

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

**TUESDAY, 23 AUGUST 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
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

Ian Toner, Toner Architects
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Ted Singer, Plumbob
Jonathan Doran, Plumbob
Fon Wang, Ballinger
Dan Howard, Ballinger
Paul Horos
Christopher Akes, Linode/Ballinger
Joe Schiavo
Janet Kalter
Kirk Nelson, MPN Realty
Jim Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Jim Cassidy, C2
Bill Becker
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
Kate McGlinchey, Old City District
Carey Jackson Yonce, Canno Design
Nicole Cabezas, Canno Design
Hal Kessler, Mt. Alto Design
Qihua Zhao
Kelly Ennis, Ennis Nehez
Elizabeth Ochal, Plato Marinakos Studio
Suzanne Becker
Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
David M. Still, Esq.
Tiffany Swank
Joseph Harmer

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 AUGUST 2016
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Michael Koep, Greythorne Development

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 508-32 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Install signage; remove window grilles

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jennifer Cooperman - Keystone Property Group

Applicant: Joel Darras, Ascent Restoration Consultants

History: 1914; Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company Building; 530, Edgar Seeler 1914; 520, Ernest J. Matthewson, 1930; 508, Mitchell/Giurgola Associates, 1971

Individual Designation: 9/25/1962

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert the ground floor of a former insurance building into a retail space. In order to attract a retail tenant, the application seeks a pre-approved signage package that would include banner signage and a detached street identifier. While the content of the signage would change depending on the tenant, the shape, size, materials, and attachment methods would not. For the banner signage, the application offers two options. Option A proposes flat-wall banner signs to be installed on two pilasters on the north elevation and two on the west elevation. Option B proposes projecting banner signs at the same locations. The banners would be made of a canvas or Sunbrella material, and attached by an anchored plate bracket into the mortar joints.

The proposed signage package also includes a low, free-standing, non-illuminated composite board sign supported by two posts that would not extend above the height of the watertable. The sign would be located adjacent to the primary entrance.

The application also proposes to remove the existing iron window grilles on both the north and west elevations. The intricate grilles are part of the original design by architect Edgar V. Seeler.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Option A of the signage package (flat banner signs), and the detached sidewalk signage, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; but denial of the removal of the historic iron window grilles, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Consultants Joel Darras and Becky Sell, and property owner's representative Jennifer Cooperman represented the application.

Mr. Cluver questioned whether the applicants had a preference between Option A and Option B of the signage package. Mr. Darras responded that their primary concern is visibility, and that he believes the projecting banner signage increases visibility along the south and west corridors. Ms. Gutterman commented that the problem with the banner signs is that they appear to anchor into the stone units rather than the mortar joints. She questioned whether there was a way to anchor the projecting signage into the mortar joints. Mr. Darras responded that it would be possible to anchor the projecting banner signs in the mortar joints as well. Ms. Gutterman noted that the attachment detail shown for Option B anchors into the stone. Mr. Darras responded

that, if anchoring into the mortar joint was the Committee's primary concern, he could work to develop a new attachment method detail that anchors solely to the mortar joint. Ms. Gutterman noted that the attachment into the mortar joint is the main reason for her preference of Option A over Option B. She commented that another consideration regarding the anchoring of the projecting banner signage is how much movement there would be, and how much degrading of the anchor point over time. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the applicants had that information. Mr. Darras responded that he does not have that answer at this point, but that the attachment method is something they could work out with the staff, if given approval for the signage.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Ms. DiPasquale if the staff's concern was the attachment method for the mounting of the banner signs. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff recommendation related in part to the attachment method, but that the staff also concluded that the flat banners obscure the building less.

Ms. Stein asked for the dimensions of the banners, noting that there are no dimensions depicted on the drawings. Mr. Darras responded that the banners have not yet been dimensioned, but would likely be between 24 and 30 inches wide, and approximately 12 feet in height. Ms. Stein noted that they appear quite large, perhaps three feet wide. She questioned why two projecting banners would be necessary at the corner, noting that the number of banners works when they are flat, but that the projecting banners appear crowded. Mr. Darras responded that the idea was to place the banners near the corner to signify the primary access point in terms of circulation around the building. He noted that, if one is traveling south on 6th Street, one might miss the banner if it was just located at the corner. Ms. Stein stated that she understands the two banners on Walnut Street, but questioned the necessity for two banners on 6th Street, since there is no entrance on 6th Street. Mr. Darras responded that the additional banner at the north end of the building would help attract passers-by coming from the south along 6th Street; it would provide information about the location of the entrance.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the content of the free-standing sign. Mr. Darras responded that it is a wayfinding sign. Ms. Gutterman asked if it would provide a plan of the building and indicate various locations. Mr. Darras responded negatively, explaining that the sign would be associated with the retail tenant; he noted that the identity of the retail tenant is not yet known. He noted that the intent of obtaining an approval now for the proposed signage package is to use it to attract a tenant. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the sign would be located within the building footprint or whether it would be located in the public right-of-way. Mr. Darras responded that it would be located within the property line. Ms. Gutterman commented that, given its proximity to the building, the signage may not be visible until someone is on top of it. Mr. Darras responded that the freestanding sign would be secondary to the banners; the banners will identify the tenant in the retail space; the freestanding sign will simply reinforce the identity of the tenant.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the projecting banner signs would be by-right under the Zoning Code, or whether a variance would be required. Mr. Darras responded that he does not know, but that he does not anticipate a zoning variance.

Mr. Cluver addressed the proposed removal of the window grilles. He commented that the window sills are at least seven feet off the ground, and questioned how much visibility the removal of the grilles would offer to a potential retail tenant. Mr. Darras responded that the request to remove the grilles is two-fold. First, he noted, is the issue of visibility from the exterior, and secondly, the overall experience from the interior. When inside, he opined, the grilles provide a sense of enclosure that is not really necessary given the current use of the

building. He explained that he understands that they are original to the building, but opined that they are not necessary to a retail space. Mr. Cluver asked whether the application is looking for absolute right to remove the grilles, or if they would do so only at the tenant's request. Mr. Darras responded that it would be helpful in attracting a tenant if the removal was pre-approved. Mr. Cluver noted that there are some tenants that lock their windows or storefronts, and for whom window grilles would actually be preferable. Ms. Stein agreed, noting that she could imagine a restaurant tenant in a building like this, rather than a tenant such as a CVS or a Starbucks that would require connection to the street. She noted that grilles might actually appeal to a restaurant tenant, and that it is difficult to approve removal of original historic fabric without knowing the actual necessity or purpose. Mr. Darras asked whether the Committee would consider partial removal of the grilles, in which the more decorative perimeter of the grilles would be retained, but the interior grid portion would be removed. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that he would not approve such a removal. Mr. Darras noted that, in their internal discussions, Ms. Sell had suggested that the entire removal of the grilles would be preferable to the partial removal of the grilles. He suggested that, with the complete removal of the grilles, they might be able to create some sort of display inside that could educate people on the history of the grilles and iron work in Philadelphia in general. Ms. Gutterman asked how the grilles are anchored. Mr. Darras responded that he believes they are anchored laterally to the granite. Mr. Cluver noted that he can appreciate that the grilles speak to the building's history and are therefore important, but that he also understands that the removal of the grilles might help find a new use for the building. However, he noted that, without knowing the specifics of the actual tenant and how they will be using the building, he does not see how the argument could be made that the removal is necessary to the viability of the building. He opined that the request is too general for him to feel comfortable approving the removal of highly decorative, original fabric. He suggested that, with more information on the tenant and use, he personally might be able to entertain the idea of removing the grilles. Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the grilles are character-defining features of the building, and questioned how much visibility their removal would actually provide for a tenant. He agreed with previous comments that he would be hard-pressed to find a reason to remove them. Mr. Cluver noted that he would not be in favor of removing portions of the grilles. Mr. Darras asked whether the Committee would generally be in favor of the wholesale removal of the grilles if necessary for a specific tenant. The Committee members responded negatively. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he would not be in support of the removal under any condition. Ms. Gutterman responded that, with additional information, the Committee might consider the removal, but that it would be a difficult argument to make given the height and distance of the windows. She noted that there would need to be an assurance that a future tenant would not put some sort of security system back in to keep someone from breaking into the store. She stated that she would rather see the original decorative grilles rather than a modern security screen that a tenant might install. Mr. Cluver commented that these are the types of features that tend not to be reinstalled once removed. Ms. Sell noted that there have been serious discussions with a potential high-end retail tenant regarding the removal of the grilles. She noted that, although the windows are high, the bigger issue is attracting people coming from all directions, and that it would be easier to see into a retail space from farther away with the grilles removed. Ms. Gutterman responded that, although they may not accomplish quite as much as an unobstructed view into the retail space, the banner signs would greatly help identify the retailer.

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 detached sidewalk sign, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; denial of the removal of the historic iron window grilles, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9; and approval of

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 AUGUST 2016
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

either Option A or Option B of the signage package, with the following provisions, with the staff to review details:

- any signage attaches solely into the mortar joints and not the stone itself,
- any signage that is installed should be compliant with zoning, with no variances required,
- the number of banner signs is limited to four,
- the width of projecting banner signs is limited to approximately 24 inches, or proportional to the signage presented in the application, and
- the width of flat banner signs maintains a three to four inch reveal on either side;

Ms. Pentz abstained, owing to her late arrival.

ADDRESS: 2012 AND 2014 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Proposal: Demolish buildings; construct three-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robyn Willner

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio, LLC

History: 1950; BP #31167-B, 8-25-1950

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish two existing non-contributing houses, and to construct a new single-family residence. The proposed new construction would be three stories in height, with a brick façade, limestone detailing, and a standing-seam metal mansard roof.

The Historical Commission approved an in-concept version of this application, pursuant to Standard 9, in July 2016. The current application is compliant with the parameters set in the in-concept approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tim Kerner represented the application.

Mr. Cluver questioned the dormer window pane configuration, noting that they are eight-lite casement windows, while the windows below have a six-lite casement/transom configuration. He noted that the proportions of the dormer panes become horizontal, and questioned the purpose of that design. Mr. Kerner responded that he has been working on the detail of those windows, and originally had a pattern more similar to that of the lower windows. He explained that he was trying to vary the pattern a bit, because the pane size in dormer windows does tend to be reduced. Mr. Cluver responded that it is the horizontality of the panes that caught his attention. Mr. Kerner noted that he is not quite happy with the current design for the dormer windows. Mr. Cluver recommended reverting to six-lite casement windows.

Mr. Cluver commented that he would not object to a single casement for the second floor windows rather than a casement and transom combination. He asked why the application proposes casement windows as opposed to double-hung windows. Mr. Kerner responded that, functionally, casement windows open more widely than double-hung windows, and it allows for a larger grille opening, which he felt looks appropriate for this façade.

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Kerner to explain the changes made since the previous in-concept review. Property owner Robyn Willner arrived. Mr. Kerner responded that the only change to the front façade is the pane configuration of the dormer windows. At the rear, the materials remain the same, but there was a change in the deck location at the second floor level from the east to the west side of the building. He noted that there was also a change to the alleyway elevation, which is shown with a six-foot eight-inch brick return, per the Committee's recommendation during the in-concept review. He explained that the remainder of the wall along the 30-inch wide alley would be stucco. He noted that there is the possibility of retaining the base of the existing brick wall, which would create a 30-inch high brick base with stucco above, rather than a solid stucco wall past the return. Mr. Kerner explained that the limestone base would return from the front façade onto the alleyway approximately two feet, ending at a new solid gate.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the proposed window material. Mr. Kerner replied that the proposed windows are aluminum-clad wood Marvin windows. Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. DiPasquale if that was permissible. Ms. DiPasquale responded that such windows would be acceptable, owing to the fact that the building will be new, not historic.

Mr. Cluver asked if the material above the door is limestone, and Mr. Kerner confirmed that it would be.

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Kerner to explain his ideas for the metal mansard roof. Mr. Kerner responded that the intention is that the roof be a pre-finished, medium-grey colored, aluminum roof. Mr. Cluver asked if the mansard was part of the in-concept approval. Ms. Gutterman responded that it was.

Ms. Gutterman noted that there was some discussion at the previous meeting about the limestone beltcourse being continuous versus interrupted, and asked if there had been any further development of that design element. Mr. Kerner responded that he believes the band is an attractive element, but has been thinking about the height of the band. He noted that it is currently proposed to be five brick courses in height, but that he may reduce the height to four brick courses and utilize a groove across the architrave, which would then be the dimension shown. Mr. Cluver suggested that the architrave could be below the frieze course, so that it would create an architrave, frieze, and cornice, instead of just an architrave and cornice. Mr. Kerner responded that that may be difficult.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that the current design reflects the comments of the Committee and Commission at the in-concept review.

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

Ms. Gutterman asked if there is any intention for a future roof deck. Mr. Kerner responded that there is not.

Mr. Kerner asked whether he would need to return to the Committee if he were to introduce a groove and the band was five bricks high as opposed to four. Mr. McCoubrey responded that such details could be reviewed by the staff.

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

ADDRESS: 1416-22 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Stablefish LLC

Applicant: Ted Singer, Plumbob LLC

History: 1891; Police Patrol Stable

Individual Designation: 4/8/2016

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story building to the north and rear of this recently-designated former stable building, which is situated on a large lot that extends from Frankford Avenue to N. Front Street. Historically, the stable was connected at the rear to a large police station that faced onto N. Front Street. The proposed new construction would be primarily free-standing, attaching to the stable solely at a rear two-story stairtower addition previously approved by the Historical Commission. The portion of the proposed new construction facing onto Frankford Avenue would be set approximately 6 feet 10 inches from the north elevation of the stable building, and would be designed as a modern expression of a traditional mixed-use rowhouse building. The application proposes three options for the cladding of the upper floors, in either red brick, tan brick, or limestone.

The rear portion of the addition would be set 5 feet 5 inches from the rear elevation, the depth of the stair addition, and would extend 38 feet in height.

The new construction shown in the renderings south of the south elevation of the stable building is not part of this parcel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Ted Singer and Jonathan Doran represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicants to present the project. Mr. Singer noted that renovations of the stable building are underway, and that the staff has indicated their appreciation for the quality of the brick pointing and window details. Mr. Singer asked about the degree to which the additions should relate to the existing historic building. He explained that the additions, which are intended appear to be free-standing buildings, will attach very subtly to the historic building.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the staff had a preference of material for the proposed Frankford Avenue elevation. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff deems any of the options acceptable, given that the new construction sits separate from the historic building, and is not located in a historic district. Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants had a material preference. Mr. Singer responded that they are still in an early design phase, noting that the renderings at the back of the packets were façade studies that are potentially more modern than the two or three options presented more fully in the submission. He noted that the owners of this parcel also own a lot to the south, which they are developing simultaneously and would like to create a cohesive development. He noted that, although it may not be affordable, the general preference would be the limestone with punched openings, as it relates to the materials of and frames the stable building. He opined that it would be difficult to find a modern red brick that would match the historic stable building, which led them to an idea of tan brick. Of the brick options, he noted, the client would prefer red brick. Mr. Cluver replied that, since the new construction is not trying

to replicate the appearance of the historic building, the fact that the red brick would not match perfectly would not be a negative. Mr. Cluver did, however, recommend that the colors be harmonious. Mr. Singer noted that a building to the north of the parcel has an orange-brown brick, so it is difficult to create a color palette that does not introduce too much variety.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the appearance of the stable building doors. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Committee reviewed that project a few months ago. Ms. DiPasquale noted that there is no work to the historic building proposed in this application. Mr. McCoubrey commented that there appears to be an iron framework supporting a gate that spans between the historic building and the proposed new construction. Mr. Singer responded that the intention is to reuse the existing steel gate in front of the stable entrance that has been removed. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the steel beam exists, and Mr. Singer responded that it is new. Mr. McCoubrey recommended pulling the steel beam off of the historic building.

Ms. Stein commended the architect on the formal language of surrounding a historic building with new architecture, noting that it leaves interstitial spaces between the historic building and the new construction. She commented that those spaces have been gated on both ends, and wondered if the gates could be dropped to align with the watertable. Mr. Singer responded that he believes the gate on the southern side of the building was approved in the previous application. Ms. DiPasquale agreed. Mr. Singer noted that the gate to the south is to provide security for the ground-floor commercial tenant, and that they intend to reuse the steel gates that had been in front of the stable entrance. The area to the north, he continued, becomes the main residential entrance to the complex and units above, and from a security perspective, they want to prevent trespassers from entering the complex. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the drawing on the third to last page shows a closer view of that gate, which does not appear to connect into the historic masonry. Mr. Singer confirmed that the gate would not connect into the historic masonry.

Mr. Singer noted that the intention is to integrate utility meters and an intercom system into the gate to prevent them from cluttering up the historic building. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the Commission staff could also write a letter to the utility companies stating that the property is historic and that utility meters should be located on the interior of the property. Mr. Singer commented that they have managed to locate all of the electrical utilities behind a door that will be on the side of the existing building so only a conduit line is visible.

Mr. Cluver questioned the design of the N. Front Street elevation. He noted that it is drawn, but there are no notes on the proposed materials. Mr. Singer responded that the Front Street elevation is still a work in progress. He noted that the façade is completely separate from the historic building, and will never be viewed with the historic building, so he feels that it would be unnecessary to make any specific commitments to the design at this stage. He noted that the front of the building will be beneath the elevated train tracks. Mr. Cluver responded that he understands that the property is individually designated for the stable building, but on the other hand, there is a context around it, and the design seems ambiguous at this point. Mr. Singer responded that they have looked at a number of options, but do not have a final design at this point. He suggested that they could present a more firm design at the Commission meeting. Mr. McCoubrey asked whether this portion of the site was historically part of the stable building site. Ms. DiPasquale responded that it is a very large parcel, and historically there was a police station facing N. Front Street, with the stable building behind it. She noted that, since the existing historic building and the proposed new construction sit separately from one another, the staff did not feel that it was necessary for the N. Front Street elevation to match the architecture of the stable building. Ms. Stein opined that the proposed design does not seem to fit in the

context of the street. She suggested that masonry would be appropriate. Ms. DiPasquale responded that, since it is not located in a historic district, the staff contends that there is some flexibility. Mr. Cluver noted that, while there may be some latitude, there should be some clarification for the Commission meeting in terms of design and materials.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with the following provisions:

- the design of the Front Street elevation is developed and materials identified for the Commission meeting,
- the gates and utility meters are not mounted to the historic building, and
- red brick is considered for the building to the north of the historic building.

ADDRESS: 150 S INDEPENDENCE W ML

Proposal: Replace exterior doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Abde Mahamedi

Applicant: Glenn Werner, JKRP Architects

History: 1923; Public Ledger Building; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing set of brass-framed vestibule doors with frameless glass doors. The existing doors are not original, however doors with full frames are appropriate to the building. The Commission has previously denied similar applications for butt-glazed doors on comparable buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with the recommendation of approval for new doors with less substantial frames, provided the frames surround all four sides of the glazing.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Stein noted that the application lacked details, but that the renderings appear to show a frame around all four sides of the door. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the application definitely does not propose a frame along the sides of the door, as the staff offered to approve a door with a reduced frame, provided it extended across all four sides, at the staff level, but the applicant declined and stated that they did not want any frame on the sides.

Mr. Cluver noted that it appears that the door would be widened. He opined that the proposed 4 feet 6 inches is very wide for a door. Ms. Gutterman noted that the door would also be very heavy. Ms. DiPasquale commented that the staff conceded that the door could have a reduced frame, but asserted that it should have some frame. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, noting that the frame should not become too narrow or be eliminated.

Ms. Gutterman asked if this application was reviewed previously. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the previous application proposed to remove the original decorative panel between the doors.

Mr. Cluver commented that the existing door may be 3 feet wide or 3 feet 6 inches, He stated that a metal frame with a metal stile and rail with glass in it that is about 42 inches wide would provide plenty of opening and be consistent with the historic appearance. Ms. Gutterman opined that a frame of a darker bronze color as opposed to the existing bright brass would be preferable.

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

The Committee members concluded that a 42-inch-wide door would be more appropriate than that proposed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, but approval of new doors that are approximately 42 inches wide and have darker bronze colored perimeter frames on all four sides of the glass.

ADDRESS: 249-53 ARCH ST

Proposal: Renovate building; construct addition on roof; install ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Christopher Aker, Atlantis Investments, LLC

Applicant: Fon Wang, Ballinger

History: 1907; Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust; Seaman's Institute; Newman & Harris, architects

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a highly-visible rooftop addition and deck on the former Corn Exchange building, a Significant property in the Old City Historic District. The addition would be located on the rear of the building, along N. 3rd Street. It would be constructed of a glass and aluminum storefront system, and rise almost directly from the plane of the N. 3rd Street façade. The addition would include a large central roof deck with a cablewire railing.

The application also proposes to install an ADA ramp with a steel handrail at the main entrance on Arch Street. The existing stone entry step would be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the ADA ramp, pursuant to Standard 2 and 10; but denial of the rooftop addition, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, which recommends that rooftop additions be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Christopher Aker of Linode and architects Fon Wang and Daniel Howard represented the application.

Ms. Wang distributed revised drawings showing a greatly reduced rooftop addition and deck. Ms. Wang explained that they set back the addition from N. 3rd Street to make it less

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 AUGUST 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

conspicuous. She described the existing roof configuration, noting that there are three penthouses. She noted that the previous design had the stair extending through the roof near the 3rd Street elevation, but they were able to move it to the northeast corner where an existing penthouse is located. She explained that, in addition to the stair located in the existing penthouse, there would be a small fourth-floor enclosure and roof deck with cable railing, both set back from 3rd Street. She noted that the existing penthouse at the northeast corner of the building has dunnage on top of it, and that the new mechanical equipment is proposed to be located on top of that dunnage.

Ms. Wang presented renderings from Arch Street, showing a minimally-visible railing, and from the Betsy Ross House site, showing the removal of one of the existing penthouses. She noted that the railing would be visible along the perimeter of the wall facing the Betsy Ross House.

Ms. Stein questioned the height and clearance of the existing penthouses, noting that they appear too low to provide proper access. Ms. Wang responded that the penthouses are low, but that they do provide access.

Ms. Wang explained that the other component of the application is the installation of an ADA ramp at the main Arch Street entrance. She noted that the current proposal is a worst-case scenario, and that they would prefer to ramp the sidewalk to eliminate the need for a railing. She noted that the currently proposed ramp is a simple, one-step high concrete ramp with a handrail.

Ms. Stein asked if there are any street-level views of the ramp. Ms. Wang responded that the only renderings of the ramp are the aerial views.

Mr. Cluver asked if there is currently an accessible route into the building. Ms. Wang responded that there is not. She noted that there is a one-step stoop. Ms. Stein asked how high the step is. Mr. Howard responded that it is approximately four inches. Mr. Cluver noted that any step or ramp would have to have a handrail. Ms. Stein asked if the step would have to be extended, or whether it is possible to approach the step from the side. Ms. Wang responded that it would need to be extended, noting that the existing step is shaded in grey in the plan drawings. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the existing step. Ms. Wang responded that it is granite. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any thought given to making the ramp the same material as the step. Ms. Wang responded that that is something they could consider.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the height of the penthouses and door clearance, opining that it does not appear that there is 6-foot 8-inch door clearance. Mr. Howard responded that he believes there would be a 7 foot door.

Ms. Gutterman returned to the proposed roof alterations. She asked if thought was given to pulling the railing in so that it aligns with the front of the existing penthouses so that the railing is not visible from the Betsy Ross House property. She opined that pulling the railing in would make the deck less conspicuous and would not result in a great loss of usable deck space. Ms. Wang responded that they could study pulling the deck back. Ms. Gutterman suggested working with the staff to determine an appropriate location. Ms. Wang noted that there is a possibility that the existing elevator overrun will not be necessary with the new elevator system they plan to install. Ms. Gutterman opined that the applicant has done a good job of pulling the deck back from the west, 3rd Street elevation, but that they also should pull it back from the east elevation so that it is inconspicuous from the Betsy Ross House. Ms. Gutterman suggested that it may only need to be pulled in four or five feet.

Ms. Stein stated her objection to the placement of the mechanical equipment on top of the existing penthouse and dunnage, as it would be visible from the Betsy Ross House. She noted that, although there are large trees in the garden currently, trees die, and when they do, the mechanical equipment will be highly visible. She opined that it is not acceptable to see the mechanical equipment from a National Park Service property. She suggested placing the mechanical units so that they are inconspicuous from the public rights-of-way, as well as the Betsy Ross House. It was noted that the City of Philadelphia, not the National Park Service, owns the Betsy Ross House. Ms. Wang responded that they could explore placing the units on the roof of the new enclosure. She noted that the addition is proposed to be higher than the existing penthouse, which is why they proposed the latter location. Mr. Cluver noted that, although shorter, the roof of the existing penthouse would be a more prominent location. Ms. Stein suggested utilizing curb-mounted units to reduce the height of the units further.

Mr. Cluver commented that the ramp appears to be a worst-case scenario, and asked if the applicants had explored resloping the sidewalk. Ms. Wang responded that they would prefer to reslope the sidewalk. Mr. Cluver noted that the interior configuration seems to prevent an interior ramp on the 3rd Street side, but that he does not feel comfortable approving the Arch Street ramp knowing that other opportunities have not been exhausted. Ms. Stein suggested that the use of dissimilar materials of concrete and the existing granite would not be complementary to the architecture of the building. She echoed Mr. Cluver's suggestion to slope the sidewalk. Ms. Wang responded that they have not yet done a survey and cost analysis of the sidewalk option. Ms. Stein responded that it would certainly be less expensive to slope the sidewalk than some of the other possible options.

Ms. DiPasquale asked if the Committee had any comments on the material or finish of the rooftop addition. Ms. Stein asked about the proposed material for the revised scheme. Ms. Wang responded that they are proposing a light-grey metal wall panel system, with operable doors like a NanaWall. Ms. Gutterman asked if the soffit above the doors would also be metal panels. Ms. Wang confirmed that it would be. Ms. DiPasquale asked if the material would be a matte finish, and Ms. Wang responded that it would likely be a matte finish. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the height of the doors in the new addition, and recommended that the soffit above the doors be limited in height as much as possible. He noted that, in section, it appears that there would be an uncomfortable rake between the adjoining building and the proposed addition.

Ms. Stein noted that the revisions were a big improvement from the originally-proposed design, and help to make the addition inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. She asked whether the staff could review a mock-up for the addition and deck railing. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff could review a mock-up if the Committee would like it to. Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Stein explained that the mock-up could be a series of two-by-fours assembled to create the corners of the addition and deck railing. Ms. Stein suggested that the mock-up show the southwest corners of the addition and railing, as well as the railing facing the Betsy Ross House. Ms. Wang asked if the mock-up should be completed before the Commission meeting. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the design could be approved, with the staff to review the mock-up to determine that it is inconspicuous. Ms. DiPasquale noted that it would be preferable if the mock-up could be completed prior to the Commission meeting.

Mr. Howard asked if it is preferable for the existing elevator overrun and other small addition to be remain, or have them replaced with a railing, or neither. Mr. Cluver responded that one of the problems with having the railing extend to the edge of the building is that it brings people to the edge of a previously-unoccupied roof, and that is one of the reasons for his suggestion to pull

the railing back. Ms. Gutterman noted that she would prefer the elimination of the elevator overrun, the small addition, and the placement of the railing away from the edge of the building. She agreed with Mr. Cluver's comments about the distraction of people on the roof waving to visitors at the Betsy Ross House. Mr. Cluver noted that it is a very large roof deck that might present egress issues and need to be reduced in size anyway.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Old City resident Joe Schiavo noted that he does not have any objection to the revised addition proposal, but questioned the ADA ramp and whether there was a plan to relocate the structured sidewalk signage outside the entrance. Ms. Wang responded that they would like to work with the Old City District to reduce the impact of the ramp or relocate existing signage.

Ms. Wang asked whether the Committee would prefer the mechanical equipment to be located on the roof of the addition, even though it is higher. Ms. Gutterman responded that the equipment should be made inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, and recommended including the equipment heights for both locations in a mock-up. Ms. Stein stated that it would be preferable if the units were completely invisible from a public right-of-way and Betsy Ross House. She noted that, if the units were to be located on the lower, roof-deck height itself, that would be even better.

The Committee suggested that the applicants investigate sloping the sidewalk to satisfy the entrance requirement.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the ADA ramp, but approval of the remainder of the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, provided:

- a mock-up to shows that the addition, railing, and mechanical equipment are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way,
- the elevator overrun is removed if determined unnecessary,
- the small addition between the elevator overrun and other penthouse is removed if possible,
- the railings are to be set back from the property line along the Betsy Ross House,
- the fascia panel above the doors on the addition is to be decreased in height to the greatest extent possible, and
- the addition is clad in metal panels with a matte grey finish.

ADDRESS: 1629 WALLACE ST

Proposal: Restore front façade; rehabilitate building; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1422 Front LLC (Michael Abramson & Alon Bentolila)

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert an existing vacant shell into a five-family dwelling. The building is located within the Spring Garden Historic District, and the rear of the building is highly visible from N. 17th Street. The application notes that the front façade had been

rebuilt in the recent past but that original elements remain. The work at the front façade includes restoring the cornice and marble base and installing new wood windows and a new wood door. The application also proposes to extend the existing three-story rear ell an additional 27 feet. The north and west façades of the addition, which would be visible to the public, would be clad in brick, while the non-visible east façade would be stuccoed. New aluminum clad windows are proposed for the existing rear ell and addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the basement windows of the front façade are changed to the appropriate pane configuration, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ian Toner represented the application.

Mr. Toner stated his support for the staff recommendation.

Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Keller to clarify the staff's acceptance of aluminum-clad windows at this building. Ms. Keller explained that the aluminum-clad windows are proposed at the rear ell. Since the building is not located immediately on the corner, only a few windows would be visible from a public right-of-way at a significant distance. She also indicated that wood windows are proposed at the front façade.

Ms. Gutterman inquired whether a roof deck is also proposed. Mr. Toner replied that a roof deck is not in the scope of work. Ms. Gutterman then asked where the mechanical equipment would be placed, noting that it should not be visible from a public right-of-way. Mr. Toner responded that the placement of the mechanical systems has not yet been resolved. The side yard near the main block, he continued, may work well, since no exits exist at that location. He added that the units could be placed on the roof, but that it would be easiest to locate them on the ground. He asked for recommendations from the Committee. Ms. Stein stated that the Committee does not know the size of the units and could not determine whether they would fit within the side alley. Mr. Toner replied that the building will house five small apartment units and that the systems consist of five small condensing units, each measuring approximately 30-inches by 30-inches.

Ms. Gutterman questioned an annotation in the drawing set specifying that marble at the front façade was to be sanded following paint removal. She advised against such an intervention. Mr. Toner remarked that he sought guidance from Randal Baron of the Historical Commission staff and was advised to belt sand the marble smooth, because it is currently rough and pitted. Ms. Gutterman responded that a masonry restoration contractor capable of resurfacing marble should be retained for the work and added that she believed the resurfacing would be done with chisels rather than a belt sander. Mr. Toner asked the Committee how to better annotate the drawing. Ms. Gutterman stated that the finish of the marble will remain unknown until the paint is removed and that the next step cannot be determined until then. The annotation, she continued, could indicate that the marble is to be restored to its original appearance. She reiterated that sanding is not recommended. Mr. Cluver added that no acid-based removers should be used, as they will etch the marble. Mr. Gutterman noted that the paint removal method would need to be tested. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that sanding of the marble is often done by hand and not mechanically. Ms. Gutterman countered that chiseling is typically employed instead of sanding. Mr. Toner asked whether there is any certification for masonry restorers that could be required. Ms. Gutterman recommended that Mr. Toner write in a specification that a mason have 10 years experience, including five projects with work of a similar nature.

At the cornice, Mr. Cluver asserted, attention must be paid to any reconstruction of infill areas. He recommended using Spanish cedar or another exterior grade wood species, adding that a wood like pine would rapidly deteriorate. Ms. Gutterman advised against preservative treatments that would react with paints.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether the front entryway would remain unchanged in its configuration. He noted that no ADA accessible route is shown and asked whether the Committee would need to review the application again, owing to accessibility requirements. Mr. Toner explained that the rear first-floor unit will be bi-level between the basement and ground floor, so no ADA-accessible entrance would be required for the unit. The front unit may be required to have an accessible entrance, he continued, because the unit is planned as a single-level apartment on the ground floor. Mr. Toner noted that a ramp would need to extend halfway across the next building to accommodate the height of the entrance, and he felt he could get an exemption, owing to the circumstances. He did indicate, however, that it would be possible that he would be required to install a chairlift or other option and would return to the Committee with another application. Mr. Cluver concluded that he would not want to see a ramp in front of the building, and Mr. Toner agreed.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided that:

- the front basement windows are changed to the appropriate pane configuration;
- the mechanical equipment is not visible from a public right-of-way;
- marble features are not sanded during the paint removal process and that staff is consulted once the paint is removed to determine the final treatment; and,
- samples and mockups of each process are provided for the staff to review.

ADDRESS: 140 N CHRIS COLUMBUS BLV

Proposal: Install mural on former party wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: FringeArts

Applicant: Kate Jacobi, Philadelphia Mural Arts Advocates

History: 1902; High Pressure Fire Service Station

Individual Designation: 4/6/1972

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 south wall of the FringeArts building. The building, which originally functioned as a water pumping station, was individually designated in 1972 and is listed as significant in the Old City Historic District. The building's south wall currently faces a parking lot, contains no openings, and is uniformly stuccoed. The wall is a former party wall; a five-story building historically abutted this building. The proposed mural would be painted directly onto the stucco wall by Phillip Adams of the Mural Arts Program.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Stein observed that the application stated that a finalized version of the design and mockup would be submitted prior to the Architectural Committee's review. She asked if the staff had received any updated material. Ms. Keller replied that no further submissions had been received. Ms. Stein asked if the application was submitted for an in-concept review, and Ms. Keller answered that the applicant is seeking final approval.

The Committee discussed the probable extent of the mural and questioned whether it spanned the entire wall or would be created with negative space. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the mural should not extend the entire length and height of the party wall. Mr. Cluver stated that the wall appears to have a parapet cap and requested that the architectural element be retained.

Mr. McCoubrey requested that the mural is shown in an elevation photograph or drawing to illustrate its size relative to the wall, and Ms. Gutterman concurred, adding that she supports the proposed concept but would like to see more details.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Janet Kalter expressed concern over the lack of public availability of application materials and suggested that copies of the application materials should be available in paper form for the public at the meetings. Ms. Keller stated that all application materials are available to the public for review at the Historical Commission's office. The public may access these documents, she added, once the agenda is made available. Ms. Kalter commented that, while visiting the office is not difficult for her, she imagines it would be for many other people. She added that it is a problem that needs a solution. Ms. Keller noted that the staff is aware of the issue.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 720 ARCH ST

Proposal: Construct loading platform and ADA ramp; install glass in existing doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Delancey Arch Associates

Applicant: Ryan Sell, Delancey Construction & Maintenance, Inc.

History: 1860; George S. Harris & Sons; Lit Brothers

Individual Designation: 6/30/1970

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create an ADA-accessible entrance and to install a loading platform at the western alley of the Cast Iron Building. The proposed changes are to accommodate a new U.S. Post Office. To allow for ADA accessibility, the application proposes to replace a deteriorated marble step in kind and to install a new ramp and railing at an existing eastern entryway along Arch Street. The Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia holds a façade easement on the building. At the Alliance's suggestion, the applicant has designed the ramp railing to match existing metal elements at the building's east façade. The application also proposes to replace wood panels with glass panels in the existing doors that would serve the ADA entrance. Black vinyl and rigid insulation board would be installed behind several windows and a door along the Arch Street façade. The proposed loading platform would be located at an existing loading area along the west wall. In addition to the platform, the application proposes to replace an existing roll-down garage door with swinging doors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 AUGUST 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the ADA-ramp railing is simplified to a black metal railing with vertical pickets, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jim Campbell and Ryan Sell represented the application.

Mr. Campbell acknowledged the application's lack of clarity and explained that the doors at the proposed ADA entrance each contain a single upper panel. His request, he continued, is to replace that upper panel with a glass panel for visibility. Mr. Campbell distributed additional documentation that included photographs and drawings showing a revised plan.

Ms. Gutterman asked if Mr. Campbell is planning to replace only the upper panel with glass, and Mr. Campbell confirmed that the lower panels would remain. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the door is drawn differently in elevation. Mr. Campbell replied that the drawings were provided by the U.S. Post Office, and he provided an enlarged version to better illustrate where the proposed glass would be located within the doors. Several errors in the drawings were identified and clarified for the Committee. Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the panel size would change, and Mr. Campbell stated that it would remain the same, adding that he found no need to replace the bottom panels.

The existing step, Mr. Campbell observed, is 4 inches high and 14 inches wide. Although not included in the application, Mr. Campbell stated that he would like permission to research a method to build up and slope the sidewalk in order to eliminate the proposed ramp. The alternate option, he added, would be contingent on obtaining other approvals. Mr. Campbell noted that entering into an agreement with the client has been problematic and asked that the Committee approve only one option. Mr. Sell stated his preference for building up and sloping the sidewalk to avoid installing a ramp. He added that the client's funding status is requiring them to make a quick decision, and having to present a second application to the Committee could potentially terminate the agreement.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the application had indicated that the marble step would be replaced as part of the ADA ramp proposal and asked if the new option to slope the sidewalk would require a similar replacement. Mr. Campbell answered that, because the marble step is well worn, it would be replaced in both scenarios.

Mr. Cluver inquired about the width of the doors, and Mr. Campbell replied that they are 36-inches to the center mullion. Ms. Gutterman asked if the doors would be operated by a push button, and if so, where the applicant intends to locate the button. Mr. Campbell stated that a push button would be located in an accessible area. Ms. Gutterman stated that with the installation of a ramp, the push button would be installed on the railing rather than on the building, which she found to be preferable.

Mr. D'Alessandro remarked on the difficulty in reviewing a proposal that has not been visually presented and asked how sloping the sidewalk would affect the architectural elements at the base of the building. Mr. Campbell responded that the concrete would slope up to meet the existing 4-inch step. The result at the base of the building, he added, would be that the concrete would taper away from the step. Mr. Campbell then distributed a set of drawings that illustrated the proposals for both the ramp and sloped sidewalk alteration. He commented that their preferred option would involve sloping concrete in all directions away from the step and noted that the concrete would minimally cover the features adjacent to the step.

Ms. Stein inquired whether a landing is required at the ADA entrance. Mr. Campbell responded that if the entire sidewalk is sloped 2% or less to the curb, then no landing is required. Even when a ramp is constructed, he explained, the landing is sloped to allow water to drain. The Committee and applicants discussed the building's orientation and errors shown in plan. Ms. Gutterman stated her preference for sloping the sidewalk, and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.

Mr. Campbell stated that he would like the Committee to make recommendations for both options. Ms. Gutterman commented that the Committee may choose to make a recommendation for one option and, if the client disagrees with the outcome, the applicant could work with the staff. Mr. McCoubrey added that, if the staff reviews the details of the ramp, the Committee's preference would be for vertical pickets rather than the mesh depicted in the drawings.

Mr. Baron stated that if the applicant can slope the sidewalk, it would be best to install a post for the push button rather than attaching it directly to the building. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Campbell agreed. Mr. Cluver again questioned the width of the doors, which Mr. Campbell had previously stated were 36 inches. Mr. Campbell reiterated that the drawings were provided by the U.S. Post Office and contain errors. Mr. Cluver asked if the push button serves a programmatic function, or if it is a code requirement. Mr. Campbell answered that it would function programmatically.

Mr. Campbell asked the Committee for comments on blacking out the windows. Ms. Gutterman replied that as long as the work is on the interior, it would not be under the purview of the Historical Commission. Ms. Keller explained that the blackout material is being applied to a board that will be placed behind the window and will not be applied directly to the glass. Ms. Gutterman asked if the owner would be willing to place a graphic image on the board rather than black film. The concept, she added, is similar to what the Committee requests at other commercial buildings, such as drugstores, and is more attractive to pedestrians. Ms. Gutterman inquired whether logos are being applied directly to the building in other locations. Mr. Campbell replied that vinyl graphics are being applied to the backside of the glass.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following comments:

- glass may be inserted into the upper panels of the doors to the proposed ADA entrance, but the transom and bottom panels should remain;
- if required, an ADA-compliant push button should be mounted to a freestanding post, not attached to the building;
- the marble step should be replaced in kind with the sidewalk to be sloped to eliminate the ramp and railing;
- graphic images should be used where the blackout panels are proposed; and,
- if technically infeasible to slope the sidewalk, a ramp may be installed with vertical pickets rather than mesh railing.

ADDRESS: 148 N 03RD ST, UNIT C

Proposal: Construct roof addition with deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ari Halbert

Applicant: Jim Cassidy, C2 Architecture

History: 1830; storefront added c. 1855

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a fifth-floor addition and roof deck on top of an existing four-story building. The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application at the July 2016 meeting. That proposal called for a long pilohouse arm extending out along the north side of the building, which would have been highly conspicuous from N. 3rd Street. That application was withdrawn prior to review by the Historical Commission. This revised design has removed the pilohouse arm, per the recommendation of the Committee, and has replaced it with a black metal railing. The addition would be clad in stucco, and the deck would feature two tiers, and would surround two new large skylights.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a mockup demonstrates the addition and railing are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jim Cassidy represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked about visibility of the rear of the property. Mr. Cassidy confirmed that the rear of the property is not visible from a public right-of-way. Ms. Stein asked for a brief overview of the changes that were made since the prior month's review. Mr. Cassidy responded that the pilot house was removed and was replaced with a roof hatch. He explained that the deck steps down because the roof slopes towards North 3rd Street. Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff has reviewed a mockup. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff has not yet reviewed a mockup. Mr. Cassidy commented that the greatest visibility of the deck railing will be on an angle, owing to the one-story building that is next door. Ms. Stein opined that the revised design is fairly inconspicuous and the revisions have made a big improvement to the project. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the staff review a mockup prior to the Commission meeting.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Joe Shiavo, a neighbor who resides on the opposite side of North 3rd Street, commented that he has no objection to the project as presented.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mockup demonstrates the addition and railing are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with "inconspicuous" to mean that the visibility is consistent with the submitted drawings, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 160, 162, AND 164 N 02ND ST

Proposal: Demolish one-story buildings; construct mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: TFC 2nd Street Holdings LP

Applicant: Nicole Cabezas, Canno Design

History: Parking lot

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 two one-story non-contributing buildings and construct a five-story mixed-use building at the corner of N. 2nd and Race Streets. The building's primary facades would be composed of red brick, and feature large aluminum clad windows with cast stone sills. The N. 2nd Street ground floor would include an aluminum storefront system with awnings. A parking garage would be accessed via Race Street. A common roof deck and penthouse for roof deck access would be located on the rear half of the roof.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Carey Jackson Yonce, developer Michael Koep, and architect Nicole Cabezas represented the application.

Mr. Yonce explained that the design intent is to create a slightly more modern take on the typical Old City industrial building. He stated that he considers the 2nd Street façade to be the primary façade. He distributed a detail drawing of the brick coursing around a bay.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the penthouse. Mr. Yonce responded that it is 10 feet above the roof deck level, and that a low parapet is proposed. Ms. Gutterman opined that the parapet is not tall enough to cover the structure. Mr. Yonce agreed that the parapet is low, but that the intent is to keep it minimal. Ms. Gutterman commented that the parapet should be taller, because it looks like a part of it was removed. Mr. Cluver commented that the whole architectural expression is one that is thinner than one would expect out of a traditional building, and, in that sense, it is consistent with the architectural premise. Ms. Gutterman stated that the building has been thinned, but then there is a tall penthouse on top of it. Mr. Yonce suggested that the Committee look at the perspective rendering, noting that the penthouse is set far enough back that it will never be seen in the relationship shown on the elevation.

Ms. Stein asked about the Race Street elevation, and whether the building steps back above the second story. Mr. Yonce responded that the setback is one brick wide. Ms. Stein commented that the Race Street elevation is not pedestrian-friendly and is turning its back to an important street. Mr. Yonce responded that the detail was continued around the corner to engage Race Street. Ms. Stein stated her concern regarding the wide garage opening. Mr. Yonce responded that he is following the zoning requirements for drive aisle width, which specifies a 24-foot requirement. Ms. Stein questioned whether that width was required for four car parking. Mr. Yonce responded that he would prefer to have a narrower opening. Ms. Gutterman asked if consideration was given to treating the Race Street façade equally to the 2nd Street façade. Mr. Yonce responded that he wrapped the bay around the Race Street façade to address that. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he was advised that 24 feet is not the minimum width for a garage opening, but is rather the maximum width. He suggested a width of 18 feet for the garage opening. Mr. Yonce responded that the footprint is tight, and it lacks the room to

maneuver into the parking spaces with a narrower opening. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that he produce a drive pattern. Mr. Yonce responded that he can revisit the garage width with the Streets Department.

Ms. Stein asked about the architectural mesh in the opening next to the garage entrance. Mr. Yonce responded that City Planning has a landscape buffer requirement, which is why there are shrubs planted in the opening. The opening would be some type of metal mesh. Ms. Stein questioned how the plants will survive under a building. Mr. Yonce reiterated that it is a City Planning requirement, and noted that the project was approved by City Planning. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested a recess instead of the mesh. Ms. Gutterman responded that a recess could be a security concern. Ms. Stein suggested that the plants are shifted to the sidewalk to grow up a mesh or brick wall.

Ms. Stein asked about the canopies along 2nd Street, and questioned whether the building needs four canopies when there are only two entrances. Mr. Yonce responded that the façade is very regular and uniform, and it took away from the regularity when only two canopies were proposed. Ms. Stein opined that having only one canopy at the residential entrance would result in a stronger design.

Ms. Stein asked about the south elevation. Mr. Koep responded that there is currently a one-story building to the south, but the site will very likely be redeveloped in the immediate future. Ms. Stein opined that the brick should have a more substantial return on the south elevation. Mr. Yonce responded that no windows are proposed because there is strong potential that the site will be developed in the very near future, and will likely be constructed right against the subject building. The stucco is in anticipation that this wall will be covered in the near future.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the west elevation. Mr. Yonce confirmed that the cement board is proposed to go down to grade. Ms. Stein advised that a base course of masonry be used instead for durability purposes, perhaps to the bottom of the windows. Mr. Koep commented that it may not be visible, owing to the building to the west. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the cement board siding. Mr. Yonce responded that it looks like clapboard with a smooth finish. He distributed a revised elevation which showed a reduced number of windows, which was a result of a preliminary plan review.

Ms. Stein asked about the height of this building compared to the surrounding area. Mr. Yonce responded that it is probably taller than buildings heading west, but there is a wide variety of building heights along 2nd Street. He noted that this building is below the zoning allowance for height.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Joe Shiavo, an Old City neighbor, commented that he shares the Committee's sentiments regarding the disjointed nature of the 2nd Street and Race Street façades. He commented that the building would be better served by facades that seem more in unison. He commented that the Race Street façade is not pedestrian-friendly, and the screen wall with interior plantings seems to be either a misdirection or a misunderstanding of the requirement. He stated that, other than those points, he has no specific objections. Janet Kalter, an Old City neighbor, commented that this is an excellent opportunity for a creative solution. She commented that the Race Street wall is unfriendly and an insult to that street. Bill Becker, the president of 212 Race Street Condominium Association and a former architect, commented that the materials are appropriate, but it is a disservice to create three distinct facades. He commented that uniform materials and windows on all three sides would enhance

the building. He commented that the Race Street and 2nd Street facades should have equal importance, as this is a corner building.

Ms. Gutterman summarized that the applicant should treat both Race Street and 2nd Street as primary entrances, but that does not mean that they have to be identical. The pedestrian experience should be improved along Race Street, and the building should look like it belongs on a corner, rather than a building that looks like it belongs between two other buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: By a vote of 5 to 1, the Architectural Committee recommended denial.

Mr. D'Alessandro excused himself and left the meeting.

ADDRESS: 210 CHURCH ST, UNIT 10

Proposal: Install ADA ramps

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Charles Lee

Applicant: Hal Kessler, Mt. Alto Design + Drafting

History: 1853; Upper stories burned 1944; reconstructed 1981

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two ADA ramps with railings at the storefronts located at 219 and 221 Market Street. The ramps would rise to 4 ½ inches above grade, and feature brick pavers to match the surrounding sidewalk. The 36 inch tall railings would be wrought iron. The staff previously approved narrower ADA ramps with no railings at these entrances, but ongoing litigation regarding ADA access to these storefronts has resulted in this new proposal for wider ramps with railings, which the staff suggests falls outside of its approval authority.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Cluver stepped out of the room for the review to take a telephone call. Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Hal Kessler represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent explained that the storefronts in question are located on Market Street, despite the building's Church Street address.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the design of the railing. Mr. Kessler responded that it will be wrought iron. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether it will be actual wrought iron. Mr. Kessler responded that he intends for a wrought iron appearance, but the railing material is open to discussion.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the granite panels on the sidewalk. Mr. Kessler responded that he believes there may be vaults below. He explained that he is proposing to building over part of the granite slab and put a membrane in between to protect the granite.

Ms. Stein commented that the rise of the ramp is only 4.5 inches, and asked if the applicant had explored doing a 1/20 sloped plane. Mr. Kessler responded that he had proposed a minimal ramp initially, but it was not accepted and the ongoing litigation has resulted in the current proposal. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material choice of both concrete and brick. Mr. Kessler responded that the concrete edging holds the brick in, and the design intent was to use brick to match the brick sidewalk pavers. Ms. Gutterman suggested constructing the entire ramp of pigmented concrete, noting that bricks can be slippery when wet. Ms. Stein opined that the current design may be more complicated than it needs to be, and a simple pigmented concrete band could be used rather than different materials. Mr. Kessler responded that he would not be opposed to that solution. Ms. Stein commented that the goal is not to draw attention to the ramps, but rather keep the attention on the historic buildings. Ms. Gutterman suggested a gray pigment instead of white concrete.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. No one responded.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, considering the existing litigation, provided the ramp is concrete and the railing is a simple galvanized steel design to meet code, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 35 N 02ND ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Liu Junlan & Chan Jian Ji

Applicant: Kumar Perlote, Plato Studio

History: 1900

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third- and fourth-story addition and to alter the N. 2nd Street façade to support commercial and residential functions. The building, located in the Old City Historic District, is adjacent to a parking lot at its north elevation. The existing structure is three stories at the N. 2nd Street façade and two stories toward the rear. The proposed addition would begin at the rear of the three-story main block, 45 feet from the front façade. While the third story would extend the entire length of the building, the fourth story would be constructed with a 25-foot break at the center of the building. A non-visible light court is also proposed. At the front façade, the application proposes to alter the existing storefront to include two doors and two one-over-one windows. The remainder of the storefront would be infilled with a brick to match the existing brick of the second and third stories.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the proposed changes to the front façade, but approval of the remainder of the application including the rear addition and courtyard, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Elizabeth Ochal represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that he had met with the architect, who has submitted a revised design with a modified front façade to match the historic design as seen in a historic photograph. He

distributed the revised drawing of the storefront and second-floor windows and displayed the photograph. Ms. Gutterman opined that the design was better, but that the new doors should be more symmetrical even though they would not then match the historic photograph. She also recommended creating a beveled vestibule for the new door.

The Committee members expressed concern regarding the amount of demolition inside the building. Ms. Gutterman called it a “facadectomy.” The Committee members asked Ms. Ochal to explain the extent of demolition. She said that the exterior front and side walls would be retained. The exterior walls would be reinforced inside. The floor structure would be replaced. The rear façade would be demolished and a new rear wall constructed creating a rear yard, satisfying the zoning requirement. A new light court would be constructed in the center of the building to give light to rooms in this very long, very narrow building. The roof would be replaced and the foundation reinforced. Ms. Stein asked the applicant to submit an engineering report.

Ms. Stein expressed a concern that perhaps the design does not meet code because it would only have one fire stair. In response to a question, the applicant said that the mechanical equipment would be placed on the roof behind the addition and that no decks are proposed. Mr. Cluver expressed concern about the visibility of the new addition. He asked Mr. Baron why the staff supported the new addition. Mr. Baron said that the new addition, which would be set back 45 feet from N. 2nd Street, would only be visible because of the open parking lot to the side. The addition would not affect a character-defining front façade. It would merely change the appearance of a non-historic stucco wall. It would still leave the building lower than the surrounding structures.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Joe Schiavo, a resident of Old City, said that the addition would be visible because Filbert Street forms a T with 2nd Street and allows for distant views. He said that the addition should be designed to match the architecture of the rest of the building. Job Itzkowitz of the Old City District said that he is happy that the revised design now shows a store window at the front façade. He said that the demolition of the rear wall is not a concern because the building is landlocked and backs up to another building. He supports the limited demolition to allow for light and air to make more of the building useable.

Mr. Cluver objected to the level of demolition as well as the visibility of the addition. He stated that the front façade is acceptable in concept, with the details to be worked out with the staff.

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

ADDRESS: 521 S JUNIPER ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Claire Stidwell

Applicant: Kelly Ennis, Ennisnehez

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: @phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck with pilothouse access on the rear of this corner property. The pilothouse would rise approximately 1 foot 8 inches above the peak of the front-sloping roof. The deck would be surrounded by a 42 inch stucco-clad parapet wall.

The staff notes that a condition of a previous Historical Commission approval to legalize several unpermitted alterations to the building including stuccoing the side was never satisfied. This approval, from December 2007, required the installation a solid wood beaded board fence and gate along Rodman Street; the fence and gate were never installed, but should be to bring the property into compliance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the deck is surrounded by a vertical metal picket railing rather than a solid parapet wall, and that the pilothouse is sloped at the front to align with the slope of the roof, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kelly Ennis represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the original roof shape. Mr. Baron showed an historic photograph of the roof. Ms. Ennis said that she could modify the proposed stairhouse to follow the existing roofline. Ms. Ennis said that she had proposed the solid railing for privacy. The Committee members preferred the metal picket railing. Mr. Cluver expressed a concern about setting back the structure of the roofdeck. The Committee members agreed that the applicant could finalize the minor details with the staff.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the deck has a vertical metal picket railing rather than a solid parapet wall, and that the pilothouse is sloped at the front to align with the slope of the roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 260 W JOHNSON ST

Proposal: Replace slate roof with asphalt-shingle roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bryant Hatcher Group LLC

Applicant: Andrea Hatcher, Bryant Hatcher Group LLC

History: 1891; Edmund B. Seymour House; Hazelhurst & Huckel

Individual Designation: 9/14/1988

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install asphalt shingles on the entire roof of this building, which currently is covered primarily with original red slate. The contractor has provided two quotes for re-roofing the building to illustrate the cost difference between the desired asphalt shingles and new red slate and copper. The asphalt shingles, which the applicant prefers, are estimated to cost \$29,000. The red slate and copper would cost \$140,000; the new red slate and copper could be approved by the staff administratively.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of an asphalt or synthetic shingle that replicates the color, shape, and dimensions of the existing red slate, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney David Still and roofers Tiffany Swank and Joseph Harmer represented the application.

Mr. Baron distributed additional submission materials from the applicant including a letter from the owner and another cost estimate. He said that the staff recognizes that the recommendation is something of a contradiction because the asphalt does not replicated the appearance of the red slate. He said that the staff had questions about the ability to save slate in some of the more visible areas in particular the turret and the front dormers. He asked the applicants to address the viability of keeping the slate in those areas. Mr. Harmer reported that the slate on the turret is probably in good condition. He observed that there are leaks in the dormers, which may be the result of deteriorated roofing or deteriorated window sills. He stated that the sills have not been painted and are absorbing water.

Mr. Still explained that the roof is in very poor condition and that there is a concern not only for the cost of a new slate roof but also the health of the current occupants. He said that mold has become a problem.

Ms. Gutterman asked if all the copper trim on the roof is to be replaced with aluminum. The applicants responded that they intend to retain the copper, which is in good condition. Ms. Gutterman asked whether they could repair the slate on the front slope and replace the other three slopes with asphalt shingles. Mr. Harmer said that he is concerned with repair because it is hard to replace individual slates without face nailing to the roof. Ms. Gutterman said that there are hangers that allow for the installation of new slates. Mr. Cluver asked why the building was individually designated. Mr. Baron said that it had been nominated to the National Register first and then the Historical Commission considered it for local designation. He noted that the building was designed by the well-known Philadelphia architectural firm of Hazelhurst & Huckle.

Mr. Cluver explained that the current red slate roof is character defining and that he does not think that its removal meets the Standards without a finding of financial hardship. He said that very limited photographs have been provided to show the condition of the slate. He stated that

he recognizes that it may be at the end of its life span. He noted that red slate usually lasts longer than other slate, but it 125 years old and at the end of its life expectancy. He said that he would like to see the slate repaired.

Mr. Baron noted that Mr. Farnham had visited the site and found much of the roof to be in very poor condition. Mr. Baron asked for a clarification on the retention of copper, noting that the application calls for new asphalt ridges with no mention of the reuse of copper. The applicants again stated that they will keep all existing copper and install asphalt ridges where it does not exist. Mr. Cluver said that he thinks that the copper needs to be consistent along each ridge area.

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

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

ADDRESS: 4309 MAIN ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition with pilot house and roof deck
Type of Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Philly Comfort Homes LLC
Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
History: c.1855
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Contributing, 12/14/1983
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story addition behind an existing rowhouse. With the exception of the pilot house, the addition would be set below the cornice of the rear of the existing building. This addition would replace non-historic material at the rear of the existing building. The addition would have a stucco façade that would create a solid three-story street frontage on Station Street. It would have a roof deck and stair house on the addition. The deck could be improved with a sloped stairhouse.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Arash Eadvan and architect Logan Dry represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the new addition. Mr. Dry said that the addition would be about two feet taller than the adjacent yellow building. He reported that the addition would be set back about 21 feet from Station Street and the remaining open area behind the building would continue to be paved. Mr. Cluver objected to the stucco covered lintels of the new construction. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the new windows and the placement of the mechanical equipment. Mr. Dry said that the windows would be metal clad and the mechanical units would be placed on the deck in an enclosure.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the deck railing is metal pickets, the stucco is removed from the window heads, and the height of the pilot house is reduced by sloping the roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:06 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 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

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

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