rear would improve the aesthetics and extend the life of the brick. He emphasized that, while Waverly Street, at the building's rear, falls within the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, it serves dog walkers, car parkers, and trash pickers. He stated that many buildings along the street include stuccoed facades and wood and metal decks. Mr. Thompson argued that the proposal would improve the quality of the street by eliminating many utilities, gas lines, and phone lines that old buildings accumulate over the years. Under the current proposal, Mr. Thompson continued, unused utilities would be removed in order to stabilize the brick façade and building interior. He contended that the exterior brick is not high quality and that deterioration, including structural deterioration, has been present for a number of years. Mr. Thompson commented that deterioration at the fire escape connections would be eliminated through the installation of a

free-standing fire escape. Mr. Thompson discussed the proposal for removing the lower portion of the side bay and recladding the feature with Trespa panels or a similar material, which would replicate the appearance of the neighboring bay. Mr. Thompson encouraged the Committee and Commission to consider the EIFS system as a way to address energy use and climate change issues, while balancing them with historic preservation.

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Thompson to explain the changes in the current proposal from the previous proposal. Rear window awnings and a change in materials were identified. Mr. Thompson discussed the proposed alterations at the west elevation, which included modifications to the bay that would allow an entranceway to be installed where the bay currently extends to the ground level. He reiterated that the proposal includes installing a free-standing fire escape, replacing windows at the second, third, and fourth floors, and applying EIFS system to cover the existing brick. At the rear, Mr. Thompson continued, the windows would be replaced and traditional-style canvas awnings would be installed, and the EIFS system would be applied. At the east elevation, Mr. Thompson added, the exposed brick would be covered in EIFS. Mr. Thompson stated that he would consider a true stucco if one would be compatible with the insulation.

Mr. McCoubrey asserted that the fundamental proposal has not changed from the previous application. He added that a gap exists between their basis of assessment, which relies on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and Passive House and sustainability considerations. He stated that he has the same concerns as those voiced at the previous meeting.

Mr. Thompson asked whether a situation exists where an application of stucco at the rear façade could be approved. Ms. Gutterman responded that it could be approved only where it already exists. She clarified that only if the existing stucco is failing and the underlying brick is damaged or in poor condition from the previous application would the Committee recommend approval for a new stucco application. She also noted that the material would need to be stucco and not a product such as EIFS.

Ms. Gutterman remarked that there are several issues with the application of the EIFS system. She identified the first issue as the vulnerability of the EIFS system at ground level. Without a base, Ms. Gutterman continued, the material is more susceptible to moisture, traffic, and impact damage, since it is merely a cementitious coating over insulated board. The second issue, she added, is the proposal to build out the wall four inches. She also questioned the relationship of the window to its opening after the addition of the insulation and EIFS. Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the material of the proposed replacement windows. She stated that replacements with non-wood windows have been approved at secondary elevations and could be considered here; however, the size of the glass opening should not be reduced in the attempt to get a more insulated unit. She then commented that the fire escape seems to be more of a maintenance issue and did not oppose the replacement of the feature. She did, however, question the use of non-metal cladding at the bay. Ms. Gutterman recommended insulated metal panel in lieu of the proposed Trespa panels and cautioned against the loss of details and dimensions of the character-defining feature. She advised staff to review details of the panels and cornice.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether Mr. Thompson was proposing to reframe the existing bay at the west elevation. Mr. Thompson responded that it is an existing bay that is vinyl clad and contains no historic details. He stated that the application is proposing to reintroduce complementary historic details resembling the nearby bay at 1724 Pine Street.

Ms. Stein noted that the Committee previously asked that the rear brick be assessed for its structural and general condition. Mr. Thompson replied that a brick moisture absorption test is included in the application and explained the results of the test. At the west elevation, Mr. Thompson added, the brick is lower quality and very absorptive. He claimed the best location for insulation is at the exterior, so it protects the brick and manages the water, leaving the interior dimensions and plaster features.

Mr. Thompson addressed the issues raised regarding the EIFS application extending to grade, and noted that he had similar concerns about how it terminates at grade and its durability. He suggested that fiberglass or other materials be installed to protect the surface and harden the material. Mr. Thompson stated that, following the EIFS application, the windows would be installed within the masonry opening to a depth relative to the exterior wall that matches the current depth. He noted that the proposed windows would be higher quality than the existing windows, but would be of the same aluminum-clad wood material. He suggested the exterior finish consist of uPVC, a type of PVC plastic. Ms. Stein inquired whether the proposed windows at the exterior are the same windows approved by the Historical Commission. Mr. Thompson responded that they are similar but would not feature the six-over-six configuration and would not have a painted finish, though they would be of similar energy efficiency. Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the rear windows will go from one-over-one double-hung sash to a single fixed window. Mr. Thompson replied that the current one-over-one double-hung sash would be replaced, and the replacement windows could replicate their appearance. Mr. Baron stated that at the front façade, the Commission approved an energy efficient window, but that it was wood and not clad. He also noted that the staff is to look at the details and dimensions to ensure they match, and that the proposed rear windows in this application differ from those approved by the Commission for the front façade. Several Committee members asked for more details to be provided.

Patrick Grossi remarked that the Preservation Alliance currently has no formal position on the application, but stated the organization's interest in the proposal, since it could potentially set a precedent for energy efficiency guidelines for historically designated properties. Mr. Grossi continued that, in many ways, the circumstances presented here are not dissimilar to the evolving set of standards and practices when seeking ADA compliance at a historic building. He noted that the Preservation Alliance will continue to weigh unique merits of this request and plan to review the proposal more closely in order to formulate a firmer position by the 8 July Commission meeting. Mr. Grossi expressed his interest in the project and his appreciation for the applicants' effort in seeking this level of energy efficiency.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9 and the Historical Commission's denial of 13 May 2016.

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 304 ARCH ST
Proposal: Install mural
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Charles City Properties LTD/Daniel Schwartz
Applicant: Phil Asbury, Charles City Properties
History: 1914; Friends Building; John Lloyd & Associates, architect
Individual Designation: 9/9/1974, 12/31/1984
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a mural on the east wall of 304 Arch Street. The wall, which faces N. 3rd Street, is a former party wall, is constructed of brick, and is currently stuccoed. The proposed project is a collaboration between artist Marcus Balum, students at Mastery Charter School–Lenfest Campus, and the Mural Arts Program. The mural would incorporate a series of sixty-three brushed-aluminum composite panels of various sizes, printed with photographs taken by students. Each panel would be anchored to the wall by 12 four-inch masonry screws. The mural would be concentrated at the north end of the wall and would not obstruct any existing masonry openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that stainless steel fasteners are used, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Philip Asbury, Marcos Balum, and Ambrose Liu, all of the Mural Arts Program, represented the application.

Mr. Asbury distributed a revised design to the Committee members. Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the wall is painted brick or stucco. Mr. Asbury replied that the wall is stucco, although exposed red brick exists at the south corner. Ms. Gutterman asked whether any uncoated brick would be covered. Mr. Asbury confirmed that the mural would be applied only to the stuccoed surface. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the stucco has been inspected to ensure that it is structurally sound and has enough integrity to support the panels. Even if the panels are anchored to the masonry behind the stucco, Ms. Gutterman continued, she was concerned over its strength and added that, if in poor condition, it could bulge behind the panels. Mr. Asbury replied that Murals Arts has contracted Roe Fabricators to install the panels, which vary in dimension. Ms. Gutterman reiterated her concern over the structural integrity of the stucco after the panels are anchored and again stated that the attachment process could eventually lead to bulging if the stucco is not sound prior to attachment. Mr. Asbury answered that Roe Fabricators has inspected the wall, taken measurements, and have included a two-inch gap between panels in the mural's configuration. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the panels protrude slightly from the stucco wall. Mr. Asbury confirmed that they project and distributed samples of the brushed aluminum panels. He also stated that the panels can be removed at any time following installation and the wall repaired if necessary.

Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the proposed mural, which consists of separate attached elements, differs from traditional murals that are painted onto walls. Mr. D'Alessandro raised the issue of keeping the panel joints square and in a flat plane when anchored to an irregular wall. He asked whether the gap is shimming space. Mr. Baron stated that the design is comparable to Pointillist art in that the panels do not read as a continuous plane. If the panels are not on a continuous plane, he continued, the differences would accentuate the artistic character of the mural. Mr. Balum agreed and added that the design is very fractured.

Mr. Asbury stated that the proposed design includes painting the remaining stucco. Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the stucco would be repaired before being painted, and Mr. Asbury replied affirmatively. Ms. Gutterman asked if the images are only placed on the metal panels rather than painted on the wall, and Mr. Asbury again replied affirmatively.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that 304 or 316 stainless steel fasteners are used where fastened into the masonry, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:50 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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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

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

Standard 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.

DRAFT