ADDRESS: 2026-28 SPRING GARDEN ST
Proposal: Construct four-story multi-family dwelling on vacant lot
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: David Altenhofen
Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design
History: 1886
Individual Designation: 5/1/1975
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:
The vacant lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street was historically the side yard of the double-wide lot for the building at 2028 Spring Garden Street. This applicant submitted an in-concept application in 2018 to gain clarity from the Commission as to its level of review for new construction on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street, and to elicit comments on a proposed four-story, full-width building on the site. At its 13 July 2018 meeting, the Historical Commission unanimously voted to approve the application in concept. This in-concept approval was for a four-story, full-width building on the lot. As required, the applicant has submitted an application for final approval which closely resembles the prior in-concept application.

SCOPE OF WORK
- Demolish non-historic vestibule and site wall.
- Construct four-story multi-family building on vacant lot.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:
- **Standard 3:** Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
  - Aspects of the proposed front façade, including door and windows, replicates the next door building to a level that is not preferred on new construction. These elements do not need to replicate historic elements exactly, but rather should be compatible with those historic elements but not to a degree that it creates a false sense of history.

- **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.
  - The proposed building is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, but is differentiated from the old in terms of width.

- **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 building is proposed for construction on a vacant lot.
**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the 13 July 2018 in-concept approval by the Commission.
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

ADDRESS OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION:
2026 Spring Garden St. Philadelphia, PA 19130

APPLICANT:
SUSAN UHL ACCT#2583008
COMPANY NAME:
LANDMARK ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN
PHONE # (215) 755-9050
FAX #

PROPERTY OWNER’S NAME:
David Altenhofen
PHONE #
FAX #

ARCHITECT/ENGINEER IN RESPONSIBLE CHARGE:
Vincent Mancini
ARCHITECT/ENGINEERING FIRM:
Landmark Architectural design
PHONE # (215) 755-9050
FAX #

CONTRACTOR:
Center City Construction and Development
CONTRACTING COMPANY:

USE OF BUILDING/SPACE
(R-2) MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF WORK:
For the erection of a four story, attached structure, with habitable cellar and roof decks as per plans. To be used as a multi-family dwelling.

Note to PHC: Application is for final approvals

TOTAL AREA UNDERGOING CONSTRUCTION: 17,507.00 square feet

ESTIMATED COST OF WORK: $2,500,000.00

COMPLETE THESE ITEMS IF APPLICABLE TO THIS APPLICATION:

# OF NEW SPRINKLER HEADS (suppression system permits only): ___________ LOCATION OF SPRINKLERS:
# OF NEW REGISTERS/DIFFUSERS (hvac/ductwork permits only): ___________ LOCATION OF STANDPIPES:

IS THIS APPLICATION IN RESPONSE TO A VIOLATION? [ ] NO [ ] YES VIOLATION #: ________________________

All provisions of the building code and other City ordinances will be complied with, whether specified herein or not. Plans approved by the Department form a part of this application. I hereby certify that the statements contained herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I further certify that I am authorized by the owner to make the foregoing application, and that, before I accept my permit for which this application is made, the owner shall be made aware of all conditions of the permit. I understand that if I knowingly make any false statement herein I am subject to such penalties as may be prescribed by law or ordinance.

APPLICANT’S SIGNATURE: ___________________________ DATE: 5 / 10 / 2019

(81-3 Rev 5/04)
5-13-2018

2026-28 Spring Garden Street
APPLICATION FOR FINAL APPROVAL
Owners: David Altenhofen and Mariette Buchman

Dear Members of the Philadelphia Historical Commission,

The existing site was occupied by a four-story multifamily dwelling with side yard. To this date our firm has completed the following:

1) Subdivision of the parcels to create two lots.
2) Obtained a zoning variance for the height of the structure.

The application is for proposed work:

3) Removal of the existing one-story entry hall accessory to existing structure.
4) Proposed new construction of 4 story with cellar and roof deck to serve as a multifamily dwelling.

Vincent Mancini
Landmark Architectural Design
PROVISO PLAN 3-12-2019:
1) REDUCED 4TH FLOOR
2) DIRECT ACCESS FROM UNIT TO SIDE YARD
3) REDUCED HEIGHT OF THE BUILDING AT REAR (HT. N.T.E. 38'-0')

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIREMENTS OF RM-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF MAIN BUILDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATERAL SETBACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR YARD SETBACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX. HT. AT REAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX. HT. @ MID. PORTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX. HT. @ FRONT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing:
- 6'-0" RAIL OR PARAPET
- MAX. HT. 6'-0"

Proposed:
- 3'-6" RAIL OR PARAPET
- MAX. HT. 6'-0"

Architectural Design, L.L.C.

PENNSYLVANIA License No. RA011382X
New Jersey Firm Authorization No. N.T.E. 38'-0" 2028 SPRING GARDEN STREET
Pennsylvania Firm Authorization X010629
New York License No. 028788-1
A.I.A. Member No. 30135052
Philadelphia, PA 19148
vsm@landmarkaia.com

Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
Materials related to July 2018 application for
2026-28 Spring Garden Street,
approved in-concept by Historical Commission
Approved in-concept by Historical Commission, July 2018
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be composed of wood and would be installed within the existing masonry opening. The application further proposes to remove the existing aluminum siding and to restore the brick to the roofline. The cheek walls of the dormer would be clad in cement siding, and the windows of the façade would be replaced to reflect the historic configurations, although the windows are identified as one-over-one sash windows in the elevation drawing.

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

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS:** 2026-28 SPRING GARDEN ST
Proposal: Construct building on vacant lot; demolish non-historic vestibule and site wall
Review Requested: Review In Concept
Owner: David Altenhofen and Mariette Buchman
Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design
History: 1886
Individual Designation: 5/1/1975
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application proposes to subdivide 2026-28 Spring Garden Street to create two lots, remove and reconstruct a non-historic one-story vestibule at 2028 Spring Garden Street, and construct a four-story residential building on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street. In the Spring Garden Historic District inventory, 2026 Spring Garden is listed as a vacant lot. Historic maps show that the vacant land at 2026 Spring Garden Street was always the side yard of the double-wide lot for the building at 2028 Spring Garden Street. Despite this, 2026 Spring Garden Street was given its own entry in the Historic District inventory, as shown below:
The applicant has submitted this in-concept application to gain clarity from the Historical Commission as to its level of review for new construction on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street. The staff suggests that the Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over any proposed new construction at the site because it was a developed site at the time of the Historic District designation; the site should be considered developed because it was historically the side yard for the property with the building at 2028 Spring Garden and because a wall with fence stands on it.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Agata Reister represented the application.

Ms. Chantry explained that this in-concept application was supplemented since the time of review by the Architectural Committee. The non-historic one-story vestibule referenced in the staff overview is now proposed for removal rather than removal and reconstruction. New renderings were provided by the applicant to show two concepts. One concept is for a three-story building and the other concept is for a four-story building on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street.

Ms. Reister explained that she is looking for the Commission to opine on the two concepts. She stated that, in order to match the cornice line of the adjacent building, the project will need to go through the variance process at the Zoning Board of Adjustment because the cornice itself exceeds the allowable height per zoning regulations. She stated that the client would like to proceed with the Commission’s recommendation. She explained that she initially proposed a three-story structure in front to allow for a by-right project, but now she is asking for the Commission to support the concept of a four-story building because it will have to go through the variance process regardless. She stated that the building is proposed to occupy the entire width of the lot, with an overbuilt alleyway for ADA access to an accessible unit at the rear. She acknowledged that the proposal will need to be presented to the Commission for a final review at a future date. She clarified that the building as proposed is exceeding allowable width and height per zoning regulations. She asked that the Commission comment on the proposed width.
of the building and she requested that it recommend approval of the concept of the full-width building so that she and her client know it will not be an issue when the project comes back for a final review.

Mr. Thomas asked if the only variance needed from the Zoning Board of Adjustment is for height. Ms. Reister responded that this is correct, but that if she has to provide a side yard, it will technically generate additional zoning reviews. Mr. Thomas opined that the Zoning Board is unlikely to deny the construction of a four-story building on a block that is lined with four-story buildings. Ms. Reister responded that she understands, and the concern now is more about occupying the entire width of the lot, and if the Commission would be willing to approve that. Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission would consider the entire design.

Ms. Cooperman asked if there are openings on the side elevation at 2024 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Chantry responded that there are no openings on the party wall, where the proposed building would attach. Mr. McCoubrey noted that there are a few openings on the side wall at 2028 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Reister clarified that there is a cellar window and one window on the first floor at 2028 Spring Garden Street, but that the elimination of the one-story vestibule would in effect create a side yard so that those windows would not be blocked by the new construction, even if the new construction is built to the property line at 2026 Spring Garden Street.

Mr. Thomas commented that the Commission should determine if the in-concept proposal satisfies the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Ms. Cooperman commented that, from the standpoint of the Standards, the removal of the historic wall and fence is troubling, as they are historic features of the vacant lot. She acknowledged that her fellow Commissioners may not agree. Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is important to remember that this application is in-concept, and the Committee and Commission will have another opportunity to review the project. He observed that the building is three bays in width rather than two bays, if it spans the full width of the lot. He stated that the Committee was in favor of the concept of a four-story building at this site, adding that it was preferred, given the height of the rest of the block. He commented that the odd thing about the site is that that building at 2024 Spring Garden Street has a party wall and looks like it is missing its twin, although it never had a twin and the lot actually belonged to the adjacent property at 2028 Spring Garden Street. Mr. McCoubrey commented that perhaps there are ways to retain and incorporate parts of the wall or fence in the new building. He noted that the site wall has been altered, as one end was cut off to put the gate in, likely when the one-story vestibule was constructed. Mr. Thomas agreed, and noted that not every twin on the block is the same. He expressed his approval of a four-story, full-width building on the lot. Mr. Mattioni asked if an in-concept approval included the proposed full-width lot coverage. Mr. Thomas confirmed that it would.

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

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application in concept. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.
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ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2018
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES
CALL TO ORDER
Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Mr. D’Alessandro joined him.

ADDRESS: 1026 SPRUCE ST
Proposal: Remove non-historic garage, construct wall and parking pad
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owners: Scott Baldasare and Alex Cook
Applicant: George Baker, architect
History: 1865
Individual Designation:
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Ms. Gutterman questioned if the garage was being taken down because of its condition. Mr. Baron responded that the property owner would like to create an open parking area. Mr. Baron described the garage as constructed of brick with a corbelled brick cornice and built between 1910 and 1916.
Mr. McCoubrey stated that the applicant should make every effort to keep the height of the top of the pilot house down.

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

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

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

**ADDRESS:** 2026-28 SPRING GARDEN ST
Proposal: Construct 4-story house on vacant lot; reconstruct vestibule; remove wall and fence
Review Requested: Review In Concept
Owner: David Altenhofen and Mariette Buchman
Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design
History: 1886
Individual Designation: 5/1/1975
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application proposes to subdivide 2026-28 Spring Garden Street to create two lots, remove and reconstruct a non-historic one-story vestibule at 2028 Spring Garden Street, and construct a four-story residential building on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street. In the Spring Garden Historic District inventory, 2026 Spring Garden is listed as a vacant lot. Historic maps show that the vacant land at 2026 Spring Garden Street was always the side yard of the double-wide lot for the building at 2028 Spring Garden Street. Despite this, 2026 Spring Garden Street was given its own entry in the Historic District inventory, as shown below:
The applicant has submitted this in-concept application to gain clarity from the Historical Commission as to its level of review for new construction on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street. The staff suggests that the Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over any proposed new construction at the site because it was a developed site at the time of the Historic District designation; the site should be considered developed because it was historically the side yard for the property with the building at 2028 Spring Garden and because a wall with fence stands on it.

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

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

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

Ms. Gutterman asked about the one-story vestibule that provides access to 2028 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Chantry responded that the vestibule is not original to the building and the staff would approve its removal. Ms. Reister noted that they wish to reconstruct it because it encroaches onto the proposed subdivision, but that it will appear much as it does currently. She suggested that it also may have been constructed without proper footing. Ms. Gutterman asked about circulation on the interior via the vestibule door. Ms. Reister responded that she does not know about that because she has not walked through that building. She explained that this in-concept application is to elicit a decision from the Commission as to whether or not it enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street, known as a vacant lot in the Spring Garden Historic District inventory. She explained that the vestibule encroachment is approximately one foot into the subdivided lot. She clarified that no additional work is proposed.
to 2028 Spring Garden Street, and that she will provide more information for the final review. Ms. Chantry commented that zoning documents show that the vestibule entrance served as a separate entrance for a doctor’s office. Mr. D’Alessandro asked if an easement could be obtained to allow that entrance to remain as-is. Ms. Reister responded that she could look into it, but that it would be more cost-effective to remove and reconstruct the vestibule. Mr. D’Alessandro responded that it is not a cost issue, and the new construction work can be done without collapsing the vestibule building.

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

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

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

Ms. Stein asked if the cornice line will match the cornice line of the adjacent building. Ms. Reister explained that the building that is being attached to at 2024 Spring Garden Street is four stories in height when including the mansard, but that a new building at that height would exceed by-right zoning. Mr. McCoubrey noted that almost all of the historic buildings on this block are four stories in height. Ms. Stein commented that it is critical to match the cornice height of the adjacent building that is being attached to, because these read as paired homes on this block, and this lot is the one missing link. Ms. Reister noted that the building at 2028 Spring Garden Street, which is also adjacent to the vacant lot, is a three-story building. She stated that she could match that three-story height. Ms. Gutterman commented that there is a six-foot gap proposed between the new building and the three-story building at 2028 Spring Garden Street, because that is the location of the proposed walkway. Ms. Reister clarified that there will not be a gap, because the walkway will be a covered-over alley that is right on the property line. Ms. Stein reiterated that the proposed building has a mate, and the cornice height should match its mate, which in this case is 2024 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Reister responded that she understands, and that the Commission could force the applicant to go through the variance process for the height.
Ms. Gutterman commented that the Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the lot known in the Historic District inventory as 2026 Spring Garden Street, but that comments related to the design of the new construction will be withheld until a design is provided for review. She encouraged the applicant to match the cornice line of the adjacent property. Ms. Reister asked if the Committee is recommending that the new building have a fourth-floor mansard. Ms. Gutterman responded that she is not sure about the mansard, but that the cornice is important. Ms. Reister asked if the Committee would prefer that the new building match the mansard and four-story appearance of the adjacent building. Ms. Stein responded that she is not sure, but that the cornice is most important, and that the mansard would be secondary. Ms. Reister noted that the three-story by-right concept would match the cornice line. Ms. Gutterman suggested that Ms. Reister design the building, have the staff review it, and then have the Committee review it. She suggested that Ms. Reister could provide two options, one with and one without a mansard. Mr. McCoubrey cautioned that the new building should not be four stories and masonry all of the way up. Ms. Reister responded that she understands, and that it is planned to be three stories with the cornice line being in line with the building next door. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Committee is not adverse to a fourth story on the new building.

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

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

**ADDRESS: 321-27 WILLINGS ALY**
Proposal: Install ADA ramp and lift; relocate historic plaques/sculpture
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Old St. Joseph’s Roman Catholic Church
Applicant: Barry Eiswerth
History: 1838; Old Saint Joseph’s Church and Rectory
Individual Designation: 4/30/1957
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

The staff suggests reducing the height of the new screen brick wall if the dimensions of the lift allow, and retaining the plaque and sculpture in-situ.
Correspondence received regarding the application for
2026-28 Spring Garden Street
Dear Mr. Thomas:  

Re: 2026 Spring Garden St., proposed new residential construction, review of building plans

We urge the Commission, when reviewing final building plans for the proposed new construction at 2026 Spring Garden Street, to require the developer to provide revised façade plans that are consistent with established historical preservation and restoration principles, and with the Historic District, and the historic block, in which the property is located.

The current proposed plans - - which, we learned to our astonishment and dismay, were approved (in whole or in part) “in concept” by the Commission in July 2018 - - would result in a building that fails to meet Standards #2 and #9 of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards; is jarringly out of character with the other historic properties on the block; and would mar the appearance of that historic thoroughfare.

The subject property (2026 Spring Garden) is currently the side yard of an existing 3-story Victorian residential structure at 2028 Spring Garden. The 2026 property has a historic fence and wall; and the Commission has assumed full jurisdiction over the 2026 property.
We understand that the Architectural Committee and later the Commission had recommended matching the cornice height (and overall 52’ height) of either of the 2 abutting properties, 2022 or 2028 Spring Garden Street, in planning the new building at 2026. The building at 2022, at 4 stories and 52’, is taller, and extra height provides the potential of additional living space. Not surprisingly, the developer chose to match the 2022 building.

But, other than the height, nothing else about the proposed new property at 2026 is consistent or compatible with 2022 Spring Garden and the Historic District.

Standard #9 of the Secretary’s Standards states: “New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work 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.”

The design of the front elevation facing Spring Garden Street fails to meet Standard #9. This design clumsily copies details from the adjacent historic building (to make it appear as historic) while at the same time is incompatible with the overall scale and massing of the neighboring structures. A basic tenet of designing a new building within a historic context is to NOT attempt to make the new building appear as historic, thereby confusing the public as to what is original and what is new. This design is a classic example of what NOT to do when incorporating new construction into a historic district, and thus should not be approved by the Architectural Committee and the Commission.

The developer also seeks to fill the entire width of the lot (minus a narrow side alley) with the new construction. The design will eliminate (and build over) half of what was originally the traditional, character-defining, open air side alley on the west side of the 2026 property - - a feature shared by the other historic properties on the block and the Historic District - - to create a “covered alley” with a second door on the first floor front, accessing the alley. In addition to this door, an additional bay (a third bay) is being proposed for both the second and third floors and a second dormer is proposed for the fourth floor. Adding an additional bay on floors 1-3 and a second dormer on the 4th floor disturbs the whole rhythm and balance of the historic block and is inconsistent with the abutting historic buildings.
The proposed scheme would result in an inappropriate, ungainly extra-wide structure, disturbing the rhythm of the width and spacing of the properties on that block, which is an integral feature of the historic character of the street.

The purpose of the covered alley (and the wider building above the covered alley) is apparently to gain a few extra feet of width/living space at the 2nd through 4th floors). To “balance” the extra-wide building, as noted, the developer seeks to add the extra 2nd through 4th floor windows and 1st floor door, beyond what exists at the 2022 building next door.¹

The Commission should not allow this proposed deviation from the historic character of the block and district. An open alley on the west side of the property should be retained in its original width, and there should be only one front door, not 2; and no additional bays and dormer on floors 2 through 4.

The developer proposes to use the covered alley and the second front door for access to the rear units; but access to those units can just as easily (or better) be achieved through an attractive, wider landscaped open-air alley vs. a long, dark, narrow tunnel.

The developer has already been before the Zoning Board and was given a variance for the proposed 52′ height at the front of the property - - the only zoning refusal issued by L&I. However, the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission still have jurisdiction over, and must still review, the final building plans; and they can still act to bring the proposed structure into compliance with the Secretary’s Standards, while allowing the developer adequate leeway to develop the site.²

¹ The Commission staff has explained that the extra front door and the extra windows on the 2nd through 4th floor are needed to balance the appearance of extra-wide building. But in our view, there is no reason for the Commission to allow the extra-wide building in the first place. It flies in the face of historic preservation/restoration principles; and the original configuration of the 2026 and 2028 properties should be honored and not sacrificed to facilitate additional density.

² The developer proposes to build, as of right, under the 2012 New Zoning Code, on most of the 2026 lot, and a large portion of the rear yard of 2028, for a monstrosity 4-story (with an extra 5th floor of basement living space), 11-unit rental property, with 28 bedrooms - - a proposal described by the Chairman of the Zoning Board as “a gloried rooming house”. As noted, the only zoning refusal was for height (52′ vs. the allowed-as-of right 38′). A zoning variance for the 52′ height was approved by the Zoning Board in March 2019, with a lower 38′ height proviso for the rear of the property. The Commission does not need to allow the construction to take over half of the original west side alley between 2026 and 2028, and it can, instead, require the retention/recreation of the entire historic alley at its original width, and other necessary changes to conform to historical standards.
Many homeowners in our Spring Garden Historic District who have been required to spend substantial sums to assure that restorations/alterations of their properties meet proper historic preservation/restoration standards, as regards even the most minute details -- something we do not disagree with in principle -- are shocked and upset that the Commission initially “approved in concept” the current proposed plans for 2026. Why should long-time homeowners be held to stricter standards than a developer, especially when the only reason for the proposed deviation is to facilitate the additional density?

We urge the Commission to reject the covered alley, the extra-wide building, the second front door, and the extra upper-floor windows/dormer window, and to bring the building width (and façade, front windows, and front door design) into sync with the rest of the block. The developer can still build a property at the heights allowed by the March 2019 zoning variance.

While the Commission’s corrective actions may not do much to eliminate the extreme density that is proposed, and the expected resulting adverse effects on the community, at least the building to be constructed would not mar the Historic District and the streetscape of this important historic thoroughfare.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patricia L. Freeland
SGCA Zoning Committee Member

cc: Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
    Kim Chantry, Preservation Planner
    Allen Rubin, Chairman, Zoning SGCA Zoning Committee