

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

**TUESDAY, 25 OCTOBER 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
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

Caroline Slama, Preservation Alliance
Peter Kelson, Esq., Blank Rome
Mark Merlini, Brickstone
Peter Moriarty, Brickstone
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Eric Comp, Briarwood
Paul Kutufaris, Briarwood
Lyle Seuss, Barton Partners
Brett Renfrew, BlueCadet
P. Kosteros
Earley Paul
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Anne Aarfa
Ashley James, Village Green
Stacy Geneteaux, Village Green
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
John Pringle, Stantec
Steven Cohen
Jessica Senker, J&M Preservation Studio
David Patchefsky
Rachel Royer, Alterra Property Group
Robert Glick, Kelly/Maiello
Emanuel Kelly, Kelly/Maiello
David Colman, MIS Capital LLC
Elsbeth Brown
Kate McGlinchey, Old City District
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District

Carol Huff
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
Peter Daniele

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: 2967 W SCHOOL HOUSE LA, ALDEN PARK

Proposal: Construct in-ground swimming pool
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: L3C Alden Park Apartments I LLC
Applicant: Tom Chapman, Esq., Blank Rome
History: 1925; Alden Park; Edwyn Grant Rourke, architect
Individual Designation: 5/7/1981
District Designation: None
Preservation Easement: Yes
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an in-ground swimming pool at the Alden Park apartment complex in Northwest Philadelphia. The Architectural Committee has already reviewed this application twice. The Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended approval of the pool proposal at its May 2016 meeting. At the following Historical Commission meeting, a few residents of the apartment complex opposed the plan and the Commission tabled the application to allow the applicants an opportunity to submit more information to the Architectural Committee about the proposed pool and its location. The Architectural Committee reviewed the revised application in July 2016 and was unable to agree on a recommendation; two members voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review paving and fence details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Cultural Landscapes. Two members dissented. The applicants withdrew that application prior to the August 2016 meeting of the Historical Commission because the window for the construction of a pool during that swimming season had closed. The current application is identical to that reviewed in July.

The pool would be located on a large lawn area adjacent to a formal garden. The lawn where the pool would be located included a bird bath and was ringed with a flagstone walk, but those features were lost many years ago. An English garden to the east and a pergola with walk to the west of the pool location would be retained.

Alden Park was listed on the National Register on 15 August 1980. It appears that the Historical Commission used the National Register nomination when it designated the complex on 7 May 1981. No landscape features are called out in the nomination and none were noted in the Historical Commission's and Committee's on Certification's minutes during the reviews of the nomination. The nomination notes that the apartment towers are set on spacious grounds, but those grounds are not described or inventoried in the nomination.

The Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia holds an easement on the property and has approved the pool design under its easement agreement. The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission reviewed a larger project that includes the pool as part of a tax credit application, approving the pool, finding that it satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 OCTOBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Cultural Landscapes, Alterations/Additions for the New Use (Recommended: Designing new features when required by the new compatible use to assure the preservation of the historic spatial organization and land patterns.)

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Peter Kelson, architect Lyle Seuss, and preservation consultant Robert Powers represented the application.

Mr. Kelson stated that he had little to add to Mr. Farnham's summary, but wanted to emphasize that the pool was designed to comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards as well as the Historical Commission's review criteria as expressed in the preservation ordinance and the Commission's Rules & Regulations. Mr. Kelson stated that the Commission had requested additional information during the last review and that information has been provided. He asked Mr. Powers to review the information. Mr. Powers explained the results of his research from the Library of Congress and local repositories. He stated that it was all included in a report provided as part of the application materials. He observed that the pool location and design has been approved by the National Park Service as compliant with the preservation standards as part of a tax credit application.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Powers if he had any information to add. He stated that he did not. Ms. Gutterman asked him to confirm that the submitted plans included all aspects of the project. She reported that she was concerned that a storage shed or other structure that was not included on the plans might be built. Mr. Powers confirmed the plans are complete. No structures that are not included in the plans will be erected. Ms. Gutterman asked him to confirm that they will be building a pool with hardscaping and a fence and nothing else. Mr. Powers stated that that is the extent of their proposal. Mr. Kelson also confirmed that the design documents show the extent of what they will be building. He asked the architect to provide additional details about the proposal. Mr. Seuss displayed large versions of the plans and renderings. He displayed existing and proposed site plans. He displayed aerial photographs taken from a drone, which demonstrated that the area is a lawn, not a garden. The intent is to minimally insert a pool. He stated that the pavers will be all natural materials, stone. He said that they will add plantings and six oak trees. The grading will remain the same. The existing trees will be retained. The fence will disappear into the landscape. He stated that the pool will have an accessible entrance. Mr. Powers stated that the new materials will match the surrounding materials, like the existing flagstone nearby. Ms. Gutterman asked about the fence. Mr. Seuss stated that it would be a 42-inch, pre-finished, extruded aluminum fence. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the pool equipment like the filter and pump. Mr. Seuss stated that it would all be contained in an underground vault; he pointed out its location on the site plan.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about chairs and umbrellas. He asked why they had not been depicted in the renderings. He asked where they would be stored. Mr. Seuss stated that they would be stored off season in an adjacent apartment building, but left in place during the season. Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the chairs would not be stored at the end of every day. Mr. Seuss stated that he was involved in the day-to-day operations of the apartment complex. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the materials of the furniture. He asked what the furniture "would be like." The architect stated that the furniture had not yet been selected. He noted that the furniture at the other pool is quality wood furniture, Adirondack chairs. It would not be wicker or fabric furniture. It would be relatively hardy. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the furniture would impact the space. He asked about the trash cans. Mr. Seuss stated that there would be one waste bin on the hardscaped area. He pointed to its location on the site plan. Mr. Kelson asked

if the furniture specifications could be reviewed by the staff. Mr. Cluver responded that the Architectural Committee should not be reviewing the furniture. The Historical Commission has no authority over furniture. The property owner could place furniture on the lawn today with the Historical Commission's review or a building permit. He concluded that the Committee should not be requesting information about furniture.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment.

Anne Aarfa introduced herself as a tenant at the complex. She distributed packets of information to the Committee members, which were similar but not identical to those provided to the Committee members in their meeting materials. She pointed out a photograph of the garden in 1992. She also pointed out a plan of the garden. She asserted that the garden has existed since at least 1926. Ms. Stein noted that the garden at one end and the trellis or pergola at the other end of the lawn would be preserved. She asked Ms. Aarfa if she objected to the installation of the pool at the lawn. Ms. Aarfa replied that the lawn should be planted like a garden. She acknowledged that there has been no money to plant the lawn as a garden. She stated that the lawn has been planted as a garden in the past. She stated that this is a 90-year-old garden. The Committee members noted that the garden would be maintained and even restored. Ms. Aarfa asserted that the lawn should also be planted as a garden. She suggested that the pool could be located at the parking lot. She stated that she is not against the pool, but just wants the lawn to be planted as a garden. She stated that 80 residents of the complex do not want the pool located on the lawn. She stated that the management did not poll the 300 residents on her email list prior to the last meeting; however, the management is now polling residents about the pool. Ms. Aarfa stated that the pool would create security problems. "People could just walk in anytime to help themselves to that pool."

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the information from Marianna Thomas in Ms. Aarfa's submission is new. Mr. Powers responded that that information was generated when the Preservation Alliance accepted the easement on the property. He noted that it was all presented to the Committee and Historical Commission at the earlier reviews. He also noted that the Alliance has approved the pool under its easement agreement. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance confirmed that the Alliance holds an easement on the property and has approved the pool, pursuant to a set of drawings dated 12 August 2016. He asked the applicants to forward any revisions to the design to him. He stated that the approval stands despite Ms. Aarfa's information.

Mr. Kelson submitted a petition supporting the pool application signed by about 100 residents. Mr. Kelson asked the Committee to consider Mr. Power's report, including a photograph in the report that shows the area in question as a lawn in the 1930s. Ms. Gutterman asked if those signing the petition were in favor of the pool in the proposed location. Mr. Kelson stated that they support the pool as proposed. Mr. Powers emphasized that the historic garden, which will be adjacent to the pool, will be restored when the pool is constructed. He reminded the Committee that they are proposing to retain and restore all historic garden elements and build the pool on the lawn adjacent to the historic garden. He stated that they are not proposing to insert the pool in the garden. Ms. Gutterman asked if the chemicals from the pool will damage the garden. Mr. Powers stated that the pool would have no adverse effect on the garden.

Ms. Aarfa stated that people at the pool will produce noise and hang around late into the night. The pool will ruin the "ambience." The Committee members reminded her that the Historical Commission is responsible for protecting historic resources. She replied that the pool will ruin the "atmosphere." The pool will be "obtrusive."

Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee must review the project based on preservation standards. Potential side effects of the pool like noise cannot factor into its decision. He stated that the Committee needs to focus on its mandate. He stated that the nomination does not specifically identify the lawn or garden as a historic resource. He noted that the historic elements of the garden would be retained and restored in this proposal. He suggested that the Committee recommend approval of the pool. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee recommend against any above ground structures at the pool except the fence. Others noted that no structures other than the fence are proposed, so such a provision is unnecessary. Mr. Cluver stated that he would accept Ms. Gutterman's suggestion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the English Garden and pergola are retained and no above-ground structures except the fence are added to the pool area, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Cultural Landscapes.

ADDRESS: 701-39 MARKET ST

Proposal: Install canopy with signage

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Bricktone Realty/Independence Center realty LP

Applicant: Mark Merlini

History: Lits Brothers Store, various buildings, 1859-1906

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 6/30/1970

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes four schemes to update the main entranceway to the Lits Brother Store with a canopy or a so-called "immersive threshold." The goal is to attract more visitors into the large building. The main entranceway is located at about the midpoint of the 700-block of Market Street, on the north side of the street. Historically, the entrance area in question was not an entrance, but was made up of storefront windows. The main entranceway was added during the renovations in the 1980s. A large canvas canopy stood at the main entranceway until recently, but it has been removed.

The in-concept application proposes two schemes, each with two variations. The first scheme proposes to install a canopy over the main entrance. The canopy would include a large Lits Brothers sign on its fascia and a dynamic video screen on the underside of the canopy. The smaller of the two proposed canopies, Option 1A, would hang from the building. The larger, Option 1B, would stand on columns on the sidewalk.

The second scheme proposes to install an "immersive threshold" at the entranceway. An "immersive threshold" is a series of seamless LED panels. Two versions are proposed. One would wrap each of the three entrances with an "immersive threshold," Option 2A. The other, Option 2B, would wrap all three entrances with an "immersive threshold."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff comments that a canopy that is compatible with the building would satisfy Standard 9. The staff questions whether the video screens on the undersides of the proposed canopies would satisfy the Standards. The staff acknowledges that it does not entirely understand the "immersive threshold" schemes, but suggests that they would not satisfy the Standards.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Mark Merlini, architect Peter Moriarty, and designer Brett Renfrew represented the application.

Mr. Merlini stated that his company restored this building, the Lit Brothers Building, as well as several others including the Wanamaker Building and the City Hall Annex. He stated that his company has renovated numerous historic buildings over the last 30 years. He explained that Five Below will be relocating its corporate headquarters to the Lit Brothers Building. He reported that Five Below was attracted by the façade lighting and LED sign recently installed on the building. He noted that the blue canopies that were added to the building when it was restored have been removed. He stated that they need to identify the main entrance for the new tenant. He reported that they are investing significantly in the streetscape along Market, 7th, and 8th Streets. He observed that they are trying to bring the energy that once existed on East Market back to the area. He stated that the area was a riot of signage through the 1950s. His company hired Bluecadet, which was already working inside the building, to consider the exterior as well.

Mr. Moriarty stated that, at the urging of Edmund Bacon in the 1980s, they added an atrium connected to the underground concourse. It now needs to be updated. A media sculpture will be added to it by Bluecadet. However, people need to be attracted into the interior atrium. Therefore, Bluecadet will redesign the main building entrance as well. Mr. Moriarty asked the Committee to provide comments on the two proposed canopies and the two proposed immersive thresholds. He displayed some images of Bluecadet's work. He stated that they are not asking for the Historical Commission's approval at this point, but only for advice and direction. He discussed the canopy designs with the video displays on the undersides, the soffits. He stated that they may install a Lit Brothers sign in a historic font on the face of the canopy. The canopy may hang from the building or be self-supporting on piers with vertical screens. He then displayed images of the immersive thresholds. He stated that thousands walk by the building but never enter. They would like to entice them to enter.

Ms. Stein asked the applicants to point out the entrance that would be altered on a photograph of the entire Market Street façade. She stated that the application does not clearly identify the location of the work. Mr. Moriarty pointed out the location of the entrance. Ms. Stein stated that the submission lacks important information. Mr. Moriarty stated that they are proposing one canopy or threshold at one entrance which has three sets of doors, central doors flanked by side doors. Mr. Moriarty noted that canopies have been added to many historic buildings in the city. He noted that they would not change the door configurations, only add the canopy or threshold. Mr. Cluver stated that the renderings imply that the transoms would be filled with panels. Mr. Moriarty stated that the transoms would not be infilled. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the immersive thresholds. Mr. Moriarty stated that the doorways would not be altered; the digital screens would be attached inside and out, but the doorways would remain in place. Ms. Stein asked about the thickness of the screens. Mr. Renfrew stated that the exterior screens would be about 4 inches thick and the interior ones would be less. He added that the screens would be a seamless digital tile. Mr. Moriarty stated that their designs are "generic solutions." They are looking for guidance and feedback on them. Ms. Gutterman stated that it is difficult to understand the impact on the historic fabric without additional details. Mr. Moriarty stated that, if they receive positive feedback, they will develop the preferred design. Ms. Gutterman asked if this would be advertising for Five Below. Mr. Merlini replied that Five Below would like it to be. Mr. Cluver pointed out minor deviations in the depictions of the doors from one scheme to another. Mr. Moriarty stated again that they are not proposing to alter the doors or storefronts, just add the canopy or threshold. Mr. Cluver stated that he prefers the Canopy 1A because it has a light touch. He stated that he likes the fact that Canopy 1B does not attach to the building,

but believes that the columns or piers are too large and heavy. Mr. Cluver stated that he prefers Option 2A over 2B because it is more responsive to the architecture. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the approval process would be simplified if the screens were pulled inside the building, behind the glass in windows and doorways. He stated that he prefers the smaller canopy. He wondered if the screen on the underside of the canopy could be moved into the building. Mr. Moriarty stated that they need something to highlight the entrance on the 400-foot long façade. People need to know how to find the entrance of the building. Mr. Cluver stated that any canopy should either be detailed to be perfectly historic or fully contemporary, but not in between. Mr. Moriarty responded that it is not advisable to emulate a historic feature that never existed. He concluded that the canopy should be contemporary in style. Ms. Stein voiced her preference for a canopy, stating that there is a tradition of canopies at central entrances. She stated that a more contemporary expression would be better. Any canopy should be removable in the future. Mr. Moriarty asked if the Committee liked the Lit Brothers sign. Ms. Stein and Mr. Cluver confirmed that the Committee does approve of the proposed sign.

Mr. Cluver stated that he would be in favor of adding something at the entrance on Market Street. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, stating that the main entrance deserves to be highlighted. He noted that the storefront window displays used to draw people into the building. Mr. Cluver suggested placing the screens within the vestibule. Mr. McCoubrey stated that signage could be placed in the transoms to draw the long façade together and to point toward the entrance.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that he agreed with the comments of the Committee and preferred the canopy options. He stated that he liked the Lit Brothers signage. He stated that he had no opinion on the exterior video displays.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee did not offer a recommendation, owing to the fact that the application was presented in concept and the applicants only sought comments.

ADDRESS: 4236 MAIN ST

Proposal: Replace entry doors; replace loading dock door; construct ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Venbrow, a PA Partnership

Applicant: Jessica Senker, J&M Preservation Studio

History: 1880; Venturi Scott Brown Associates

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Significant, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an ADA ramp on the front of the property, to replace the front doors, and to replace the side garage/truck loading door. The application offers three ramp and stair alternatives, all of which include the same placement of the ramp portion along the north side of the primary east elevation. The front doors, which are currently wood with a bottom panel and a ledge below the glass, and which appear to be original to the building, are proposed for replacement with flat metal framed doors with large lites that generally replicate the proportions of the existing doors. The application also proposes to replace the elevated side garage door—which does not appear to be original to the building—with a metal garage door. The existing door is wood with a 10 by 4 panel configuration. The top two rows are glazed, while the bottom two are wood panels. The proposed door would be

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 OCTOBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

constructed of metal and feature a fully-glazed 9 by 4 configuration. A wrought-iron guardrail would be installed in front of the garage door for safety purposes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the following provisions, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9:

- the dimensions and details of the front doors match those of the existing doors,
- the front doors are painted or powder coated to match the surrounding trim, and
- the ramp is clad in an appropriate material, and features a simple black metal railing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McCoubrey recused, owing to his employment at the business that owns the building. Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Preservation consultant Jessica Senker represented the application.

Ms. Senker presented boards showing revised elevations. She noted that the client has had more discussions with the Streets Department, and that the Right-of-Way Unit prefers Option 3 as presented in the Architectural Committee packets. Option 3, she noted, has a larger landing with steps to one side, the ramp to the other side, and a railing extending across the front. The feeling of the Right-of-Way Unit, she explained, is that it is less obtrusive if the steps are to the side rather than the front, which would encroach on the six-foot sidewalk minimum. She noted that the client also liked the idea of the landing being as wide as the storefront width, as it feels like a more gracious entrance.

Ms. Stein asked if four feet six inches is the minimum width of a ramp, noting that that ramp seems very wide. Mr. Cluver responded that the ramp itself can be narrower, but the landing has to be wider in order to allow for a proper turning radius. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the existing recessed landing could accommodate a portion of that landing width. Mr. Cluver replied that the ramp itself would only need to be 36 inches wide.

Ms. Stein explained that it is a very large appendage to the front façade, so they are looking for ways to minimize it. Ms. Senker understood, but argued that her client wanted everything to stay in the same plane, so it would be necessary to keep the ramp wider. Mr. Cluver responded that, because the door is recessed, the landing will by default be wide enough. Ms. Stein noted that the landing only needs to accommodate a five-foot radius, but the existing width appears to be at least seven feet. Ms. Stein argued that the ramp could indeed be minimized while retaining a compliant landing width.

Mr. Cluver asked if the staff had a preference between the three ramp options. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff withheld a recommendation on the ramp options owing to the lack of elevation drawings in the initial submission.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the width of the ramp. Ms. Senker clarified that the ramp width in the Committee packets was four feet six inches, but the revised ramp on her boards is four feet wide.

Mr. Cluver commented that if the ramp is narrower, there is more space for the center steps as shown in Option 2. He quickly followed up, noting that Option 2 does not show a handrail extension, which would cut into the sidewalk space. Ms. Senker responded that that is what triggered the discussion at the Right-of-Way Unit.

Mr. Cluver asked if there was any discussion of installing the ramp along the side where the garage door is being replaced in order to leave the historic entry untouched. Ms. Senker responded that there was some discussion of that with the team, but that the change in elevation is so great that they would have to have a switchback. Mr. Cluver responded that he did not see why that would be, since the ramp would essentially be starting from the same location as the other ramp, and rising to meet the same floor level. Ms. Senker replied that the grade change along Rector Street goes steeply downhill. Mr. Cluver reiterated that beginning of the ramp at the corner of the building and the interior floor heights should be approximately the same whether the ramp is located on the front or the side of the building. Ms. Gutterman clarified that more support would be needed underneath the ramp, but that the ramp itself should essentially be the same rise, if the length is the same.

Mr. Cluver opined that the installation of a ramp on the front façade is a highly inappropriate intervention, particularly when there is a possibility of placing it in a less conspicuous location. Ms. Senker responded that she does not know the width of the sidewalk on Rector Street, which may pose an issue. She noted that the team looked at placing the ADA entrance at the rear of the building, but that posed several issues and was viewed as inappropriate.

Ms. Senker explained that the clients also want to replace the garage door with a fully-glazed operable door so that they have the option to open it for fresh air, or keep it closed for light.

She noted that another revision that was made was to the front doors, and there are now two options: an aluminum door that would be bronze to match the railing out front, or an alternative for a wood door that would match the design of the existing doors, but with wider leaves. She noted that the two leaves that are there now are two feet seven inches wide, and are not accessible. Ms. Gutterman asked if there is a need to install a push button to operate the doors. Ms. Senker responded that the doors would be manual.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the garage door coils or goes up flat against the ceiling. Ms. Senker responded that it will go up across the ceiling.

Ms. DiPasquale asked if the revised front doors would remove the sidelights or make the sidelights narrower. Ms. Senker responded that the sidelights would need to be narrower and the doors wider to make them accessible, but that they would match the paneling of the existing doors. Ms. Stein noted that the transom has mullions that align with the doors, and asked if they propose to change those as well. Ms. Senker responded that they were not proposing to change the transom, but could if that was the recommendation of the Committee. Ms. Stein noted that when she saw the packets, she wondered why the applicants were proposing to replace the front doors, since they must already be ADA-compliant because it did not show a change in size. Ms. Gutterman commented that if the applicants were to install a push button, they could utilize the existing doors, and have both of them open. Ms. Stein commented that it is a beautiful building, and historic fabric, so she wants to understand why they would allow the removal of that fabric. She noted that the bronze doors in particular seem out of keeping with the building. Ms. Senker responded that the design team felt that if they were going to replace the doors to make them accessible, the bronze doors would go with the new railing. She noted that they do also now have the option to use wider wood doors.

Mr. D'Alessandro commented that he is not in favor of all of these changes, and agreed with Mr. Cluver's suggestion that the applicants should consider creating an accessible entrance in the new garage door.

Mr. Cluver reiterated his preference for a ramp on the Rector Street side of the building, and opined that the sidewalk appears to be wide enough at that location. Ms. DiPasquale asked if there would be any issues with covering the stone base and basement window openings on the side of the building. Mr. Cluver opined that the fact that there is vegetation growing out of the grates in the sidewalk suggests that they are not too active.

Ms. Gutterman questioned what the person door would look like in the garage door. Mr. Cluver responded that, since the garage door is scheduled to be replaced anyway, they could create a more storefront-like door in the garage door. Ms. Senker asked what aesthetic would be employed if they inserted a storefront door in the garage door. Would it be contemporary in style?

Ms. Stein commented that the side ramp and door would be a better option for the building. She objected to the railing across the entire ramp at the front of the building. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicants could rethink the entire interior floor plan to shift the main entrance to the side ramp and door for everyone going into that space.

Ms. Stein noted that, when she saw the plans, she wondered if there was a way to insert a ramp inside in the building, noting that that is typically what the Committee requests for alterations to significant buildings. Ms. Senker responded that they evaluated that option, but found that it would require removing the front steps entirely and lowering the doors, which they felt was infeasible.

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

Ms. Senker asked about the Committee's recommendation for the aesthetic of a ramp at the side, at the garage door. Mr. Cluver responded that, from his perspective, the type of treatment shown for the proposed garage door has a nice aesthetic, and that he can easily picture a door being added into that glass system.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval, provided the ramp is relocated to the side, the accessible entrance is inserted into the new garage door, and the railing is a simple metal railing, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 365 GREEN LA

Proposal: Construct garage and driveway

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Roger Ross

Applicant: Roger Ross

History: 1871; Benjamin Kenworthy House; William F. Rayner, builder

Individual Designation: 4/10/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a free-standing garage at the rear of this corner property. In 2014, prior to historic designation, a previous owner demolished a circa 1900 outbuilding that stood in this approximate location. The design of the proposed garage is similar to that of the main house, with a mansard roof and bracketed cornice. Stucco or scalloped siding is proposed for exterior wall cladding. A historic stone retaining wall runs along the front

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 OCTOBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

and side of the property. Based on current photographs provided by the applicant, a section of this retaining wall has been removed to accommodate a driveway from Manayunk Avenue to the garage entrance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Peter Daniele represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for confirmation that the foundation for the garage is already constructed. Mr. Daniele confirmed that the foundation has been built. Ms. Pentz asked for information regarding the previous building that stood in this approximate location. Ms. Broadbent responded that she included a Google Street View image that shows a section of that building with the application materials. She explained that the former building was demolished by a previous owner, prior to the designation of the property. Mr. Cluver commented that the mansard might feel heavy on top of this one-story building, but there is some precedent for this type of roof on an outbuilding. He asked if there was a reason why the flat roof portion is sloped toward one side, as opposed to a more typical double pitch where water would flow over the mansard on two sides. Mr. Daniele responded that he was not sure. Mr. Cluver continued that typically the roof would pitch in two directions, with a low pitch that is not noticeable. He opined that it is odd to drain onto the entrance door steps. Ms. Pentz suggested stucco instead of fish scale siding for the main body of the building. Mr. Cluver commented that the stucco should continue over the concrete that is exposed at the base so that it looks more finished. Ms. Gutterman commented that the material of the brackets is not specified. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the lack of gutters. Mr. Daniele responded that, if they are not in the drawing, then they are not proposed. Mr. Cluver responded that omission of gutters is acceptable if it meets City storm water regulations, noting that the storm water question is outside of this Committee's purview. Mr. Cluver suggested that the flat roof portion have a slight ridge down the middle running north-south, then have it slope east and west where there are no garage entries. Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the main body is clad in stucco rather than fish scale siding, the stucco extends over the concrete foundation walls so there is no exposed concrete, the brackets are painted wood, the pediment above the dormers has a more plain board appearance, and the flat roof portion of the mansard is revised to be treated more like a typical mansard, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

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. A similar application was submitted and then withdrawn

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 OCTOBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

during a recent round of reviews. The building, listed as significant in the Rittenhouse-Fitler 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 new slate roof is also proposed to match the adjacent existing roof. The proposed area of construction totals approximately 61 square feet. At its 27 September 2016 meeting, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application and asked for additional information on the history and evolution of English Village.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Architectural Committee's recommendation of denial at its 27 September 2016 meeting.

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

Mr. Cohen stated that he investigated further and found additional photographs, which were submitted in the new application. The vestibule the Architectural Committee questioned previously, he continued, was part of the original construction. He indicated that the latticework applied to the front façade is not original, and the blue latticework and wooden arches would be removed. Mr. Cohen referenced a series of photographs included in the application, noting that they were taken every 10 feet as he approached the residence from 22nd Street. He asserted that the addition would not be visible at all from 22nd Street, and it would only become visible about 20 feet from the residence. Consequently, he argued, the addition would minimally impact the overall composition of English Village, and he stated that his documentation proves the fact. Mr. Cohen further noted that, over the years, original windows have been removed and vinyl installed. In only one case, he asserted, did he find that the windows were corrected. He reiterated that his proposal would have a minimal impact on the block.

Mr. Cluver noted that the screening of the view from the street is all vegetative. Mr. Cohen concurred. Mr. Cluver asserted that the view could change. Mr. Cohen responded that the vegetation lends character to the courtyard and, though it could change, he believes it would be to the residents' advantage to maintain some quality of vegetation.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether the desire to reuse the existing windows was an economical or design decision. It was a design decision, Mr. Cohen responded. The goal, he elaborated, is to create a garden room and minimize the impact on the overall courtyard. He asked for the Committee's input on whether the window was inappropriate. Mr. Cluver answered that those windows are replacement windows from another era. Mr. Cohen replied that he could find another more suitable window that would be similar to the original.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any consideration of making the addition a conservatory and constructing the walls and roof out of glass and aluminum. Mr. Cohen stated that he had not considered those materials and was concerned that glass and aluminum would be problematic. The brick, he added, would be more in keeping with the building's character. He reminded the Committee that there was some discussion about a temporary structure at the last meeting, but Mr. Cohen opposed that approach.

Mr. Cluver noted that he has differing perspectives on the proposal. On the one hand, he commented, the cottage style of the block does not maintain strict symmetry and can accommodate an evolution of design. On the other hand, he continued, English Village has a very strong vocabulary of small entry vestibules that stand proud of the façades, with the main façades set back. Mr. Cohen claimed that, in looking at the original plan, no other vestibules

exist. Mr. Cluver then responded that some have small pent roofs or an element defining the entry. Ms. Keller interjected that Mr. Cohen's statement was incorrect and that there are number of vestibules that are original to the English Village structures.

Mr. McCoubrey observed that, in reviewing historic photographs, the façade of 2127 St. James Street clearly serves as the terminus of the walkway. Rather than viewing it obliquely, he continued, one approaches it head on. Mr. Cohen agreed that it appears that way in the historic photograph prior to the vegetation's growth, but he argued that over the years the vegetation, which lends significant character to the courtyard, obscures the building, because of its unique position at the end of the block.

Mr. D'Alessandro raised the issue of the addition extending beyond the face of the vestibule and stated that the extension would be problematic. Mr. Cohen claimed that the addition would not project beyond the face of the vestibule. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the drawings show it projecting 9 ½ inches beyond the vestibule. Mr. Cohen asked if the Committee would suggest that the addition be in the same plane as the vestibule wall.

Ms. Stein inquired whether the English Village courtyard is in the public way or if the public way terminates at 22nd Street. Ms. Keller responded that the courtyard is not an official city street but is open to the public. She referenced a prior discussion at a Historical Commission meeting in which it was decided that St. James Street is a public way because it is open at both ends and serves as a thoroughfare for pedestrians.

Ms. Pentz stated that she appreciates the addition of the historical information supplied by the applicant, but that she finds the documentation supports the case that the building should not have a front façade addition. The historic photographs, she continued, make clear that the block consisted of a unified composition of flat facades with small projecting entrances. This elevation, she added, is the building's main façade and an addition of this nature would be unprecedented. Mr. Cohen responded that in the application he provided a letter written to the property owner in 1995 that discusses the designation and notes on the second page that the Historical Commission staff commonly approves upon submission permit applications for alterations not visible from the public right-of-way. Given the building's location at the end of the courtyard, he continued, the structure is not visible until one stands approximately 20 feet from the façade. He added that one would be well into the courtyard space at that point.

Mr. Cluver stated that the decision hinges on whether St. James Street is considered a public right-of-way. Mr. Cohen asserted that the street is privately maintained and controlled by its residents, even though it has public access. Mr. Baron responded that the Commission's staff regularly reviews changes to buildings on college campuses that are not in public rights-of-way. The public experiences the surrounding space where buildings are highly visible, he continued, and that serves as the basis for the staff's review of buildings such as College Hall at the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Baron then contended that, because each property owner essentially has a front yard, an approval of this application would set a precedent for other owners to construct additions onto the front facades of their buildings. The Commission has approved applications, he added, for rear additions, but not front façade additions.

Mr. Cohen reiterated that the location of the building is unique, because the proposed addition sits in the corner where it would not be clearly visible from 22nd Street. Mr. McCoubrey countered that the building is not clearly visible when leaves are on the trees and shrubbery, but that lack of visibility can change in the winter. The façade, he added, is quite prominent in the

complex. Mr. Cohen asserted that removing the vegetation would have a more negative impact than the construction of the proposed addition.

Neighbor Elsbeth Brown stated that the street is private and residents are required to plow and repair the paving. She commented that there is a very strong argument among property owners that the St. James Street courtyard is not a public space and reiterated Mr. Cohen's reasoning that the building is not visible until one is well inside the courtyard. Ms. Brown then voiced her support of the application.

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

1001 S 15TH ST

Proposal: Construct addition; rehabilitate train shed
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Steven Gendler, AIA
Applicant: Emanuel Kelly, Kelly/Maiello Architects & Planners
History: 1876; Railroad Depot
Individual Designation: 5/31/1966, 8/12/2005
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, 215 686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition at the east end of a historic freight depot (called a train shed in the application), which would be rehabilitated as part of this project. Historically, the freight depot occupied the entire width of the block between 15th and Broad Streets. The eastern portion of the building was demolished between 1967 and 1970, leaving behind the vacant ground upon which the proposed addition would be constructed. The proposed addition would be one-and-a-half stories in height and clad in a dark red-brown brick. It would feature a flat roof with a raised clerestory at its central bay. Brick piers and large windows on the north and south elevations would continue the rhythm of the historic train shed openings. The historic building would be substantially rehabilitated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers Steve Gindler and David Coleman and architects Emanuel Kelly and Robert Glick represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that he has some questions about materials. Specifically, the plans state that the roof will be Slateline; however, a photograph in the application depicts a regular three-tab shingle. Likewise, a photograph shows red brick; however, the brick has very rough edges that preclude a thin joint profile. Mr. Cluver asked how the architects intend to terminate the eave ends, given that they are adding insulation to the roof. He asked whether they will be tapering the insulation toward the ends or raising the sill of the clerestory windows. The architects responded that they will be raising the sills, but that they will not add the insulation to the roof outboard of the pole gutters. Mr. Cluver also inquired about replacing stucco panels on the sides of the historic building instead of repairing brick. He commented that the drawings appear to show stucco in areas where there is currently brick. Mr. Glick responded that that is not the intention. He was asked to clarify note 6 on page 9 regarding this stucco.

Ms. Pentz asked if the internal trusses will be modified. Mr. Glick responded that they will be able to leave the trusses and the wood ceiling exposed. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the intersection of the new and old building. He recommended a setback or reveal at the intersection. Ms. Gutterman asked about the paving. The architects responded that the granite block paving will be reinstalled on the south side of the train shed, but that it will be used on only a portion of the Carpenter Street side. This is because pedestrians will utilize that side and there is concern that the granite block poses a tripping hazard. There will be a combination of hardscaping and planters. Ms. Stein inquired about the loading dock for trucks as well as an area for dumpsters. The architects responded that trash will be accommodated through the door on 15th Street; loading will take place along the south side of the building.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about modifying the roof on the south side for truck access. Mr. Kelly responded that they are working with the Streets Department to try to lower the sidewalk and roadway to avoid modifying the roof. The Committee members stated that they are not willing to recommend approval for a modification to the roof with no drawing and without knowing that it is not possible to solve the problem by lowering the paving. Mr. Kelly stated that it is not their intention to alter the overhanging eave, but to adjust the grade at the sidewalk instead. He stated that they will work with the Streets Department to find a solution that precludes altering the overhanging eave.

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

1. existing brick is maintained and restored while existing stucco panels can be replaced in stucco;
2. insulated paneling for the roof is terminated at the pole gutter with the sills of the clerestory raised 4 to 6 inches to accommodate the insulation;
3. the parapets or side walls of the new addition are modified so that they fit under the roofline of the existing building;
4. the sidewalk area is modified to accommodate the truck deliveries so that the roof of the shed does not need to be modified;
5. the intersection of the new and old fabric is articulated with a joint; and
6. the brick for the existing building matches the existing brick in size, color, and edge crispness.

141-43 N 4TH ST AND 319 CHERRY ST

Proposal: Construct additions and 7-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: John G. Traver Co., Inc.

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: 1780

Individual Designation: 4/26/1966

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition to a historic school building building and a new building on a surface parking lot to create a residential complex on a series of interconnected lots between 4th and Orianna north of Cherry. The Historical Commission reviewed a similar application for the properties in May 2016. The earlier application, submitted

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 OCTOBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

by a different architect on behalf of a different developer, proposed to construct an addition on top of and around the school building as well as to construct a building on the parking lot at Cherry and Orianna Streets. The Commission approved that application in concept, provided that the addition on the school was limited in size to maintain the “clarity” of the school and the new construction was limited to four stories in height.

The current application again proposes the construction of an addition on top of the historic school building and at the south façade; however, no elevation drawings have been provided to explicate the proposal. The application proposes a seven-story building for the lot at Orianna and Cherry Streets, which is much larger than that approved in concept.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, the Commission’s previous approval in concept, and owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

Mr. Rosenberg explained that this application differs from the application that the Commission previously approved in concept. This application proposes a taller building on Orianna Street, where the zoning height limit is 65 feet. He noted that this application proposes a building height of 62 feet, although other nearby buildings are taller. He commented that the adjacent church building is taller and a nearby apartment building is 70 feet tall. The Committee members reminded Mr. Rosenberg that the Historical Commission is not bound to accept maximum zoning envelopes, but can impose its own restrictions based on the review criteria in the preservation ordinance. Those restrictions may be more limiting than the zoning restrictions. It was noted that the Commission enjoys full jurisdiction over the proposed construction for the Orianna Street site because the new building would be an addition to the historic building. The Committee members opined that the architect was trying to force too many floors, seven, into the building. Historic buildings of that height would have five stories. The Committee members concluded that the proposed building was too much for the site.

The Committee members discussed the impact of the proposed additions on the historic school building. Mr. Rosenberg stated that they intend to demolish a single-story garage that wraps around the historic school building on two sides, and add two stories on top of the building. He opined that it is appropriate, owing to the existing alterations historic building. Ms. Stein pointed to the addition on the south side as well as the rooftop addition and concluded that the proposal to add to the historic school building is unacceptable.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment.

Dick Snydermann of 303 Cherry Street commented that this design is significantly worse than the design that was approved in concept. He commented that an appropriate design for the new building would be a taller at the first floor and floor-to-floor heights would diminish on the upper floors. He complained that the developer had failed to enter into a dialogue with the community.

David Pachevsky of 315 Cherry Street commented that buildings in other parts of the district may be taller than the proposed building, but the proposed building is too tall for this particular site. He commented that the school building may be the oldest surviving school building in Philadelphia and should be restored.

Carol Hobb commented that this street has an ambiance that should be preserved. She commented that this building will tower over the Orianna Street.

Job Itzkowitz of the Old City District commented that this part of the district is lower in scale and more colonial in nature, and the proposed design is inappropriate.

Mr. Rosenberg objected to the neighbors' assertions that the parking lot should remain as open space. He asserted that undeveloped site is an anomaly and will be developed sooner or later. He contended that it is unrealistic for the neighbors to expect that lot will be maintained as a gathering spot and play area; it will be built upon.

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

2141 ST JAMES ST

Proposal: Demolish rear vestibule; construct new vestibule with deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John James

Applicant: Ben Sabagh

History: 1923; English Village; Spencer Roberts, architect

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 to replace a non-historic addition with a new addition at the rear of this house in English Village. The new stuccoed one-story addition would be a vestibule and would have a roof deck with metal picket railing. To access the deck, a rear window at the second-floor level would be converted to a door. The door to the new deck should be more like the window that is being removed. The Historical Commission has previously approved rear additions at other properties in English Village.

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

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

Ms. Stein opined that, although the proposed addition is at the rear, it would be highly visible because this building is the first in the row and the addition would be adjacent to 22nd Street. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the addition should be set back from Chancellor Street. Mr. Baron commented that a further setback would preclude the inswing of the door and may affect the size of the landing. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that perhaps the door should continue to open outward like the existing door. The Committee members commented that there are several concerns including the size of the vestibule and how it is designed and detailed. They also commented that the existing vestibule is smaller and better designed. The Committee recommended that the addition should have a stone base. Several members objected to covering and modifying existing windows.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:05 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 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.

Guidelines for Rehabilitating Cultural Landscapes, Alterations/Additions for the New Use:
Recommended: Designing new features when required by the new compatible use to assure the preservation of the historic spatial organization and land patterns.