

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

**TUESDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Edward Singer, Plumbob
Caitlin Rotkiske, Tackett & Co., Inc.
Keith Braccia, PMC Property Group
Kiki Bolender, Bolender Architects
Christian Panten
Sean McMullan
Steven Cohen
Kevin J. O'Neill
Elsbeth Brown
Yvette Sheline
Thomas Crumlish
David Hsu
Ben Weinraub
Talar Tcholakian Chalian
Paul Boni, Esq.
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Associates
Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Developers
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker & Associates

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 1231-33 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Replace storefronts

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Empire Building Partners

Applicant: Keith Braccia, PMC Property Group

History: 1900; Empire Building/Albemarle Hotel; Carl P. Berger

Individual Designation: 7/12/1995

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The building in question stands at the northeast corner of 13th and Walnut Streets. This application proposes to remove and replace the storefronts at the two northernmost shops along S. 13th Street.

The northernmost shop, Insomnia Cookies, has storefronts facing 13th Street as well as an alley around the corner. The storefronts in these openings are historic storefronts. They are wood and metal with a recessed entry along 13th Street.

The other shop, Shibe Vintage Sports, has a non-historic aluminum storefront.

Recently, the Historical Commission's staff approved at the staff level the replacement of non-historic storefronts in this building with new storefronts that approximated, but did not replicate, the surviving storefronts at Insomnia Cookies. The staff has offered to approve the same storefront system at Shibe Vintage Sports because the existing storefront is not historic, but has refused to approve the replacement at Insomnia Cookies because the historic storefront is extant. The storefronts at Insomnia Cookies should be repaired rather than replaced. If repair is not possible owing to the extent of deterioration, the storefronts may be replaced with the previously approved system, but the recessed entranceway should be replicated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the proposed storefront replacement at Shibe Vintage Sports, but denial of the replacement at Insomnia Cookies, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Caitlin Rotkiske and property manager Keith Braccia represented the application.

Ms. Rotkiske stated that they were revising their application and would now retain and repair the storefront in the north-facing opening, along the alley. She stated that they still propose to replace the historic storefront in the northernmost opening along 13th Street, at Insomnia Cookies, with the system approved for the other storefronts because it is in poor condition, owing to the wear and tear, and because the property owner would like the storefronts along 13th Street to have a consistent appearance. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the applicants had obtained a conditions report for the storefront, or if they had tested it in any way. Ms. Rotkiske responded that there was no need to test it because one can easily see that it is in very poor condition. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the elements of the historic storefront could easily be replicated by many millwork companies. He noted that the butt glazing at the corners of the recessed entrance of the storefront in question is not original. The corners would have had vertical members that can be remade. He also suggested epoxy consolidation for some of the repairs. He concluded that the storefront is relatively small and could be duplicated easily and relatively inexpensively.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants if they had created an architectural drawing of the existing storefront that indicated the elements that would need replacement. Ms. Rotkiske stated that she had not created such a drawing. Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants are proposing to install aluminum storefronts like those seen farther to the south on the building. Ms. Rotkiske stated that they are proposing to use the storefront system they used to the south. Ms. Gutterman asked if they had attempted to replicate the details like grills when they replaced the storefronts to the south. The applicants responded that the storefronts that were replaced were non-historic. They did not have the grills or other details. They stated that the replacement storefront system that they have installed to replace non-historic storefronts replicates the lines of the historic storefronts, but not all of the details. Ms. Gutterman posited that the grills provide light to basement windows. She asked if any storefronts other than the northernmost one have or had grills or basement windows. The applicants stated that they did not have grills or basement windows.

Mr. Cluver commented that it would not be easy to remove the recess because of the step up to the storefront. Without the recess, the doorway would not have the code-mandated landing at the step. He asserted that the recess should be retained if the storefront is replaced. He asked whether the transom portion of the storefront could be retained, even if the lower section required replacement. The applicants responded that they could devise a replacement base to the storefront that would have “some accent pieces” on it to resemble the grills.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the historic storefronts are in “surprisingly good condition and with some sensitive restoration could be brought back.” Mr. D’Alessandro agreed and suggested ways in which the storefronts could be repaired. The applicants again stated that the property owner is seeking uniformity across all of the storefronts. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the original storefronts at the north are even more important now, given that they are the only ones to survive. He stated that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards do not allow for the removal of the historic storefronts. He stated that a conditions assessment of the storefronts might augment the information that can be garnered from the photographs, but would be unlikely to prove that the storefronts require replacement. The photographs do not reveal any significant problems with the condition of the storefronts. They need repair, but not replacement. He added that repair would be less expensive than the proposed replacement. Mr. Cluver added that anything that cannot be repaired can be easily replicated to retain the historic character.

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

Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Cluver suggested that the Committee adopt the staff’s recommendation. The other Committee members agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed storefront replacement at Shibe Vintage Sports, but denial of the replacement at Insomnia Cookies, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 317 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Margaret Petri

Applicant: Sean McMullan

History: 1815; storefront added in early 20th century; storefront removed 1958

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a section of the rear slope and the rear dormer and construct an addition. The Historical Commission reviewed a similar application at its June 2016 meeting. At that time, the Historical Commission voted to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10. A Commissioner suggested redesigning the addition with a gambrel roof that would intersect the rear slope of the main building, with new dormers in the addition. The applicant submitted an in-concept application reflecting this suggestion, which was approved in concept by a vote of 10-2 at the Historical Commission's August 2016 meeting. During that review, a Commissioner encouraged the applicant to provide a rendering showing the extent of visibility from the public right-of-way. The application does not include such a rendering.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Historical Commission's August 2016 approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kiki Bolender and property owner Sean McMullan represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the previous application was available for review and if the applicant had photographs of the building. Ms. Broadbent provided a copy of that application, and the prior application, both of which contained several photographs. Ms. Bolender explained that this is her third application for this project, and that, at the August 2016 Commission meeting, she decided that she did not have enough information and asked to be considered an in-concept application. She stated that she now has more details, including roofing material. She stated that the drawings show a zinc roof, but she would like to change to a lead-coated copper roof. She stated that she has not yet detailed the bay, but it would likely be a painted material rather than lead-coated copper.

Mr. Cluver asked if the mansard slopes on only one side. Ms. Bolender responded that it does have a very slight slope. Ms. Gutterman commented that the mansard should slope on both sides, to the same degree. Mr. Cluver asked for additional information about the detailing on the west dormer element around the window, since only minimal information about material is provided. Ms. Bolender responded that it will be traditionally detailed, with corner pieces and trim at the window. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the dormer looks too wide for only one window. Ms. Bolender responded that she can change it to be two windows. Ms. Gutterman suggested either two windows, or the dormer could be narrower with one window. Mr. Cluver commented that the detailing of the double-window dormer needs to be carefully considered. He suggested the applicant provide precedent photographs of double-window dormers for the Commission meeting. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the windows.

Ms. Bolender responded that the windows will be painted wood simulated-divided lights. Mr. Cluver commented that there is a "busyness" of different materials. Ms. Bolender commented

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 SEPTEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

that this is not like a traditional dormer in that there is a flat roof at the top of the mansard, and she does not want to have a sloped roof on that dormer that would require another downspout. Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the availability of lead-coated copper roofing. Ms. Gutterman responded that it is available again, but that the National Park Service still has concerns about the material and will not allow it on its buildings. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he approves of lead-coated copper for this project. Ms. Bolender asked about the proposed half-round surface-mount gutter. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that it is acceptable.

Ms. Bolender commented that, given the mansard slope, it looks like the west dormer ought to have a sloped roof, but a sloped roof would look odd on the rear dormer. Mr. Cluver commented that dormers are most successful when they match the size of the window, do not match the height of the ridgeline, come off the roofline a little, and are elements sitting within the roof rather than being an extrusion of the roof. Ms. Bolender commented that she can make the adjustments to the windows, but would rather keep the dormer roof as part of the main roof. Mr. Cluver suggested that the north dormer be centered. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the height of the head of the window in the dormer could be raised to have a taller window.

Mr. Cluver noted that the Commission approved this application in concept. He stated that there has been a lot of discussion about details during this review, which is to say that the application is still not quite complete. He opined that the proposed design cannot be approved, because the Committee has suggested too many changes. He suggested that the applicants complete the design changes prior to the Commission meeting.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the Committee should deny the application as presented, with the understanding that changes were discussed that could improve the project. Ms. Bolender asked if the suggestion could be changed to approval, provided the revisions are made. Mr. Cluver responded that the Committee should not recommend approval in light of the number of suggested changes. Ms. Gutterman stated that the applicant can go to the Commission with a modified design predicated on this discussion. Mr. McCoubrey commented that another alternative is a recommendation of approval, with the staff to review details. Mr. Cluver opined that the details are beyond the capacity of the staff to review. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the staff is capable on reviewing such minor revisions. Mr. Cluver put forward a second suggestion of denial as presented, with the understanding that the design could be acceptable if the north slope matches the west slope, the north dormer is centered between the windows on the lower floor, the west dormer is resized appropriately, the roofing material is changed to lead-coated copper, and the windows are painted wood with simulated-divided lights. Mr. McCoubrey maintained that the staff is capable of reviewing the details. Mr. Cluver responded that the Commission still needs to review the changes, and it has absolute authority to override the Committee's recommendation of denial. He stated that he prefers to give the Commission this choice by encouraging new drawings for the Commission meeting. Ms. Bolender referenced having trouble with previous minutes written by Mr. Baron of the staff, and asked how this recommendation will be transcribed in the minutes. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Commission has the authority to approve the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, but approval of a revised application that incorporates the following modifications:

- the angle of the north mansard slope should match that of the west mansard slope;
- the north dormer should be centered between the windows on the lower floor;
- the west dormer should be resized to better relate to the window size;

- the roofing material should be lead-coated copper; and,
- the windows should be painted wood, but simulated-divided-light windows are acceptable.

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: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@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. Owing to a lack of information regarding exterior cladding materials, the Commission approved the application in concept, rather than granting final approval, at its September meeting. The current application has clarified the proposed materials for the new construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Historical Commission's September 2016 approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Edward Singer represented the application.

Mr. Singer explained that the proposed Frankford Avenue façade has not changed since the last review, other than deciding on red brick for the exterior cladding. He discussed the new annotated renderings of the Front Street elevation. Ms. Gutterman asked about the paneling next to the storefront on the Frankford Avenue elevation. Mr. Singer explained that, for pricing purposes, the annotated drawings show a painted metal rather than what had been labeled composite panel. Ms. Gutterman asked about the texture of the panel. Mr. Singer responded that he has not decided on one type of panel, if the Committee has a preference. Ms. Pentz asked about the panel colors. Mr. Singer explained that they are black and gray, and the gray panel is used as an accent piece for items like framing the entry and separating the windows on the second and third floors.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the material between the windows on the Front Street elevation. Mr. Singer responded that the preferred option is glass block because it allows for additional light into the commercial space. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the use of wood siding. Mr. Singer responded that it is used primarily next to the door, in order to use a warmer material at the entrance. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that wood does not look right in that location, and suggested the use of the same material as the rest of the ground floor. Mr. Gutterman stated that she understands the desire to differentiate the doorway. Mr. McCoubrey stated his preference for a masonry material rather than wood. Ms. Broadbent clarified that the applicant was given

guidance from the Commission to go in a contemporary direction with the Front Street façade because the new building will never been seen in relationship to the historic building. Ms. Gutterman responded that it does not have to do with contemporary or not, but that her concern was more of an aesthetic issue, in response to Mr. D'Alessandro's suggestion to use all of the same material. She opined that it is a good idea to differentiate the entrance, and suggested a metal panel. Mr. McCoubrey commented that Philadelphia was a masonry city because wood burned. Mr. Singer commented that he is open to reconsidering the material. Ms. Gutterman commented that he could even use a different color. Mr. Cluver stated that he does not object to wood in this location, as this façade is going in its own direction. He stated that his focus is on ensuring that the experience of walking along the façade maintains an urban character to it, with appropriate rhythm and scale. The Committee expressed its support for glass block as the material choice for the Front Street elevation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to the Historical Commission's September 2016 approval in concept, with the recommendation that metal panel is considered in lieu of composite panel on the Frankford Avenue elevation, that preference is given to the glass block option on the Front Street elevation, and that a material other than wood is considered for the area around the entrance on Front Street.

ADDRESS: 614 N 16TH ST

Proposal: Construct two townhouses on vacant lot

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Sean & Geraldine Trainor

Applicant: Paul Kreamer

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two three-story multi-family dwellings on a currently vacant lot within the Spring Garden Historic District. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction is limited to review and comment only. The proposed N. 16th Street elevations incorporate many elements representative of the district's Italianate buildings. An elevated base, stone stoop, and arched door surround define the entryway, while two-over-two double-hung aluminum clad windows are proposed for the remaining fenestration. The design includes a simplified cornice, cast stone lintels and sills, and brick veneer. Small decks are proposed for each unit at the rear of the property, although these decks would be confined within the plan and would not extend beyond the rear wall.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed construction is compatible with the Spring Garden Historic District, but recommends that the brick veneer be similar in color to the red brick of the Italianate buildings within the district.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Kevin O'Neill represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked Mr. O'Neill if he was committed to the yellowish brick color depicted in the rendering. Mr. O'Neill responded that he is not committed to the color and brought a sample of the brick for the Committee to review. Ms. Gutterman observed that the sample is redder than

the yellowish brick shown in the rendering, and the Committee generally approved of the proposed brick sample.

Mr. Cluver commented on the cornice's masonry corbels, which are drawn to terminate below the top cornice line. The truncated corbels, Mr. Cluver continued, interrupt the frieze portion. He added that the elements typically act as an extension of the party wall, like those of the adjacent building, and asked if there is a historic precedent on which the design is based. Mr. O'Neill stated that there is no historic precedent, and the corbels were designed to unify the two buildings. He remarked that he did not have a strong preference for whether or not the corbels extended through the cornice. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the corbels should step in concert with the profile of the cornice.

Regarding the window sills and lintels, Mr. Cluver asked whether the rendering or elevation drawing was correct, since the dimensions were represented differently. Mr. O'Neill answered that the elevation drawing shows more detail and correctly reflects the lintels and sills, which would extend just beyond the masonry openings.

Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification on the note that reads "Band RockCast" on the architectural drawings. Mr. O'Neill replied that RockCast is a custom cast stone made by ReadingRock. He stated that the cast stone will be used for certain features of the front façade. He also clarified that the "3-course header" annotation indicates the height of the header and not the material. The material, he stated, would be cast stone.

Ms. Pentz commented that the proposed design seems very compatible with the district.

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

The Committee members decided that a formal recommendation was not necessary and that the comments offered by individual Committee members could stand on their own.

ADDRESS: 2127 ST JAMES ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marion Ruth Rogel

Applicant: Steven Cohen, Steven S. Cohen, Architect P.C.

History: 1923; English Village; Spencer Roberts, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition, called a plant porch, in place of a non-historic trellis at the front façade. The building, listed as significant in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District, is one of the 20 distinctive cottages that comprise English Village. The proposed work includes constructing new brick walls and relocating the existing window to the new exterior wall. A metal standing seam roof is also proposed. The area under consideration totals approximately 61 square feet.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Steven Cohen represented the application.

Mr. Cohen stated that he would eliminate the standing seam metal roof in favor of shingles to match the roof of the adjacent vestibule. The other modification, he continued, involved pulling back the addition in order to retain the existing metal railing. He added that the brick and mortar would match existing. With these changes to the original application, Mr. Cohen stated, he believed the addition would be consistent with the overall design of the building. He also noted that the project proposes to convert an unused space into a garden room.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Keller if the entry vestibule is original to the building. Ms. Keller responded that she did not know if the vestibule was original and stated that some alterations have been made to it, including the addition of the latticework. Mr. Cluver commented that English Village is a quaint little enclave, but that he was not familiar with the changes or evolution of the buildings within the district. He asked whether the facades along the walkway have remained unchanged or if other additions have been made over time. Mr. Cohen responded that he could not speak to the history of changes to the facades of other buildings. Behind the building in question, he added, the buildings on Chancellor Street have received additions. Mr. Cluver equated the buildings of English Village to those of Elfreth's Alley in that the area has a very unified appearance. He stated that he did not know the history of the development well enough to know if an addition at the front façade would be appropriate. Ms. Gutterman commented that additions have been considered at the rear of the English Village properties but not at the front facades facing the common green. Mr. Cohen noted that the building sits in an alcove created by the outside wall of the house and vestibule. The addition, he argued, would be one story in height and would blend with the existing house. He reiterated the changes to the application and noted that the addition would allow the owner a small garden room. Mr. Cluver asserted that the importance of the case is how it relates to the house itself and how it fits into the overall development history of the district. Without that information, he added, he did not feel comfortable making a decision. Mr. McCoubrey remarked that English Village was conceived as a romantic urban escape that has many projections and recesses. Ms. Pentz agreed and expressed apprehension at approving a change to that rhythm without knowing the evolution of the district.

Neighbor Elsbeth Brown stated that the district was created just before she purchased her property and contended that other additions have been constructed on the buildings within the district following the designation. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Cluver asked whether these additions were constructed at the front façades, and Ms. Brown answered that the additions have been constructed at the rears. Ms. Gutterman replied that she has seen applications for rear additions, but those differ from proposed additions at the courtyard elevation. At the courtyard elevations, Ms. Brown replied, significant changes have been made. She asserted that the property owner is an 84-year-old woman who wants to keep her roses over winter and that no neighbors would object to the proposal. Mr. Baron stated that, in his 33 years, he does not remember the Historical Commission approving any addition to the front façade of any building in this development. He acknowledged that the Historical Commission has approved rear additions at the English Village, but never front additions. He stated that the Historical Commission has approved significant changes to the fronts of the buildings in a few instances, but those projects have all been restoration projects that removed non-historic alterations and restored the historic conditions.

Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern that the addition would project beyond the vestibule. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that, if the real purpose is to overwinter plants, a less permanent or

temporary solution should be considered, and Mr. Cohen asked if a temporary structure would be acceptable. The Committee discussed the potential for a temporary structure, and Ms. Gutterman noted that the Committee would need to review any proposal for a temporary structure.

Mr. Cluver reiterated his questions about the block's evolution, stating that he would support such an addition if the fronts of the buildings evolved organically over time with additions that complement the block's character. However, he added that, if the group of buildings has remained relatively static at the front and represent a cohesive thought dating to the original design intent, he would be hesitant to approve the addition. Without knowledge of that history, he continued, he would support the staff's recommendation of denial. Mr. Cohen stated that the building is located at the end of the courtyard, and the addition could be inserted without impacting the adjacent properties.

Ms. Brown asserted that the area under question is already enclosed by a fence and flower pots. She added that the addition would not adversely impact the property. With the construction of a new brick wall and new roof where currently there is an open area, Ms. Gutterman responded, an addition would change the appearance of the building three-dimensionally. She added that the area may contain a garden not accessible to the public on the ground plane, but an addition would change the building's appearance visually. Ms. Brown argued that trailing vines enclose the area. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant demonstrate how this property differs from others in the district in order to justify the proposal. One concern, he noted, was in allowing one addition, other property owners may propose similar additions in the future. He emphasized that an approval of this addition should not set a precedent for other additions to English Village properties.

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

ADDRESS: 1726 SPRUCE ST, AKA 1727 DELANCEY ST

Proposal: Construct single-family residence on sub-divided lot

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1727 Delancey LP

Applicant: Shimi Zakin, Atrium Design Group

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to subdivide a parcel that runs from Spruce Street back to Delancey Street and construct a single-family four-story residence on Delancey Street. Currently, the Delancey end of the site is open and used for surface parking. To accomplish the subdivision, a non-historic, one-story rear addition would be removed from the Spruce Street building.

The proposed house would be four stories tall with a pilot house and deck at the fifth-story level. It would include a front-loaded garage, a recessed front entry, and a front terrace at the third floor. It would be clad with brick and zinc panels and fenestrated with aluminum-clad window systems.

The height and massing of the proposed building are generally compatible with the surrounding streetscape, but the scale and proportion of the building's elements are very large, overwhelming the historic buildings on the block. With its deep corbels, projecting masses of masonry, and unfenestrated garage door, it has the appearance of buildings of the 1960s and 1970s, which appeared to defend the occupants from a dangerous city rather than opening out to the city. With its large window wall, garage door, and inset entranceway, the proposed building eschews the rhythms of the surrounding historic district. The bulkiness, weightiness, and plasticity of the front façade should be reduced. The garage door should be fenestrated. The recess at the entrance should be eliminated. The rhythm of the neighborhood should be reflected in the door and window openings. The massiveness of the top floor should be eliminated. Contemporary styling is appropriate, but that styling should echo the basic characteristics of the historic buildings nearby.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Shimi Zaken and Snezana Litvinovic represented the application.

Mr. Baron inquired whether the demolition of the single-story connector would have any effect on the cast iron decorative porch of the Spruce Street property. Mr. Zakin said that it would not.

Mr. Zakin explained how his team has studied that block of Delancey Street to determine how to reinterpret the character-defining features of the block in a contemporary design. Ms. Litvinovic explained how they considered the two end buildings on the north side of the block to set the "datum" for the block. She said that the buildings in between are "ragged." The south side, in comparison, is more regular. She said that the top of the proposed building is a reinterpretation of the mansard of the end building. She said that the proportions of their building are based on proportions of other buildings in the area.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the solidity of the proposed building along the pedestrian path is one negative aspect of the proposed design. Ms. Litvinovic said that the streetscape has 10 access points for 28 cars. She offered that they could add windows in the garage or in the side wall of the garage. She said that the windows of the second and third floor are full floor-to-ceiling height. She said that the area above the door is quite heavy but that that is typical of the areas above the doors at many buildings in the neighborhood. Mr. Zakin distributed an alternative drawing. He said that the new drawing removed the corbelling above the door and added a side window to the garage. Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to identify the primary plane of the façade. Ms. Litvinovic pointed to a brick pier. Mr. Cluver said that the planes of the façade are fragmented and the primary plane represents perhaps 15% of the total façade area. He said that other buildings in the area have one primary plane in the front façade; this façade is too plastic to be compatible with other buildings in the district. He said that it would be better to have a plane with punched openings. He also pointed out that the building should not have roof deck at the front. Ms. Litvinovic said that there is a planter but no deck. Mr. Cluver said that it looks like a deck. He said that he understands that they have studied various elements of building design in the area, but they have then applied them to the design of this building in a way that is not consistent with the vocabulary of the area.

Ms. Gutterman said that she objects to the massing of the building. She said that the fourth floor appears too tall. She said that the element at the top of the building appears to be a parapet wall to hide a deck. She said that any deck should be setback behind the stair house and the top of the building should be reduced in mass. Mr. Zakin said that they would be willing to

replace the element at the top with glass or metal. Ms. Gutterman said that she believes the building needs more glass at the first floor. Mr. McCoubrey said that he thinks that the facade has too many planes and that it appears to be an unorganized aggregation of elements. He said that it needs a basic plane onto which one can add elements such as a bay. Ms. Pentz asked about the thickness of a corner pier. Ms. Litvinovic replied that it is about 30 to 36 inches wide. Ms. Pentz said that elements such as the pier seem very heavy in scale, giving the building a commercial or public appearance. Mr. McCoubrey said that it is a soup of elements without an organizing principle. He said that the building can be frankly modern. He pointed to the building adjacent which he said is not a great building but it is comfortable in the streetscape because of its plane and its simplicity. Ms. Litvinovic said that she appreciates the comment about simplicity. Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment.

Yvette Sheline said that she has lived across the street for six years and that she finds the proposed building ugly. She said it looks like a condominium building rather than a house.

Neighbor David Hsu said that the proposed building is out of scale with the buildings across the street. He said that, with the pilot house, it is really five stories and it should really be three stories to fit in with the block.

Neighbor Thomas Crumlish asked if the Committee had received the petition. The Committee members indicated that they had. Mr. Crumlish stated that the proposed building is not compatible with the block.

Neighbor David Wollaston stated that the area is historically significant; it was surveyed by W.E.B. Dubois. He stated that the proposed building is not compatible with the block.

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

ADDRESS: 2013 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Construct roof decks and elevator

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ben Weinraub

Applicant: Ben Weinraub

History: 1887

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes an elevator and decks. The Historical Commission reviewed and denied a similar application in August 2016. At that time, the Commissioners offered several suggestions for improving the proposal, some of which have been incorporated into the current application. The application proposes to add an elevator tower on the side façade facing Woodstock Street. The application now includes interior plans and a discussion of the impacts of several alternative locations for the elevator including at the rear of the property, as requested by Commissioners. The property owner maintains that the side location, as originally and currently proposed, will have the least adverse impact on the historic character of the property. The application also proposes to add a rooftop deck, but the access has been revised. The earlier application proposed a spiral stair to a deck cantilevering out from the mansard. The current application proposes an interior stair with a roof hatch. The current

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 SEPTEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

application, like the earlier application, proposes a third-floor rear deck with access out of a rear dormer.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Ben Weinraub represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff had a preference among the three options presented for the location of the elevator. Mr. Baron said that there were pluses and minuses to each of the alternate locations. He said that the side location had the advantage of building on top of an existing first-floor extension and the fact that the corner of the building helps to make the addition less conspicuous. The two rear locations are less visible from Locust Street but negatively impact the rear of the mansard with the demolition of a dormer and the chimney. These locations at the rear also create interior problems associated with moving bathrooms. Ms. Gutterman asked the staff to comment on the proposed deck. Mr. Baron said that the deck would be located on a rear ell and has been revised so that it no longer has a stair house or a bridge access, which would interrupt the chimney and rear dormers.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that there are no elevation drawings to show the potential impacts of Alternates B and C. The owner described those alternates. The owner stressed how Alternates B and C would impact the mansard and how thousands of people see the mansard from high-rise buildings. Ms. Gutterman said that all three elevator proposals impact the mansard. Mr. Weinraub said that Alternate B blocks two basement access points and would necessitate the removal of a flowering Japanese tree. Ms. Gutterman opined that the photographs are very confusing. Mr. McCoubrey asked if Mr. Weinraub had selected a particular elevator and if it would fit the proposed shaft. Mr. Weinraub said that he had and that it does fit. He said that the override could fit below the attic roof. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the material of the exterior of the shaft. Mr. Weinraub said that it may be the metal of the rear bay but that he would prefer glass because it would look frankly modern and allow light into the building. Mr. Cluver asked about the location for the doors to the elevator at the ground and upper floors. Mr. Weinraub said that the door on the ground would face north and the door at the top floor would face south. Mr. Cluver noted that that explanation contradicts the drawings. He said that the drawings are incomplete. Mr. Weinraub summarized why he prefers the side option, Alternate A. He said that Alternate B would interrupt the access to the basement as well as necessitate the removal of a tree and a dormer on the mansard. In Alternate C, he would have to remove the bathrooms from the bay at all the floors as well as modify the dormer on the rear mansard. Ms. Gutterman asked about the roof deck. She asked why it needed to stand 5'-6" above the roof. Mr. Weinraub said that the mansard roof has a west to east slope calling, which necessitate piers to make it level.

Ms. Pentz said that she found the drawings very confusing and lacking. She said that the tree looks like it should be removed anyway because it is damaging the wall. Mr. Weinraub said that he has spoken to an arborist and that the tree is not doing any harm to the building. He explained that tree roots seek out pools of water, which do not exist in this building. He said that, in Alternate B, the tree would be removed, but in his favored proposal at the side, the tree would remain. Mr. McCoubrey said that he does not understand how the elevator is going to enter into the mansard in Alternate A. He said that the rear locations for the elevator would be much better and have less of an adverse effect on the historic building. He said the side location would block four windows and the interior of the rear bay is the preferred location for the elevator. Mr. Weinraub said that this will require moving the bathrooms and will disturb a tenant

who has been with him for two decades. Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that Alternate B is the preferred location for the elevator.

Mr. Weinraub sketched on an elevation drawing to show the effect of an elevator at the Committee's preferred location. He said that it would be seen by "tens of thousands" of people. The Committee members said that they did not think that the sketch was accurate. Ms. Gutterman said that she also did not think that the roof deck was appropriate. She said the third-floor deck on the rear bay was acceptable but not on the rear ell. She said that the drawings are incomplete and need to detail the elevator shaft and cab, deck structure, and placement of mechanical units. Ms. Pentz agreed that the application as a whole should be deemed incomplete. Mr. Weinraub described his education in architectural history and said that, as the owner of the building for 15 years, he understands this building better than they could. He said he started the process in May and may not get an approval when the Commission meets in October. The Committee members responded that it is the applicant's responsibility to help them understand the application. They claimed that complete information has not been provided and the application is still incomplete. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the owner had considered bringing the elevator to the third floor and making that the owners unit. Mr. Weinraub said that he rejects that idea because the third floor has only a junior one bedroom while the fourth floor is a senior one bedroom.

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

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee recommend denial owing to incompleteness. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.

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

ADDRESS: 2108 AND 2110 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish parts of rowhouse and carriage house; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2110 Walnut Street Development LLC

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker + Partners

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

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 2108 Walnut Street includes a four-story Second Empire rowhouse facing Walnut Street and a two-story carriage house facing Chancellor Street. A non-historic, one-story structure connects the rears of the rowhouse and carriage house. The property at 2110 Walnut Street is a vacant lot and was at the time of designation in 1995. The application proposes to demolish the one-story connector and parts of the rowhouse and carriage house and then construct a 10-story building on and between the historic buildings and on the vacant lot. The Historical Commission approved a very similar project in September 2015. The primary change from the approved design is the shift of the parking entrance from Chancellor Street to Walnut.

The project would result in the removals of significant portions of the two historic buildings at 2108 Walnut. The proposed addition would engulf the historic rowhouse and carriage house.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 SEPTEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The addition would be highly conspicuous from the public right-of-way. The proposed addition would alter spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the historic buildings and historic district. The proposed addition would be inappropriate in size, scale, massing, and proportion. The proposed addition would impair the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10 and the New Additions and Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Eric Leighton and Cecil Baker, attorney David Orphanides, and developer Tim Shaaban represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the massing had changed since the previous proposal was approved by the Commission. Mr. Baron responded that it had not. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the reason for the revision and submission of a new application, when the earlier application had been approved. Mr. Orphanides explained that a group of neighbors have appealed the previously approved project. In an attempt to satisfy the objections of neighbors, they are now proposing exiting and entering the parking area from Walnut Street. In the earlier design, the parking access was located on Chancellor Street, a small street at the rear. In addition, they have now setback the second floor of the structure on Chancellor Street at 2110 Walnut Street to create more privacy for their neighbor to the west. He said that the high-rise portion of the building is now several feet taller than shown previously. Mr. Leighton distributed documentation of the previously approved proposal for the Committee's information. He explained that the existing surface parking lot at 2110 Walnut Street has curb cuts at the front on Walnut Street and at the rear on Chancellor. The parking lot has chain-link fences and gates at both Walnut and Chancellor Streets. He said that Chancellor Street is not an open, public street, but rather is privately owned and used jointly by easement by the neighbors facing onto the street. He said that they have applied for a special exemption to park at grade, having already received an as-of-right approval for below ground parking. He explained that they have modified the façade of the building at 2110 Chancellor to set back at the second floor where it overlaps with the neighboring property. He said that they have carried through a cornice and sill line in the form of horizontal steel bands. Mr. Cluver asked if there is some legal reason why Chancellor Street cannot be used for vehicular access for this project. Mr. Orphanides explained that, in their opinion, there is no reason why Chancellor cannot be used for access to the garage; however, some neighbors would disagree, claiming that Chancellor cannot be used as access. Mr. Cluver said that, in terms of urban and historical design concerns, Chancellor Street, a street of carriage houses, is the appropriate place for the garage access. He said that Walnut Street, in spite of the former curb cut, is a street of commercial and residential facades and would be highly inappropriate for the garage access. He said that Chancellor Street is by far preferable for a garage access. Ms. Gutterman asked if both the entrance and exit from the garage would be located on Walnut Street in this proposal. The applicants answered affirmatively, noting that the parking would be accessed through one opening on Walnut Street. He said they are proposing a narrow opening on Walnut and they will have a commercial space in 2108 Walnut Street. They are also proposing to extend the awning on Walnut Street. Ms. Gutterman asked if there will be more demolition in this proposal than the last. Mr. Leighton stated that there would be no more removal than in the previously approved project.

Mr. Leighton explained that they had further developed the Chancellor Street façade since the submission for this round of reviews. He said that they are now proposing several recessed reveals in the rear facade that will feature planters and greenery on a trellis. Mr. Baron asked for

a clarification on the setback, which he asserted interrupts the continuous street wall on Chancellor Street. Mr. Leighton explained that they have designed a six-foot setback to provide breathing room for the deck of the property at 2110 Chancellor. Mr. Baron also asked about the increase in total height from the approved design. The applicants replied that the building will be approximately five feet taller to accommodate the revisions to the design of the steel structure. The change in height will occur at the new construction only. Both Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey again stressed the inappropriateness of a garage entrance on Walnut Street and again opined that the garage entrance should be located on Chancellor Street. Mr. Baker said that they too, as architects, were very conflicted about the current design; he noted, however, that we live in a democracy and the neighbors have expressed their opinion. The revised design is intended to respond to the neighbors' concerns.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Attorney Paul Boni explained that he represents three property owners whose properties face Chancellor Street, 2110, at the west end of the block, 2108, across Chancellor from the property in question, and 2107, to the east of the property. He objected to the height and size of the proposed construction. The concept of a 10 or 11-car garage is the heart of the problem, he contended. He asserted that Chancellor is a "private shared driveway," not a street. He opined that, it would fine if this developer wanted to park one car from Chancellor Street, but 10 cars is the problem. Ms. Gutterman asked how many parking spaces are currently located at existing parking lot at 2110 Walnut. Mr. Boni said that it did have approximately the same number of spaces as the proposed garage; however, in his clients' experience, the cars have always entered and exited from Walnut Street. Chancellor Street has not been used as an exit. Mr. Boni said that they appreciate the attempt to make design changes to address their concerns; however, this is the first time they are seeing the new design and, for that reason, cannot comment. He said that there may still be a concern that the Chancellor Street end of 2110 Walnut overlaps with the first floor of 2110 Chancellor Street, even if the proposed building is set back at the second floor. Ms. Gutterman noted that it appears that the 2110 Chancellor wall is built on the property line and is a party wall. She asserted that the developer may build up against a shared party wall. Mr. Cluver observed that the massing and location of the overall project were approved one year ago; the current review involves the garage entrance, set back at the second floor, and other changes, which are revisions to an approved project. He concluded that Chancellor may be private, but it is shared with the property in question and is the appropriate place for vehicular access. Mr. Cluver contended that the Committee should recommend denial the application pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, owing to the proposed placement of the garage door on Walnut Street. Ms. Gutterman agreed and opined that the garage access should be located on Chancellor.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 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.

New Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed; Recommended: Placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building; Recommended: Designing a rooftop addition when required for the new use that is set back from the wall plane and as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

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.