

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

**TUESDAY, 22 JANUARY 2019
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 9:00 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:

- Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
- Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Tom Chapman, Esq., Blank Rome
- David Feaster, KieranTimberlake
- Amanda Anderson, CANNO Design
- Gabrielle Canno, CANNO Design
- Matt Evans, St. Peter's School
- Fon Wang, Ballinger
- Kate McGlindey, Old City District
- Katie Tia
- Jennifer Maide
- Joe Schiavo
- Janet Kalter
- Carolyn Campbell, Studio CCLA
- Rob Kettell
- David Whipple, Assimilation Design Lab

Stuart Rosenberg, SRGA
Faye Anderson, All That Philly Jazz
Adam Hunt, SGRA
Elliot Koppel
Amy Wiseman, Pella
Lance Losey, Pella
Joaquin Koenig
Fred Lorenzen
Gabriel Gottlieb
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
Olivier Chateau
Jennifer Chateau
Dave Schmauk, Wulff Architects
Jesse Smith, Wulff Architects
Scott Orens

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 400-36 S 3RD ST, AKA 301-15 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct 3-story building with parking

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. Peters Protestant Episcopal Church

Applicant: David Feaster, KieranTimberlake

History: 1758; Saint Peter's Church and Yard; tower and spire c. 1842, William Strickland; iron spiral staircases c. 1846, Thomas U. Walter

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The property in question, 400-36 S. 3rd Street, is a large parcel that occupies much of the block bounded by Pine, S. 3rd, Lombard, and S. 4th Streets. St. Peter's Church stands at the northeast corner of the site. St. Peter's Cemetery occupies much of the northern half of the site. The southwest corner of the site, which is currently used as a surface parking lot, is being subdivided from 400-36 S. 3rd Street as 301-15 Lombard Street. St. Peter's Church proposes to build a three-story parish house with below-grade parking on the site at 301-15 Lombard Street.

The overall property, 400-36 S. 3rd Street, was individually designated in 1957 and was included in the Society Hill Historic District as a Significant resource in 1999. Although part of the larger tax parcel at 400-36 S. 3rd Street at the time of designation, the surface parking lot at 301-15 Lombard Street was separately classified as Non-contributing with archaeological potential in the Society Hill Historic District inventory. Unrelated to this project, the Historical Commission will consider a proposal to reclassify the 301-15 Lombard Street site to Contributing owing to its archaeological potential at its March 2019 meeting.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a three-story parish house with below-grade parking
- Conduct additional archaeological investigations

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Rehabilitation Standards of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.*
 - The application includes the report of a Phase IA archaeological investigation that was undertaken for the site in question. The report identifies and maps three types of zones within the 301-15 Lombard Street parcel, those with high archaeological sensitivity, with moderate sensitivity, and with relatively little chance of archaeological remains. The report concludes that further archaeological investigation should appropriately entail a Phase IB or combined Phase IB and Phase-II level study; and, if significant archaeological remains are discovered, an appropriate level of mitigation should be implemented.

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed three-story building would be clad in brick would include a wood-window curtain wall system on the east and north facades. The garage entrance would be located on Lombard Street. The building is designed in a style that is reminiscent of and compatible with the 1970s-era infill buildings in the historic district. The proposed building would be differentiated from the old and would be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that any disturbance of archaeological remains in the high archaeological sensitivity zones is mitigated with either data recovery excavation or monitoring during construction, as recommended in the Phase IA report, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Tom Chapman and architect David Feaster represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee requested an explanation of the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction over the site.
 - Mr. Farnham explained that, in his opinion, the Historical Commission enjoys full or plenary jurisdiction over the site for two reasons. First, although the site is listed in the inventory as a non-contributing parking lot, it was part of the larger tax parcel with the church and cemetery at the time of designation and is therefore not “undeveloped.” Second, the Historical Commission has notified the property owner that it will consider reclassifying the site as contributing at upcoming Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission meetings; the upgraded classification can be assumed to be in place unless and until the Historical Commission rejects the reclassification request.

- Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to explain how the proposed building fits into its context.
 - Mr. Feaster stated that the proposed building is appropriately scaled for the neighborhood. He stated that he and his client considered a larger building, but then decided to limit the program to allow for the construction of a smaller building that would fit better into the neighborhood. He stated that the scale of the building is appropriate for the neighborhood. He stated that they chose brick as the cladding material to correspond to the neighborhood. He noted that the building is set back from 3rd Street to allow for alignment with the church to the north and for open space. He noted that the proposed curtain wall is wood, not metal, to better correspond to the neighborhood. He added that the window design is drawn from the proportions of historic windows in the neighborhood. The other windows in the building will also be wood and have designs that correspond to the curtainwall design.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the curved brick walls. He asked if they would be built with custom bricks or cut standard bricks.
 - Mr. Feaster explained that two experienced masons constructed a mock-up of the wall and determined that the curved walls can be constructed with standard bricks.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the Lombard Street façade “does not feel contextual.”
 - Mr. Feaster stated that the project was designed to integrate into the neighborhood. He noted that a walkway terminating at Lombard Street will be constructed through the site to encourage pedestrians to enjoy the site.
 - Mr. Detweiler commented that the east elevation facing S. 3rd Street is wonderful, but the south façade on Lombard Street does not engage the pedestrian. He suggested that the first floor of the Lombard façade could be enlivened.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the curtain wall would allow too much light out into the neighborhood.
 - Mr. Feaster stated that his architectural firm has engaged a lighting design firm to consult on the lighting. The great room behind the wood and glass curtain wall will be lighted with a wash of light on the back wall of the room. The room will have a warm glow but will not create glare outside.
- The Committee asked if the applicants have met with the community association.
 - Mr. Feaster stated that the design team has met with the Society Hill Civic Association. Since that meeting, the design has been developed to the point that the design can be bid and a general contractor identified. Once the process moves ahead, the church and its consultants will meet with neighbors again.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he finds the design compatible with the neighborhood. It continues the architectural trajectory established by the Redevelopment Era buildings.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the proposed building was unlike the buildings around it.
 - Others pointed out that there are several institutional and larger buildings in the immediate area including a retail and parking garage building on the block to the east, a St. Peter's school complex immediately to the west of the site, and a large community center and the Presbyterian Historical Society to the west. Mr. Farnham showed an aerial photograph of the surroundings that indicated that there are several institutional buildings in the immediate surroundings.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about mechanical equipment and louvers.
 - Mr. Feaster pointed out the mechanical equipment and venting on the roof plan.

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the plans for archaeological study.
 - Mr. Feaster explained that the church cannot afford to undertake a separate archaeological project prior to the start of construction. Any archaeology will be undertaken during the construction phase.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the entrances to the building.
 - Mr. Feaster explained that the main entrance is at the northwest at a courtyard where paths from the church and street terminate. The second entrance is a service entrance along Lombard Street, where food for the Philabundance program will be moved in and out.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he finds the building compatible with the historic district. He stated that the brick and wood curtainwall are appropriate. The siting of the building set back from 3rd Street is appropriate. The scale and materials are appropriate. He suggested that the Lombard Street façade could be made “more friendly.”

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed design complies with Standard 9. The new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- The project will comply with Standard 8, provided that any disturbance of archaeological remains in the high archaeological sensitivity zones is mitigated with either data recovery excavation or monitoring during construction, as recommended in the Phase IA report. Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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

- provided that any disturbance of archaeological remains in the high archaeological sensitivity zones is mitigated with either data recovery excavation or monitoring during construction, as recommended in the Phase IA report;
- with the suggestion that architect study the Lombard Street façade “to make it more inviting”;
- with the staff to review details including the brickwork, lighting, and windows;
- pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

ITEM: 400-36 S 3rd 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	0	0	1

ADDRESS: 5423 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; install ADA ramp
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Kajen Properties LLC
 Applicant: Ken Weinstein, Philly Office Retail LLC
 History: Constructed 1874 as Masonic Hall; rear addition circa 1915
 Individual Designation: 1/25/1966
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND: The building at 5423 Germantown Avenue is a three-story Gothic Revival building composed of a masonry façade, ornate wood cornice, and pointed arch windows. The building was originally constructed as the Germantown Masonic Hall, but in more recent years (1971-2016) served as a showroom for the Cunningham Piano Company. The building was individually designated in 1966.

This application proposes an exterior and interior rehabilitation to create two commercial tenant spaces at the first floor front, two apartments at the first floor rear, and 14 apartments on the second and third floors.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct ADA access ramp at main entrance.
- Cut openings in masonry for additional windows, doors, vents, and mechanicals.
- Reconfigure main entry and install new doors.
- Restore and replace windows
- Repair/replace storefronts and remove security grills.
- Remove fire escapes.
- Repair cornice, merlons, and masonry in-kind.
- Install gates/fencing and exterior lighting.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - Further investigation of the existing front entry steps is required. The application states that concrete front steps will be removed to accommodate ADA ramp. If the steps are original, ADA ramp design should incorporate the historic configuration and material.
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, and finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*

- Proposed new storefront should take into account (and incorporate) surviving historic materials and original storefront design.
- *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 shall 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 shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:32:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver inquired what historic materials survive, if any, behind the existing storefront.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that the staff does not know the answer to that question, but will request additional information from the applicant.
 - Ms. Gutterman recommended that further exploration to determine the extent of existing historic fabric, and the proposed storefront and main entry reflect the historic configuration.
- The Committee recommended that wood windows are appropriate for the front and east elevations, and that aluminum clad windows are acceptable for the south and west elevations, owing to visibility from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned if a paint analysis was conducted to determine historic paint colors on wood elements.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern that mechanical equipment may be visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about awnings and signage, which were not shown as part of the proposed scope of work.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the center window on the second floor of the front façade should be a double-hung window.
- The Committee commented that the drawings and notes are not clear as to the extent of removal of historic fabric, changes to masonry wall openings, proposed new openings, and window repair versus replacement. The Committee asked that these elements are clarified for review by the Commission. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the drawings should be rejected as submitted, and questioned whether this should be an in-concept application.
 - Mr. Farnham commented that the staff is experienced in working with the applicant and developer of this project. He noted that the developer, Ken

Weinstein, has a history of preserving rather than replacing historic fabric in other similar projects.

- The Committee responded that the application materials do not necessarily show that and would not provide a contractor with clear direction.
- Mr. Farnham responded that the application materials presented to the Committee and Commission are generally never the final construction drawings, which is what the staff eventually reviews as part of the building permit application process. Additionally, should the staff determine that the final drawings do not meet certain standards, the application can be remanded back to the Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The drawings must be revised to clarify the full scope of work, particularly as it pertains to the extent of restoration versus removal of historic fabric.
- The general scope of work preserves the historic character of the building while allowing for a new use.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the recommendation that the Committee’s comments be considered when preparing a final set of drawings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

ITEM: 5423 Germantown Avenue				
MOTION: Approval, with recommendations				
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	5	1	0	1

ADDRESS: 1725-27 ADDISON ST

Proposal: Alter door openings at first floor; reconstruct cornice; construct rear deck; alter rear site wall and install gates; install windows and modify openings at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Olivier and Jennifer Chateau

Applicant: Gabrielle Canno, CANNO Design

History: c. 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

1725-27 Addison Street is a double-wide three-story red brick rowhouse listed as Contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District; it is not individually designated. The existing building was created when two separate rowhouses were combined into one prior to historic designation. When the buildings were combined into one, window and door openings at the first floor were altered, so that 1725 Addison Street now has two narrow doors, and 1727 Addison Street now has two windows but no door.

SCOPE OF WORK, FRONT:

- Remove easternmost doorway and replace with window.
- Widen existing remaining doorway to 36 inches and install new door and transom.
- Reduce existing six-foot-wide non-historic entrance steps to three feet, and fill empty three feet with planter.
- Install historically appropriate wood cornice.

SCOPE OF WORK, REAR (SERVICE ALLEY):

- Re-stucco entire façade.
- Install new wood windows at second and third floors; infill one window opening.
- Construct small deck at second floor with French doors for access.
- Remove non-historic first floor windows and install one larger window with steel sash.
- Remove two sections of non-historic rear site wall and replace with operable metal gates.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The proposed project alters the historic location of the entrance door at 1725 Addison Street. The retention, rather than removal, of a door at the far east of the building would satisfy this standard. The remainder of the proposed work satisfies this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the existing easternmost doorway is retained rather than altered to be a window, pursuant to Standard 2.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:56:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Gabrielle Canno and Amanda Anderson, and property owners Olivier and Jennifer Chateau represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked why the easternmost doorway is proposed to be altered into a window. The Committee stated that the door could be retained and fixed in place to be non-functional.
 - The applicants explained that the building was previously two units, hence the two entrance doors side-by-side, but is now proposed for returning to single-family use where there is need for only one entrance door. The applicants explained that retaining two doors will make it look like a multi-family property and will affect the interior layout and proposed location for the interior stair.
- The Committee asked about the proposed design of the new cornice.
 - The applicants responded that they surveyed the cornices on the block and based the new cornice design on those that appeared to be historic.
- The Committee acknowledged that the neighboring property's door and windows at 1723 Addison Street have been elevated, so that it will not align with this property's door and windows.
- The Committee stated that the existing non-historic double-wide steps should be retained, or if the proposal is revised to shift the door location, then the stairs may be narrowed.
- The Committee stated that the proposed planter on Addison Street is out of context for the block and should be omitted.
- The Committee stated that the rear window proposed for removal and infill at the second floor needs to be acknowledged when the façade is stuccoed by way of a recess in the stucco. The Committee suggested that a similar approach be taken regarding a non-existent front façade basement window if applicable.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed project alters the historic location of the entrance door at 1725 Addison Street. The retention, rather than removal, of a door at the far east of the building would satisfy Standard 2.
- The remainder of the proposed work satisfies Standard 2.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the existing easternmost doorway is retained rather than altered to be a window, the proposed planter is omitted, and the second-floor rear window opening proposed for infill is acknowledged by way of a recess in the new stucco, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2.

ITEM: 1725-27 Addison St				
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	0	0	1

ADDRESS: 146-48 BREAD ST

Proposal: Demolish roof and clerestory; construct 4-story addition on 1-story building; replace door

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Orvo Properties LP

Applicant: David Whipple, Assimilation Design Lab LLC

History: 1913

Individual Designation: 8/23/1982

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

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

BACKGROUND:

146-48 Bread Street is a one-story, stepped gable-roofed former industrial building, individually designated in 1982 and listed as a Contributing property in the Old City Historic District in 2003.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove portions of roof and entirety of clerestory.
- Retain exterior walls.
- Construct four-story rooftop addition set back five feet from front (east) façade and flush with north façade.
- Construct rear addition that encapsulates rear façade.
- Remove metal roll-up door on front façade.
- Restore door opening on front façade to original width; install doors.
- Replace historic windows in kind.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The proposed project alters the historic roofline, including the removal of the clerestory, a character-defining feature of this type of historic industrial building. The proposed rooftop alterations do not comply with this standard. The retention of the

façades and their historic windows complies with this standard.

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition destroys the gabled roof and clerestory, and, although extremely differentiated from the old, is not compatible with the massing, size, scale, materials, or features of the property or the district. The project does not comply with this standard.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*
 - The proposed roof configuration and addition would be difficult to reverse in the future and would impair the integrity of the building. The project does not comply with this standard.

- *New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction Guideline | Not Recommended (pp. 159-160):*
 - *Constructing a rooftop addition that is highly visible, which negatively impacts the character of the historic building, its site, setting, or district.*
 - *Constructing a highly-visible, multi-story rooftop addition that alters the building's historic character.*
 - *Constructing a rooftop addition on low-rise, one- to three-story historic buildings that is highly visible, overwhelms the building, and negatively impacts the historic district.*
 - The proposed addition is greater than four stories on top of a one-story building, is highly visible. The proposed project does not comply with this guideline.

- *Roofs Guideline | Not Recommended (p. 101):*
 - *Changing a character-defining roof form, or damaging or destroying character-defining roofing material as a result of an incompatible rooftop addition or improperly-installed or highly-visible mechanical equipment.*
 - The application proposes to remove the character-defining industrial roof shape and clerestory in order to construct an incompatible rooftop addition. The proposed project does not comply with this guideline.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:15:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect David Whipple and prospective buyer Mahmoud Saeed represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee agreed with the staff that the addition is too large for the site, destroys too much historic fabric and is out of context with the historic character of the block.
 - The applicants responded that they are trying to create a project that is financially feasible.
- The Committee stated that the addition is set too close to the front façade and that the height overwhelms the historic building.
- The Committee recommended that the applicants study various setbacks and massing permutations to create an addition that is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
 - The applicants asked whether they could increase the setback of the addition but also increase the height of the proposed addition.
 - The Committee responded that the issues are interrelated and would need to be studied.
- The Committee opined that the materials and arrhythmic articulation of the proposed addition's facade calls attention to itself and is not in keeping with the character of the district.
 - The applicants responded that there have been other projects in Old City that have had a similar aesthetic.
 - The Committee responded that the Historical Commission's review of some of those projects may have been limited to review and comment jurisdiction, or there may have been other extenuating circumstances.
- The applicants opined that there are other tall buildings and new construction projects in the Old City Historic District.
 - The Committee responded that, while the height may fit in within the larger context of the district, the proposed massing overwhelms the historic building and the narrow Bread Street on which it is located.
- The staff noted that the application proposes to consolidate the lot with the building (146-48 Bread Street) with a vacant lot (217 Quarry Street), but that the proposed new construction is located almost entirely on the existing building, rather than the lot.
 - The applicants responded that the consolidated lots will face open area zoning challenges if they propose to build on the vacant lot. They are trying to stay within the zoning allowance to avoid additional issues.
- The Committee suggested that the addition be set back far enough that it does not destroy the character-defining clerestory.
- The Committee questioned what appeared to be a rooftop pilot house and recommended reducing or eliminating that element of the design in order to reduce the overall height of the proposed addition.
 - The applicants responded that it is an elevator overrun.
- The Committee questioned whether the proposed design includes parking.
 - The applicants responded that zoning requires approximately three parking spots, which would be located in a below-ground parking lot.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Neighbor Joe Schiavo agreed with the staff recommendation and suggested that the applicants build significantly on the 217 Quarry Street lot and leave the open area behind the existing structure, rather than build on top of the existing historic structure. He noted that a five-story building could easily be constructed on the 217

Quarry Street lot and the open area behind the existing Bread Street building. He acknowledged that it is a difficult property to reuse and that the applicants will run afoul of the parking and open area requirements, but opined that those are easier to forgive, given the location, than not respecting the existing historic structure.

- Neighbor Rob Kettell commented that the articulation of the façade of the addition is not in keeping with the brick and industrial character of the neighborhood and block.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed addition overwhelms the historic building and is incompatible in scale, massing, materials, and fenestration patterns with the historic district.
- The proposed addition destroys the clerestory, which is a character-defining feature of the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10 and the Roofs and New Exterior Additions Guidelines.

ITEM: 146-48 BREAD ST & 217 QUARRY 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: 1314-16 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Convert building to hotel; construct addition, entry vestibule, and patio

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rendez Blu LP

Applicant: Scott Orens, Orens Brothers Real Estate

History: 1878; Blue Horizon; 1916, Carl P. Berger

Individual Designation: 3/13/2015, front façade only

District Designation: none

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

BACKGROUND:

At its 13 March 2015 meeting, the Historical Commission designated 1314-16 N. Broad Street, the former Blue Horizon boxing venue created by the combination of three brownstone mansions, with the stipulation that “the Historical Commission will only regulate the front or Broad Street facades of the historic brownstone mansions.” The front façades extend four stories in height with elevated basements and fourth-story mansards.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Brace and retain façade.
- Construct new one and a half story glass enclosure for accessible hotel entrance.
- Install signage above entry vestibule.
- Remove center railings at existing stair and construct elevated patio with glass railings.
- Replace doors.
- Replace dormer windows, with upper sash to receive spandrel glazing.
- Stabilize damaged pilasters at doors.
- Restore canopy.
- Install façade lighting.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The proposed glass entry vestibule obstructs a large portion of the historic façade, and the construction of the raised patio removes character-defining railings and irreversibly alters the entrance stair, changing the spatial relationship of the properties' historic entrances. The windows proposed at the mansard do not properly replicate the arch of the historic windows. The proposed vestibule, patio, and replacement windows do not comply with this guideline.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed entrance enclosure, though differentiated from the historic structure, is not compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the brownstone façade. The proposed vestibule project does not comply with this guideline.
- *New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction Guideline | Not Recommended (pp. 156):*
 - *Constructing a new addition on or adjacent to a primary elevation of the building which negatively impacts the building's historic character.*
 - *Attaching a new addition in a manner that obscures, damages, or destroys character-defining features of the historic building.*
 - *Designing a new addition that is significantly different and, thus, incompatible with the historic building.*
 - Both the proposed glass entry vestibule and raised patio negatively impact the historic character of the brownstone façade. The proposed glass vestibule further obscures character-defining features of the carved brownstone window surrounds and would cause a partial loss of the cornice. The new vestibule is also distinctly modern with materials that do not relate to the historic façade. The proposed project does not comply with this guideline. The proposed hotel addition is not within the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:29:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Dave Schmauk and Jesse Smith and property owner Scott Orens represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee questioned whether the applicants considered using the entry to the north rather than creating the large glass vestibule along Broad Street.
 - The applicants responded that they attempted to make the entry vestibule as small as possible while still maintaining the functional requirements of an accessible entry. They explained that the entry must snake along the side of the building at a width of 4 feet 10 inches, which causes the need for the space offered by a vestibule on Broad Street. The applicants noted that, since submitting the application, they have revised the size of the entry vestibule, reducing its width from two bays to one. They distributed revised renderings to the Committee members.
- The Committee inquired about the use of the space between the vestibule and curved staircase.
 - The applicants responded that they had originally attempted to avoid that area, because it will collect trash and leaves. Based on the staff's recommendation that the canopy is intrusive, the applicants reduced the size of the vestibule and conceded that a smaller entry will create that void.
- The Committee questioned whether the entrance could be moved back to align with the historic façade.
 - The applicants replied that it could be moved back, but the alignment of adjacent properties is problematic. They explained that the historic façade sits 10 feet behind the Broad Street property line and that the neighboring new construction is currently being built to the property line.
 - The applicants further responded that aligning the hotel entrance with the façade of the building would create an accessibility issue, since the corridor is less than 5 feet wide.
- The Committee offered several suggestions on interior and exterior space configuration to improve access to the hotel space while eliminating the large entry vestibule.
 - The applicants answered that even to accommodate the Committee's requests, the hotel would still need an entrance on the street that creates a weather break, has the appropriate space for turning around a wheelchair, and offers space for guests to roll in luggage.
- The Committee commended the applicants' canopy design at the vestibule, which matches the height, material, and color of the existing north canopy. However, they suggested that the vestibule column be minimized and the glass system include structural butt-glazed joints to increase transparency.
 - The applicants replied that the column could potentially be eliminated and the joints could be butt glazed.

- The Committee expressed concern over sealing the doors at the top of the character-defining circular staircase and recommended that the applicant consider different ways to make the doors operable.
 - The applicants responded that there is no reason the doors cannot remain operable, though that entrance cannot be counted as a means of egress. The applicants added that the doors would be restored.
- The Committee inquired about the design and programming at the northernmost entrance.
 - The applicants explained that the entrance would contain a raised patio over the steps to provide outdoor seating for a cafe. The patio would be pulled back one step and pulled in at the sides to allow for the retention of three of the four historic railings. The three doors would be replaced in kind.
- The Committee offered several suggestions on alternative configurations of the patio and alternative placements for seating. Some options included tiering the seating and overbuilding the steps in the form of a deck.
 - The applicants explained that the patio is located under the canopy to take advantage of the existing cover. It does not have a large capacity and would only hold a few small tables; instead, it should function to show activity and draw people in from the street. The applicants were receptive to the Committee’s suggestions of tiering and creating a deck.
- The applicants informed the Committee that the windows in the mansard would have the proper arch, which was not depicted in the original submission.
- The applicants explained how the facades would be stabilized during demolition and construction, noting that a core would be constructed at the interior and the façade would then be braced to the core. The applicants provided a letter from the engineer explaining the stabilization process.
- The Committee requested that the historic paint colors of the windows and doors be determined and considered in the final design.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Faye Anderson, director of All That Philly Jazz, agreed with the staff recommendation, and explained that the Legendary Blue Horizon is one of the few extant buildings associated with Philadelphia’s golden age of jazz. She noted that the Blue Horizon is depicted on a Philadelphia courthouse mural commissioned under the Percent for Art Program. She then distributed an image of the mural to the Committee members. She argued that the proposed design “cheapens a beloved historic landmark” with modern add-ons, materials, and signage and erases the historic character of the facades. She contended that the application does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Ms. Anderson argued against the developer’s past use of public funds for the project, suggesting that taxpayers would pay for the demolition and defacement of the historic landmark. She asked that the Committee to deny the application and that the developer preserve the facades and respect their historic character.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The glass vestibule conflicts with the building rather than complements the historic brownstone façade.
- The central circular staircase is a character-defining feature of the façade, and the doors at this entrance should not be sealed.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The vestibule should include structural butt-glazed joints rather than framed glass and the column should be minimized in order to provide a clear object in front of the building that obstructs less of the historic façade.
- The mass of the raised patio is out of context for the character-defining canopied entrance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10 and the New Exterior Additions Guidelines.

ITEM: 1314-16 N BROAD ST				
MOTION: Denial				
MOVED BY: Gutterman				
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro				
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: 1001-07 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Convert church to residential building; construct ADA ramp
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Buddhist Congregation of Quang Phat
 Applicant: Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola, Architect
 History: 1869; Emanuel Evangelical Lutheran Church
 Individual Designation: 7/23/1963
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND: The building at 1001-07 S. 4th Street is a freestanding church building constructed in 1869 for the Evangelical Lutheran Church. It was individually designated in 1963. It has suffered from a lack of maintenance and has been the subject of many violations over years. This project proposes to convert the church for residential use.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace windows to account for addition of internal floors.
- Replace roof with added skylights.
- Install condensers and transformer.
- Install ramp on north side facade.
- Restore brownstone.
- Reinstall original clock.
- Restore woodwork, including tower, clock and cornices.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The proposed project retains and restores nearly all elements of the building.

- *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.*
 - The proposed restoration of the tower, cornices, windows and doors complies with this standard.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*
 - The ramp, skylights, and mechanical equipment are designed to be as inconspicuous as possible and will be reversible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 10 with the staff to review details.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:10:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Equitable owner Elliot Koppel and architect Ray Rola represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee questioned the location of the condensing units. Mr. McCoubrey preferred that all the units sit on the ground.
 - The applicants responded that most of the units will be on the ground, with several on the apse roof.
- The Committee questioned the design of the fence.
 - The applicants responded that the fence exists and will remain.
- The Committee questioned the visibility of the skylights.
 - The applicants responded that they will be inconspicuous.
 - Mr. Baron noted that churches are notoriously hard to preserve and that this one has been particularly endangered in the past. The skylights allow for light to loft areas bedrooms that otherwise have no windows without a rooftop addition.
- Ms. Pentz asked about the leaning of the tower and whether this was being repaired.
 - Mr. Koppel explained that he hired an engineer to investigate and found that the structure was stable and safe.
- Mr. Cluver questioned what was happening to the site statuary.
 - Mr. Koppel said that it was recent and was being removed. It was noted that the historic signage over the door will be preserved and restored.

- Mr. Cluver questioned the design of the ramp and suggested that it be more permanent.
 - Mr. Rola responded that he was trying to preserve the existing stone stoop.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated his organization’s support for the proposal and noted that this same developer is also preserving the Old Brick church of Kensington.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposal satisfies Standards 2, 6, and 10.
- The staff should work with the applicant to find the most inconspicuous design for the skylights.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 10 with the staff to review details.

ITEM: 1001-07 S. 4th St				
MOTION: Approval				
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: 2204 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; remove roof and rear mansard; construct 7-story addition with decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AMZ Four LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg, Architects

History: 1870; refaced c. 1960

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 2204 Walnut Street was designed by Frank Furness as a double wide house for John Ashhurst and constructed in 1872. Architect Wilson Eyre Jr. added a mansard and made other alterations later in the nineteenth century. In 1900, the building was remodeled for the Holman School for Girls. In 1938, the front façade was replaced when it was converted to a

showroom for the Anthracite Industries, Inc., a trade organization. During one of these alterations, the rear ell was removed and the rear wall greatly altered.

The current building does not appear to retain any original exterior fabric. In light of the many changes to the building as well as the fact that it is a commercial building in a district significant for its residential history, the staff considers the building to be relatively insignificant.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove roof and portions of rear wall.
- Retain rear wall as part of light well.
- Construct seven story rear addition and four-story rooftop addition with set backs from front façade.
- Cut windows in top floor and enlarge storefront in front facade.
- Restore door and casement windows in front facade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The project proposes to cut new windows at the top section of the front facade. The proposed new front façade window opens do not comply with this standard. The project also proposes to rehabilitate and restore the storefront and lower windows. These changes to the storefront and lower front façade windows comply with this standard.
- *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.*
 - The proposed restoration of the front windows and door complies with this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
- *Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*
 - The proposed addition could comply with Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline if the addition was setback farther from the front façade so that it was inconspicuous.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*
 - Although the proposed roof configuration and addition would be difficult to reverse in the future, it would impact a roof that is not visible from the public right-of-way and is relatively insignificant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided no new windows are cut in the front façade and the addition is set back farther from the front façade to make it inconspicuous, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:24:47

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Stuart Rosenberg and Adam Hunt represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Baron noted that the staff thought that, if the fifth floor was pulled back from the façade, it would provide light without cutting windows in the front façade. The higher floors could each be pulled back an equivalent amount, resulting in the rooftop additions being less conspicuous from the public right of way. He explained that the front half-round door design and the casement windows would be a partial restoration.
 - Mr. Rosenberg opined that the owner would be amenable to the idea of the setbacks.
- Ms. Gutterman clarified that the fifth floor should set back approximately 11 feet, the sixth floor 22 feet and the seventh floor 33 feet.
 - Mr. Rosenberg agreed.
- Ms. Cluver asked what color and material the addition would be.
 - Mr. Rosenberg said that it would be beige brick to match the façade

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposal meets Standards 2, 6, 9 and 10 conditional upon setting back the fifth, sixth and seventh floor additions approximately 11, 22 and 33 feet from the front facade.
- The staff should work with the applicant to work with the applicant on the color and material of the additions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the new fifth-floor façade windows are deleted and the fifth, sixth and seventh-floor additions and decks are set back approximately 11, 22, and 33 feet from the front façade, with the staff to review details and visibility of additions, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9 and 10.

ITEM: 2204 Walnut St				
MOTION: Approval, with conditions				
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	0	1

ADDRESS: 2041-55 CORAL ST

Proposal: Restore facades and water tower; construct 3-story addition; create courtyard

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sterling Wilson

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg, Architects

History: 1895; Harbisons' Dairies; Stearns & Castor, architect; 1914

Individual Designation: 1/12/2018

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND: The complex at 2041-55 Coral Street is a connected multi-building former dairy, individually designated in 2018. It is a landmark in the community because of the milk bottle shaped water tower on the roof, which can be seen from many vantage points in the neighborhood. The proposal calls for converting the vacant structure to residential office and commercial use.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove portions of roof and construct three-story rooftop additions with decks.
- Retain and restore exterior walls.
- Remove infill and replace historic windows and doors in kind with the staff to review shop drawings.
- Cut some new windows in existing walls.
- Add deck on top off roof monitor.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The proposal retains the exterior walls and character-defining roofs. The roofs that are being removed are not visible from the public right-of-way or character-defining elements.
- *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.*
 - The proposed restoration of the walls, windows, doors and water tower complies with this standard.

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition is compatible with the existing structure except for the deck proposed for the roof of the monitor. This deck should be moved to the flat roof where it would be hidden by a parapet wall.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*
 - The project complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the deck proposed for the roof monitor is moved to a flat roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:37:35

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Stuart Rosenberg and Adam Hunt represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Baron explained that he visited the building to look for evidence of original windows and doors. He noted that the architect has said that he will revise the drawings and details in conjunction with staff review based on the evidence.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the windows will be wood.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that they would be. Mr. Baron explained that some of the industrial windows in building A were originally steel and metal windows would be better for those locations.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the deck will be pulled off of the monitor and will sit only in front of the monitor. She also asked if glass will be put back in the monitor and whether the elevator and pilothouse will still sit on the roof of Building A.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded affirmatively.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Neighbor Fred Lorenzen asked what was intended for the lot across the street and whether they would provide parking.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that that would be a separate phase but that plans had not yet been developed.
- Neighbor Joaquin Koenig asked whether there are any dangerous contaminants in the building having to do with refrigeration or other uses.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that the clean out will follow all mandated safety guidelines.
- Blogger Gabriel Gottlieb asked whether the milk bottle will be illuminated.
 - Mr. Rosenberg said that they will be developing a lighting plan to highlight the restoration of the bottle without disturbing the neighbors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposal meets Standards 2, 6, and 9 conditional upon the deck being moved off of the monitor.
- The staff should work with the applicant on the color of the additions and the correct doors and windows based on historic evidence.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9 with the staff to review details.

ITEM: 2041-55 Coral Street				
MOTION: Approval				
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	5	0	0	2

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

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."