

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

**WEDNESDAY, 27 JUNE 2018  
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029  
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

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

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I  
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

**ALSO PRESENT**

George Boudreau  
Adam Rogers, Cadre Design  
M. De Berardine  
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Peter McElhill  
C. Burgens  
Kubra Mercan  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Matt Otricelli, Designblendz  
Scott Woodruff, Designblendz  
Emma Erwin  
William O'Connor, PPM  
Mick Doyle, Acheson Doyle  
Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design  
Walter Modrys, Old St. Joseph Church  
M. Guttenberg  
Barry Eiswerth, Old St. Joseph Church  
Jose Hernandez, JKRP  
Kerry Canal  
Gavin Riggall  
Matt Stone  
Joe Schiavo  
Janet Kalter  
William Becker  
Nicholas Chelko, MA Architects

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2018  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Marc Kaplin, Revolution Development  
Eric Silverman  
Patricia Silverman, EAA  
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District  
Kate McGlinchey, Old City District  
Andrew Kaplin  
Morris Adjmi, MA Architects  
Frank Swift  
Rob Kettell  
Mimi Hanks-Bell  
Daniel Pendleton  
DM Stanton  
Jennifer Morgan  
Francis J. Purcell IV  
Bev Hendry

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**ADDRESS: 1026 SPRUCE ST**

Proposal: Remove non-historic garage, construct wall and parking pad  
Review Requested: Final Approval  
Owners: Scott Baldasare and Alex Cook  
Applicant: George Baker, architect  
History: 1865  
Individual Designation:  
District Designation: None  
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to demolish a brick garage and construct a wall set back behind the garage and concrete parking pad. From maps the garage was constructed in the early twentieth century, much later than the Second Empire house at the front of the lot. The applicant seeks to create two open parking spaces on this alley. The staff would recommend demarcating the street line with a change in pavement.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Ms. Gutterman questioned if the garage was being taken down because of its condition. Mr. Baron responded that the property owner would like to create an open parking area. Mr. Baron described the garage as constructed of brick with a corbelled brick cornice and built between 1910 and 1916.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the staff recommendation to demarcate the street line. Mr. Baron responded that he was concerned about losing the building because it was important to keep the street wall but the remainder of the staff felt that it was enough to put a paving stripe to demarcate the street. The Committee requested clarification on the area of demarcation and potential materials. Mr. Baron described the applicant's site plan that included a garden behind the main house and then a brick wall to separate the garden area from the parking area. He clarified that the demarcation area would be where the garage wall (south wall) meets the side walk. The Committee discussed possible materials such as brick pavers, concrete pavers, and Belgian block.

Ms. Stein inquired how the applicant would patch the neighboring party wall of the adjacent garage at 1024 Spruce Street. Mr. Baron responded he did not know. Ms. Stein commented that the plans did not show where existing walls and objects stop and start. Mr. Baron pointed out a note on the drawings indicating an "existing 6 foot high masonry wall." Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Stein responded that it is most likely just the garage wall. Ms. Gutterman stated that the neighboring garage may have been built directly against the 1026 Spruce Street garage wall. She continued that when the garage is demolished, the adjacent garage may not have a wall.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the proposed brick wall between the garden and parking area has brick on both sides. Mr. Baron and Mr. D'Alessandro confirmed that the drawings show that it will be brick on both sides. Mr. Baron pointed out there will be an iron gate as well. Ms. Gutterman inquired if a brick color was specified by the applicant. Mr. Baron stated that brick color was not specified.

Ms. Gutterman stated a concern about wear and tear on the proposed pavers from cars constantly driving over them. She continued that if they displace it may result in someone patching them poorly with concrete.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she was not quite clear on why the building needs to be torn down. Mr. Baron responded that the garage provides one parking space; an open parking area will provide two parking spaces. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Baron both noted that the owner cannot get the additional parking space with the current garage. Ms. Gutterman inquired if the building was in bad condition. Mr. Baron responded he did not know, but added that one wall had been stuccoed.

Mr. Baron explained that the staff felt that the building's original door had been changed and this influenced the staff recommendation. He continued that the staff recommendation also took into account that the main building was built about 1860 and the garage was built considerably later. The staff concluded that the garage had no architectural or historic value.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that they could take out the back or north wall of the garage and there would be enough room for two cars to park in a line. Mr. Baron responded that he had suggested this to the applicants, but they were concerned it would make the garden or yard smaller. Mr. Baron noted that parking in a line would be less convenient and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. McCoubrey commented that extending the garage would take up space in the yard.

Ms. Stein stated that she was amenable to approval but would like to see a brick side wall adjacent to the neighboring garage. She explained that this would help retain the historic character of the street.

Mr. McCoubrey opened up the discussion for public comment, of which there was none.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a paver strip is added between the parking spaces and side walk; the material of the paver strip is brick, concrete, or Belgian block; a brick party is added on the east side of the property and adjacent to the neighboring garage; pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 2314 GREEN ST**

Proposal: Construct addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2314 Green Street LLC

Applicant: Lala Stein, Cadre Design and Development

History: 1855

Individual Designation: 12/5/1974

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to demolish the rear ell of this rowhouse and construct a rear addition that is the entire width of the lot. The rear ell is much altered with stucco, altered door and window openings, and non-historic doors and windows. The upper section of the side of the rear ell is visible from the public right-of-way at a distance of about 150 feet across a courtyard. In addition to the work at the rear, the application proposes a pilothouse on the main roof and a metal-clad parapet that would surround the entire main roof. The application also appears to propose a roof deck, but no railing is shown. It is likely that the parapet and pilothouse would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Rogers, property owner Micheline De Berardine and contractor David Stafford represented the application.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Baron if there was a demolition plan within the application, and Mr. Baron replied that there was not but that they could compare the existing conditions drawing with the proposed. Mr. Baron explained that the entire side wall, back wall and floors would be demolished, which is why the staff was characterizing the application as a demolition more than an addition.

Mr. Rogers explained that there were two challenges with the project, the first of which was creating enough space for Ms. De Berardine and her family without impacting the historic fabric at the front of the house, and then the fact that the interior of the house had been significantly altered when it was converted into a duplex in the 1970s. He stated that the windows at the back did not match the historic character of those at the front façade. Mr. Rogers explained that

they wanted to infill the adjacent alley which abuts a retaining wall rather than a neighboring property, and that there were certain conditions with the site that would prevent it from being visible. He said their goal was to rebuild the rear back to capture its historic character.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there were any photographs of what the rear of the house looked like. Mr. Rogers directed her to images within the application and Ms. Gutterman responded that they were of the existing conditions, not what it looked like previously. She asked if Mr. Rogers was planning on restoring the rear of the subject property based on the conditions of the adjacent house. Ms. Gutterman explained that in using the word restore, it meant that the work would be based on some part of history, so either a photograph of the house or an adjacent property. Mr. Rogers replied that when he said that the rear would be restored, he was referring to the materials and characteristics of the front façade and the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Gutterman said that they were not proposing to put brick on the rear, so using the word restore was not correct. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the proposal was not a restoration.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Baron if, despite alterations to the windows, the form of the rear ell currently exists. Mr. Baron replied that the historic half-gable rear roofline is still there as are the walls, but an addition was constructed, a wider window cut and the rear stuccoed. He said that the staff was not saying that it was unaltered; however, the basic form of the ell still exists. Mr. D'Alessandro added that the scale remains as well. Mr. Baron showed the Architectural Committee members the wall of the adjacent courtyard on one of the plans, and explained that the change would be seen above that wall.

Ms. De Berardine said that previously the rear had had many windows but that they had all been blocked up. Ms. Gutterman responded that the windows would have been there historically because they would have let light and air into the middle rooms, and that the five-foot wide alley was very common, character defining feature of a house. Mr. Rogers responded that historically, it would have had an adjacency which has since been demolished, and, to the right of the alley there are currently new construction town homes and garages. Ms. De Berardine added that the townhomes and garages appeared to be from the 1950s, and that the windows would have looked out on to them, which is probably why they were boarded up.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the applicant had the section drawings that were referenced in the materials, to which Mr. Rogers replied that they had not brought the entire construction set with them. Mr. D'Alessandro said he was asking to see section drawings, which would help the Architectural Committee members understand what was going on. Mr. Rogers directed Mr. D'Alessandro to a section cut on page EX.2. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that there was no longitudinal section. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that there was a section drawing on the last page of the packet, to which Mr. D'Alessandro repeated that there was still no longitudinal section. Mr. Rogers stated that there was a side elevation drawing in the materials.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if he would see the proposed new and windowless stucco wall if he looked down the courtyard at the end. Ms. De Berardine said that a stucco wall could be seen currently from the courtyard, to which Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey replied that the existing wall had windows. Ms. De Berardine said that the existing wall did not have windows. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the new stucco wall would be visible from 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, to which Ms. De Berardine and Mr. Rogers replied that the existing wall was also currently visible from this location.

Mr. Baron asked whether the metal parapet on the drawings would enclose a deck. Mr. Rogers explained that there would be a pilot house and a new roof deck with the required five-foot setback. Mr. Baron said that on the elevation drawing, it looked like the parapet would be located at the very front of the building, without a five foot setback. Mr. Rogers replied that there was no reason why the parapet could not be pushed back if it was something that the staff and the Architectural Committee wanted modified. Mr. Baron explained that normally, decks on the main roofs of houses were not approved at all, adding that he was concerned about visibility especially because the buildings to the east of the subject property were so low. Mr. Baron said that it was likely that the pilot house and everything else on the main block of the house would be visible from the street. Ms. De Berardine commented that the new townhomes at the end of the block all had roof decks at the front, and Ms. Gutterman explained it was because they were new construction and therefore fell under different criteria. Ms. Stein pointed out that the subject property was also individually designated building, and demolitions were typically not permitted unless there were structural issues. Ms. Gutterman added that the Historical Commission does not review interior work; however, it does review exterior work visible from the right of way, even if the building was located 150 feet away from the right of way. Ms. De Berardine said that what they were proposing would basically be as visible as what was currently there.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Baron if the subject property was visible by the public from the rear. He responded that he did not think that it was. Mr. Rogers explained that they had walked around the property and tried to find any areas where the back was visible and they did not find any. Mr. Baron said that because the building to the east of the subject property was almost a full story lower, it would not really help hide anything.

Ms. De Berardine stated that, with this proposal, they were also trying to get more light into the back of the property since no light could currently enter through the alley due to the height of the wall. She added that the subject property was at a disadvantage because the adjacent retaining wall prevented light from reaching the back.

Mr. Baron asked whether there was a site line from the adjacent empty lot to the rear of the subject property. Mr. Rogers and Mr. Stafford confirmed that there were no direct sight lines from that lot. Mr. Baron asked if there was visibility from either from N. Judson Street or from the double-wide lot behind the subject property, because he believed that it looked like it would be visible from both of these locations. Ms. De Berardine added that there were trees that would obstruct the view.

Mr. Baron stated that previous rear-ell demolitions tended to negatively impact the structure of the front block of the houses. He commented that there had been cases where the rear ell had been demolished and it resulted in the front being declared imminently dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections and ultimately demolished as well. Mr. Rogers said that the process of illegally converting this building into a duplex resulted in the front and the back being very independent structurally speaking. He added that the front and the back were actually on different grades and did not tie together, and that their proposal for the front of the building was very independent from the back of the building, which was intentional on their part.

Ms. De Berardine stated that the way in which the existing wall was cut open, if they were able to remove it, it is likely that this location would be where they would add some additional support.

Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification as to what would be demolished. Mr. Rogers explained that they were proposing to retain a protrusion off the rear but that much of the remainder would be demolished.

Mr. Baron asked if the roof structure would be demolished, and Mr. Rogers confirmed that it would be at the third level. Mr. Baron stated that if the proposal was to remove the side wall, much of the rear wall, and the roof, and if the floor levels would be changing, he understood the proposal as the demolition of the rear ell.

Ms. De Berardine said that the small area at the rear that bumped out was not going to be demolished but rather repaired and the windows replaced. Ms. Stein asked whether the rear wall at the third floor would be pushed out further, and Mr. Rogers responded that the intent was to push it out about five feet further.

Ms. Gutterman said that with the exception of the small section of the rear wall that was to be retained and repaired, the proposal would change almost everything that was currently visible. Mr. Rogers said that was not the case. Ms. Gutterman stated that they had discussed taking off the roof, to which Mr. Rogers responded that it was the cornice line that they were proposing to take down so that the structure could be extended to the right, into the alley. Ms. Gutterman said that were proposing to remove the side wall, the rear wall, the far wall, and the roof in order to accommodate a deck, and they were proposing to repair the small section of the rear wall and replace the windows.

Ms. De Berardine said that she was not sure if it mattered, but the third floor of one of her neighbors extended out further than her proposal. Ms. Gutterman responded that it was difficult to understand the proposal. She said that demolition plans would be helpful for them to better understand what proposed changes they were making to the building, as opposed to the Architectural Committee members having to ask them so many questions about what they were proposing to retain and what they were proposing to remove.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that they were proposing to remove a significant amount of the existing fabric and they were also proposing to change the building's form. He noted that the third floor would be extended out.

Ms. Stein remarked that she agreed with the staff that the proposal was essentially a demolition, and that the only thing that would ultimately remain would be the party wall with the adjoining house. She added that the structure would need to be replaced in order to accommodate the extensive changes being proposed. Mr. Rogers stated that the beams had already been engineered, and Ms. Stein asked how large they were. Mr. Rogers explained it had already been engineered, and that there would be posts along the edge. Ms. De Berardine added that she believed the posts were going to be placed where the window openings were since there were so many.

Ms. Stein said she had a structural concern about removing a section of the brick wall at several floors would alter the sheer forces available. Mr. Rogers replied that they would certainly address any structural concerns to make sure that all sheer forces were appropriately handled. Ms. Stein said that the wall was also likely a part of the original form of the home, and she was not sure that it needed to be removed in order to make a successful plan. Mr. Rogers responded that part of the problem with the wall was that it had been extremely altered and that it was currently almost all glass with very little original fabric remaining. He pointed out that there were large windows from the ground floor up to the third floor. Ms. De Berardine commented that she had been trying to say the same thing earlier about the rear wall being so open due to all of the windows that had been installed.

Mr. Baron said that to him, it looked like it was a solid masonry wall with windows in it, to which Mr. Rogers responded that there were even more cut openings that were covered. Mr. Baron said that the masonry wall and half-gabled roof still existed.

Ms. De Berardine said that she thought that so many of the windows had been covered up because no one wanted to look out on to the adjacent non-historic houses. Ms. Stein stated that it would be different if the proposed addition was just at the first floor, but that the review changes significantly once an addition goes higher.

Mr. Stafford stated that he could speak to the structural issues. He said that the building was in sound structural shape, and that in previous renovations, the building had been split into two separate units. He said that once they had started with the interior demolition, it gave them an understanding of how the house had originally been laid out, which would also help them to determine how to move forward. He said that he did not anticipate any structural issues would come forward and that the interior had already been gutted.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a skylight on the roof, and Mr. Rogers confirmed that there was.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were any other questions or comments from the Committee or the public, and there was none.

Mr. Baron asked the Committee members what their thoughts were about the proposed parapet and pilot house. Mr. McCoubrey remarked that no matter what they did at the main roof, it would be highly visible. Ms. Gutterman added that she did not understand why there had to be a solid wall at the roof deck instead of a railing. Mr. McCoubrey said that there was already a big area for a deck at the rear ell.

Ms. De Berardine asked for clarification about what solid wall they were referring to, and Ms. Gutterman explained that the plans showed a solid metal paneled parapet wall was proposed for the roof deck at the main block. Mr. McCoubrey added that there was no railing shown nor site line drawings included.

Ms. Gutterman commented that this was really an application for the demolition of the rear ell, rather than an infill project. She said that allowing a roof deck on the main block of a house was not typically something that was approved, and even if it was, it would be with a railing in order to reduce visibility, rather than the proposed solid metal paneled parapet wall. Mr. Rogers asked

whether they would receive an approval if they changed the parapet to a railing would it be approved. Ms. Gutterman replied that they would still recommend denial. Mr. Baron informed the applicant that the issue was not only with the railing, but rather with the proposed location of the roof deck at the main block rather than at the rear ell. Mr. Rogers asked if they could remove the roof deck from the application, and Ms. Gutterman said that it would still be a denial of the work proposed at the rear.

Ms. De Berardine said that she felt that the subject house was at a disadvantage because of the wall between it and the adjacent townhomes because it made it difficult to get light in. Ms. Gutterman remarked that she thought there were other ways to get light into the property, such as Ms. Stein's suggestion of a one-story addition with windows above.

Mr. D'Alessandro said that it would be better if they provided a set of documents that had all of the information so that all of the verbal back and forth could be avoided.

Ms. De Berardine asked what would happen next. Mr. Baron explained that she could withdraw this design and return the following month to present a new design to the Architectural Committee, or she could take her current design to the Historical Commission with the possible unanimous recommendation of denial. Ms. De Berardine asked how to withdraw the application, and Mr. Baron told her that he would assist her.

Ms. Stein told the applicant that, should the proposal come before them again, the issue of whether the rear ell was being raised should be clarified. She noted that in comparing the two section drawings, it looked like the entire rear ell was getting raised up. Ms. Stein said that it was fine to change floor heights within the original volume of the building, but if the height of the building or the roof were to be raised, the Architectural Committee would need to understand that more clearly.

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

**ADDRESS: 236 S 22ND ST**

Proposal: Construct addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Shawn Murray

Applicant: Scott Woodruff, Designblendz LLP

History: 1845

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 construct a small addition and deck on the two-story rear ell of this corner building. The addition would be clad in clapboard and the deck would be enclosed by a railing.

The front-facade windows were replaced with vinyl windows without the Historical Commission's approval since the property was designated in 1995. The windows are not addressed in this application, but should be brought into compliance under a separate application.

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

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Scott Woodruff and Matt Orticelli of DesignBlendz represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that when they previously reviewed this project, the proposal was to stucco the addition, but the Architectural Committee recommended that the material be changed. Mr. Baron said that the current proposal was for the addition to be finished with clapboard. He reminded the members that they had also recommended that the solid parapet be changed to a railing, which was also reflected in the current plans. Mr. Baron explained that the reason the application had to return to the Architectural Committee was because the applicant had decided to modify the size of the addition and also because instead of pulling the deck back from the rear as was recommended, the proposal pulls back from the side. He said that the staff was fine with the extent of both the deck and the addition, which was why it was recommending approval, with the staff to review details.

Mr. Woodruff explained that one of the main differences for the new configuration was that it flipped the door going out on to the deck, tucking it in and making it non-visible from the right of way. He said that the new location of the door was the result of the circulation of the house. Mr. Woodruff informed the Architectural Committee members that the previously proposed skylight had been removed from the plans.

Ms. Gutterman asked if one of the photographs in the application was of another section of the property, and Mr. Woodruff said that he believed it was a photograph of the rear. Mr. Baron clarified that there was a fairly substantial yard between the deck and the adjacent property. Ms. Gutterman asked if it would be possible to pull the deck back an additional five feet from the rear to reduce the visibility from Latimer Street. Mr. Woodruff responded that his client already had a concern that the roof deck as proposed would already be fairly small due to the six-foot setback off of the side, and he was hoping to gain some distance at the rear. Ms. Gutterman stated that the deck would be twenty-four feet long. Mr. Baron commented that the addition appeared to be modern, with the garage built into it, and visible decks on rear ell had previously been approved. Ms. Gutterman responded that the issue was with the deck's visibility, since it was on a corner property. She stated that she would still recommend that the deck be pulled back, because even if it was reduced to 20 feet by 9 feet, that was still one 180 square feet, which was still an adequate deck for the city. Mr. Woodruff said that it seemed like there were some other decks on Latimer Street, but he did not know if they had been approved or if they were illegal.

Mr. McCoubrey said that the decision to swing the access door to the deck around resulted in the addition appearing to be four feet longer than previously proposed. If the door was located where the sink was, the addition would be significantly shorter. Mr. Woodruff explained that the zoning code would not allow a deck within the five-foot setback but did allow an addition, so this was their solution to comply.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a parapet on the addition and requested further information about the proposed roofing materials. Mr. Woodruff responded they would probably use a metal cap. He said there was a very shallow parapet on the existing roof which sloped back to a gutter.

Mr. Baron pointed out that the last time the Architectural Committee members reviewed this proposal, the deck was much more visible because it was right at the edge. He said that by pulling it back six feet, it had become much less visible.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the applicants could create some kind of a return with the rail. Mr. McCoubrey asked if there would still be a zoning problem if a railing came out instead of the addition's wall. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Baron said that they thought there would be a zoning problem with this idea. Ms. Gutterman added that a person could fall over a railing that close to the edge.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were any other comments or questions from the Committee. Ms. Gutterman asked how far back the skylight was situated from the edge. Mr. Woodruff said that he believed the existing skylight was approximately two feet from the edge. Mr. McCoubrey asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the deck is pulled back to align with the western edge of the existing skylight at the alley side, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 520 QUEEN ST**

Proposal: Alter façade; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2622 West Hagert Street LLC

Applicant: Gerald Boyce

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 8/21/1973

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a third-story rear addition with pilot house and roof deck and to alter the front façade. The roof of the proposed addition would abut the rear slope of the existing roof just below the ridge. The pilot house would be set back on the addition and would feature a sloped roof to minimize visibility from Queen Street. A rear elevation was not provided, but the cover letter notes that the rear walls and pilot house would be clad in cement siding and a wrought iron railing would be installed at the deck.

The proposed work to the front façade includes reconfiguring the ground-story door to allow for car access to the garage. A new pedestrian entrance would flank the garage door, and the existing transom configuration would remain. The pedestrian entrance and garage door would be composed of wood and would be installed within the existing masonry opening. The application further proposes to remove the existing aluminum siding and to restore the brick to the roofline. The cheek walls of the dormer would be clad in cement siding, and the windows of

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2018**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

the façade would be replaced to reflect the historic configurations, although the windows are identified as one-over-one sash windows in the elevation drawing.

At its 22 May 2018 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept application for the property that proposed to demolish much of the structure and to construct a four-story building. At that time, the Committee advised the applicant to restore the Queen Street façade and to work with an architect to determine whether the rear of the property could be redesigned or reconstructed to allow for additional living space with limited or no visibility from Queen Street.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the front façade window openings are returned to their original sizes, the dormer cheek walls are clad with wood clapboards, the dormer's segmental arch and surround are restored, and all front façade windows are wood six-over-six double-hung sash, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Peter McElhill represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman inquired if there were staff comments about the combined garage and entrance door. Ms. Mehley responded that the staff will need more door details and a better understanding of how it will work. Ms. Mehley asked Mr. McElhill to provide more information about the door. Mr. McElhill stated the door itself will be accessible for street access as well as cars and he described it as a door within the garage door. He further explained that the wood structure would have a pedestrian door, as well as a garage door, and it will look like one garage door.

Ms. Stein asked if the entire door would be made by a garage door manufacturer. Mr. McElhill responded that it will have to be. He stated that there are 18 inches of brick on each side and the whole structure will be a garage door. Mr. McElhill explained that the current garage door cannot be restored, as it is in poor condition.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the drawing needs to show additional pieces of wood to show that there is a pedestrian door there. She noted that the drawing should be revised to show the door's header piece and jamb piece.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the sight lines drawing show that the addition is not visible from the public right-of-way. She recalled from the 22 May 2018 Architectural Committee discussion that the rear of the property is not visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Mehley confirmed that it is not visible.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. McElhill if he had any concerns about the staff recommendation of returning the front window openings to their original size with a six-over-six configuration and restoration of the dormer windows. Mr. McElhill stated he did not.

Mr. McCoubrey commented on the interior floor-to-ceiling heights and the fact that the floor heights were different on each floor. Mr. McElhill replied that the split-level design was the only way they could achieve the additional story and make it not visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the applicant should make every effort to keep the height of the top of the pilot house down.

Mr. D'Alessandro inquired if new garage door will maintain the existing door's details and dimensions. Mr. McElhill responded it is their intention to maintain as much as possible of the design. Ms. Gutterman commented that it will have to change some in order to make it operable. Mr. McCoubrey added that the details will be important.

Ms. Gutterman asked if they explored under the metal panning of the cornice. Mr. McElhill responded that it is brick. He explained that some of the brick is still there and it will be restored. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the drawing showed the panning still there. Mr. McElhill replied that the drawing was mistaken and the brick will be restored all the way to the roofline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the front façade window openings are returned to their original sizes; the dormer cheek walls are clad with wood clapboards; the dormer's segmental arch and surround are restored; all front façade windows are wood six-over-six double-hung sash; the brick cornice is restored; the pilot house not visible from public right-of-way; and the historic garage door is documented with details and dimensions prior to demolition; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

**ADDRESS: 2026-28 SPRING GARDEN ST**

Proposal: Construct 4-story house on vacant lot; reconstruct vestibule; remove wall and fence

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: David Altenhofen and Mariette Buchman

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1886

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application proposes to subdivide 2026-28 Spring Garden Street to create two lots, remove and reconstruct a non-historic one-story vestibule at 2028 Spring Garden Street, and construct a four-story residential building on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street. In the Spring Garden Historic District inventory, 2026 Spring Garden is listed as a vacant lot. Historic maps show that the vacant land at 2026 Spring Garden Street was always the side yard of the double-wide lot for the building at 2028 Spring Garden Street. Despite this, 2026 Spring Garden Street was given its own entry in the Historic District inventory, as shown below:

**2026** Vacant lot.

**2028** 3-story, 2-bay, brick, Italianate semi-detached house. Marble watertable; marble steps with iron railing; segmental arch entrance opening with paneled wood jamb; double-leaf, full-glazed door with transom; segmental arch window openings; 1/1 wood sash with exterior storm windows on 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> stories; marble segmental arched window hoods with carved end brackets and sills; bracketed and sub-bracketed wood cornice; gable roof.

East elevation: brick with fanlight at gable.

Built c. 1886. Alterations: 1-story, 1-bay flat roof entrance to the east with modern paneled door; alterations to exterior and interior, 1990. Contributing.

Documentation: NPS Tax Credit Application.

The applicant has submitted this in-concept application to gain clarity from the Historical Commission as to its level of review for new construction on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street. The staff suggests that the Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over any proposed new construction at the site because it was a developed site at the time of the Historic District designation; the site should be considered developed because it was historically the side yard for the property with the building at 2028 Spring Garden and because a wall with fence stands on it.

Owing to extremely limited information provided for the proposed new construction, the staff suggests that the Committee limits its comments to the appropriateness of a four-story building at the site.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the Historical Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the lot known in the Historic District inventory as 2026 Spring Garden Street; and approval of the concept of removing the fence and wall and constructing a four-story residential building on the lot.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Agata Reister represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the one-story vestibule that provides access to 2028 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Chantry responded that the vestibule is not original to the building and the staff would approve its removal. Ms. Reister noted that they wish to reconstruct it because it encroaches onto the proposed subdivision, but that it will appear much as it does currently. She suggested that it also may have been constructed without proper footing. Ms. Gutterman asked about circulation on the interior via the vestibule door. Ms. Reister responded that she does not know about that because she has not walked through that building. She explained that this in-concept application is to elicit a decision from the Commission as to whether or not it enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street, known as a vacant lot in the Spring Garden Historic District inventory. She explained that the vestibule encroachment is approximately one foot into the subdivided lot. She clarified that no additional work is proposed

to 2028 Spring Garden Street, and that she will provide more information for the final review. Ms. Chantry commented that zoning documents show that the vestibule entrance served as a separate entrance for a doctor's office. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if an easement could be obtained to allow that entrance to remain as-is. Ms. Reister responded that she could look into it, but that it would be more cost-effective to remove and reconstruct the vestibule. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that it is not a cost issue, and the new construction work can be done without collapsing the vestibule building.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is interesting that the plot plan makes it look like the site was a garden for 2024 Spring Garden Street and not 2028 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Chantry agreed.

Ms. Stein asked if the application before the Committee is the idea of building a four-story building on the vacant lot, the removal of a granite wall and iron fence on the lot, and opinions about this proposed work. She asked if any walls or fences would be removed prior to a design being approved. Ms. Reister confirmed that no construction will occur at this time.

Ms. Reister explained that the size of the lot will allow for a multi-family building, which is what her client intends to build. That means that the issue of accessibility needs to be addressed, while remaining sensitive to the context. She observed that most entrances on this block have a substantial number of steps, which violates the ADA requirements. She stated that she is proposing to construct a three-story building in the front which would match the entrance level of the building directly adjacent to it at 2024 Spring Garden Street, and a walkway next to the existing steps and small vestibule that would lead a person with a disability to the rear of the building, where the floors would be offset. She clarified that the front portion of the new building would be three stories in height, and would match the height of the adjacent building, but the rear portion would be four stories in height, to comply with zoning and to address accessibility. Ms. Gutterman commented that she would need to see plans and elevations. Ms. Reister responded that she understands, and the objective of this meeting is to gain clarity regarding the Commission's level of jurisdiction, and also to elicit comments on the proposal to construct a three-story building to comply with zoning which allows for a 38 foot maximum height by-right.

Ms. Stein asked if the cornice line will match the cornice line of the adjacent building. Ms. Reister explained that the building that is being attached to at 2024 Spring Garden Street is four stories in height when including the mansard, but that a new building at that height would exceed by-right zoning. Mr. McCoubrey noted that almost all of the historic buildings on this block are four stories in height. Ms. Stein commented that it is critical to match the cornice height of the adjacent building that is being attached to, because these read as paired homes on this block, and this lot is the one missing link. Ms. Reister noted that the building at 2028 Spring Garden Street, which is also adjacent to the vacant lot, is a three-story building. She stated that she could match that three-story height. Ms. Gutterman commented that there is a six-foot gap proposed between the new building and the three-story building at 2028 Spring Garden Street, because that is the location of the proposed walkway. Ms. Reister clarified that there will not be a gap, because the walkway will be a covered-over alley that is right on the property line. Ms. Stein reiterated that the proposed building has a mate, and the cornice height should match its mate, which in this case is 2024 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Reister responded that she understands, and that the Commission could force the applicant to go through the variance process for the height.

Ms. Gutterman commented that the Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the lot known in the Historic District inventory as 2026 Spring Garden Street, but that comments related to the design of the new construction will be withheld until a design is provided for review. She encouraged the applicant to match the cornice line of the adjacent property. Ms. Reister asked if the Committee is recommending that the new building have a fourth-floor mansard. Ms. Gutterman responded that she is not sure about the mansard, but that the cornice is important. Ms. Reister asked if the Committee would prefer that the new building match the mansard and four-story appearance of the adjacent building. Ms. Stein responded that she is not sure, but that the cornice is most important, and the mansard would be secondary. Ms. Reister noted that the three-story by-right concept would match the cornice line. Ms. Gutterman suggested that Ms. Reister design the building, have the staff review it, and then have the Committee review it. She suggested that Ms. Reister could provide two options, one with and one without a mansard. Mr. McCoubrey cautioned that the new building should not be four stories and masonry all of the way up. Ms. Reister responded that she understands, and that it is planned to be three stories with the cornice line being in line with the building next door. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Committee is not adverse to a fourth story on the new building.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Historical Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the lot known in the Historic District inventory as 2026 Spring Garden Street.

**ADDRESS: 321-27 WILLINGS ALY**

Proposal: Install ADA ramp and lift; relocate historic plaques/sculpture

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Old St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church

Applicant: Barry Eiswerth

History: 1838; Old Saint Joseph's Church and Rectory

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to make alterations related to ADA accessibility in the courtyard at the Old St. Joseph's Church complex. In order to make the main floor of the building accessible, the application proposes to raise an existing door and to construct a new ramp and landing. These elements would be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. In order to make the lower level accessible, the application proposes to install a lift that would lower parishioners to an existing open areaway. The application proposes to install a brick wall to conceal the lift and to blend in with the brick wall behind it. To preserve the iconic view of the courtyard from Willings Alley through an historic carriage entrance, the application proposes to relocate the historic plaque and sculpture from the obscured historic wall to the new brick wall.

The staff suggests reducing the height of the new screen brick wall if the dimensions of the lift allow, and retaining the plaque and sculpture in-situ.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Michael Doyle, Father Walter Modrys, parishioner Barry Eiswerth, and contractor Bill O'Connor represented the application.

Ms. DiPasquale distributed supplemental materials, including technical specs and renderings of the proposed enclosed lift, submitted by the applicant following the original submission. She explained that the staff had recommended reducing the height of the proposed brick screen wall, because the staff did not have information on the proposed lift.

Mr. Doyle noted that they plan to reuse as many materials as possible from the site. He explained that the proposed brick wall is intended to screen the proposed lift, which they would like to be enclosed. He noted that exterior lifts that are unenclosed fall apart quickly owing to elements such as snow and rain. He explained that they could lower the proposed wall by approximately six to eight inches. The finish of the lift, he noted, would be inconspicuous, in a matte finish and neutral color.

Mr. Doyle explained that there is no narthex in the church, so when parishioners exit into the courtyard, they exit right out onto the edge of the existing steps, so the proposal also includes a deeper platform on the exterior. He noted that they are also proposing approximately six-inch risers, which is more pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Doyle noted that they also revised their proposal for the built-in seating along the proposed ramp wall in the courtyard. The revised drawing includes free-standing benches instead of built-in seating.

Mr. Doyle explained that they looked carefully at the issue of raising the door, and it is possible to accommodate the increased height on the interior. He noted that they would utilize very skilled masons to remove and reinstall the door surround and alter the opening.

Mr. Stein noted that she has never been inside the church, and questioned the interior program of the church at the various levels. She also questioned where the existing ramp in the courtyard leads. Mr. Doyle responded that it leads to the basement of the rectory. Ms. Stein questioned whether it would be possible to install an elevator in the rectory building that would provide access to the church, but noted that it did not seem like it would be possible. Mr. Eiswerth responded that the three different buildings have three different sets of interior floor levels, and that an interior elevator would require excavation. Father Modrys noted that people would almost have to leave the church property to use the existing ramp.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether there would be a roof over the lift. Mr. Doyle responded that the wall would be independent, but the lift cab that goes up and down would be enclosed. Ms. Gutterman questioned the purpose of the wall. Mr. Doyle explained that it is to block the view of the lift and also to provide a place to relocate the plaques on the historic wall that are currently over the areaway. He noted that there is an interest in locating them to a position where they can be appreciated more closely. Mr. McCoubrey noted that it appears the plaques are lower on the proposed wall than they are on the existing wall. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether both elements will fit on the new masonry wall. Mr. Doyle responded affirmatively. Ms. Gutterman

opined that the proposed wall should not be lowered such that the relocated elements would be scrunched. She argued that they should be applied to the new wall gracefully and proportionally to their historic configuration. Ms. Gutterman also cautioned against installing the elements too close to the ground that snow would pile up and harm them. Mr. Eiswerth replied that that is something that could be studied.

Mr. McCoubrey commended the applicants for a sensitive solution to a difficult problem. He noted that while he initially thought there had to be a different place to install a lift, he can see now that there is not.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether the metal railing where the proposed lift is being installed will be salvaged. Mr. Doyle responded affirmatively, noting that it will be stored on site and used to replace any damaged pieces in the future. He noted that that way they do not have to install any new elements in the future.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the material of the proposed steps. Mr. Doyle responded that they are proposing to match the existing courtyard material. Mr. Eiswerth responded that the courtyard and steps feature bluestone and granite. He noted that historic photographs show that the existing steps are not the original steps.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that an existing metal louver will be obscured by the proposed lift, which is positive. Mr. Doyle responded that they would like to replace that louver. Mr. McCoubrey noted that it would be better if the louver was a recessive color rather than white. Father Modrys agreed.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the drawings only show one-foot treads, and suggested that the applicants look more closely at that detail for an exterior application. He also noted that a railing may be necessary in the middle of the steps. Mr. Doyle responded that they will look into those details. Mr. Eiswerth noted that a center railing may need to be removable to allow for funeral processions. Ms. Gutterman suggested looking into the maximum allowable width without a railing, which she estimated at 84 inches. She noted that it may be possible to have one on either end, rather than one in the middle.

Mr. D'Alessandro cautioned against using salt for snow management as it can cause deterioration of historic masonry and other materials. Mr. Doyle responded that Father Modrys has been considering heating the courtyard to account for that issue. Ms. Gutterman noted that that may be difficult through a solid stone step.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the following suggestions: the relocation of the historic plaques is studied; the width of the treads is revised; the exterior railings are evaluated to meet ADA requirements; and the benches are free-standing rather than built-in; with staff to review details; pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

**ADDRESS: 226-30 S 3RD ST**

Proposal: Alter facades; construct addition, pilot house, and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Vince and Rebecca Trotta

Applicant: Jose Hernandez, JKRP Architects

History: 1974, Charles F. Kain, Zenith Engineers, Inc.

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to modify window openings, alter the building's asymmetrical form, and to construct a pilot house and roof deck. The two-story corner building, which is listed as Contributing in the Society Hill Historic District, features numerous character-defining arched and round windows. This application proposes to remove the arched windows on the S 3<sup>rd</sup> Street elevation and to install two bays of rectangular windows set into two-story cast stone surrounds. A round window on the Willing's Alley elevation would be replaced with a large round window with a rectangular window with a cast stone surround. Also along the Willing's Alley elevation, the application proposes to remove character-defining V-shaped inset walls and to infill that area with brown metal panels. The application also proposes to construct a sloped pilot house and roof deck.

The staff has recommended that the applicant retain the existing arched and round windows, as well as the notched Willings Alley elevation. In order to achieve the owner's desire for additional windows, the staff suggests an additional bay of windows on the S. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade that replicate the size, shape, and configuration of the original windows.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the roof deck and pilot house, but denial of the window alterations and infill, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jose Hernandez and owners Vincent and Rebecca Trotta represented the application.

Mr. Hernandez commented that it is a unique property and is part of the overall development to the west. He explained that he felt it was important to show interior photographs, noting that the architecture of the building, which was built in 1974, is representative of what the area was at the time. He noted that the internal orientation of the building and its lack of fenestration was a response to the state of the city at the time. He explained the challenges of the current layout as a two-bedroom house, noting that there are walls that intersect windows, windows in the kitchen that are not the best for a kitchen layout, and an inaccessible courtyard area. He noted that the new program is for a family of five, with three bedrooms for the children, a master suite for the parents, a common area and open floor plan, and a new stair. He explained that he rearranged the floor plan and filled in the notch area to maximize the square footage. He opined that the new plan is better than the existing plan. He argued that, while bringing the interior to the modern day, they wanted to also make the exterior modern and use materials they have seen in new developments in the neighborhood. He explained that they created a new appearance for the façade at 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and Willings Alley, but noted that the most critical component is to make it a functioning home by infiling the notch. He conceded that he was open to working with the staff on fenestration.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2018**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Ms. Stein noted that the building was built concurrently with the adjacent I.M. Pei-designed Bingham Court, and questioned whether this is an I.M. Pei designed building as well. Mr. Hernandez responded that it is not; the building was designed by Charles F. Kain of Zenith Engineers, Inc., an entirely unknown designer and firm. Ms. Trotta noted that it was built for a female doctor.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the thing that makes this building unique is the unusual shapes of windows. She explained that it is important not to make it look like its neighbors and to remove its character-defining features. She noted that, although she does not necessarily agree with it, she understands the need to infill the notched area. She argued that installing limestone surrounds and squaring off the window openings takes away the uniqueness and character-defining elements of this building. She asked whether the applicants would consider duplicating the arched windows on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street elevation to gain the additional fenestration they are looking for. Mr. Hernandez agreed, noting that the critical aspects are getting additional fenestration and square footage.

Ms. Gutterman reiterated that she understands the need to infill the notched area in order to create a more usable plan, and opined that the applicant has treated it in such a way that it is not too prominent. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that it is a flawed plan and that infilling the notch is acceptable, but opined that the infill needs to acknowledge the former plan. He suggested that it should be lighter and scaled so that it is its own singular element, rather than a wall with punched openings in it. He also suggested that it be recessed to acknowledge the void. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the staff had suggested that infill with glass rather than metal panels would be more appropriate. Mr. Hernandez agreed that the recess would be possible, and noted that the plane of the infill could be changed, but opined that a glass wall does not work with the proposed interior plan. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. D'Alessandro suggested using a curtain wall system with solid and transparent panels, rather than punched openings. Mr. Hernandez noted that glass would look different than panels. He opined that they would see punched openings in any wall. Mr. McCoubrey disagreed, noting that there are ways to create windows that are flush with the surrounding material in a window and wall system. Ms. Gutterman agreed that it should read as a whole rather than punched openings, perhaps through the use of a storefront-like system. Mr. Hernandez expressed confusion and asked for more guidance. Ms. Stein responded that it is a very solid brick building, and that the solidity of the existing building should be retained, but the infill should be light. She noted that a storefront system, whether it is clear or opaque glass, would look like an insertion into the heavy brick, rather than like an original solid wall like the current proposal. She added that the brick site wall at the base of the notch should be retained and the glass system would spring from that point. Mr. Hernandez agreed. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the infill should be sympathetic yet differentiated.

Mr. Hernandez noted that they went through the whole design process not understanding that the building was designated as historic. Ms. Gutterman suggested working with the staff on revising the design to retain the character-defining features.

Ms. Gutterman questioned how much of the roof would be decked. Mr. Hernandez responded that that is yet to be determined, but that the proposed deck is set back four feet from the edge of the building. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the Roofs Guideline calls for roof decks to be inconspicuous, and noted that the applicants have not shown the proposed railing or deck

structure. Ms. Gutterman noted that the applicants would need to have those elements reviewed for approval by the staff. Ms. Stein questioned whether it would be possible to minimize the pilot house, noting that it appears it could be pulled back four feet from the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade. She also suggested that the color of the pilot house cladding match the surrounding material. Mr. Hernandez responded that they are proposing a skylight in that location, but that it would be possible to place the skylight on the roof instead of the pilot house and to pull the pilot house away from the roof edge.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance agreed with the staff recommendation and the suggestions of the Committee. He noted that, while the Alliance understands the need for more light and space, this is a unique property, and the key features of the building are its solid massing and angles and its unusual window shapes.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the pilot house is pulled back four feet from the parapet wall; the existing windows are not altered and the new windows match the existing windows; and the infill along Willings Alley is a lighter design element like a storefront system, is set back four inches from the exterior plane, and the brick base wall is retained.

**ADDRESS: 1920 NORTH ST**

Proposal: Construct 3-story building with garage and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kerry Canal

Applicant: Kerry Canal

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 a three-story rowhouse with pilot house and roof deck on a vacant lot within the Spring Garden Historic District. The lot is located mid-block and historically served as the rear yard of 1919 Wallace Street. The property was subdivided in September 2017, though the district's inventory identified 1920 North Street separately and listed it as "a vacant lot with wood lattice fence." Pursuant to the inventory entry for this parcel, the Historical Commission's level of review should be review-and-comment, not full jurisdiction. The proposed new construction consists of a red brick façade with aluminum clad two-over-two double-hung windows, a wood entry door with transom, and a bracketed wood cornice. A wood-paneled garage door with transom windows is proposed at the ground story. The application further proposes to construct a pilot house and roof deck set back from the front façade.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided that the height of the building is reduced to more closely reflect the height of the row, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Kerry Canal and architect Gavin Riggall represented the application.

Ms. Keller explained that since the staff made its recommendation, new information was submitted by Doug Mooney of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum regarding intact burials. She asked the Committee members to review the information.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether a house previously existed on the lot. Ms. Canal answered that there was a garage. Ms. Keller clarified that the garage did not exist at the time of designation. Ms. Canal commented that the garage was demolished in 1985.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether other garage doors existed on North Street. Ms. Canal replied that there are. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether there is an existing curb cut since a garage previously stood on the site. Ms. Canal responded that it is unclear due to the condition of the sidewalk. Ms. Gutterman observed that the plans show a curb cut.

Mr. McCoubrey requested that a longitudinal section be included with the application to show whether there is an opportunity to lower the structure, as the staff suggested. He also questioned the additional four feet in the first-story elevation that heightens the building. He commented that the plans include a basement and noted that the plans show floor heights of eight and 12 feet. Mr. Riggall replied that the building is designed as a split level. Mr. McCoubrey countered that there is a lot of volume above the garage that is not being utilized.

Ms. Stein questioned why the building needs to extend four feet above its neighbors. Ms. Canal explained that the houses to the east are taller than the houses to the west. She further stated that when she purchased the lot from developers, that was the height of their proposed construction. She further noted that the new construction on the opposite side of the street, at 1915 North Street, is taller than neighboring buildings.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether Ms. Canal could provide photographs of the neighborhood that show the taller buildings to the east. Ms. Canal provided a photograph of 1915 North Street. Mr. Riggall argued that it is difficult to get the heights to align. Ms. Gutterman commented that the proposed construction falls between two properties and questioned whether those properties are approximately the same height. Mr. Riggall answered that one is slightly lower than the other, with the building to the east having a taller water table and taller basement. The floors of the properties, he added, do not align.

Mr. McCoubrey returned to the issue of floor heights, noting that the floor height from the basement to the first floor is shown as 12 feet. He asserted that the floor height could be lowered, though he identified the need to have some height for the mechanical space.

Ms. Stein observed that the floor heights vary from floor to floor, adding that the place one would expect the most height appears to be shorter. Mr. Riggall asked whether the Committee is requesting that the new construction be as close as possible in height to the adjacent buildings or if it needs to match exactly. Ms. Gutterman answered that the heights certainly do not match. Ms. Canal commented that she measured from the sidewalk to the first story windows of the neighboring buildings and that there is quite a bit of variation. Ms. Stein replied that those couple of inches are fine in the pattern of a block, but the proposed building suddenly extends 30 inches and is quite jarring. If a couple of feet were to be removed from the basement, she continued, the structure could be lowered to align with the block. Mr. Riggall explained that the height of the basement is reflected at the rear in order to capture as much

light as possible. The front of the basement, he added, is much lower. Ms. Gutterman suggested reducing the heights of the second and third stories to 10 feet, which would lower the building by approximately three feet to match the cornice line and windows of the neighboring buildings and would not impact the height of the basement.

Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the lack of sightlines to show the visibility of the roof deck and pilot house. She then stated that Ms. Keller distributed a letter that describes the possibility of burial plots. Ms. Keller explained that the property is located on the site of the former City Hospital #3 and that Mr. Mooney believes intact burials may survive below ground. Ms. Stein asked what the owner's obligation would be. Ms. Keller replied that the Historical Commission could recommend that the owner retain an archaeologist prior to any excavation for foundations. Ms. Gutterman suggested contacting the Philadelphia Archaeological forum to discuss potential investigative work.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the rear of the property would be visible. Ms. Keller answered that the rear would not be visible, because the property abuts 1919 Wallace Street, which is part of a complete row.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT:** The Architectural Committee commented that the building should be reduced in height to more closely align with the adjacent structures; the pilot house and roof deck should be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way; and an archaeologist should be retained to determine the likelihood of extant burials.

**ADDRESS: 152, 154, 156, 158, 160, 162 AND 164 N 2ND ST**

Proposal: Renovate building; demolish non-contributing buildings; construct 19-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 160-164 N 2nd Street Associates L.P.

Applicant: Marc Kaplin

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application proposes to construct a nineteen-story structure comprised of a six-story base with setback tower. The proposed site is located at the corner of 2<sup>nd</sup> and Race Streets, just south of the Ben Franklin Bridge, and consists of seven contiguous parcels containing one contributing building located at 152 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, three non-contributing buildings, and three vacant lots. The new building will contain ground-level commercial space with a hotel and condominiums above. The contributing building at 152 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street will be rehabilitated as the hotel lobby. In addition to general maintenance, work to the contributing building will include restoring the altered parapet, installing new windows to match existing, and replacing the non-historic storefront and awning with a recessed hotel entrance and projecting marquee. The design of the adjacent six-story base reflects the industrial character of Old City through the use of tapestry-patterned red brick and the size and rhythm of its fenestration. Garage access to below-grade parking will be incorporated at the ground story along Race Street. The proposed tower will extend to a height of 212 feet and will consist of an exposed structural concrete frame, articulated metal spandrels, and a series of floor-to-ceiling windows.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2018**

**23**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

The tower will contain a substantial setback along Race Street and a small setback along N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street.

The staff agreed that the proposed work to the historic building at 152 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. It also found that the six-story brick base of the proposed new construction reflects the scale, materials, and context of the Old City Historic District. The staff did not reach a consensus on its recommendation for the tower. Some staff members objected to the height of the tower, while others opined that the massing and materials were not compatible with the historic district. Other staff members found that the tower, given the context next to the Ben Franklin Bridge, was acceptable as proposed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff offers no recommendation.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers Marc Kaplin and Andrew Kaplin and architects Morris Adjmi and Nicholas Chelko represented the application.

Marc Kaplin explained that he and his son own three of the properties and have four of the properties under agreement of sale. He described the previous process of presenting to the Historical Commission to reclassify the contributing building at 152 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to non-contributing. He stated that the building was last modified around 1931 or 1932 and that Jon Farnham obtained a photograph showing the building during the construction of the Benjamin Franklin Bridge, which occurred around 1923. He added that he accepted the Historical Commission's determination that the building is contributing and abandoned further efforts to reclassify or rescind the building's designation. He commented that he tried to find the best architect he could to help develop a building in the historic district that would be compatible with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the Historical Commission standards that would simultaneously be economically viable. He identified Morris Adjmi, located in New York City, to design the project.

Mr. Adjmi described the background of his practice and his experience as an architect, designing buildings in historic districts, which he argued are not frozen in time. He asserted that there are tremendous opportunities to add in historic districts and that his firm has extensive experience with restoration, repurposing, adding onto existing buildings, and constructing new buildings in historic districts. He stated that he starts with the context and directed the Committee members to the application's appendix to show the breadth of projects his firm has designed. He offered comments on several of the buildings depicted and added that he attempts to extract what is important and fundamental about the districts prior to commencing a project. For this project, he continued, the site comprises a number of lots, with 152 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street standing as the historic building that will be repurposed and restored. Mr. Adjmi directed the Committee to historic and current photographs of the building in the application and noted that the project would include restoring the parapet, cleaning and repointing the brick, installing new windows, and repairing the storefront surround. The building, he continued, would serve as the entrance lobby for the hotel. He explained that the proposal entails constructing a 65-foot high building at the corner of 2<sup>nd</sup> and Race Streets with a tower behind to contrast with the building. The building at street level, he added, references many of the buildings and the type of construction found in Old City, while the tower contrasts with that and reads at a larger scale in the distance to reference the building known as The Bridge and other projects. He directed the

Committee to images in the application that show tapestry brick buildings and buildings with punched factory-style windows, which were referenced for the design of the brick base. He contended that the six-story base building is of the scale of the surrounding buildings and that the tower and The Bridge frame an entrance on Race Street. He noted that the brick portion of the building would contain divided-light windows, a regular fenestration pattern, and brick framework around the openings. At 152 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, he remarked that he is suggesting the addition of signage. The materials, he continued, are presented in the application and include red brick with matching mortar, concrete for the external structure, and metal trim applied to the windows of the lower portion as well as the tower.

Ms. Gutterman inquired whether zoning is by right or if the proposed building is taller than zoning allows. Marc Kaplin answered that the use is permitted, but he needs dimensional variances and height variances. Ms. Gutterman asked how much of a height variance is needed. Mr. Kaplin replied that there is a 65-foot height limit in Old City and, at 212 feet, he needs a height variance or zoning adjustment to allow the project to move forward. Ms. Gutterman responded that the only portion of the project that could be constructed by right is a 65-foot building. Mr. Kaplin noted that dimensional variances would still be necessary. Ms. Gutterman clarified that the entire tower requires a variance. Mr. Kaplin asserted that it would require some type of zoning relief, whether it be a variance or amendment to the zoning code, as was done with The Bridge across Race Street. Mr. Adjmi clarified that The Bridge is part of the Bridge Approach District that has different height limitations. Ms. Keller reminded the Committee that the application is in-concept.

Ms. Stein commended the design team, stating that she likes the design of the brick base and the tower and the building would be a great addition to Philadelphia. However, she added that she struggles with the scale of the building and is trying to imagine what twelve similar buildings would look like on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. She argued that buildings of that scale would really alter the nature of Old City. She added that she loves the consistent character of Old City and that the brick structure of the proposed building would be a lovely addition and would fit with the historic district. She contended that she could not envision the neighborhood with the tower, though she understands that there is a tall building next to the Ben Franklin Bridge, which she argued is on the perimeter of Old City. This property, she argued, seems to be more in the heart of Old City. Ms. Stein further asserted that the proposal calls for the demolition of buildings that are of a two-story scale in order to construct a building that stands 212 feet in height. That building, she continued, would change the character of Old City, which is where her concern lies. If the Committee were only reviewing the red brick building, she contended that she would have very few comments. The tower, she added, would be visible from many vistas in the city and reiterated that it would alter this former industrial section of the city, which is important to Philadelphia's heritage.

Andrew Kaplin responded to Ms. Stein's comment about demolishing buildings, noting that there are only three one-story non-contributing buildings proposed for demolition. The one three-story building, he continued, is contributing and would be restored. Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the plan involves gutting the building. Mr. Kaplin replied that the building is a warehouse that has been gutted at the second and third floors. Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether all the floors had been removed. Mr. Kaplin responded that all walls were removed from front to back and that the building functioned as a family warehouse for the Swift business for nearly 70 years. The second and third stories, he continued, show evidence of the original brick wall between

150 and 152 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. He explained that his team's intention is to repair and restore that wall; the renovations will extend to the first story to allow it to serve as a hotel lobby. He added that he intended to save as much of the façade and structure as possible and integrate it into the structure of the tower. The basement would also be retained, he noted, which would protect both 152 and 150 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street.

Marc Kaplin addressed their application to the Historical Commission despite needing zoning approvals by explaining that he has watched applicants go through the entire zoning process only to come to the Historical Commission and get denied. He commented that he experienced that scenario with an application for 22 S. Front Street. He remarked that he wanted to begin the Historical Commission review process up front and to pursue zoning simultaneously. If the Historical Commission were to approve the application, he would still need to go through the zoning process. Mr. Kaplin further explained that he requested a conceptual review, because he wanted feedback, knowing that it is a large project and anticipating what the initial reactions would be. He then noted that he applied to the Department of Licenses & Inspections to begin the zoning process.

Ms. Gutterman agreed with Ms. Stein that the lower portion of the building is handsome but that she also had concerns over the tower. She commented that the tower stands 30 to 40 feet taller than the large tower across the street. Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the applicants considered limiting the building to 18 stories, which would place the building at approximately 186 feet and fall closer to the vocabulary that has already been started. She stated that the inclination of each person to construct the tallest building is problematic. Mr. Adjmi responded that the process makes projects better. One important factor, he continued, is that he is not presenting this building as a precedent for further development. He argued that the site is unique and the proposal fits the site, given the size of the lot and the proximity to the bridge and the Bridge Approach District. He added that his team did not consciously work to make it the tallest building but considered the proportions of the building and designed it to be aesthetically pleasing. If there is a height that is not appropriate, he continued, his team could reconsider the design.

Marc Kaplin stated that there are 24 condominiums planned for the tower and that the tower only has a 5,000 square foot footprint, which is half the ground dimensions. Rather than make the tower shorter and wider, he continued, his team wanted to create a setback at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street of approximately 10 feet and a larger setback at Race Street. The goal was to eliminate the view of the tower from 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and keep the Race Street corridor visually open, he added. Ultimately, he continued, the tower is set back approximately 45 feet from Race Street. He contended that he would prefer not to make the building shorter and wider in respect to The Bridge across the street, which he thinks is a great building.

Mr. McCoubrey countered that The Bridge is at an edge, immediately abutting the Ben Franklin Bridge, and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street serves as the transitional point to the scale of Old City. He argued that, architecture aside, it is concerning to see a leap across Race Street at this scale into what is a three- to six-story community. Given the quality of the district, he continued, the proposed construction is inappropriate. He contended that The Bridge is a more unique site, given its location. If the proposed tower were invisible or minimally visible, he added, there would be a different discussion. He asserted that the tower is aggressively visible.

Marc Kaplin asked to better understand Mr. McCoubrey's comment and directed the Committee to a perspective drawing in the application's appendix that contextualizes N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street from approximately Elfreth's Alley. He identified several large buildings and argued that he set the proposed building into the streetscape. Ms. Gutterman countered that there is a difference between the 10-story building Mr. Kaplin identified and the 24-story building proposed. Andrew Kaplin clarified that the proposed building would stand 19-stories in height. Ms. Gutterman responded that the building would be 230 feet tall. She argued that, divided by 10 feet, which a more typical floor height, the building would be equal to 23 stories.

Mr. D'Alessandro contended that the building does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment.

Bill Becker, a retired architect and gallery owner, stated he has serious concerns over the proposed construction. He claimed his neighbors find that the underlying condition for approval lies in the zoning. He disagreed, adding that the bulk of the review falls on the Historical Commission. He encouraged the Committee not to consider the individual properties that comprise the larger lot or the building itself but to view it in the context of Old City. Old City, he asserted, is a unique asset in Philadelphia and is a draw for many tourists and residents. The appeal, he continued, is due to the appropriateness of its scale, materials, and details. He admonished the Committee to consider his argument and "do the right thing" for the community.

Stanley Taraila claimed he "did the original plan for Old City" in the late 1970s that helped revive the area and allow the small growth that happened. It is a shame, he continued, to see someone "raping" the neighborhood to make money. He added that he developed properties in Old City but held the buildings to 65 feet and contended that all developers and builders should be held to the same standard. He remarked that the applicants knew the code prior to developing the project and questioned why they disregarded it.

Marc Kaplin replied that he has a different perspective and that he has owned and developed property in Old City, including the recent construction of eight townhouses. Mr. Taraila interrupted several times. Mr. Kaplin asked to be able to speak. He then stated that he had frequently passed the corner of 2<sup>nd</sup> and Race Streets and ultimately invested a great amount of time in trying to acquire the properties under consideration. He spent time determining what type of use would benefit Old City and concluded that the neighborhood needed a hotel. He subsequently had a hotel study done that confirmed the lack of hotel availability in the neighborhood. At the prices of construction in Philadelphia, he continued, one cannot build a hotel. He noted that all hotels recently constructed in Philadelphia have been deeply subsidized with grants. In addition, he added, he has been informed that there is a desire for permanent residents as opposed to renters and believes that now is the time in the building cycle to develop a successful condominium building. He contended that the proposed building contains a small number of units, with only 24 units. He countered that he is not "raping" Old City but rather is proposing a building that benefits the district. In order to get a modicum of units, he continued, the solution required the design to go vertical. He further argued that it is not economically feasible to construct a hotel at this location. Mr. Kaplin offered an excerpt from a presentation made by the developers of The Bridge, adding that there is a history of larger buildings in the Walnut Street area. He noted the height of the Hopkinson House and Provident

National, stating that they set a precedent. He suggested that he and the Committee have different concepts of what the height limitations are. In his view, the 65-foot height limit in Old City is not appropriate.

Mr. Taraila responded that he built a 27-unit condominium within the 65-foot height limit and made money. The Committee members asked how many people wanted to speak and asked to move along the public comment period. Marc Kaplin addressed the previous comment, stating that a sufficient number of for-rent apartments exist already and that a hotel is a more difficult economic route. He explained that the cost would be supplemented by the condominium portion of the project. Mr. Taraila replied that he built a hotel on Delaware Avenue and was protested by Elfreth's Alley Association due to height, though the building was barely visible above the I-95 wall.

Old City resident Joe Schiavo noted that the applicant mentioned the need for dimensional variances and added that he understands the Historical Commission operates independently of the city's zoning code. He opined that creating zoning classifications with an associated floor area ratio (FAR) is an attempt to control the mass of any new construction built within the community so that the new building would then be contextual. He added that the zoning height limit is a maximum and that a developer need not build to the maximum allowed. Today, he continued, the zoning code is even more liberal, because of bonus tables that provide a mechanism to allow more FAR and height. The Bridge, in spite of its height, he argued, did not exceed its FAR, though it was built to the limit. Marc Kaplin countered that The Bridge was constructed in a different district enacted specifically for the building. Mr. Schiavo responded that it did not include an increased FAR allowance. This project, he continued, intends 1,300 percent FAR, which is 260 percent of the allowed FAR. He contended that Old City has a height limit in certain areas of Old City and not the entirety of the district. The same applicants, he asserted, were able to construct 22 S. Front Street without exceeding the height allowance, since that limitation never applied south of Market Street. Mr. Schiavo noted that the limit applies north of Market Street and claimed that the logic behind that difference is that the historic fabric north of Market Street is of a smaller, more sensitive scale. He noted that the parcel under discussion is contained within the area north of Market Street that is subject to height controls. Since the passing of the new zoning code in 2012, he continued, most new construction has not required dimensional variances and has been built by-right. He explained that the 65-foot height limit applies to properties zoned CMX-3 and that most parcels are required to retain a 15% open area. Mr. Schiavo reiterated that, with those zoning limitations, developers build by-right, arguing that the same can be applied to this N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street property. However, he claimed, the applicants have different ambitions.

Mr. Schiavo argued that, with those limitations, developers build by-right and that it could be done here, but the applicants have different ambitions. He asserted that the applicants constructed their own problems, adding that the applicants have not owned the parcels for decades and have only recently assembled them in order to build this large building. He reiterated that the applicants created their own problems and suggested that that is not reason for the Committee to yield in terms of the intention of the historic district regulations, which are posted on the Historical Commission's website and have been adopted by the Commission. The idea, he asserted, is to maintain the character. Mr. Schiavo then opined that he is a modernist and would prefer that a building be built in the style of The Bridge. He remarked that he never

thinks that a building built in Old City should look anything other than today. In order to make it contextual, he continued, the zoning code controls the scale of the building.

Andrew Kaplin asked to clarify one comment, stating that Mr. Schiavo's information about the proposed building intending to be 1,300 percent FAR is incorrect. Mr. Schiavo responded that he obtained his information from Mr. Kaplin directly and asked if his information is wrong. Mr. Kaplin stated that it is incorrect. Mr. Schiavo apologized.

Old City resident Rob Kettell introduced himself as a retired architect and community planner, adding that he was involved when the Old City Historic District was adopted. Businesses and residents, he continued, were proud of raising the funds to complete the research required. He commented that he and others thought the district plans would work well into the future. Mr. Kettell distributed an excerpt from the Old City Historic District property owners' guide, adding that the guidelines adopted at the time of designation are still appropriate. The importance of being contextual, he continued, stands as the strongest guide for new construction. He suggested that the historic district remains viable and argued for the importance of history. He congratulated the Historical Commission for adopting Old City as a district and for maintaining it, adding that he hopes it continues to do so in the future.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance invested quite a bit of time in reviewing the application, noting that Marc and Andrew Kaplin met with the staff in their office several weeks ago. He asserted that he understands their motives and that they hired a first-rate architect with the intention of bringing some design ambition to Philadelphia, which the Alliance fully supports. He noted that many of the comments already offered were similarly made by the Alliance's advocacy committee. He remarked that there was consensus that the base structure was contextual and does fit within Old City, adheres to the 65-foot height limit. He added that the committee was further satisfied with the planned treatment of 152 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, which was previously attempted to be removed from the Register. The ultimate issue, he continued, is that the scale of the tower is too much for most preservationists. He argued that it is not the building itself but rather the alteration to the district as a whole. There are several ways to mitigate the issue, he added, though there was not as much consensus on the method. One suggestion, he noted, is to build a smaller building that is unabashedly modern, adding that this building need not look like it was constructed in 1840 or 1920. He contended that there is flexibility in the building's appearance. The issue that preservationists, residents, and this Committee are struggling with is the size of the structure. The Bridge, he contended, is not the best comparable, because of all the zoning peculiarities and its placement at the edge of Race Street, being adjacent to the Ben Franklin Bridge. He concluded that he would love to see first-rate contemporary construction in Philadelphia, suggesting that it be accomplished in a way that is sympathetic to Old City as a historic resource. He questioned whether that type of proposal is currently on the table.

Center City resident Marta Guttenberg commented that she is considering purchasing an apartment in a building near the proposed construction. She expressed concern over the purchase and added that she appreciates the past development in Old City due to height limitations. She contended that just the six-story base of the proposed building, which she considered "bulky," would diminish the light and air entering the apartment she is considering purchasing. She then opined on the character of Quarry Street and asked the Committee to consider it when making a recommendation.

Eric Silverman, resident and member of the board of directors of the Elfreth's Alley Association, stated Elfreth's Alley is a National Historic District and draws over 300,000 visitors a year. The visitors, he continued, come specifically for the appearance and character of the community. He claimed that visitors often complain about and question why tall buildings, such as The Bridge and the new National Building, are allowed to be constructed in a district they are visiting for a very specific reason. He addressed the applicants' comments about hotels not being financially feasible without assistance and stated that tourists would not necessarily be interested in staying in a hotel in a 19-story building. He questioned why the applicants would not limit the proposal to the 65-foot base condominium building, if that is the profitable portion of the proposal. He concluded that the proposal would have a negative impact on visitor experience.

Elfreth's Alley resident Francis Purcell offered analogies on parenting and dentistry. In terms of dentistry, he stated that there are a number of holes in Old City and commented that it is nice to fill them, including the hole at N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. He commended the applicants for addressing the corner properties. He questioned whether the proposal is an exercise in futility, where the applicant is asking for a 230-foot tall building, which follows the construction of The Bridge, the National Building, 108 Arch Street, and another under construction across from the Betsy Ross House. He expressed concern over having four tall buildings and approving a fifth, commenting that he hopes the 65-foot limit will one day be enforced instead of allowing giant teeth to emerge. The result, he continued, will lead to more teeth.

Bev Hendry, chairman of Aberdeen Standard Investments, stated that he is a property owner on Elfreth's Alley and has seen cities where similar construction has occurred. That "creep," he continued, results in the disappearance of heritage and history. He added that he supports the redevelopment of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and Race Street site but considers the proposal too tall.

Professional historian George Boudreau stated his appreciation of Mr. Purcell's analogy. He opined that a 65-foot red brick hotel is appropriate and remarked that when he sees renderings of the proposed construction, he thinks the tower is a joke. He made comparisons to several recently constructed buildings in London, concluding that sometimes old and new construction does not work well together. He then compared Old City to Spitalfields in East London, which he noted was constructed at a similar time and in a similar style and also had similar problems with holes in the streetscape. Mr. Boudreau explained that a moderate though sensitively-designed boutique hotel was constructed immediately across from an important house museum. He argued that he does not see where the city is desperate for hotel space, nor did he understand the need for condominiums in Old City. He claimed that too much construction may soon lead to vacant spaces in the neighborhood. He implored the Committee to side with the history of Old City, which he called integral to the city and one of the oldest neighborhoods in the United States. It is a place, he continued, that has remained culturally and historically intact. He claimed millions of visitors come to Old City to walk the space and that the type of construction proposed with hurt residents and will destroy one of Philadelphia's main economic drivers.

Long-time Old City resident Janet Kalter expressed her dismay over The Bridge being used as a precedent, since it was not intended to serve as one. She stated that she loves the character of Old City and supports the strong comments already offered related to the preservation of that character. She asked to see a contemporary design at the location under consideration,

contending that there is not enough contemporary design in Old City. She concluded that the proposed building is not appropriate.

Marc Kaplin responded that the comments from Old City and Elfreth's Alley residents are interesting and asked Andrew Kaplin to offer a few comments on the need for a hotel at this location. Andrew Kaplin explained that he and Marc Kaplin have developed properties in Old City since 2003 when they purchased two parking lots. One, he continued, was located at 22 S. Front Street and the other at 232-40 Race Street. He commented that they built a seven-story condominium building south of Market Street where there were no height controls. He clarified that the original proposal included ten stories but that it was rejected by the Historical Commission at the time. He stated that he has developed projects involving new construction and the renovation of historic structures in Old City. During his time as a parking lot manager, he continued, a hotel was proposed at 5<sup>th</sup> and Race Streets. He added that hotels have been considered in this part of Old City for a number of years. He then asserted that he has lived in Old City for approximately 15 years and has watched it grow, which has included the transition from parking lots to buildings. He explained the development and growth of Race Street from the National Constitution Center to the Race Street Pier.

Mr. McCoubrey responded that he understands that the applicants have created a program that they feel is appropriate and necessary for the neighborhood but that the question of use is outside of the Committee's purview.

Marc Kaplin asked for clarification on the Committee's comments, adding that he understood their comments to be related to the building's height. He asked for further advice. Ms. Gutterman replied that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction pertains to the relationship between the proposed building and the Old City Historic District.

Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that the tower does not adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He called the tower incompatible to the district and contended that construction needs to remain within the 65-foot limit.

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

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:48 p.m.

#### **STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES**

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

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

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

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

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs—their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roof material such as slate, wood, clay, tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning. 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.