

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

**TUESDAY, 21 AUGUST 2018
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
NAN GUTTERMAN, ACTING CHAIR**

PRESENT

Nan Gutterman, FAIA, Acting Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Justin Detwiler
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
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Stuart Rosenberg, SHRA
Claudia de Leon
Michael Cole, MC Architectural LLC
Venise Whitaker
Elizabeth Nestor, NorthStar
Kyle Kernozek, BLT Architects
Julie Morningstar, BLT Architects
Nate Sunderhaus, BLT Architects
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su
Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop
Richard Conway Meyer, RCMA
Chris Burns
Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects
Maribeth Rentschler, Stanev Potts Architects
Robert Parsky, Parsky Architects
Ian Toner, Toner Architects
Bart Bajda, Toner Architects
Ray Rola

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Gutterman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Pentz, and Stein and Messrs. D'Alessandro and Detwiler joined her.

ADDRESS: 2314 GREEN ST

Proposal: Demolish rear-ell; construct 4-story rear addition and roof deck with elevator

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 2314 Green LLC

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

History: 1859

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 is nearly identical to an application for this same property reviewed by the Architectural Committee in June 2018. At that time, the Architectural Committee determined that that application proposed a lost and recommended denial. The current application again proposes to demolish much of 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, non-historic doors openings, window openings, doors, and windows. The upper section of the side of the rear ell is visible at a great distance, about 200 feet, from the public right-of-way across a courtyard as well as from Pennsylvania Avenue. In addition to the work at the rear, the application proposes an elevator penthouse on the main roof and a deck and railing that would cover much of main roof. The application also proposes two other roof decks. A site visit has confirmed that the railing and elevator pilothouse would be visible from the public right-of-way. The drawings again do make clear the extent of demolition.

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

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

Mr. Baron explained that the current application, like a similar one for this property reviewed in June 2018, still does not clarify the extent of demolition. Mr. Rosenberg informed the Committee that he would like to propose a revised design, which differs from the design distributed to the Committee members in their meeting materials packets. He explained that the revised design has no roof deck or elevator on the main block. It also proposes no demolition of the rear ell. In the revised design, the addition to the side of the rear ell would be restricted to the basement, first and second floor and would sit back to expose the rear corner of the building at the lower levels. The new construction at the upper level would add 16 feet in height, but would retain the shape of the shed roof.

Mr. D'Alessandro said that it would be important to provide a recommendation on the application as originally submitted and then comment informally on the new proposal unveiled at the meeting.

Ms. Gutterman asked for public comment, of which there was none.

Regarding the initial design, the Committee members agreed to recommend denial. Regarding the revised design, the Committee members thought that, in general, it was much improved because it reduced the amount of demolition. The Committee members expressed concerns about the independence of the new side wall from the neighbor's wall as well as potential

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 AUGUST 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

drainage problems. Mr. Baron raised concerns about stucco and engineering the side wall such that it would not result in demolition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the design originally submitted, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1511 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Reconstruct façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1511 Lombard St LLC

Applicant: Samuel Weiner, 1511 Lombard St., LLC

History: 1835

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 demolish the historic front façade of the row house at 1511 Lombard Street and reconstruct it. The Historical Commission denied a very similar application for the property in April 2017. Unlike the earlier application, the current application includes a letter from an engineer recommending that the façade be rebuilt. The letter does not indicate that the façade cannot be repaired. The letter mainly offers aesthetic concerns regarding the patched look of a repaired façade. The letter cites the replacement of windows and doors as well as infilling air conditioner holes in support of the rebuilding of the brick façade. In fact, the windows do not need to be replaced. A door replacement is unrelated to the structural stability of the facade and the infilling of air conditioner openings is a relatively minor repair. A new cornice would hide the mismatched brickwork at the parapet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Historical Commission's decision of 13 April 2017.

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

Ms. Pentz asked questions about the drawing showing a series of exposed straps. She asked whether it proposed an alternative to the rebuilding of the wall. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that it should be possible to reinforce the existing wall with Syntech anchors from the inside and Gunitite on the inside wall. Ms Stein observed that she was frustrated with the lack of any documentation of the condition of the existing wall.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Historical Commission's decision of 13 April 2017.

ADDRESS: 300-04 RICHMOND ST

Proposal: Replace windows; construct ADA ramp; install mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Kensington M.E. Church

Applicant: Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect

History: 1853; Kensington "Old Brick" ME Church

Individual Designation: 2/28/1967, 6/27/1967

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert the church at 300-04 Richmond Street into multiple residential units with a chapel retained for religious services. The application proposes to remove the stained glass windows from the side and rear facades. The application also proposes to add mechanical equipment to the roof of the building and repair the copper cornices. Although this application only requests an in-concept review, insufficient information has been provided for the Historical Commission and Architectural Committee to conduct such a review. Very little information has been provided about how the new windows will be divided or where spandrel panels would be placed. No roof plan for the main building is provided. No side and rear elevations are provided. No discussion of how the cornice might be modified is included. Without this information, it is not possible to render an opinion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Raymond Rola represented the application.

Mr. Rola distributed copies of revised drawings and Mr. Baron distributed copies of a letter submitted by the Philadelphia Archeological Forum raising concerns regarding the remnants of a cemetery in the basement of the church. Ms. Pentz asked about supporting the additional floors and if the supports would result in an archeological disturbance owing to the enlarged footings. Mr. Rola responded that that portion of the design has not been completed, but the existing foundation may be able to support the greater load with bolted ledgers. Mr. Baron explained that the owner has been making provisions for addressing the burials in the basement, speaking with the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum as well as the congregation and legal experts. The owner would like to disinter and reinter any remains that might be found in the basement at a cemetery where other congregation members previously moved. At the moment, the application does not call for any excavation in the basement.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the type of windows that would be installed on the side elevation. Ms. Gutterman asked about the plan for the windows being removed. Mr. Rola said that the windows on the Richmond Street façade would be retained. The windows on the north façade would be replaced with clear glass units. He explained that he has proposed two alternatives for the windows on Marlborough Street. In the first alternative, all of the windows would be replaced with clear glass and spandrel panels would be installed in locations to align with the new floor levels. In the second alternative, the top of the stained glass windows would be retained and wells would be created for the spandrels. The new clear windows would have a muntin pattern based on the first-floor windows, which are being maintained. Mr. Rola reported that they have no plan for the removed stained glass. Mr. Rola explained that the owner does not own the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 AUGUST 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

building, but has 60 days of due diligence to determine whether he can make the project work financially. Mr. Rola explained that they need three levels of units in order to make the financing work. Ms. Gutterman asked about the current and proposed roofing material. Mr. Rola replied that they have no plan for the roofing yet. Ms. Stein said that she is very concerned with the moving of the spandrels and the appearance of the windows.

Ms. Gutterman opened the floor for public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance said that he is also concerned with the disposition of the windows that are being removed. However, he is sympathetic with the goal of trying of reusing this empty church. He suggested that perhaps it would be easier to resolve the window question if fewer units were proposed.

Mr. D' Alessandro stated that he would approve of the installation of floors in concept. He noted, however, that he was not comfortable with moving the spandrels and reconfiguring the window patterns. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee should deny the application, owing to a lack of information and detail. She also acknowledged that the installation of other floors would be acceptable. She observed that there is too little known about the disposition of the windows, the possibility of retaining the spandrels and windows, the material of the roof, the potential for archeology, and the placement of any new mechanical equipment. She opined that the ramp was acceptable.

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

ADDRESS: 643-45 N 15TH ST

Proposal: Alter first-floor façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 643-645 N 15th St, LP

Applicant: Michael Cole, MC Architectural, LLC

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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 alter the ground-floor front façade of this building. The area of the façade to be altered currently has a non-historic storefront.

The application proposes to remove the storefront and partially recreate the two lost window openings as door openings. The new openings would extend down to grade. Flush metal doors would be installed in the openings, providing access to a trash room. The remainder of the openings above the doors would be infilled with double transoms. While removing the storefront and restoring the ground-floor window openings would satisfy the standards, the creation of openings that span the basement and first floor levels and the installation of the non-historic doors and transoms do not. Another solution for trash storage and removal should be sought. It should be noted that second-floor vinyl windows and capping as well as glass block in basement windows have been installed since designation without the Historical Commission's approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Michael Cole represented the application.

Mr. Cole explained that the building had been used for religious services and was much altered in the past by a previous owner. He reported that the current owner wishes to return the structure to residential use. He seeks to remove the storefront and partially restore the left side of the first floor based on the right side. Because the zoning code requires a trash room, he has proposed adding two metal doors to a new trash room. Ms. Stein asked if his client would be willing to forego the trash room and restore the first floor more completely. Mr. Cole replied that the trash room is a zoning requirement. Ms. Stein asked how neighboring properties address trash. Mr. Cole said that they carry their trash out.

Mr. Detwiler asked if the first-floor windows originally had transoms above the main windows. Mr. Baron replied that they did not. He noted that they should be arch-head two-over-two windows. Ms. Stein pointed out that the stone lintels and watertable should be marble not sand stone. Mr. Detwiler observed that these windows that they are giving up for a trash room would be prime windows in the first-floor apartments. He recommended applying for a zoning variance if necessary.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 318 LAWRENCE CT

Proposal: Construct front addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Hannah Kim and James P. Dunn

Applicant: Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect

History: 1970; Lawrence Court Townhouses; Bower & Fradley, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a fourth-story addition at the front of 318 Lawrence Court. The building, classified as contributing in the Society Hill Historic District, is one of seven identical townhouses constructed around 1970. These buildings were designed with a set back fourth story and front deck. Many of the neighboring Lawrence Court townhouses have enclosed the deck to create additional living space. This application proposes to construct a similar enclosure system with a series of casement windows, an offset brick pier, and metal panels.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ray Rola and property owner Hannah Kim represented the application.

Mr. Rola distributed a set of revised drawings to the Committee members. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Rola to explain the differences between the original submission and the drawings just distributed. Mr. Rola replied that the drawings show a more detailed elevation with the color scheme identified. The terratone color, he continued, matches the additions to other Lawrence Court buildings. He added that the revised application includes photographs of other additions. He stated that his intent is to match the proportions and color of the previous additions, although there are slight variations between each.

Ms. Stein thanked Mr. Rola for providing other examples of additions at Lawrence Court, adding that it is a prominent addition since it is flush with the face of the front façade. She stated that the Architectural Committee rarely recommends approval for front additions in the Society Hill Historic District. In this context, she continued, such an addition seems appropriate, and the examples are successful. She commented that one difference between the proposed enclosure and those of nearby buildings is the lack of symmetry. Every one of the examples, she observed, maintains the symmetry of the façade. She asserted that the symmetry is part of the success of those additions, because it reinforces the symmetry of the façade below. She found the proposed design to be off balance, with a horizontal window and paneling on one side and large, vertical casement windows on the other side. She asked whether there could be a solution that could provide symmetry, which she argued would be more successful and more in keeping with the context.

Mr. Rola responded that one or two buildings may not maintain that symmetry. He then explained that a shower is planned to be installed behind the portion of the addition with the horizontal window and metal paneling and that those elements offer privacy. He clarified that he considered using a solid metal panel to provide privacy, adding that other additions have a similar configuration. Ms. Gutterman replied that the use of a metal panel would be more successful. She agreed with Ms. Stein's comments and stated that the horizontal window disrupts the design.

Ms. Stein observed that the original application included a brick pier between the groups of windows. Mr. Rola responded that he eliminated the brick pier from his current design and that the vertical element between windows is a metal panel.

Mr. Detwiler supported the use of the dark terratone metal, adding that it allows the addition to recede. However, he agreed with previous comments, stating that the façade of the first three stories is so symmetrical that the upper level should maintain that rhythm.

Mr. Rola asked whether he could create symmetry by introducing a horizontal element, such as a transom, over the series of casement windows. The Committee was not receptive to the idea. Ms. Gutterman remarked that the verticality of the casement windows reflects the verticality of the other additions and windows in Lawrence Court.

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

The Committee considered recommending approval of the addition as revised, but did not reach a consensus.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the design as submitted, but approval a fourth-story addition with the fenestration redesigned to be symmetrical.

ADDRESS: 1401-15 ARCH ST

Proposal: Install marquee; replace roof signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1401 Arch, LP

Applicant: Kyle Kernozek, BLT Architects

History: 1898; United Gas Improvement Building; Wilson Brothers & Company, architects; Western addition, first-floor & roof alterations, 1926; Perry, Shaw & Hepburn, architects; Samuel Yellin, gates

Individual Designation: 6/24/1987

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a marquee at the first story and new lettering and lighting at the penthouse of the former UGI building. New metal letters at the penthouse will be installed on an existing metal sign. Spot lighting at the base of the sign will illuminate the lettering. The marquee is proposed at the first story of the Arch Street entrance and will be anchored with a tie rod to masonry above the storefront and at the jambs of the storefront, where the existing entrance includes a pocket and sliding gates designed by Samuel Yellin. The proposed marquee would be constructed of a steel structure with an oval-shaped skylight. LED lighting is proposed to backlight recessed panels within the marquee and to illuminate the sidewalk.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the marquee is installed in a manner that does not interfere with the sliding Yellin gates, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Kyle Kernozek and Julie Morningstar represented the application.

Mr. Kernozek elaborated on the details of the application, stating that they reference details of the historic building.

Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the installation of the marquee would impact the operability of the Yellin gates. Mr. Kernozek answered that it would. Ms. Stein asked whether the marquee could be modified so as not to impact the gates. Mr. Kernozek responded that to provide a sufficiently deep cover for people entering the building and to provide a signature sign for the entrance to the new residential units, the marquee would have to interfere with the operation of the gates. He explained that the gates are currently fixed in place and that the entrance is necessary for egress. He argued that there would be limited ability for the gates to be deployed.

Ms. Stein asked whether there is a gate at each side of the entrance. Mr. Kernozek affirmed that there is.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the marquee is necessary. Mr. Kernozek replied that the owner is looking to identify the new residential units being introduced and to provide coverage for people entering and existing through the main entrance.

Ms. Stein asked whether the gates are currently operable. Mr. Kernozek answered that they are not operable, though they remain in place with gears and a chain.

Ms. Pentz asked whether there are photographs of the gates. Ms. Stein replied that a portion of the gates is visible in one of the photographs provided in the application. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there are currently two gates that, if functioning, would slide to the center. Mr. Kernozek affirmed, adding that they span the entire portico.

In reviewing a section drawing, Ms. Stein asked whether the marquee could be moved in front of the sliding gates, although she questioned the accuracy of the drawing. Mr. Kernozek replied that the drawing is field dimensioned and located. He added that the largest constraint is structural and that his team is confident in how the marquee would tie into the wall as it is currently shown. He also commented that removability was one consideration. If the building were rebranded in the future, he continued, the marquee could be removed. He added that incorporating the gates would cause the need to find alternative egress.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the proposed "One City" letters are backlit or channel letters. Mr. Kernozek responded that they are uplit with an LED strip. Mr. D'Alessandro observed that the marquee includes a skylight and lighting, adding that he opposes the installation of the marquee.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the letters mounted at the roof. Mr. Kernozek replied that they would either be backlit or uplit with an LED light. Mr. Detwiler asked whether the back panel that the letters would be mounted to already exists. Mr. Kernozek responded that it exists and was installed in either the 1950s or 1960s and originally served as signage for UGI. The signage includes a painted metal enclosure, he added.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the color of the letters of both signs. Ms. Morningstar answered that both would be bronze. Ms. Gutterman asked about lighting at the roof. Mr. Kernozek responded that non-functional lighting currently exists in the signage housing and that he is proposing to upgrade those lights by installing LED lights to either uplight or backlight the sign. Ms. Stein observed that the drawings call for spot lighting. Mr. Kernozek replied that spot lighting currently exists.

Ms. Gutterman questioned how the marquee would be secured to the building. Mr. Kernozek answered that the marquee would be tied into an existing beam, which would carry the lateral load. He added that it would consist of two steel rods extending to an escutcheon. Ms. Stein asked whether the escutcheon could be reduced in size. She noted that the drawings show it as being 18-inches in height. Mr. Kernozek responded that the escutcheon could be reduced to 6-inches by 6-inches, but it would be off center. Ms. Gutterman requested that the escutcheon be

shown in elevation. Mr. Kernozek agreed to provide the detail, although he contended that the section shows the height and that it is off center.

Ms. Pentz stated that she does not oppose the work to the roof but that the ground-level work should move in the direction of restoration, including restoring the operability of the Yellin gates. Ms. Gutterman explained that the gates could never be closed owing to egress requirements, adding that they could still be made operable.

Ms. Stein agreed that the gates should not be left in the pockets without ever being seen and asked whether the marquee could be shrunk to allow for partial exposure of the gates. Other Committee members agreed.

Mr. D'Alessandro voiced opposition to the installation of any marquee, commenting that it does not respect the building's understated elegance. He called the marquee an advertising piece that does not have any other function.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that a minimum of 12 to 18-inches of the Yellin gates remain visible, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 251 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Construct glass addition; cut new entrances

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: University of the Arts

Applicant: James Wyper, III, Jacobs/Wyper Architects

History: 1906; Philadelphia Art Alliance; Wetherill Residence; Frank Miles Day & Bro., architects

Individual Designation: 4/28/1970

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a two-story glass enclosure in an existing rear garden area, and to replace an inoperable elevator and create an accessible at-grade entrance and new rear stair from Manning Street at the side of the building. No major alterations are proposed for the front façade. The existing ADA ramp along Rittenhouse Square Street would be removed as part of the construction of the glass addition, but the fence would remain. Two concepts are proposed for interior access to the new enclosure, which is set back slightly from Rittenhouse Square Street.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Peter Saylor and Mark Wieand represented the application.

Mr. Saylor stated that the University of the Arts has acquired the building in conjunction with the Arts Alliance. He noted that the University of the Arts has engaged his architectural firm to study

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 AUGUST 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

potential changes on the interior, in addition to the exterior project. Mr. Saylor explained that the rear garden has been used as outdoor dining space by previous restaurant tenants occupying the building. He stated that the most recent restaurant has closed but the University is interested in maintaining a restaurant in the building and has interviewed several restaurateurs who have expressed an interest in turning the garden into a year-round space.

Mr. Saylor continued that they are proposing to enclose the garden area with a glass box and party wall. He explained that the construction of an addition to the brick party wall at the rear of the property is a way to address future construction on the adjoining parking lot. Mr. Saylor noted that the Art Alliance has sold the parking lot and it is unknown whether something will be built next to the proposed glass addition. He stated that the proposed design envisions a glass wall along Rittenhouse Square Street and a glass roof. Mr. Saylor continued that the addition's interior is proposed as an open space and would include dropping the garden down to sidewalk level, therefore eliminating the current ramp that has been built in front of the historic railing and gate. He stated that the plan is to keep the historic railing and gate, allowing for plantings behind it and in front of the new glass wall.

Mr. Saylor explained that they are currently working on the details to attach the glass and not disturb the actual stonework on the existing building. He stated that the plan is to take the weight off the glass roof through new columns within the garden and on the rebuilt party wall. He noted that the party wall would be rebuilt in brick and they are currently studying the possibility of a series of smaller windows that might go in the party wall.

Mr. Wieand stated that two options for the addition's floor plan were submitted to the Historical Commission. He described the first option as allowing the garden to go from the sidewalk all the way back to the former servants' wing wall (north elevation wall in the garden area) on the back of the building on one level. He described the second option as opening up the dining room on the back wing and extending the dining room level out into the garden where there can be more tables and then steps down to a garden level dining area. Mr. Wieand noted that they were seeking permission to alter the lower windows on the north elevation wall and turn them into a series of doors that would open into the garden for both options. He stated that this would allow for a closer relationship between the dining and the garden on both sides.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the location of the elevator. Mr. Saylor responded that the new elevator is in the general area of the existing elevator but slightly pushed back. He noted that the main goal for the elevator was to provide an ADA entrance into the building that would enable access to all floors and to keep the elevator off the front wall. Mr. Wieand explained that, on the Manning Street side, a street grade entrance is planned for a newly created level that is four feet below the first floor. The entrance at street level on Manning Street will provide access to the elevator. Ms. Gutterman asked if the architects had an elevation drawing that showed this. They indicated that it is shown on SK-200. Mr. Wieand noted that they are proposing a new door directly under an existing window. Mr. Wieand also noted new stair exit on Manning Street near the back of the building.

Ms. Stein requested additional clarification for the proposed exterior alterations along Manning Street. Mr. Wieand responded that the two changes include the street level opening to access the elevator for ADA compliance and an additional stair at the rear. Ms. Stein asked the

architect to confirm that two windows will be removed, one for the new street level door and the other owing to the new rear stair. Mr. Wieand confirmed that this is correct.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a need for two stairs at the rear. She asked if one of them could be removed. Mr. Wieand responded that they could theoretically remove it. He noted that there is an alternate scheme in the restaurant floor plan that is being considered. He stated that, as shown on SK-301, the expanded terrace shown on the plan, they could conceivably reconnect what is shown as Stair B across the back space of the dining area to the existing stair out to Manning Street. Mr. Saylor pointed out that the back stair entrance would become the entrance for the guest quarters on the upper two floors. The upper floors could be accessed through this entrance without having to go through the first-floor spaces. Mr. Wieand stated that the overall intent of either scheme is to avoid the basement entrance and provide better access to and from the building.

Mr. Detwiler commented on the connection between the glass addition and the masonry wall at the east elevation. Mr. Wieand noted they tried to avoid connecting the green house to the cornice; the greenhouse connection would sit directly underneath the third-floor window sills. He explained that the upper windows would be outside the glass structure whereas the two lower windows would be within it.

Ms. Gutterman inquired if there were any changes proposed to the “west side” of the garden, specifically if the existing masonry opening would remain where they are and the size that they are. Mr. Wieand and Mr. Saylor confirmed that they were proposing no changes to the east façade of the building along the garden.

Ms. Stein stated that she preferred the terrace scheme of the two floor plan schemes presented. She stated that she prefers the terrace scheme because it removes the need for a handicapped lift.

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

The Committee members requested that the applicants provide additional information and detail on how the glass addition connects to the original stone façade of the building when the project is submitted to the Historical Commission for final approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 2042 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Construct decks, pilot house, and side addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sue Lee and Roan O'Sullivan

Applicant: Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 11/6/1975

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story addition at the side of the rear ell, a roof deck on the three-story rear ell, a pilot house and mechanical enclosure on the main block, reconstruct a rear deck on an existing one-story rear addition, and modify several window openings on the side and rear of the rear ell. The rowhouse is located three buildings in from the corner of N. 21st and Mount Vernon Streets, and as such, portions of the side and rear of the building are somewhat visible from N. 21st Street. The proposed two-story side addition will be clad in painted composite siding. Posts are proposed to support the upper roof deck above the slightly pitched roof of the rear ell. Railings for both decks are proposed to be horizontal black metal. No work is proposed for the front façade as part of this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the pilot house and mechanical enclosure are reduced in size and a mockup demonstrates that those elements are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the pilot house and mechanical enclosure are already reduced in size as much as possible and will not be visible from the front of the building, and will be inconspicuous if not invisible from the side of the building, but a mockup would confirm this.

Ms. Stein commented that a significant portion of brickwork of the rear ell is being removed to insert the new staircase addition, and it is at a vulnerable spot of the building structurally which could compromise the rear ell. Mr. Rasmussen responded that there will be steelwork at that corner to support it. Ms. Stein commented that a switchback stair is proposed, but perhaps a different configuration could fit better within the space. Mr. Rasmussen responded that he considered multiple stair configurations but the split-level condition made it such that the switchback stair is the only option. The Committee members asked about the extent of removal of parts of the side and rear wall of the rear ell. Mr. Rasmussen called out areas of the drawings to demonstrate where sections of the walls would remain or be removed.

Ms. Gutterman asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the pilot house and mechanical enclosure are reduced in size and a mockup demonstrates that those elements are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, and a structural engineering report is provided to the staff that documents that the

proposed alterations to the rear ell will not necessitate its complete demolition, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 262 S 16TH ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building; construct 7-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Briarpatch Holdings LLC

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop, Inc.

History: 1980

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-contributing building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District and to construct a seven-story building with pilot house and decks. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction. The fifth through seventh floors of the new building would be set back five feet from the front elevation. The front elevation would be clad in brick, and feature a stuccoed first-floor storefront and stucco cornices. The upper floors would feature three bays of paired windows. The north and south elevations would be clad predominantly in stucco, but transition to fiber cement siding at the rear.

The staff notes that the property is located mid-block along consistent three-and-a-half-story row and that the proposed seven-story building is not compatible with the scale, size, or massing of its surrounding environment. While there are nearby high-rise apartment buildings, they are located on corners, not mid-block. The staff suggests that the building be greatly reduced in height, the floor levels of the first three stories align with the neighboring buildings, and additional and greater setbacks be utilized for upper floors beyond the third floor. The ridge of the gable roof to the north is approximately 20 feet from the front elevation, which could offer a minimum setback for the upper floors of the proposed building. The staff also suggests using an alternative material than stucco for the storefront and cornices.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the new construction, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano explained that they are proposing to demolish the existing two-story building which is recessed from the street with an odd courtyard, and to construct a brick, seven-story building with a setback at the fifth through seventh floors. He noted that the new building would be faced with a red brick compatible with the streetscape, and detailed similar to the sills and lintels nearby, but in a red sandstone material as opposed to a white marble or limestone. He noted that the adjacent Monk's Café building is four stories with a mansard-roofed fourth floor, which is why they are proposing four stories at the street façade, with a setback for the upper three floors. He opined that, while the Bentley building on the opposite side of the street is a corner building, it carries up the street quite far, so that it is almost across the street from the subject property. He acknowledged that larger buildings are typically located on corners, but

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 AUGUST 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

opined that it is worth mentioning that the buildings on the block are fairly tall. He noted that, while this property is located mid-block, there are tall buildings nearby. He noted that this property is located near the gable-roof buildings and the mansard-roofed building on this side of the block. He conceded that the proposed first floor has a taller elevation than the adjacent storefronts, which are about 16 feet to the top of the first floor, and suggested that he could better align the upper floors.

Ms. Stein agreed with the staff comments that the proposed massing is inappropriate for this particular side of the street, which features a continuous block of three-story brick buildings. She opined that, unless the top three floors disappeared, she cannot imagine the proposed construction fitting in. Ms. Pentz agreed, noting that the long row of three-story brick buildings that would be disrupted with this construction. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, noting that the massing is overwhelming in comparison to the adjacent buildings with sloped roofs and dormers. Mr. Detwiler also agreed, pointing out that Photograph 7 on the cover sheet shows what the Architectural Committee is trying to preserve, which is the continuity of the block. He stated that even the lower four stories of the proposed construction are too tall, as they feature floor levels that do not align with the neighboring properties. Mr. Montalbano replied that the adjacent Monk's Café building is four stories. He noted that he met with the staff several times and discussed the importance of not creating a false sense of history by replicating the neighboring historic buildings. He noted that it was important to do something that is contextual in terms of massing and materials. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the staff always recommended that the floor levels align and that the building be limited in height. Ms. Gutterman noted that four stories might be acceptable, but the height of the first four stories in the proposed design is too great. She stated that seven stories is much too tall. Mr. Montalbano agreed to look into better aligning the first four stories with the adjacent buildings. Mr. Montalbano clarified that it sounds like the Architectural Committee objects to the overall height of the building and asked whether additional and further setbacks of the upper floors would be acceptable. Ms. Gutterman responded that, in her mind, anything over four stories is inappropriate. Ms. Stein reported that she might be amenable to more than four stories if the upper stories were completely invisible from the street. Ms. Gutterman observed that there is a one-story building on the corner, so it is likely that the upper floors would be visible from that angle.

Ms. Gutterman opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance noted that the Alliance is not opposed to some additional height on the block, but agreed with the staff that aligning the lower floors and creating additional setbacks for the upper floors could help mitigate some larger massing.

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

ADDRESS: 334 S HICKS ST

Proposal: Reconstruct façade; construct rear addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Christopher Burns

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1850; Refaced c. 1950

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct the front façade with new brick, replace doors and windows throughout the house, construct a new one-story addition and add a third story to an existing two-story addition at the rear of the property. The additions are to be finished in smooth stucco to match the existing. A roof deck is also proposed that would be located on top of the remainder of the existing two-story addition. Four new skylights are proposed to be installed on the roof of the main house, and an additional skylight is proposed at the rear roof of the new third-story addition. A new stoop is proposed in order to accommodate the new height of the front door.

The staff suggests reducing the height of the proposed third story addition so that it remains lower than the existing cornice of the main block.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Chris Burns, and architects Ian Toner and Bart Bajda represented the application.

Mr. Burns explained that he had owned the house for two years and lived in it for four years. He said that, as he and his architects approached the new design, they wanted to make the house look more consistent with the other houses on the block by changing the doorway, the transom, and the window configuration, and by making the house look closer to the original historic appearance.

Ms. Gutterman asked why they were proposing to replace the brick on the front façade, to which Ms. Schmitt responded that it was due to structural concerns. Mr. Burns explained that currently, there was bowing at the wall below the first floor joists, due primarily to settlement of the foundation caused by voids in the rubble front wall. He said that multiple structural engineers had looked at the house over the last two years and all had expressed concerns. Mr. Burns explained that one recommendation from an engineer was included in the application and that was to replace the front façade. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any way the front façade could be repaired rather than replaced.

Architects Ian Toner and Bart Bajda joined the meeting and introduced themselves.

Ms. Schmitt repeated Ms. Gutterman's question to Mr. Toner and Mr. Bajda. Mr. Toner responded that there had been some recommendations from the engineer about how to approach repairing the front façade. He went on to explain that the existing façade was not the

original, and what they were proposing was to reconstruct a more historically accurate façade using more historically accurate materials as part of the project. Mr. Toner said that they were considering the replacement of the 1950s-era façade to be an improvement to the building. Mr. D'Alessandro confirmed from the staff overview that the façade had been refaced in the 1950s.

Ms. Gutterman asked if it was possible to construct the overbuild at the rear addition without resting it on top of the original roof structure, so that the addition's roof would connect below the cornice. Mr. Toner responded that they had tried their best to keep it low; however, at this proposed height, they were already at the minimum for head clearance inside in order to be able to get out on to the roof deck. He explained that the only way to reduce the height would be to obtain a variance for ceiling height or not construct the addition at all. Ms. Gutterman asked about the height at the stairwell's top floor and Mr. Bajda replied that it is seven feet and six inches. Mr. Toner directed the Architectural Committee members to Drawing H4 and explained that seven feet six inches was the minimum legal ceiling height per the code. Ms. Gutterman said that it could still be lower, and that the roof could be sloped. Mr. Toner replied that he supposed that he could slope the roof off to the side, down towards the roof deck. Ms. Gutterman stated that there was a way to avoid the overbuild. Mr. Toner explained that his client would be stepping from the existing floor down onto the first step if the ceiling were lowered. He stated that, if he dropped the roof lower, he would be encroaching on the required head room walking through the doorway. Mr. Toner said that he could certainly side-slope the roof towards the roof deck, but the part that is currently shown as higher, that is actually touching the existing roof, is at its lowest possible point. Ms. Gutterman stated that she believed that doorways could be seven feet and comply with the building code, and that made her think that there was a way around the issue. Mr. Toner replied that he would certainly take a look at the matter.

Ms. Gutterman said that she is aware that the applicant said that the skylights at the front of the roof would not be visible, but she opined that they would be visible from the street. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Ms. Gutterman, and added that they would also glow at night.

Mr. Detwiler asked if there was a reason why windows F and G on the side elevation shown on Drawing H2 were different sizes. Mr. Toner said that he believed that they were to be replaced in kind, and Mr. Burns confirmed that they were existing openings. Mr. Toner directed the members of the Architectural Committee to look at the existing conditions photographs in their packets.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the members of the Architectural Committee had any further comment. Mr. D'Alessandro said that he was in agreement about the skylights at the east elevation.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Schmitt about the staff's comments on storm doors, to which Ms. Schmitt replied that they approved them.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, in particular of the headroom issue at the proposed new addition, and the elimination of the skylights at the east elevation, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 318 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mary Morrisette

Applicant: Mary Morrisette

History: 1970; Nancy Grace House; Stonorov & Haws, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story rear addition on this 1970 building at the corner of South 4th and Cypress Streets, which is classified as contributing in the Society Hill Historic District.

Three in-concept applications for this building have been reviewed recently by the Architectural Committee. A June 2017 application proposed a three-and-a-half story colonial-style building at this site. The Committee recommended denial, and encouraged the applicant to submit an application that did not propose demolition of character-defining features. The application was withdrawn prior to review by the Historical Commission. A December 2017 application proposed demolition of portions of the building, and construction of an addition to create a three-and-a-half story modern building with metal panel bays, using some of the existing building as a base. The Commission voted to deny that application, owing to the prohibition against demolition and because it did not satisfy the Standards, and suggested that the applicant propose a plan that did not radically change the building. In May 2018, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved a third in-concept application. The proposal was thought to have responded well to comments that had been made regarding the massing, shape and compatibility of the addition.

The current proposal is for a second-story addition with a flat roof at the rear. Notes on the plans indicate that the addition will have a grid-patterned applied wood panel system with windows punched throughout. The existing chimney is to remain but will be raised in order to meet code. The existing fascia and roof shingles of the contributing structure are to be replaced. A previous plan to excavate the crawl space to create additional living space has been removed from the proposal.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Conway Meyer represented the application.

Mr. Meyer said that this is a charming building by architect Oscar Stonorov, especially because of the way it sits on the corner. He said that the two newer buildings that flank the entrance to Cypress Street made it a really good and lively corner. Mr. Meyer stated that it was in building the model that he really began to understand how complex it was. He said that the building made a lovely turn, and then it ended, and that was the scheme. Mr. Meyer went on to say that any addition that purported to be a "Stonorov Jr." was doomed to failure, and that it would water down Stonorov's original design. Mr. Meyer said that the Nancy Grace House provided a background of all kinds of scales and beautiful windows. He remarked that he decided that if he

were to design an addition that took its place among the background, it would do two things: it would set him up to not try and imitate Oscar Stonorov and it would also allow for Stonorov's original building with its two facades to be all that would be seen. Mr. Meyer stated that he guessed that if he could get the scale right, which took a while, and kept the addition polite and shy, it would result in the best of Stonorov and the best of him. Mr. Meyer added that at the upcoming Historical Commission meeting, he wanted to bring a three-dimensional model to show that the profiles of the panels would be very light. He said that the design of the addition was not heavy handed, and that he had done one that had been heavy handed and that it had not turned out very well.

Ms. Gutterman asked how much the chimney was being raised, to which Mr. Meyer responded that it would be raised eight feet. Ms. Gutterman asked if it was the front chimney, and Ms. Stein and Mr. Meyer confirmed it would be the rear chimney. Mr. Meyer explained that the rear chimney was 33 inches deep and 24 inches wide.

Ms. Gutterman asked what Mr. Meyer envisioned for the finish of the applied wood system, to which he replied that it would be either wood or Azek that could be painted. He mentioned Pantone 436 with a satin finish as an example of a paint that he would propose, so that it would not be too shiny or too dull. Mr. Meyer remarked that it would only have to be painted once every 25 years. Ms. Stein and Ms. Gutterman asked if Pantone 436 was a red or brown color, to which Mr. Meyer replied that it was a very warm grey. Ms. Gutterman clarified that the front of the house was white and red brick and that Mr. Meyer was proposing medium to dark grey panels at the addition. Mr. Meyer responded that this was intended as a ground by which Stonorov's scheme could be understood. Ms. Gutterman asked what color he was proposing for the window frames. Mr. Meyer said he did not know, but probably a lighter version of the color of the wood. Ms. Stein asked if the idea of choosing the grey color was because it disappears, or falls into the background. Mr. Meyer stated that it was a background color, explaining that it was the color one would paint a wall to put a beautiful sculpture in her dining room.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro if they had any comments. Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that he thought the design had finally gotten there, and Ms. Pentz agreed. Mr. D'Alessandro said that the design had the artistic value that had been so difficult to deal with and the simplicity needed. Mr. Detwiler said he thought the proposal was lovely. Ms. Stein said she thought the scale and proportion were finally there. She asked about the aluminum coping strip and whether it was typical to have it beveled, as it was being shown. Mr. Meyer replied that he had written coping strip in error, and that it was actually a piece of flashing. Ms. Stein asked if it would be painted the same grey color and Mr. Meyer said he thought it would be. Ms. Stein said she would be opposed to painting in white, and Mr. Meyer agreed. Mr. Detwiler suggested painting it a lead color, and Mr. Meyer agreed, saying that he appreciated the suggestion and that the color would weather beautifully.

Ms. Gutterman opened the floor for public comment. Robert Parsky introduced himself as an architect and a neighbor of the house. He said that he had worked with Oscar Stonorov for the four years while this project was in play, first with the design, and then with the construction. Mr. Parsky said that, having seen the previous versions that had been submitted, he thought that this was a really good solution for the corner, that he was extremely comfortable with it, and that he wanted to put that into the record. He added that he believed that others in the neighborhood would be just as happy.

Bob Careless introduced himself as the attorney for Mr. Gunther, who resides directly next door to the house at 320 S. 4th Street. Mr. Careless explained that they had been before the Architectural Committee before at the in-concept level where they objected to the plan and they continued to object to it. He stated that a theme that was presented during the in-concept review was that some buildings were meant to be left alone and that he thought this idea should be maintained here. Mr. Careless distributed photographs of Mr. Gunther's property to the Architectural Committee members. He explained that the first photograph was a view of Mr. Gunther's house from Cypress Street looking through the back of the subject property. He said the second photograph was a view from Mr. Gunther's property taken from the second window, and the third photograph was the opposite view taken from Cypress Street. Mr. Careless stated that he wanted to give the members of the Architectural Committee an idea of what the addition was going to look like. He restated that they believed that the property under consideration was designed for a reason. Mr. Careless remarked that he was aware that the applicant had a full set of plans but neither he nor his client had seen them and that they had only seen what was emailed to them. He said that he did not know how far back the addition would go, noting that the house would have three bedrooms but that he did not know where the third bedroom was supposed to be. Mr. Careless stated that there was a proposed carport but that he did not see any dimensions or description of it. He added that Mr. Gunther would object to any addition that would obstruct his windows. Mr. Careless said that, with the last in-concept design, the addition would have obstructed about four or five of Mr. Gunther's windows, and now, based on the model, it looked like it would be about three. Mr. Careless remarked that this would have an adverse impact on the quality and character of Mr. Gunther's property.

Ms. Stein said that she had a follow up question, asking whether there were any alterations proposed to the existing site walls. Mr. Meyer responded that there were some sections that were not in good shape that would be repaired or rebuilt, and other sections that were in good shape. Ms. Stein confirmed that the sections that were in good shape were existing to remain, and then asked if there was a gate to be repaired. Mr. Meyer responded that there was a strange looking gate made of very dark wood that was eight feet wide, so a car could fit through it and pull into the garden, but he did not think that a carport had ever been mentioned by the owner. Ms. Gutterman asked for confirmation that there were no proposed changes to the brick walls that surrounded the property, and Mr. Meyer confirmed it.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any additional public comment. Patrick Grossi introduced himself as a representative of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia. He said that the Alliance had commented on all previous iterations and agreed that the current proposal was by far the best one he had seen. He remarked that the challenge had always seemed to be simplicity and massing that quietly complemented Stonorov's design, which was what had been accomplished here. Mr. Grossi said that while he could appreciate the neighboring property owner's concerns, properties would change over time, and so the Preservation Alliance was in support of the proposal.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any further comment from the members of the Architectural Committee, and there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the wood panels and window frames are painted a mid-warm grey color; a slightly lighter grey paint color is used at the aluminum coping; and that no

changes are made to the existing site walls, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 135 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Modify entrance; install marquee, signage, lighting

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 135 S 18th Street Associates, LP

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1913; McIlvaine & Roberts, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a new canopy and lighting and replace windows and doors at the main entrance of the building, located on 18th Street. An existing banner sign that was installed without permission from the Historical Commission will be removed and light fixtures will be installed on both sides of the entrance. The proposed double-hung wood windows and the new entrance doors with sidelights are very similar if not identical to a 2008 Historical Commission approval that was never executed. The proposed dark metal-clad canopy will tie back with angled rods near the top of the two-story entrance way at the jamb. The details of the connection points are to be determined upon further inspection in the field and in coordination with the staff.

Two signs are proposed at the corner of the third story of the building, with one to be mounted on the Walnut Street façade and the other to be mounted on the 18th Street façade. These painted metal signs with cut out letters will be back-lit with LED lighting, and will be attached through existing mortar joints. A third sign is proposed at the same corner but on the roof, facing west. The sign will be mounted on to a steel support and will be set back from the existing parapet. The applicant has provided two options for lighting, the first being internally illuminated and the second being uplit from a light source that would attach to the steel support, not the contributing structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the canopy and signage, provided that the doors and windows at the entrance are restored, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Ryan Lohbauer and Maribeth Rentschler represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants had an image of the proposed light fixtures, and Mr. Lohbauer asked which location she was referencing. Ms. Gutterman clarified she was asking about the light fixtures at the entrance. Mr. Lohbauer explained that there are two existing light fixtures embedded in the ground that are currently not functional, and the proposal is to make them functional again. Ms. Gutterman sought clarification that nothing was proposed to be mounted on the building itself, and Mr. Lohbauer confirmed that the fixtures were only in the ground. Ms. Gutterman asked if the historic light fixtures seen in one of the images in the application were coming back. Mr. Lohbauer replied that they were not.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant could address the need for so much signage including the marquee, as well as the signs at the corner and roof. She said that the building was a residence, not a hotel that needed to be branded so that people could see it. Mr. Lohbauer corrected Ms. Gutterman, explaining that the building is now used as a hotel. When the property was acquired by the current owner in 2007, it was transformed into a long-stay hotel. He said just recently in 2016, they were able to do life-safety upgrades to the interior that allowed the property to become an R1 standard hotel. Mr. Lohbauer remarked that this property was one of the flagship properties for the AKA brand, hence the need for much more visible signage. Ms. Gutterman responded that, in that case, there was a problem with the signage facing west, because traffic comes from the east. She rhetorically asked who would be able to see a roof top sign from either the corner of Walnut Street or 18th Street. Mr. Lohbauer responded that they had taken a look at the visibility of the rooftop sign, and it was intended for the heavy pedestrian traffic to the west. He said that the sign would be visible from the ground, and that it was not just about the automobile traffic and the direction of that traffic, but it was about the foot traffic in and around Rittenhouse Square and the Walnut Street corridor. Ms. Gutterman responded that she did not believe that pedestrians would see a sign at the roof, but perhaps the marquee sign would be visible. Others observed that the Committee should employ preservation standards as its review criteria, not other measures. Ms. Gutterman said that she thought that there was too much signage and that the applicant would need to choose either corner signs or a marquee. Ms. Gutterman added that she was not sure about the roof sign because she did not know who would be able to see it, and told the applicant that they needed to figure out how and where they were going to brand the building.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she presumed that everyone wanted the marquee in order to have some sort of protection to stand under in foul weather, and Mr. Lohbauer agreed that the marquee was a functional component for the loading area outside of the main entry. He went on to explain that there were many similarities between this building and the former Franklin Hotel at 9th and Chestnut Streets in terms of signage. Mr. Lohbauer said that the former Franklin Hotel building had both corner and marquee signage, as well as a roof sign that was added after the original construction was complete. He remarked that they were serving different audiences in terms of wayfinding. Mr. Lohbauer stated that rooftop signage had surprising visibility from other areas in the city, sometimes being visible from farther away. He went on to say that corner signage was definitely more targeted towards people homing in on the hotel as they got closer to it. Mr. Lohbauer said that, because the building under consideration started its life out as a residential building, the signage was part of giving it a local identity, something that was really known to people as the AKA Hotel. Ms. Gutterman responded that they already also had the bar that had signage that said AKA so she was not sure what the additional corner signs would do that the other branding did not already do. She referred to a photograph in the packet, stating that there was already signage that said AKA all over the bar at the corner. Mr. Lohbauer responded that that signage was associated with a tenant, they were looking for a more long term solution, and although he did not think that there were any immediate plans for the current tenant to change, but, if there ever was, they would want the proposed signage. Ms. Gutterman said, that in her mind, that was in the future, and she was not sure what adding two small objects was getting them. She said that she understood the marquee but she was somewhat at a loss about the corner signs. Ms. Rentschler explained that the signs proposed for the corner were illuminated whereas the one on the building was not, to which Ms. Gutterman responded that that meant they would drill a hole through the stone. Mr. Lohbauer said that they were going

to locate the attachment points for the sign at grout points to avoid any damage. Ms. Gutterman asked how they were going to get electricity to the sign, because that would have to come through the stone wall. Mr. Lohbauer replied that they would work to minimize any holes or modifications to the stone.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there were other comments from the other Architectural Committee members. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he was against the corner signs and the rooftop sign, asking if every building that wanted to be seen now had to have a rooftop sign. He said once rooftop signs are placed on some structures, they will start to be placed on every structure. Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that it would start a precedent, with people wanting to see the tops of buildings from 20 miles away, and adding that this building needed more respect.

Ms. Pentz agreed that there was too much signage, and that she would like to see it scaled back somehow.

Ms. Stein stated that she thought the marquee was fine, and that the extra signage on the marquee was fine because they were removing the banner sign at the entrance as part of the project. She added that the staff would need to make sure that the stone was replaced properly when this work occurred. Ms. Stein said that she supposed since the building was on 18th Street, she would not be opposed to one sign on the corner of Walnut Street, however she was opposed to the rooftop sign.

Mr. Detwiler stated that he was opposed to the rooftop sign as well, saying he did not think it was in keeping with Rittenhouse Square. He said that the canopy seemed fine to him, though he was wondering about the connections where it hits the windows because the steel connectors seemed wider than the trim of the window. Mr. Lohbauer replied that he believed that that was a detail that could be worked out with the staff, and Mr. Detwiler agreed. Mr. Detwiler said that, in terms of the corner signage, he was less bothered by it if it was non-electrified, adding that there was enough light at that corner, even at night time, that it would still be seen.

Mr. Lohbauer asked if they could add a quick, intellectual counterpoint about the historical context, saying that hotels definitely have a need for a greater presence and that this was one of the few buildings on Rittenhouse Square that was functioning as a hotel. Ms. Gutterman disagreed, remarking that the Rittenhouse Hotel was still a hotel, and that there was a long-term stay hotel at 19th and Locust Streets.

Mr. Lohbauer commented that most of the buildings on Rittenhouse Square are apartment buildings, so this situation is unique and distinct from some of the other conditions on Rittenhouse Square. He explained that there is a long history of having signage and especially rooftop signage when it came to hotels. Mr. Lohbauer added that the Divine Lorraine was another great example of a building that was originally constructed as multi-family, and when it underwent a hotel conversion, there was an additional need for branding and wayfinding. He stated that in a historic context, rooftop signs definitely had their place.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the canopy and its signage; denial of the rooftop signage; and denial of the corner signage, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 2115 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Demolish garage; construct 4-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Phillip, LLC

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1890

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-historic garage and to construct a four-story building on the rear of the parcel along Manning Street. The proposed building would feature a recessed first floor with a cantilevered brick façade above, and irregular fenestration. The fourth floor would feature a slightly angled façade clad in horizontal metal panels.

The staff notes that the use of a recessed first floor, sliding doors, irregular fenestration, a faux mansard roof without a cornice, and metal panels is incompatible with the historic district and the historic property in massing, materials, and architectural features.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Ryan Lohbauer and Maribeth Rentschler represented the application.

The architects distributed revised drawings to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Lohbauer noted that they appreciated the staff's comments on the original design and tried to respond to those in the revisions. Ms. Rentschler explained that they are trying to be sensitive to the historic context and that the comments helped them in that regard. Mr. Lohbauer explained that they understand that the recessed first floor did not have a context in the neighborhood, so they removed that element and replaced it with a flush base with a watertable. He noted that there is an alleyway that accesses the central court, which they originally proposed to also cantilever, and have revised so it is also flush. He noted that they would like to retain the mansard roof, but have revised the proposal to feature a slate or imitation slate material. He noted that there is now a slightly-protruding metal band acting as a cornice to delineate the mansard. The asymmetry of the window fenestration is more muted. Ms. Rentschler explained that the bays are intended to be more reminiscent of the historic bays present along the block, but to be differentiated from them. She noted that the building will be set back nine feet from Manning Street, which is technically an alley, and that views of the proposed construction will be limited. Mr. Lohbauer explained that they are not proposing any alterations to the original historic structure, which is not visible from the rear. Ms. Gutterman asked what is proposed for the nine-foot setback area. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the property is multi-family, but the proposed construction would be a single family unit, and the setback area would be used as its front yard. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there would be a wall or parking. Mr. Lohbauer responded that

they are not proposing parking, and are actually replacing an under-used garage, which was constructed in the early 2000s and is difficult to use. He noted that there is no parking required here from a zoning standpoint and that they hope the proposed construction will bring some of the residential character from Van Pelt Street onto Manning Street. Ms. Gutterman asked whether this is the only residential front along Manning Street. Mr. Lohbauer responded that there is a stuccoed single-family property on Manning Street.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if there are any building sections. Mr. Lohbauer responded that there is a partial building section in the packet. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the application is incomplete without a complete building section.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the Architectural Committee has reviewed numerous applications for the installation of parking on historic properties. Ms. Rentschler replied that they did research into other similar RM-1 properties in the historic district on similar streets, and she noted that it is common for historic buildings to extend all the way through to the alley behind them. Mr. Lohbauer explained that the property is an existing six-unit multi-family property, and the proposed construction would be the seventh unit on the property.

Ms. Gutterman noted that they are proposing a roof deck, but that the drawings do not show a railing. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the mansard is designed in such a way that the deck would be concealed behind a parapet wall. Ms. Gutterman asked where they are proposing to install their mechanical equipment. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the mechanicals would be located on the roof deck adjacent to the pilot house and would not be visible from the street. He noted that the parapet would be 42 inches in height.

Ms. Stein questioned the visible side elevation and the use of brick for the fourth floor. Mr. Lohbauer responded that they are open to suggestions on the most appropriate way to clad that elevation. He noted that there is historic precedence for a flush masonry side elevation carrying up the fourth story, as well as use of a true mansard on the side elevation.

Ms. Stein asked how many four-story buildings there are along Manning Street. Mr. Lohbauer responded that there is a mix of two, three, and four-story structures along Manning Street. Ms. Rentschler noted that RM-1 properties tend to carry the four-story height all the way through to the alley behind. Mr. Lohbauer noted that the first length of Manning Street coming from 21st Street has four-story structures that extend along both the north and south sides of the street.

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

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the drawings for LV-5 do not accurately depict the mansard and dormer conditions. Mr. Lohbauer agreed, noting that the plans will be updated to show the dormers.

Ms. Stein questioned how the materials of the proposed construction relate to the historic building on the property. Mr. Lohbauer explained that historic building is rectangular and faces along Spruce Street. In the 2000s, he noted, the property was purchased by architect Greg Olson, who added a long, thin addition to the rear. The proposed construction would only connect to the addition. Mr. Lohbauer explained that the original 1890s mansion is red brick and features a slate mansard roof, which the proposed construction would imitate, if not replicate

precisely. He noted that the existing rear addition is clad in stucco. Ms. Rentschler noted that the front façade of the historic building is asymmetrical, as is the proposed construction. She noted that the new materials would be differentiated from the old.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design, with the recommendation that the side elevation is clad in red brick for the first three stories with the fourth floor clad in a slate or slate-like material, and provided the pilot house is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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.