

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

**TUESDAY, 18 DECEMBER 2018
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-031
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair	x		
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP	x		
Rudy D'Alessandro	x		
Justin Detwiler	x		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	x		
Suzanne Pentz	x		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP		x	

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

- Laura Keim, Stenton
- Deborah Woodward, Krieger Architects
- Dennis Pickeral, Stenton
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Julie Morningstar, BLT Architect
- Jianan Zhang, BLT Architect
- Juanda Myles, Citizen Planner
- Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
- Rich Solomon, Melrose Group
- Rob Nicol, CCD
- Steve Bussey, CCD
- Elizabeth Nestor, NSOR
- Richard Roark, Olin
- John Marshall, Marshall Sabatini
- Mike Opdahl, Marshall Sabatini
- Ted Agoos, Agoos Architecture + Design
- Dennis Flannery, University of Pennsylvania
- Ke Feng, University of Pennsylvania

Drew Hamilton
David McArthur, DPMRA LLC
Allan Edmunds
Sara Shoaf, PJA Architecture
David Fante
Christian Jordan, PJA Architecture
Al Fuscald

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 4600 N 16TH ST

Proposal: Construct addition; install ramp, doors, and dormers; add parking
Review Requested: Review In Concept
Owner: City of Philadelphia
Applicant: Deborah Woodward, Krieger + Associates Architects
History: 1723; Stenton Mansion and Log House
Individual Designation: 6/26/1956
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make a series of modifications to the northwest elevation of the service wing, which includes the c. 1790 kitchen, 1811 greenhouse, 1960s restrooms, and c. 1730 carriage house. The modifications are the result of a decade-long study to explore improvement options to the wing as a means of separating office and visitor spaces, creating accessibility, upgrading restroom facilities, and clarifying visitor circulation. Several options for the new offices and restrooms were considered including adapting the barn and log house, constructing a new stand-alone building, and acquiring offsite space. After much deliberation, the current proposal was deemed the least intrusive and most effective.

The application proposes to separate the administrative and visitor functions by relocating offices to the second story of the kitchen. To accommodate the offices, a 1930s dormer would be removed and replaced with two new shed dormers. The new dormers would feature a series of one-over-one windows and would have standing seam metal roofs. The cheek walls would be clad in wood siding.

At the greenhouse portion of the wing, the application proposes to install an accessible visitor entrance that would clarify and demarcate the tour entrance and ticketing area. Owing to the varying floor levels at the interior, the entrance would be elevated several feet and would require new steps and an ADA ramp. A modern glass double-door system would be punched through the existing stucco wall, and a sliding barn door would enclose the door system.

The application further proposes to reconstruct the 1960s bathroom, originally created by infilling the space between the greenhouse and carriage house. The exterior wall would be clad in wood siding above a concrete water table. A new standing seam copper roof would be installed to match the existing metal roof.

The application proposes to create a dedicated program space within the carriage house. A large infilled opening would be reopened in the existing stucco wall, and a double door system with sidelights and a transom would be installed. Like the entrance proposed at the greenhouse, this new entrance would be comprised of modern glass doors with two sliding barn doors;

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 18 DECEMBER 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

however, this entrance would remain at grade. The location and dimensions of the entrance are based on an existing lintel that once defined a historic opening.

A driveway extension is proposed to connect the existing parking lot to a future parking lot planned behind the barn, located at the periphery of the site, with access to N. 18th Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the dormers, but approval of all other aspects of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9 and the Accessibility and Roofs Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Dennis Pickeral and Laura Keim of Stenton and architect Debbie Woodward represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee questioned whether the space above the kitchen would be viable without changing the dormers.
 - The applicants responded that, without the proposed dormers, the space could not accommodate the private office or staff meeting space.
- The Committee questioned whether the size of the dormers was necessary, noting that the proposed size would compromise a substantial amount of historic fabric, including historic framing.
 - The applicants responded that the goal is to place two desks within the dormer space, so the size is dictated by the proposed use.
 - The applicants further noted that the building, unlike the mansion or other outbuildings on the site, has been significantly modified over time.
 - The applicants then commented that, through a long planning process, the current proposal was found to have the least impact on the historic fabric while still offering the required programming space.
- The Committee suggested that the details of the dormers be carefully considered so that the dormers are differentiated from the historic fabric but not modern in appearance.
- The Committee suggested that the impact of all proposed changes be reflected in a site study.
 - The applicants responded that they included a landscape master plan and revised preservation treatment plan that shows how the proposed changes will reorient visitor flow.
 - The applicants noted that all exterior alterations to amenity space will be limited to one side of the building, while the side of the building facing the early twentieth-century Colonial Revival garden will remain unchanged.
- The Committee questioned the purpose of the new entry door to the carriage house, asking for clarification on whether its intention is for egress, light, or another purpose.
 - The applicants responded that it will provide an accessible entrance and will also restore a historic entrance to the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The massing of the proposed dormers should be reduced so that more historic roof material is retained, satisfying Standards 2, 5, and the Roofs Guideline.
- If the dimensions of the dormers differ from one another, the larger dormer should be placed farther away from the mansion house, pursuant to Standard 9.
- The restroom addition should be designed with more vernacular detailing that differentiates it from the historic fabric but is not so distinctly contemporary, complying with Standard 9.
- The addition of the ADA ramp and entrance as proposed are sensitively placed at the carriage house where a historic opening once existed, satisfying Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the dormers as presented, but approval of all other aspects of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9 and the Accessibility and Roofs Guidelines, with the following comments:

- the restroom addition should be designed in a manner that is less contemporary and defers to the architecture of the site; and,
- the massing and detailing of the dormers should be revised.

ITEM: 4600 N 16th St				
MOTION: Denial of dormers; approval of remainder with conditions				
MOVED BY: D'Alessandro				
SECONDED BY: Cluver				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x			
John Cluver	x			
Rudy D'Alessandro	x			
Justin Detwiler	x			
Nan Gutterman	x			
Suzanne Pentz	x			
Amy Stein				x
Total	6	0	0	1

ADDRESS: 1401-15 ARCH ST

Proposal: Install ADA ramp and storefront with stairs

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1401 Arch, LP

Applicant: Kyle Kernozeck, BLT Architects

History: 1898; United Gas Improvement Building; Wilson Brothers & Company, architects; Perry, Shaw & Hepburn, architects of addition, 1927

Individual Designation: 6/24/1987

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application for the United Gas Improvement Building follows two previous applications for a marquee, signage, roof deck, and façade repair, both of which were approved by the Historical Commission. The current application proposes to modify the existing stairs at the southeast corner and to construct an ADA ramp that will abut the stairs and extend along the Broad Street façade. The ramp would be clad in granite to match the granite of the existing stairs, and new metal picket railings would be installed along the entire ramp and stair system.

The application also proposes to create a new storefront to support additional commercial space at the westernmost bay of the Arch Street façade. The modification would require the installation of a single-leaf door, stairs clad in granite, and a metal picket railing. At its 10 May 2000 meeting, when the Historical Commission approved the installation of a new storefront at the western bay, it required that “if another door is introduced at the west end, it must be symmetrical with the existing entrance.”

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided membranes are installed between the historic facade and the new ramp and stairs for reversibility, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:37:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Julie Morningstar and Jianan Zhang represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee requested clarification regarding access to the retail spaces from the Broad Street entrance and lobby.
 - The applicants responded that the entrance leads to a lobby and a chair lift that provides access to two retail spaces.
 - The applicants elaborated that the exterior ramp would provide access specifically to the retail space at the southeast corner of the building, adding that the residential portion of the building would have a separate interior ramp.
 - The applicants further explained that a ramp was explored for the western Arch Street entrance, but it was not accepted by the National Park Service.
- The Committee questioned how the ramp would allow an individual in a wheelchair to enter the building, observing that there is not a sufficient landing or clearance for the door to open. Committee members suggested widening the landing to allow for the proper turning radius.

- The applicants responded that the National Park Service did not allow for the modification of the existing door or landing, and acknowledged that there are issues with the functionality of the current design.
- The Committee discouraged the applicants from installing a ramp along the Broad Street façade, and generally questioned the appropriateness of a ramp anywhere on the building.
 - The applicants stated that there were benefits to placing the ramp at the Broad Street façade, owing to the slope of the site, which allows the ramp to be shorter than if it were placed along Arch Street.
- The Committee commented that ADA access to the eastern retail space is provided through the main Arch Street entrance and asked why the same cannot be provided to the western retail space.
 - The applicants answered that there are security concerns arising from the security team having to escort people to retail spaces.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- A wheelchair lift would offer more functionality than the proposed ramp, which is not code compliant, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline.
- Interior access to both retail spaces, rather than the construction of an exterior ramp or lift, would be most appropriate for the building, pursuant to Standard 9.
- The modification to the western entrance may be acceptable but is dependent on the final design of the eastern entrance and would require a future application.
- The removal of a mullion and two panes of glass and replacement with one large pane of glass at one of the Broad Street window openings is acceptable and considered a restoration of the original condition.

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

ITEM: 1401-15 Arch St				
MOTION: Denial				
MOVED BY: Cluver				
SECONDED BY: Gutterman				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x			
John Cluver	x			
Rudy D'Alessandro	x			
Justin Detwiler	x			
Nan Gutterman	x			
Suzanne Pentz	x			
Amy Stein				x
Total	6	0	0	1

ADDRESS: 236-38 MONROE ST

Proposal: Remove rear of house; reinstall party wall; construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Monroe Associates, LLC

Applicant: Richard Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1790; 1845

Individual Designation: 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove an existing rear addition, constructed in 1971, and to construct new rear additions and a party wall, returning the property to two single-family residences. The 1971 rehabilitation of the two properties into one house noted that 236 Monroe was constructed circa 1790 and 238 Monroe was constructed in 1845. The roof and dormer of 238 Monroe were constructed as part of that renovation.

The application calls for the restoration of the front facades and front gable roofs of the two properties. The staff notes that some of the details shown in the application differ from the 1971 drawings and from the historic photograph of the property. The application calls for aluminum-clad windows, but the staff recommends that the front façade windows be wood simulated-divided-lite; that the top sash of the dormer windows feature arched glazing, per the 1928 photograph of the property; and that the windows at the first and second floors of 236 Monroe feature nine-over-nine windows. The shutters for the second and third floors of 238 Monroe should be louvered with a 60/40 configuration. The application proposes a single-lite window in place of the former alley gate at 238 Monroe. The staff recommends that a solid door/panel be installed in this location instead of a window in order to give the appearance of the original alley gate.

The application proposes to retain the full front slope, ridge, and a portion of the rear slope of the gabled roof and to build a three-story addition set below the ridge. The rear of the property is landlocked. The exposed side walls of the addition would be clad in cement clapboard siding, and the rear facades would be fully glazed. Cement clapboarded-sided pilot houses and decks would be set back approximately 25 feet from the front facades. The pilot houses are shown at 10 feet in height.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the front façades are restored to their historic appearance and a mock-up shows that the pilot houses will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and the Roofs Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:58:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rich Villa and owner Rich Solomon represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked if demolition plans were included in the submission and opined that their absence constituted an incomplete application.
 - The applicants responded that demolition plans had not yet been completed.

- The Committee questioned why the project was not considered a demolition.
 - The staff responded that only the rear portions of the building are being removed, and those portions are non-historic and date to 1971.
- The Committee questioned the exterior gate referenced in the overview.
 - The applicants clarified that, historically, there was a covered alley accessed by a gate along the side of 238 Monroe Street, but that alley was removed during the 1971 renovation and the house expanded to fill the entire first floor. A single-lite window was subsequently installed behind the opening.
- The Committee asked what portions of the building are original and what portions are newer.
 - The staff clarified that the historic rear walls of the property have been removed and that the existing rear wall dates to the 1971 renovation of the two buildings into one house.
 - The applicants clarified that the 1971 renovation included the rehabilitation of the front facades, the demolition of the rears of the properties, and the construction of a gable roof and dormer at 238 Monroe.
- The Committee discussed the absence of structural drawings to save the front facades in the application.
 - The applicants responded that the intention is to save the façade and first-floor framing of 238 Monroe and the façade and three floors of framing at 236 Monroe.
 - The applicants noted the attic framing does not exist and that the front wall of 238 Monroe is bowing and there is water damage.
 - The applicants noted that they have engaged a structural engineer.
 - The Committee noted that the single downspout may not be sufficient to properly drain the runoff from the two pole gutters on the roof.
- The Committee suggested exploratory demolition on the interior to determine the condition of the front façade.
 - The applicants responded that it is difficult to get permits for exploratory repairs.
- The Committee noted that the rear of the property is landlocked and, with the possible exception of the pilot houses, the addition would not be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - The applicants offered to diagram the sightlines for the pilot houses, including from the perpendicular American Street.
 - The Committee commented that the pilot houses are too tall and should be lowered.
 - The Committee suggested that the applicants explore reconfiguring the interior stairs to reduce the height or slope the roof of the pilot houses.
- The applicants confirmed that the roof decks are only proposed on rear of the addition and that the elevator does not extend to the roof.
- The Committee questioned the front façade details referenced in overview.
 - The staff responded that some of the details shown in the proposed drawings are incorrect.
 - The applicants responded that they would restore the facades based on the 1971 drawings.
 - The staff clarified that not all of the details shown in the 1971 drawings are correct, based on additional historical information, and that the 1971 drawings were not actually approved by the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rear of 236-38 Monroe, the entire roof of 238 Monroe, and portions of the roof of 236 Monroe date to 1971.
- The attic floor framing at 238 Monroe does not exist.
- Demolition plans that identify the different campaigns of construction should be included in the Historical Commission submission.
- Structural drawings for the retention of the front facades and portions of the interior framing should be reviewed by the staff.
- The rear of the property is landlocked and not visible from the public right-of-way.
- The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials and the new work is differentiated from the old, and compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the property, complying with Standards 2 and 9.
- The pilot houses should be lowered by one foot or to the code minimum height, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.
- Both facades are original and should be saved and repaired, pursuant to Standard 6.
- The applicant should work with the staff on the correct details for the restoration of the front facades, including window and shutter details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the front façades are restored to their historic appearances; the heights of the pilot houses are reduced; and the applicants submit demolition drawings identifying the dates of construction; with the staff to review details including a mock-up confirming that the pilot houses will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way; pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and the Roof Guidelines.

ITEM: 236-38 Monroe St				
MOTION: Approval, with conditions				
MOVED BY: Gutterman				
SECONDED BY: Cluver				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X			
John Cluver	X			
Rudy D'Alessandro	X			
Justin Detwiler	X			
Nan Gutterman	X			
Suzanne Pentz	X			
Amy Stein				x
Total	6			

ADDRESS: 1400 JOHN F KENNEDY BLVD

Proposal: Construct structure in Dilworth Park

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia, Department of Public Property

Applicant: Steven Bussey, Center City District

History: 1901; City Hall, City Council Chambers; John McArthur Jr., architect

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story café in Dilworth Park. The café would be located at the southwest corner of the park, just south of the existing lawn space. It would be approximately 40 feet in length, 25 feet in depth, and 11 feet in height, and require five feet in excavation for the foundation. The structure would be clad in mirrored spandrel glass and terra cotta panels. It would be surrounded by an exterior green screen trellis system and feature a green roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 1:16:29

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Landscape Architect Richard Roark and Center City District representatives Steven Bussey and Rob Nicol represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee questioned the structure on which the green trellis grows.
 - The applicants responded that they are proposing an expanded wire mesh system up which a combination of winter creeper and evergreen clematis will grow. The vines will have an 18-inch irrigated soil bed.
- The Committee questioned the opacity and reflectivity of the mirrored glass.
 - The applicants responded that it is a bronze spandrel glass with an opaque backing.
- The Committee questioned the proposed signage and how it would be illuminated.
 - The applicants responded that there would be a Starbucks sign with internally-illuminated extruded letters on the front of the structure, and a projecting logo sign on the rear of the structure.
- The Committee questioned whether any supplemental lighting of the structure is proposed.
 - The applicants responded that one pedestrian light fixture is being relocated, but that no other lighting is proposed.
- The Committee questioned the lack of a buffer between the sidewalk and the rear wall of the structure.
 - The Committee opined that the proposal puts a blank façade and turns its back on a main city sidewalk.
 - The applicants responded that the southern edge of Dilworth Park is not as well defined as other portions of the park owing to the lack of a grade change between the park and sidewalk, and that the structure of the space is better bounded by something more substantial.

- The Committee questioned whether there would be issues with trash overflowing onto Penn Square.
 - The applicants responded that CCD has a good operational record in regards to trash removal, and that the green screen would conceal the service area at the rear of the structure.
- The Committee questioned the height of the green screen.
 - The applicants responded that the structure is 11 feet in height, and the green screen would extend approximately seven feet in height.
- The Committee questioned the purpose of the break in the green screen at the rear, noting that it presents a blank wall to the street.
 - The applicants responded that the structure is pre-fabricated.
 - The Committee commented that, although the break in the screen provides some scale, it should have visual interest to the street.
 - The applicants noted that the break in the green screen was suggested by the Art Commission.
- The Committee questioned the functionality of the green wall and the durability of the plantings given their proximity to a high-traffic pedestrian zone.
 - The applicants responded that they considered the pedestrian proximity in choosing the plantings.
 - The applicants noted that CCD tracks pedestrian patterns, and the pedestrian traffic along the stretch of sidewalk at the rear of the proposed structure is more limited than along other portions of sidewalk.
- The Committee opined that the background materials in the precedent photographs show greater visual interest and more of a layering of textures than is proposed.
 - The applicants responded that the structure and its plantings will be in a context of other existing plantings.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- the applicants should study installing an interstitial planting buffer between the sidewalk and the rear of the structure;
- the applicants should include an element of visual interest in the location of the break in the green screen on the rear of the structure;
- the applicants should present samples of the proposed cladding materials to the Historical Commission; and,
- the installation of the pre-fabricated café structure does not destroy historic materials and is differentiated from the old and its massing, size and scale are appropriate, protecting the integrity of the historic property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9, with recommendations that the applicants explore installing a buffer between the sidewalk and structure, and making the void in the green screen more inviting and interesting.

ITEM: 1401 John F Kennedy Blvd				
MOTION: Approval, with suggestions				
MOVED BY: Gutterman				
SECONDED BY: Cluver				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X			
John Cluver	X			
Rudy D'Alessandro	X			
Justin Detwiler	X			
Nan Gutterman	X			
Suzanne Pentz	X			
Amy Stein				x
Total	6			1

ADDRESS: 3600 LOCUST WALK

Proposal: Alter window openings; construct exterior fire stair, retaining wall, and steps

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Ke Feng, University of Pennsylvania

History: 1899; Psi Upsilon Fraternity House; G.W. & W.D. Hewitt, architects

Individual Designation: 4/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add an exterior, steel egress stair connecting the second and third floors to grade on the building's west elevation. Two windows adjacent to the fire stair will be removed to allow for two fire-rated egress doors to be installed within the existing openings. The remaining nine windows adjacent to the stair are proposed to be protected by the installation of interior mounted, rolling fire shutters to retain the historical character of the existing windows. The application provides an alternate option to remove the existing nine windows and replace them with fire-rated new windows. Also, a code-compliant, concrete stair on grade with the associated retaining wall will replace an existing, non-code compliant stair which provides egress from the basement to grade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the rolling fire shutters are installed to existing windows, not the fire-rated windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 1:33:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Ke Feng and Dennis Flannery, University of Pennsylvania, and architects Mike Opdahl and John Marshall represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee suggested that provided a site plan would be helpful to understanding the location of the proposed fire escape.

- The Committee inquired what the occupancy of the building is and why is the proposed fire escape so large. The Committee noted that it is big in both width and length, and that the IBC requires that a stair that serves fewer than 50 people is only 36” wide, or only 22” wide for a historic building.
 - The applicant responded that they were aware of the 36” requirement but that the dimension was driven by the existing area of the basement stair.
- The Committee asked if the building has an existing sprinkler system, as this would be their preferred and least intrusive option and would not require the removal of historic fabric.
 - The applicant confirmed the building does have an interior sprinkler system.
 - The applicant noted that the University prefers sprinkler heads near windows or fire-rated windows. The University does not prefer rolling fire shutters.
- The Committee inquired if the basement railing would be replaced and recommended that it be reused. The Committee also commented on the overly large size of the basement walls.
 - The applicant responded that their intent was to replace the basement railing.
- The Committee questioned what type of door would be used to access the fire escape. The Committee noted a preference for a door with glazing. The Committee also asked if the stone lintel would be retained and for the reason for including a transom above the door.
 - The applicants responded that they could specify a door with glazing and that a transom was included in the design because the door opening (once the historic window and masonry was removed) was taller than a standard door opening.
 - The Committee suggested removing the transom above the and instead installing taller doors in the opening. The Committee suggested that the upper portion of the door have glazing and the lower portion have a solid panel, thus allowing the same historic proportions of glazing and solid. The solid panel should be in the area where the masonry has been cut out.
- The Committee commented that the proposed fire escape is very visible and will have a negative impact. The Committee inquired if the applicants had explored other options.
 - The applicants responded that they had explored a number of options included an egress stair in the interior, but that it would have a negative impact on the building’s social spaces and that it also did not provided a true second means of egress.
 - The applicants also stated that they plan to paint the fire escape a color that will help it blend in with the wall and to add plantings for screening.
- The Committee inquired if the University has been issued a violation for not having a second means of egress for this building.
 - The applicant responded that no violation had been issued; this proposal is a proactive measure by the University.
- The Committee asked if there is a code acceptable solution that does not require an additional stair. Committee members suggested that proposed stair is a desire, not a code mandated requirement.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- the proposed fire escape, although on the rear elevation, is very visible and will have a negative impact on the historic building;
- the applicant should do more research on the code requirements for a second means of egress for this building;
- the applicant should explore options for reducing the size of the fire escape;
- adding sprinkler heads near the windows is best rather than installing fire-rated windows or rolling fire shutters;
- the proposed doors should be full height in the openings and the transoms should be eliminated. The doors should have upper glazing and a lower solid panel as part of their design;
- the basement stair railing should be reused rather than replaced;
- the basement stair walls should be minimized; and,
- the fire escape should be painted a color that allows it to better blend in with the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that:

- sprinklers are used to provide protection at the windows, not the fire shutters or fire-rated windows;
- the doors are full-height, paneled doors that extend to the existing stone lintel, with the lintel to remain, with a solid panel where stone will be removed;
- the basement stair railing is reused;
- the foundation walls are minimize;
- the fire escape or stair is painted a color that blends with the building; and,
- and options for a narrower stair or fire escape are explored;

with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ITEM: 3600 Locust Walk				
MOTION: Approval with conditions				
MOVED BY: Cluver				
SECONDED BY: Gutterman				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X			
John Cluver	X			
Rudy D'Alessandro	X			
Justin Detwiler	X			
Nan Gutterman	X			
Suzanne Pentz	X			
Amy Stein				X
Total	6			

ADDRESS: 563 AND 565 JUDSON ST

Proposal: Remove roof deck; construct additions and roof deck

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 1601-03 Ridge Avenue, LP

Applicant: Ted Agoos, AGOOS Architecture+Design

History: 1863

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to remove an existing roof deck and construct a set-back roof deck with cupola at 563 Judson Street, and construct a two-story addition on the vacant lot at 565 Judson Street. The proposed addition is set back eight feet from the façade of the rowhouse at 563 Judson Street, and a small garden is proposed for the front yard. The applicant seeks to differentiate the exterior cladding material of the new addition from the brick of the existing rowhouse. Red square tiles are depicted in the drawings; however, board and batten and ground-face block are also possibilities which were discussed during a meeting with the staff.

This in-concept application treats the rowhouse at 563 Judson Street with more sensitivity than a 2017 application, which was reviewed by the Architectural Committee but withdrawn prior to review by the Historical Commission. That application, which was recommended for denial, proposed a towering three-story addition on the vacant lot and a setback roof addition on the existing rowhouse with deck. Keeping the addition to two stories is more appropriate for the context of this block, and the proposed setback from the front facades of the row helps to maintain the view that has held the corner for many years. However, the addition is slightly taller than the existing rowhouse and the fenestration does not carry the rhythm of the other houses in the row. The height and visibility of the cupola require additional study.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept of a roof deck and rooftop access at 563 Judson Street, and approval in-concept of a two-story addition at 565 Judson Street, with differentiated materials and a cornice line to match the height of the adjacent rowhouse, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 1:55:18

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ted Agoos and prospective buyer Allan Edmunds represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee was split about whether the new addition should be set back from the front façade of the existing rowhouse or should be built out to the street. Two members thought it should be built more or less flush with the existing façade and two members found either option acceptable.
- The Committee was concerned with the height of the proposed cupola.
 - The applicants responded that the issue of the cupola had been raised during discussions with some members of the Spring Garden Civic Association. The applicants agreed that they wanted to keep it as low as possible, and that it

was currently approximately eight feet high. They explained that, rather than build a pilot house, their proposed design was intended to create transparency.

- The Committee expressed concern about the visibility of the proposed cupola from the public right-of-way, and noted that, if the addition was built out to the sidewalk on Judson Street, it could help minimize the visibility of the cupola.
 - The Committee opined that building out to the corner would also help to minimize the view of the row of garages at the end of the block.
 - The applicants responded that they agreed with the suggestion.
- The Committee suggested that the façade of the new addition did not have to precisely align with the existing houses in the row, and that perhaps it would be good to differentiate it slightly.
 - The applicants responded that they had discussed setting the façade back approximately one to two feet with the Spring Garden Civic Association, and their response was that they would prefer it to be either set back or flush, but not slightly stepped back.
- The Committee expressed concern about how the existing building would be connected to the new addition.
 - The applicants responded that they had spoken with their engineer about minimizing the penetrations to the existing party wall.
- The Committee opined that the fact that the cupola spanned the two buildings helped to show that they were conjoined in a way that the facades would not.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The scale of the addition was much more appropriate than the previous application.
- The cupola should be as inconspicuous as possible from the public right-of-way.
- The previously proposed front garden at the addition should be removed and the addition should be extended out and either be flush with the existing façade or set back from it slightly.
- The applicants should prepare sightline studies to demonstrate the visibility of the cupola.
- Details regarding the window and façade treatments should be further developed with the assistance of staff.
- The roof of the new addition does not need to precisely align with that of the existing building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept of the revised design provided that:

- the addition extends to or almost to the sidewalk line;
- the cupola is lowered in height, smaller in scale, and sightline studies show that it will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way;
- a soft joint is installed at the connection between the existing building and addition with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 563 and 565 Judson St				
MOTION: Approval, with suggestions				
MOVED BY: Cluver				
SECONDED BY: Detwiler				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x			
John Cluver	x			
Rudy D'Alessandro	x			
Justin Detwiler	x			
Nan Gutterman	x			
Suzanne Pentz	x			
Amy Stein				x
Total	6	0	0	1

ADDRESS: 502-04 S JUNIPER ST

Proposal: Demolish rear wall, roof, and garage, construct additions with roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James J. Ernst

Applicant: Hans Stein, Stein Architecture/Planning Associates, Inc.

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear wall and roof of the historic three-story building and the adjacent non-historic, one-story garage. It is almost identical to an application that the Historical Commission reviewed in October 2017. A brick four-story addition would be constructed on the garage site and would feature a garage at the first story, large sliding doors and Juliet balconies at the second and third stories, and two six-over-six windows at the fourth story. A large roof deck is proposed on the addition. The application also proposes removing the sloped roof of historic three-story building and installing a standing seam metal roof-like structure that is cut away for a deck and stair. The stair would connect the two decks, and the three-story building would be enlarged at the rear to occupy the full depth of the lot. Other work to the historic building includes replacing windows and doors, and installing new limestone lintels on the front facade. The staff contends that, with the removal of the roof and rear wall, the application proposes a demolition, the destruction of a building in significant part, and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The applicant has provided several engineering reports one of which concludes that the building should be demolished. The report by Keast & Hood indicates that the building can be repaired. "We see no reason that the structure would not be suitable for renovation and continued use." The report does not call out damage to the roof. The application makes no hardship, reuse, or public interest arguments.

The staff recommends that the applicant retain the historic roof, delete the roof deck on the old building and put the stair either on the new addition behind the existing building or in the new structure. The work could then be construed as an alteration rather than a demolition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the Historical Commission's previous denial and Standards 2 and 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 2:20:34

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee discussed whether the proposal constituted a demolition in the legal sense.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if the amount of demolition was the same as had been proposed in the earlier application and if the building had been allowed to deteriorate since that application was reviewed.
 - Mr. Baron explained that the amount of demolition currently proposed was the same as proposed earlier, but that the applicant had now supplied engineering reports. He said that the building had been allowed to deteriorate in the intervening period.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that none of the reports said that the house was in imminent danger of falling down. She quoted from the Elton & Thompson report that said that "work required to restore the building would require extensive work to restore the brick walls". She noted that this may be expensive but not impossible. She concluded that the current application does not constitute a hardship application.
 - Ms. Gutterman expressed a concern that demolishing the rear wall may destabilize the whole structure.
 - Ms. Gutterman said that demolishing the roof and installing a deck on the main house would be unacceptable.
 - Committee members noted that the Keast and Hood report had eight bullet points describing how to stabilize the building and that all of them were fairly standard treatments for old buildings.
- The Committee members did not object to the idea of building the internal stair in an addition at the rear.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application does not constitute a hardship application.
- The property can and should be stabilized and restored rather than demolished, according to suggestions found in the applicant's engineering reports.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to the Historical Commission's denial of October 2017 and Standards 2 and 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

ITEM: 502-04 S Juniper St				
MOTION: Denial				
MOVED BY: Gutterman				
SECONDED BY: Detwiler				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X			
John Cluver	X			
Rudy D'Alessandro	X			
Justin Detwiler	X			
Nan Gutterman	X			
Suzanne Pentz	X			
Amy Stein				x
Total	6			

ADDRESS: 1330 RODMAN ST

Proposal: Demolish rear wall; construct 3-story addition with pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Drew Hamilton

Applicant: David McArthur, David P. McArthur RA LLC

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a one-story rear shed addition and 3 feet 8½ inches of the existing rear addition and to construct a three-story rear addition with roof deck and pilot house. The only visibility of the rear of this property from the public right-of-way is from a small section of Juniper Street, to the east of the property. Photographs demonstrating this minimal visibility are included on the last page of the application. The roof deck is contained to the new rear addition, and the pilot house roof is sloped to minimize any potential visibility. The rear addition is proposed to be either stucco or siding. Work proposed for the exterior of the main block fronting Rodman Street is limited to removal of the existing brown and red paint, and an intention to work with staff on the approval of new windows at a later date.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 2:29:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Drew Hamilton and architect David McArthur represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee questioned the process for removal of paint on the front façade.

- The applicants responded that they would hire a qualified mason and use a PROSOCO product or equivalent, and agreed to consult with the staff throughout the process.
- The Committee suggested stucco or fiber cement siding for the rear addition, rather than vinyl siding.
 - The applicants agreed to the use of stucco or alternate cladding, rather than vinyl siding.
- The Committee suggested that the new construction not include an overbuild that rests on the existing roof structure, and that the location of the rear master bath window be reconsidered owing to its proximity to the corner.
 - The applicants agreed to further develop construction drawings and look into options.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Fante, 1332 Rodman Street, non-opposition to application, and desire to discuss construction schedule and logistics with owner.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed changes to the rear of the property will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The proposed changes to the rear of the property include demolition of a non character-defining rear ell wall, and construction of a rear addition that is differentiated from the old but compatible with the surrounding historic context, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed rear addition could be removed in the future, and the essential form of the existing rear ell would remain, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the applicants to consider suggestions discussed, and with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 1330 Rodman St				
MOTION: Approval				
MOVED BY: Gutterman				
SECONDED BY: Detwiler				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x			
John Cluver	x			
Rudy D'Alessandro	x			
Justin Detwiler	x			
Nan Gutterman	x			
Suzanne Pentz	x			
Amy Stein				x
Total	6	0		1

ADDRESS: 4328 MAIN ST

Proposal: Construct 3-story mixed-use building with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 4328 Main Street, LLC

Applicant: Donovan Clarke, 4328 Main Street LLC

History: 1925; demolished, 2016

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story commercial and residential building with roof deck on Main Street in the Manayunk Historic District. The historically designated building on this site was demolished in 2016, after it was declared imminently dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The Historical Commission approved a three-story commercial building with roof deck on this site in 2017. The rendering of that approved building is including in this application. The current application, which is reflective of a change in use of the proposed new construction, contains none of the façade elements which made the 2017 application more compatible with the historic district, including scale, proportions, and façade rhythm. The windows have been changed from industrial-style multi-pane windows to aluminum windows which emphasize their verticality. The storefront has changed from cast stone with a multi-pane folding window system, to a HardiePanel siding with a single-pane folding window system. The rooftop addition has been moved closer to the front façade of the building, although it appears to have been reduced in width from the 2017 approved application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 2:41:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Donovan Clarke and architects Christian Jordan and Sara Shoaf represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee questioned why and how the application changed since the 2017 approved design.
 - The applicants responded that the property owner has changed, and the use has changed from a restaurant to a by-right mixed-use residential and commercial one. The current application acknowledges the ground floor rear along the towpath, which was a criticism of the 2017 application. The windows have changed owing to an interior change to apartments, which necessitates windows at locations that coincide with interior use. The previous owner also owned the building next door and was proposing to get air rights from that property, which is now not the case, resulting in a party wall condition.
 - The roof deck was communal in the 2017 approval, but is now proposed to be a private deck for the third-floor apartment unit, owing to interior access.

- Architects focused on view looking west on Main Street, and how new building can fit with both small and large-scale surrounding buildings, which utilize larger windows that enhance verticality.
- The Committee suggested that there is an industrial heritage to Main Street Manayunk, which includes mill buildings, and the industrial appearance of the 2017 approved design has been entirely lost in the current application. The Committee acknowledged party wall limitations.
- The Committee suggested that a site plan, building plans, sections, and renderings or other means of showing context are included with the application for review by the Historical Commission.
 - The applicants responded that the lack of inclusion of these drawings was an oversight, and they will be provided to the Historical Commission for review.
- The Committee suggested that the proposed deck will be highly visible from Main Street, and setting the railing back further may not have a noticeable impact, and visibility from the towpath side is less of a concern. The Committee suggested that a communal roof deck is preferable to a large, private roof deck, and acknowledged that the Historical Commission approved a very large roof deck for this proposal in 2017. The Committee suggested that the deck be held back an additional distance from the front façade to limit its visual impact on Main Street.
 - The applicants responded that they incorporated comments from the Committee's review in 2017 regarding making the railings and pilot house lighter in color to better fade into the background, and that there is no way to completely hide the roof deck from the public right-of-way. The 2017 approval included two stair towers with elevator, but this application does not require that level of access. The applicants agreed to show the location of rooftop mechanical equipment in the roof plan, to be submitted for review by the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Main Street Manayunk has an industrial heritage that is not reflected in the proposed façade treatment for the building, and the proposed design is not compatible with the Main Street Manayunk Historic District in terms of scale, proportions, massing, and façade rhythm, pursuant to Standard 9.
- The application should be supplemented with a site plan, building plans, sections to show sightline studies of visibility of the pilot house and railings, and renderings or other means of showing context to neighboring buildings, to be reviewed by the Commission.

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

ITEM: 4328 Main St				
MOTION: Denial				
MOVED BY: Cluver				
SECONDED BY: Detwiler				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x			
John Cluver	x			
Rudy D'Alessandro	x			
Justin Detwiler	x			
Nan Gutterman				x
Suzanne Pentz	x			
Amy Stein				x
Total	5	0		2

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:57 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

Accessibility Guideline: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.

Accessibility Guideline: Not Recommended: Altering, damaging, or destroying character-defining features in attempting to comply with accessibility requirements.

Accessibility Guideline: Not Recommended: Making access modifications that do not provide a reasonable balance between independent, safe access and preservation of historic features.

Accessibility Guideline: Not Recommended: Designing new or additional means of access without considering the impact on the historic building and its setting.

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.

14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish.

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Architectural Committee are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical, under "Current Applications."