

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

**TUESDAY, 21 JUNE 2022
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
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		(arrived at 9:21)
Allison Lukachik		X	
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

The meeting was held remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association
- Robert Volpe
- Jay Farrell
- Monica Ortiz, VMA
- Alex Balloon
- Zachary Gant
- Paul Lorenz
- Genna Rufo
- Zach Torres
- Eric Flocco
- Derek Spencer
- Robert Gurmankin
- Job Itzkowitz
- Jack O'Brien
- Nicole Healy
- Rich Villa
- David Mercuris
- Mathew Huffman

Paul Badger
Michael Gray
Gabriel Gottlieb
Kevin King, VMA
Dennis Carlisle
David Smith
Susan Wetherill
Richard Camitta
Loyal Issa
Nancy Pontone
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Douglas Gresock
Ryan Strand Greenberg, Mural Arts
Justin Veasey
Zamir Garcia
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Christopher Tantillo, Tantillo Architecture
Bob Torres
Antonio Fiol-Silva
Alexander Roederer
Cuby Lin
Nissa Eisenberg
SITIO architecture + urbanism
Chandler Brenneman
Alina Macneal
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Rob Fluehr
Renita Dubuque

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 160-64 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct six-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: BVG 160-64 N 2nd Street, LLC

Applicant: Justin Veasey, BVG Property Group

History: 160, vacant lot; 162, built 1950; 164, built 1851, upper stories removed, 1938

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to construct a six-story building at the southwest corner of N. 2nd and Race Streets in the Old City Historic District. The consolidated parcel includes two non-contributing buildings and a vacant lot. As such, the Historical Commission retains full jurisdiction over the proposed construction. The north, east, and west elevations of the proposed building would be clad in grey brick and feature asymmetrical fenestration with a combination of rectangular and arched window openings. At the ground floor, a recessed entrance plaza would allow access to the residential lobby along Race Street, and a three-car

parking garage would be accessed from N. 2nd Street. The south elevation would be clad in metal panels and feature a mural of the Benjamin Franklin bridge, which is located one block to the north.

The Historical Commission has reviewed numerous projects for this location over the past few years, and approved a six-story building of a different design in September 2019.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six-story building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 work will 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 construction is compatible in height, massing, and overall materials with the Old City Historic District. The rhythm and fenestration of the new building differ from the older buildings in the historic district, but can be considered compatible. The context of the property is varied, with historic buildings ranging from two to five stories along the nearby blocks, intermixed with taller new construction, including the 17-story new construction to the north across Race Street. The application generally complies with Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Developer Justin Veasy and architects James Morrissey and Zamir Garcia represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Garcia explained that the design was inspired by several aspects of the context around the site. He noted that there are numerous historic buildings with a variety of types of arched windows in the neighborhood, primarily on the upper floors. He noted that the arch design was also inspired by the curved supports of the Benjamin Franklin Bridge. The large windows on the upper units of the building seek to capitalize on the spectacular views of the bridge. At the street level, he explained, the commercial unit and storefront seek to activate the space, and the arched openings at ground floor to carry building above, while the second through fourth floors have squared-off and recessed openings with some balconies. The building's brick exterior features marble accents to continue fenestration where it did not work structurally to have windows. The brickwork is a mixture of different brick patterns found throughout the neighborhood, including soldier courses and running bond. At the fourth floor, the design introduces a soldier course cornice line to separate the

- two penthouses. The proposed windows are aluminum clad on the upper floors with aluminum storefront system at ground floor in bronze.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted discrepancies between two of the renderings.
 - Mr. Garcia explained that the primary residential lobby entrance off Race Street is recessed, with four terraces above Race Street Café that are also recessed and enclosed by glass railings on the upper floors where the views are unobstructed.
 - Mr. Cluver opined that the design is differentiated but not compatible with the district. He noted that while the district contains many different types and styles of buildings, within the individual buildings themselves there is consistency, rhythm and pattern. He opined that the lack of rhythm to the facades as proposed is atypical for the district. He noted that no context or precedent photos were provided in the submission materials.
 - Mr. Veasey apologized, noting that they created a presentation of inspiration photographs to present at the meeting, but did not realize that those materials needed to be submitted in advance.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that there is rich architectural variety in the neighborhood, but that variety is not typically found on one individual building so much as it is from one neighbor to another. He continued that the district is characterized by the regularity to the facades and fenestration and general alignment of fenestration. He suggested that a regularization of windows on the proposed building would be helpful, noting that, while the windows in a given column are shown as aligning on one side, they are all different widths. He suggested that they all be made the same width within a given column. He noted that this would still allow the applicants to achieve variety in the height and shape of the openings, but that by extending the same width of the windows up the façade, it would make some order out of the chaos of the design.
 - Mr. Morrissey responded that there are plan demands and structural limitations for what they can do with fenestration.
 - Mr. Garcia commented that the floor plans are complex and not repetitive from floor to floor, so structurally there are more lines being drawn out of the space. He opined that they have tried to maximize the openings and playfully introduced marble reveals where they cannot have windows. He opined that the façade is more chaotic but more dynamic.
 - Mr. Detwiler replied that he did not mean that all the windows on the building must align and be the same size, but that he does not see any reason why the upper floor windows within a given column on the north elevation cannot be the same width. He opined that if the Committee accepts the chaos, there needs to be more order to it.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that sometimes chaos can be better if there is something more rhythmic that it is juxtaposed against.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that a major character-defining feature of the district is a first floor that is different from the floors above. He opined that the ground floor of the proposed design is not consistent with that character and does not appear like a solid base for the floors above.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed. He opined that the lower level looks very squashed and that it should appear significantly taller in height than the upper levels. He noted that he understands the whimsical effort with the arched windows, but suggested that the applicants explore strengthening and heightening the base to create a design that anchors the building.

- Mr. Detwiler commented that the fire stair mass at the rear appears as a large solid block, presenting a large blank wall toward Race Street Café. He noted that it is one thing to have a blank wall along a party line, but along the north elevation there is an opportunity to add fenestration or make it a more interesting mass.
 - Mr. Veasey responded that they are planning to have an easement to allow Race Street Café to use their courtyard for outdoor seating.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the proposed mural on the south elevation is technically signage.
 - Mr. Morrissey responded affirmatively, noting that they were inspired by the ghost signage found on side elevations of buildings throughout the district.
 - Mr. Detwiler replied that the graphic scale should be reduced.
- Mr. Morrissey commented that they have attempted to incorporate different textures of brickwork and marble slabs to make the façade playful.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that he appreciates brick patterning as it provides a level of texture on the façade, but noted that with everything being the same color it reads as the same. The building feels top heavy because the upper floor ceiling heights are greater than the first floor, and the parapet creates an even greater height and heaviness at the top. He suggested increasing the first-floor height or reducing the upper floor heights or utilizing a façade treatment to take the brick patterning up to sill line of second floor to give the base greater definition and height.
 - Mr. Morrissey responded that they could introduce banding at the second-floor level that would strengthen the podium idea.
- Mr. Cluver supported the idea of an implied cornice at the second floor, noting that the rhythm that is more typical in Old City is to have a tall first floor differentiated from the floors above, and a cornice treatment below the top floor level, which would be treated as an attic level. As currently proposed, he noted, there is little differentiation of the first floor, and there is a band at the fifth and sixth floors. He stated that he does not see the connection to the district in how the design is articulated.
- Mr. Morrissey commented that, given that the upper floors will be residences that are for sale, it is important to have tall ceilings to create desirable high-end spaces. The first-floor commercial space, while well-located, is not likely to generate enough revenue to offset the cost of increasing the height of the space economically or structurally.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the dramatic arches of the first-floor space reinforce its shortness. He suggested pulling the arches and exterior detailing up, even if the first floor itself cannot be raised.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the shift between marble slab and glass railings.
 - Mr. Morrissey responded that the lower railings are proposed as marble for additional privacy, while the upper railings are shown as glass because the views are better. He noted that they also create more push and pull of the facade. He opined that, while the rendering makes them look reflective, in reality they would appear clear.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the material of the undersides of the balconies.
 - Mr. Morrissey responded that they are proposing Ipe wood ceilings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Job Itzkowitz of Old City District commented that the design has not been presented to the neighborhood organization, so they have not taken an official position. He

commented that some of the issues with the first floor may be impacted by the two large curb cuts, noting that parking is not required in this location. He suggested that the applicants take into consideration the stated values of the district which are articulated in the Vision2026 and design guide documents available on their website.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Old City Historic District is characterized by a variety of building heights and architectural styles, but also by the consistency, rhythm, and regularity to the fenestration and features within an individual building.
- A character-defining feature of the Old City Historic District is bases that are taller or appear taller than the floors above and are differentiated through the use of cornice lines and different materials.
- The proposed design is chaotic and lacks rhythm and regularity. Creating columns of windows that are the same width would help create some order while still allowing for differences in window height and shape from floor to floor.
- The proposed building feels top heavy. The first floor is not differentiated from the floors above and feels squat owing to the actual height as well as the continuous color of brick with the floors above, and the detailing of the brickwork and arches.
- The north elevation of the fire stair should be reconsidered so as not to appear as a blank wall but to have richness and interest.
- The mural on the south elevation is ostensibly signage and is overly large for signage in the district.
- Brick patterning provides interest to the façade and could be utilized in different ways to differentiate the base, shaft, and top of the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project is differentiated from but not compatible with the features, scale and proportion, and massing of the Old City Historic District, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 160-64 N 2nd ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4				3

Ms. Gutterman joined the meeting.

ADDRESS: 200 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Install marquee, ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 200 S. Broad Property Owner, LLC

Applicant: Christopher Tantillo, Tantillo Architecture

History: 1902; Bellevue Stratford Hotel; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to reconstruct the historic marquee over the primary entrance to the Bellevue Stratford Hotel on S. Broad Street, to reconstruct the steel and glass canopies over two restored entrances flanking the primary entrance, and to install an ADA ramp. The reconstruction is based on historic photographs and the project is also applying for historic preservation tax credits.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Reconstruct entrance marquee, side entrances, and canopies
- Construct ADA ramp

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall 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 other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The reconstruction of the historic marquee and flanking canopies is substantiated by documentary and pictorial evidence. The application complies with this standard.
- *Accessibility Guideline | Recommended: Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.*
 - The proposed ADA ramp will provide much-needed access to the Broad Street elevation of the building and will minimally impact the character-defining features of the exterior. The ramp and landing should be separated from the historic masonry at all points of contact with a fiber expansion joint board or comparable material so that the ramp could be removed in the future without negatively impacting the historic masonry.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the ramp is not directly adhered to the historic masonry, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Accessibility Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:43:28

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Christopher Tantillo and attorney Michael Gray represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Tantillo noted that the Preservation Alliance holds an easement on the property and has not yet given their approval for the project.
- Mr. Tantillo explained that the impetus for project is that the hotel entrance is being relocated back to Broad Street, and they need to bring ADA access to that elevation.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that it is clear what they are proposing and asked if the applicants could focus on what elements are proposed that differ from the original design.
- Mr. Tantillo noted that they intend to use modern technology on the light fixtures, with historically inspired custom light fixtures. He explained that the ADA ramp has a more playful handrailing than standard straight pickets, and that the intent is for the cladding of the ramp to be stone in keeping with base of the building.
- Ms. Stein commented that it is fabulous to bring back these elements and return the Bellevue to former glory.
- Ms. Stein lamented that the ramp extends so far out from the building, since it has been located on the lower part of the elevation. She questioned whether there was a way to recess the entrance, noting that at the PSFS building, they were able to restructure the interior to allow for an interior lift. Ms. Stein questioned whether other, less visually obtrusive options have been considered.
 - Mr. Tantillo responded that, because the primary entrance to the hotel and drop off is in this location, having a limited access elevator on this side seemed problematic in use of bringing people in and out. He explained that they cannot relocate the ramp to the higher, north side of the façade owing to the SEPTA entrance. He noted that they also prefer a ramp to a lift because it is more versatile, allowing people to bring up luggage, since it is easier to roll up a ramp than getting in special lift or elevator. He noted that the interior of the Bellevue is also important, so adding a volume on the interior is not ideal.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the width of the ramp would make it difficult for people to pass each other with luggage.
 - Mr. Tantillo responded that it is not just a ramp entrance, but there are also additional steps to allow multiple options for access and alleviate traffic from the main entrance.
- Mr. Cluver noted that two of the non-historic and inaccurate Doric columns around the front entrance are being replaced and questioned whether the applicants could restore the original Ionic columns.
 - Mr. Tantillo responded that they had not looked to restoring the Ionic capitals, as the whole surround and columns are effectively EFIS and stucco, and they would prefer not to remove the entire existing system, even though it is not historic.
- Mr. Cluver commented that some of the details of the marquee do not match the historic photographs. He noted that the marquee historically had an overhang at the front with additional skirting, but not much of an overhang on the sides.
 - Mr. Tantillo responded that the intent is to match the historic design, though the rendering is not entirely accurate.

- Mr. Detwiler noted that there is a Streets Department code that dictates how close an overhang can be to the curb line and suggested the applicants double check that dimension.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the historic photographs show that the original marquee roof was hipped and then gabled where it joined the building. He questioned whether the use of a fully hipped roof as proposed was to allow the retention of the transom window.
 - Mr. Tantillo responded affirmatively, noting that the fully hipped roof allowed for a better drainage design with more continuous access and points of connection for the gutters, as well as the retention of the transom window.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that there was originally a cartouche on the front of the marquee, but the drawings show a similar but different design.
 - Mr. Tantillo responded that the intent is to perfect the details to match the historic marquee and utilize new Bellevue Stratford branding.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that he is happy to leave the refinement of the details to be worked out with the staff. He opined that there are many wonderful metalworkers in the area who would love to take the historic photographs and recreate the intricate metalwork details.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the metal columns supporting the flanking hoods appear boxier than the thinner and more refined columns shown in the historic photographs.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the stone base for ramp should be carefully detailed, with a coping stone to look like the existing base.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jay Farrell asked if any consideration was given to restoring other marquees on the building, including the two historically located along the Walnut Street elevation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Bellevue Stratford Hotel historically featured intricate marquees and canopies over entrances on Broad Street.
- ADA access is necessary along the Broad Street elevation.
- The current drawings and renderings do not entirely match one another and should be carefully checked against the historic photographs.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The reconstruction of the historic marquee and flanking canopies is substantiated by documentary and pictorial evidence, satisfying Standard 6.
- The proposed ADA ramp will provide much-needed access to the Broad Street elevation of the building and will minimally impact the character-defining features of the exterior if properly adhered and detailed, satisfying the Accessibility Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the ramp is not directly adhered to the historic masonry, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ITEM: 200 S BROAD 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				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 511 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Demolish rear and roof, construct addition and deck, infill storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 511 S 4th Street Realty LLC

Applicant: Cuby Lin, Liu Consulting & Construction LLC

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 1/22/1963

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to convert a mixed-use commercial and residential building to multi-unit residential use. The proposed scope at the front façade includes removal of the storefront and its infill with brick veneer with paired windows and an entrance door, window replacement on the upper floors, removal (apparently) of the cornice, and the painting of the brick façade. At the rear, the proposed scope includes demolition of the gable roof and rear wall of the main block, and the rear addition. A full-width, four-story rear addition would be constructed. The existing gable roof would be replaced by a flat roof with deck and pilot house.

The existing rear addition proposed for demolition was constructed in 1942, according to a zoning permit application for the demolition of the historic rear ell. The 1942 rear addition is visible from Gaskill Street through a rollup gate. The windows on the front façade would have been wood six-over-six double-hung windows historically. The application proposes to install one-over-one double-hung windows, not the appropriate six-over-six.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove and infill the storefront.
- Remove the cornice.
- Demolish the gable roof, rear wall, and rear addition.
- Construct a full-width rear addition.

- Construct a roof deck and pilot house, with a five-foot setback of the railing from the front façade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 demolition of the rear main wall and roof permanently removes a large amount of historic material and does not meet Standard 9.
 - The existing rear addition was constructed in 1942; therefore, the addition is not historically significant and its demolition meets Standard 9.
 - The proposed rear addition is the full width of the lot and the full height of the main block, removing the character-defining gable, and does not meet Standard 9.
 - The work to the front façade as proposed does not meet Standard 9. The cornice should be maintained and historically accurate windows should be installed or the upper-floor windows should be repaired and retained.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - The demolition of the gable roof and rear wall would be an irreversible alteration and therefore does not meet Standard 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:04:37

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Cuby Lin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Lin explained the project and stated that he is working with Pella Windows to match the appearance of the existing front façade windows. He confirmed that he would like to paint the red brick front façade white.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the proposal removes virtually all the character-defining features of the building, including its cornice, gable roof, and storefront, and therefore the proposed scope does not satisfy the Standards. He stated that the building is remarkably preserved. He explained that painting of historic brick can cause further damage to the material.
- Mr. Lin explained that he has safety concerns for the first-floor apartment if he must retain the existing storefront, but that he will retain the storefront if required.
- Mr. Lin asked if he could remove the commercial sign above the storefront, as that tenant is no longer at this location, it is not historic, and it will be residential in use even if the storefront is retained. He asked if he could also remove the roll-down security gate.

- Mr. McCoubrey responded that Mr. Lin could work with the staff on the sign detail and determining what is under the existing sign, and what that area of the storefront may have looked like historically. He confirmed that the non-historic roll-down security gate can certainly be removed.
- Mr. Lin stated that he will work with the staff on a revised scope which meets the Standards.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni, representing the Society Hill Civic Association, opposed the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The main block of the building dates to c. 1830.
- The existing rear addition was constructed in 1942.
- The application proposes a significant amount of demolition.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The demolition of the rear main wall and roof permanently removes a large amount of historic material and does not meet Standard 9.
- The proposed rear addition is the full width of the lot and the full height of the main block, removing the character-defining gable, and does not meet Standard 9.
- The work to the front façade as proposed does not meet Standard 9. The cornice should be maintained and historically accurate windows should be installed or the upper-floor windows should be repaired and retained.
- The demolition of the gable roof and rear wall would be an irreversible alteration and therefore does not meet Standard 10.

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

ITEM: 511 S 4th ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 559 RICHTER ST

Proposal: Construct three-story multi-unit building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James W. Barnes

Applicant: A. Robert Torres, Studio Torres

History: 1850; Amos Barnes House

Individual Designation: 4/13/2017

District Designation: Ridge Ave Roxborough Historic District, Significant, 10/12/2018

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW:

The Historical Commission individually designated the property at 559 Richter Street for the building's architectural and historical significance and the site's archaeological potential. This application proposes to restore the historic building and construct a three-story multi-family building behind the historic building. The scope of work proposed for the historic building can be approved by the staff. The historic building sits at a prominent corner of the Roxborough-Wissahickon neighborhood where Ridge Avenue, Richter Street, and Hermit Street intersect. The new building would face onto Hermit Street and would not obstruct significant views of the historic building. Two options for façade and roofing materials are provided in the application. The new building appears to be slab-on-grade construct, but it is unclear whether its construction will require significant ground disturbance.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story multi-unit building at rear of property.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 8: Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*
 - If the project requires significant ground disturbance, an archaeologist must be retained to ensure compliance with Standard 8.
- *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 new construction is generally compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9. It is a modern interpretation of several buildings in the immediate area. The general proportions of the façade elements could be reconsidered to be more in keeping with typical proportions, including windows, doors, and mansard height.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided an archaeologist is retained to ensure compliance with Standard 8 if the project requires significant ground disturbance, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:15:46

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Bob Torres represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Torres explained the project and his inspiration for the design of the new building, which he drew from residential buildings in the immediate area. He stated that the intention is for minimal ground disturbance, and that the only real basement would be a utility room approximately ten feet by ten feet, which would be located under the stair tower.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the precedents in the immediate area have some details which are worth considering, such as cornices. He suggested bringing the setback railing at the front all the way to the front, and aligning the dormers over the windows below. He noted that the center bay is typically designed to have the most visual interest, but that is not the case with this proposed design. He thanked Mr. Torres for continuing the brick around to the side, but questioned if the stucco option was more successful than the brick option. He stated that he found the asphalt shingle roof option preferable over the metal roof.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver except regarding stucco versus brick. He stated that he prefers the brick, but it would depend on the brick color.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with a preference of brick instead of stucco, but that his preference would be for red brick rather than a buff brick.
 - Mr. Torres explained that he selected a buff brick to complement the colors of the historic house.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that Mr. Torres could provide a brick sample, but that he likely agreed with the use of a red brick.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the window sizes need to be reconsidered. He suggested changing the dormers to be double-hung.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the mansard is too tall and the projection on the center bay is too deep.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested treating the center bay with a material other than stucco. He suggested widening the porch to give it more presence on the street.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested extending the schist base up to the sill line of the first-floor windows.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that he had the same suggestion, but wondered if the base should be eliminated entirely and the façade material continued to the ground.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that the schist is an expensive material and perhaps it should be eliminated and the brick should be extended to the ground.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The new building would face onto Hermit Street and would not obstruct significant views of the historic building.
- The scope of restoration work for the historic building can be approved by the staff.

- It had recommended a significant number of design modifications despite finding the overall proposal to be appropriate. The applicant could revise per the Committee’s comments and present that revised design to the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- If the project requires significant ground disturbance, an archaeologist must be retained to ensure compliance with Standard 8.
- The proposed new construction is generally compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9. It is a modern interpretation of several buildings in the immediate area. The general proportions of the façade elements could be reconsidered to be more in keeping with typical proportions, including windows, doors, and mansard height.

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

ITEM: 559 RIGHTER ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 3701-15 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Construct addition
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: CSC Co-Living
 Applicant: Mathew Huffman, ALMA architecture llc
 History: 1970; International House; Bower & Fradley, architects
 Individual Designation: 12/11/2020
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the final approval of the addition of a structure for retail use on the western section of the plaza at International House in University City. It also proposes to rehabilitate the eastern section of the plaza. The Historical Commission designated International House, a Modernist hi-rise, in December 2020. At the same meeting, the Historical Commission approved in concept the construction of the retail structure on the western section of the plaza. While the in-concept application approved in 2020 was not an explicit financial

hardship application, the owner did argue that the International House building had several idiosyncrasies that would render its adaptive reuse expensive and difficult, and the retail structure would offset some of those expenses. The owner agreed not to oppose the designation in exchange for the Historical Commission's commitment that the retail structure as well as a rear addition would be approved. The Historical Commission indicated its commitment with the December 2020 in-concept approval, when it approved in concept a retail addition, provided it was limited to the western section of the plaza, to the west of the main entranceway. In June 2022, the Historical Commission approved a second in-concept application for the addition of the retail structure on the western section of the plaza. During that review, the Architectural Committee offered several suggestions for the improvement of the design, which the applicant implemented.

This application proposes the same design for the retail structure that the Historical Commission approved in concept in June 2022. The structure is designed to stand on its own, without any support from the historic building. Its construction will require no significant alterations to the historic building, allowing for it to be removed in the future and the historic building restored to its original condition. It will incorporate the existing concrete wall that runs along Chestnut Street and encloses the plaza. The front of the retail structure now steps down from the main roof height to the two-story glass box, to the one-story glass box, to the canopy over the entrance, referencing the terraced façade of the historic building. At the suggestion of the Architectural Committee, the applicant turned the entrance 90 degrees from the plaza to the street, lightened the color of the metal panels cladding the addition, and additional fenestration and articulation along Chestnut Street, and made other changes to improve the design.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct retail structure on western section of the plaza,
- Rehabilitate eastern section of the plaza.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 9.
 - The new construction will 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, satisfying Standard 9.
- *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 new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Historical Commission's approvals in concept of December 2020 and June 2022.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:44:44

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Mathew Huffman represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Huffman explained the changes made to the project based on the Architectural Committee's comments for the in-concept review. He explained that the Historical Commission approved this current design in-concept at its June 2022 meeting, and it is now being submitted for final approval.
- Ms. Stein asked if signage is part of this application.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that signage is typically submitted as a separate application, and that what is shown in the renderings may only be representative of where the signage would be located.
 - Mr. Huffman confirmed that signage is not part of this application.
 - Ms. Stein commented that the signage shown in the renderings is overwhelming.
 - Mr. Huffman agreed and noted that zoning will dictate what is allowed for signage, and a separate building permit application will be submitted for review by the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested moving the signage to the entrance canopy.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested having the signage on Chestnut Street rather than facing into the plaza.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the appearance of the west façade, as an elevation drawing was not provided.
 - Mr. Huffman responded that the west façade is proposed to be flat metal panels.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that the Committee cannot recommend approval without seeing all visible facades.
 - Mr. Huffman explained that he has an elevation drawing for the west façade, but it was not included in the application materials.
 - Ms. Chantry asked that he email it to her so she could share it on Zoom. She received the file and displayed it on the screen.
 - Mr. Huffman described the west façade and the proposed simple metal panels.
 - Ms. Stein suggested that the orientation of the west façade panels mimic that of the International House, being more vertical than horizontal.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the arbitrary placement of the window openings on the south façade.
 - Mr. Huffman responded that they were trying to be playful with the openings but that they can look at aligning some of the windows to bring some balance to the façade.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that the south façade is too flat and needs additional design elements. He suggested lowering the windows so that pedestrians can see inside.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the location of delivery trucks.

- Mr. Huffman responded that the existing building has a loading dock in the back on Ludlow Street which will be used for this commercial tenant.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the location of mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Huffman responded that there will be several smaller rooftop units which will be enclosed.
 - Mr. Cluver asked that a roof plan be provided to show the location of the condenser units. He stated that the units should not be visible from the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Gabriel Gottlieb commented that the south façade is lacking in terms of the pedestrian experience.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, opposed the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This application proposes the same design for the retail structure that the Historical Commission approved in concept in June 2022.
- The new construction will require no significant alterations to the historic building, allowing for it to be removed in the future and the historic building restored to its original condition.
- The revised design reflects comments received during the in-concept review by the Architectural Committee.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 9.
- The new construction will 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, satisfying Standard 9.
- The new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, with the following conditions:

- A detail drawing is provided to show the transition from the lower roof to the International House;
- The south façade be refined in terms of window alignment and additional detailing;
- The west façade metal panels be vertical rather than horizontal;
- New rooftop mechanical equipment is not visible from the public right-of-way.

ITEM: 3701-15 CHESTNUT ST					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 500-10 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct building on parking lot
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Broad Lombard Associates LP
 Applicant: Kevin T. King, Voith & Mactavish Architects
 History: 1959; District Health Center 1; Newcomb Montgomery & Robert Bishop, architects
 Individual Designation: 10/13/2017
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rehabilitation of the Mid-Century Modern health center at the southwest corner of S. Broad and Lombard Streets and the construction of a residential tower on the surface parking lot adjacent to the health center building. The property is individually designated. It is not in a historic district.

Most of the work to the historic building would be restoration work. Windows and doors would be replaced with units to match the originals. Glass block would be repaired and replaced in kind. Masonry would be repaired and repointed. Concrete would be cleaned and repaired. Exterior metal shaft ways and other later additions and alterations would be removed. Roofing would be replaced.

The historic building would be altered to create a parking entrance at the rear, northwest corner. Materials removed to create the opening to access the basement garage would be salvaged and reused during the restoration. The new building would lightly connect to the historic building at the recessed entranceway at the first floor of the north façade, creating an entry plaza to the complex.

The proposed tower would be 43 stories and 573 feet tall. It would be clad in glass and metal panels. The Lombard Street façade of the base of the tower would be clad in masonry to echo the masonry buildings to the west on Lombard. Although tall, the height of the building is appropriate for the area, which is zoned CMX-4. Arthaus, a new building one block to the north

on S. Broad Street, is 47 stories and 542 feet tall. Symphony House, one-half block to the north, is 31 stories and 375 feet tall.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Rehabilitate health center building,
- Construct residential tower.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall 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 other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - Deteriorated historic features will be repaired when possible and replaced in kind when necessary, owing to the severity of deterioration, satisfying Standard 6.
- *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 new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 9.
 - The new construction will 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, satisfying Standard 9.
- *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 new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, with the staff to review restoration details for the historic building, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:14:20

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Cluver recused from the review owing to his firm's involvement with the project.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Antonio Fiol-Silva and Kevin King, and developer's representative David Smith, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the curved portion of the tower that hovers over the space between the historic building and the tower.
 - Mr. Fiol-Silva responded that it is part of the residential space and is designed this way to expose the entire length of the north elevation of the historic building. He confirmed that it does not overlap with the footprint of the historic building and provides breathing room between the two buildings.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicant provide a zoomed-in view of the space between the buildings for consideration by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented in support of the design of the tower which creatively pulls back at the ground level to reveal the historic building.
- Ms. Stein commented in support of the design of the tower and the overall project. She suggested a lighter color or slightly reflective material for the underside of the section which hovers over the space between the two buildings, to help with keeping that space bright rather than dark.
 - Mr. Fiol-Silva agreed with this suggestion.
- Ms. Stein asked about the restoration of the historic building.
 - Mr. King explained the full restoration scope, including windows, storefront, and glass block.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the connector between the buildings will need to be done with careful attention as to not interrupt the spandrel concrete panels.
 - Mr. King responded that the proposal is to attach under the soffit and not disrupt the spandrel panels.
- Ms. Stein asked about the location and visibility of rooftop mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Fiol-Silva responded that the tower will provide services for both buildings and the existing equipment on the roof of the historic building will be removed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Alexander Roederer, a near neighbor, commented in support of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Most of the work to the historic building will be restoration work.
- The new building will lightly connect to the historic building at the recessed entranceway at the first floor of the north façade, creating an entry plaza to the complex.
- This proposal will activate an underutilized corner of South Broad Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Deteriorated historic features will be repaired when possible and replaced in kind when necessary, owing to the severity of deterioration, satisfying Standard 6.
- The new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 9.
- The new construction will 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, satisfying Standard 9.
- The new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review restoration details for the historic building, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 500-10 S BROAD ST					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Stein					
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				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4			1	2

ADDRESS: 1904-40 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Paint mural
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Southern Land Company
 Applicant: Ryan Strand Greenberg, City of Philadelphia Mural Arts Program
 History: 1901; Warwick Apartments
 Individual Designation: None
 District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
 Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a mural to the west wall of the Warwick Apartments building on the 1900-block of Sansom Street. A three-story commercial building is currently under construction to the west of the Warwick at the southwest corner of 20th and Sansom Streets. The roof of the commercial building will include a pool and other amenities for the Laurel, the new residential tower being completed on the 1900-block of Walnut Street. The Warwick, adjacent Rittenhouse Coffee Shop building, and commercial building as well as the tower are all part of the Laurel complex. The rooftop amenity space will be accessed from the Laurel by a bridge over Moravian Street. The mural would provide a backdrop for the amenity space.

The commercial building will share a party wall with the Warwick below the sixth-story window-sill level of the Warwick. The west party wall of the Warwick above that level will be exposed. The mural would be painted directly onto the west wall or would be painted on mural cloth that would be attached to the wall. The party wall as well as the west wall at the rear, which sets back from the property line, have been painted, altered, and repaired many times, including for the removal of a fire escape. Most of the mural would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

The corners of the Warwick building at Sansom Street include an unusual architectural detail. The brick building has limestone or cast-stone quoins at the corners and an additional wythe of brick that projects out from the party walls about one foot back from the corner.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install mural.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 installation of the mural will not destroy historic features, satisfying Standard 9, provided it is set back at least five feet from the northwest corner of the building to protect the view of the quoins at the corner.
- *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 mural could be removed in the future, leaving the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment unimpaired and satisfying Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the mural is set back at least five feet from the northwest corner of the building to protect the view of the quoins at the corner, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:38:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Ryan Strand Greenberg of Mural Arts represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked if the content or overall design intent for the mural was known.
 - Mr. Greenberg responded that the artist and artwork has not yet been selected, but that it will be non-representational, meaning there will be no figures included in the design. He noted that approximately 75 percent of the mural will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Stein asked how the mural would be installed given the number of windows.
 - Mr. Greenberg responded that part of the reason for not doing a figurative work is so that parts of a body are not cut off by windows.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked for an explanation from the staff regarding the recommendation to set the mural back five feet.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that it was an estimated distance to allow for retention of the view of the quoins at the corner.
 - Committee members agreed that five feet seemed excessive.

- Mr. Cluver suggested that the mural align with the edge of the projecting brick.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with holding it to the edge of the limestone quoins.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern about painting the mural directly onto the brick.
 - Mr. Greenberg responded that it can be applied using a mural cloth which attaches with an acrylic binder rather than being painted directly onto the brick.
 - Committee members agreed to the mural cloth approach.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, asked why a mural is needed in this context.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The party wall as well as the west wall at the rear, which sets back from the property line, have been painted, altered, and repaired many times.
- Most of the mural would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The installation of the mural will not destroy historic features, satisfying Standard 9, provided it is set back to protect the view of the quoins at the corner.
- The mural could be removed in the future, leaving the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment unimpaired and satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the mural is set back an appropriate distance relative to the quoins, and that the mural is applied using mural cloth, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 1904-40 SANSOM ST					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
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				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 1914 WILCOX ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Waybar 534 LLC

Applicant: Paul J. Lorenz, CANNODesign

History: 1880

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for a third-story addition with a roof deck at 1914 Wilcox Street. The building was originally constructed as a carriage house in 1880 to serve nearby residences. Today, Wilcox Street remains a service alley for the 1900 blocks of Green and Brandywine Streets with mostly garages, parking areas, and rear yards facing the street. This review focuses on the third-story addition. First and second floor façade rehabilitation work can be reviewed by the Historical Commission's staff.

The proposed third-story addition will have a mansard roof with paired dormer windows. The mansard will be clad in standing-seam metal roofing with a steel gray finish. A roof deck will be constructed on top of addition, with a black metal railing set back five feet from the front of mansard. The roof deck railing and third-floor addition will be visible from the public right of way along Wilcox Street but will not be visually out of character for street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct one-story addition and roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 one-story addition is compatible in terms of massing, size, scale, and architectural features and meets Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed addition does not alter the essential form and integrity of the historic property; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:59:08

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Paul Lorenz represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked if there is a pilot house for access to the roof deck.
 - Mr. Lorenz replied that there is no pilot house. There is an open stair from the second-floor deck to access the roof deck.
- Mr. Cluver observed that although the roof deck railing is set back five feet from the front façade, it will still be quite visible from the public right-of-way. He asked if the railing could be made more inconspicuous.
 - Mr. Lorenz responded that they explored pulling back the railing on the east and west elevations. He pointed out the narrowness of Wilcox Street and how this limits visibility from the street level. He stated that they could consider pulling the railing back five feet from the east and west elevations.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the railing is visible at street level in front of the building.
 - Mr. Lorenz replied that it would be minimally visible.
- Ms. Stein asked about the need for a roof deck. She noted the narrowness of the property parcel. She opined that it may be better to have the second-floor deck along the back of the building.
- Ms. Stein observed that the dormers are very prominent on the mansard and do not follow the patterning of the windows below. She pointed out that what makes this building interesting is the offset nature of the garage door compared to the large window on the second floor. She asked if there was a more interesting way to add dormers that play off that geometry rather than lining up the dormers in a row in a way that is unrelated to the façade. She encouraged the applicant to explore other dormer variations.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the elevation drawing shows that the dormer windows are taller than all other windows on the building. He observed that it makes the building look top-heavy. Mr. Detwiler commented that the mansard precedent photographs included in the application show how dormer windows tend to be smaller than their lower floors. He asked about reducing the size of the dormer windows.
 - Mr. Lorenz responded that they could reduce the size by pulling up the sill to bring them more in line with the size of the existing windows.
 - Mr. Detwiler pointed to other dormer details shown in the precedent photographs and how playing with these types of details, in addition to the size, could help reduce the visual scale.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the proportions on the dormer windows are acceptable, specifically the vertical orientation which is more typical of dormer windows.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building was originally constructed as a carriage house in 1880.
- Wilcox Street remains a service alley for the 1900 blocks of Green and Brandywine Streets with mostly garages, parking areas, and rear yards facing the street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed one-story addition is compatible in terms of massing, size, and scale. Revising the application to reflect the Committee’s comments on the architectural details of the addition will allow for the application to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed addition does not alter the essential form and integrity of the historic property; therefore, the application satisfies Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the upper roof deck railing is pulled back five feet from the east and west sides, the condensing units are located only on the lower deck, and the scale, pattern, and rhythm of the dormers is reconsidered to have a better relationship with the existing fenestration, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 1914 WILCOX 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				X
Rudy D’Alessandro					
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 321 AND 323 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Consolidate lots; construct three-story addition
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Anna and Kevin Towers
 Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects, LLC
 History: 1825
 Individual Designation: 3/25/1969
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for a three-story addition with roof decks at 321 and 323 Queen Street. The property at 323 Queen Street is not designated as historic and is currently used as a parking area. The property 321 Queen Street includes a two and half story brick rowhouse with a gable roof and dormer rowhouse that maintains its 1825 historic appearance from the public right-of-way. Behind the front portion of the gable, the rear section of the building has been significantly altered and is three stories from the roof ridge to the back wall.

The proposed addition would stand in the currently open lot at 323 Queen Street and connect to the designated building at 321 Queen Street. The front façade of the addition would be red brick and would maintain the cornice line of the adjacent properties. Like the historic building, the

proposed addition would rise to three stories at the rear. Roof decks are proposed for the second and third stories. The second-floor roof deck would be connected to an upper deck with an outside staircase. The upper roof deck would span across the historic building and new addition.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story addition with roof deck extending onto the historic building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 front façade of the addition up to the cornice is compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features; therefore, it meets Standard 9.
 - The proposed front roof of the new addition is not compatible with the historic property. The proposal presents an abbreviated gable roof and visible staircase leading to the new upper roof deck. The staff recommends a full front gable roof to maintain a continuous ridge line with 321 Queen Street in order to meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed addition could be removed from the historic building at 321 Queen Street in the future, leaving the historic building intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The top-level roof deck as currently proposed would be visible from the public right-of-way; therefore, the application does not meet the Roofs Guideline. The staff recommends that the applicant create a physical mockup of the deck railing on 321 Queen Street for the staff to review onsite to determine how the roof deck, possibly through additional setbacks and alternate materials, can meet the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:14:26

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Derek Spencer represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver expressed concern regarding the truncated roof. He stated there is a strong roof ridge line in this area of the block and a truncated roof will stand out. He

- continued that there is a rhythm of dormers that would be interrupted by this as well. He stated that the interrupted roof element does not fit with the character of the row.
- Mr. Spencer responded that they were trying to avoid the need for a pilot house to access the roof deck, which is the reason for the opening in the front gable. He explained that this is also why the lower outdoor stair is accessed from the second-floor deck. This outdoor stair is the access point to the roof deck.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated the roof deck is higher than the ridge line and positioned so far forward that it is visible from the public right-of-way. He asked about the extent of replacement at the rear of the building.
 - Mr. Lorenz replied that the back wall will remain in place, and the back wall windows will be replaced. He pointed out a small area at the rear, shaped like a notch, and explained that this is an existing window area that will be demolished and reframed. He stated that this is the only area of the existing rear building that will be demolished, and the roof deck will be going over the existing rear section of the building.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that his primary concerns about the design are the truncated front gable, and that the roof deck is so far forward and elevated over the ridge line.
 - Mr. Spencer pointed out that the deck is placed behind the ridge line but offered to explore lowering height of the roof deck by one foot or more.
 - Ms. Gutterman recommended eliminating the roof deck altogether and having just a balcony. She commented that the clear glass railing is problematic. She expressed concern about the presence of the roof deck and the gable cut out necessary to access it. She expressed concern that it could set a precedent.
 - Ms. Gutterman requested that the applicant submit photographs of other garage doors on Queen Street. She expressed concern about the size of the garage door and opening in the proposed addition. She stated that the photographs provided in the application do not show the size of the house in relation to the garage doors. She continued that the issue is the proposed size of the garage door in relation to the size of the proposed addition.
 - Mr. Spencer responded that the intent was to align the cast stone window lintels on 321 Queen Street with the garage opening at 323 Queen Street, which is why there are transom windows above the garage door. He offered to consider ways to reduce the size of the garage door.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that he does not like the appearance of the garage roll-up door with the heavy rail between the door and transom. He stated that the proportions are not correct. He suggested lowering the opening with the doors to be more like carriage house doors and to be a more relatable scale.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented on the proposed bulkhead design, and recommended that the applicant look at existing bulkheads in Queen Village to determine detailing and materials.
 - Mr. Spencer confirmed that their intent is to match the historic details on the block.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Historical Commission typically holds roof decks to the rear wing rather than a building's main block. He noted that in this case the decks have subsumed the main block to some degree. He concluded that this comes close to having a deck on the main roof.
 - Mr. Cluver commented on the large size of the proposed deck.
 - Mr. Spencer responded that they will revisit the size of the deck and its placement.

- Mr. Cluver suggested a stair behind the ridge line and holding the roof deck back from the ridge line. He commented that the further the roof deck sets back behind the ridge line, the more the ridge will reduce the visibility of the deck. He stated that maintaining the ridge line across and having a dormer is very important to maintaining the rhythm on this block of homes. He added that there is a strong rhythm of dormers on this area of the street.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 323 Queen Street is not designated as historic and is currently used as a parking area.
- The property 321 Queen Street includes a two and half story brick rowhouse with a gable roof and dormer rowhouse that maintains its 1825 historic appearance from the public right-of-way. The rear section of the building has been significantly altered and is three stories from the roof ridge to the back wall.
- The addition's broken ridge line with a truncated front gable and lack of dormer interrupts the strong rhythm and pattern historically present in this row of buildings.
- The roof deck will be highly visible from the public right-of-way.
- Compatible materials for the railing on the historic building would be metal or wood.
- The garage opening and door appear to be too large for the size of the addition. Proportions and details should be revisited to make these compatible with the historic building and surrounding context.
- Historic details of bulkhead doors on this block and Queen Village in general should be used to redesign the proposed bulkhead.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed front façade and roof of the new addition are not compatible with the historic property. The proposal presents a truncated gable roof and visible staircase leading to the new upper roof deck. The garage opening and door are not compatible in scale, architectural details, and materials with the historic building. Owing to this, the application does not meet Standard 9.
- The proposed addition could be removed from the historic building at 321 Queen Street in the future, leaving the historic building intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.
- The top-level roof deck as currently proposed would be visible from the public right-of-way and has a glass railing; therefore, the application does not meet the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 321 AND 323 QUEEN ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				X
Rudy D'Alessandro					
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 416-24 VINE ST

Proposal: Demolish building; construct six-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robert W. McMillan

Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1940

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for the construction of a six-story building at 416-24 Vine Street. The existing 1-story building was constructed circa 1940 and is classified as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. The proposed project includes the demolition of the existing building and construction of a 70-unit, 65-foot-tall multifamily building with ground floor commercial space. The demolition of the existing non-contributing can be approved without a hardship or public necessity finding. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

The property is located at the southwest corner of Vine Street and N. Lawrence Street. The surrounding buildings in this area of the historic district range in height from three to six stories and are clad in red brick. The new building's exterior design references nearby historic industrial buildings. The building's cladding is proposed as a combination of dark grey metal and cement fiber board. A lighter bronze color cement fiber board will be used on the first level. All windows will be aluminum clad on the exterior.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing building.
- Construct new six-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 massing, size, and scale of the proposed building are compatible with nearby industrial buildings in the historic district and surrounding neighborhood. Although the architectural features and detailing are a combination of historic and modern elements, in general they are compatible with the historic district. However, the exterior cladding and color scheme are not compatible with the historic district. If the color scheme and cladding materials are revised to be compatible, the application could satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the exterior color scheme and cladding are revised to be compatible with the historic district, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:34:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rich Villa represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver commented that when he compares this proposed design to other buildings in Old City, like the historic building with the black façade cited by Mr. Villa as a key design reference, there is a calm that comes from the rhythm of the other buildings, but is not found with this proposed design. He stated that historic building designs can be digested as a whole, but with the proposed design, the whole cannot be appreciated because it is visually complicated. He concluded that there are aspects of the design that he appreciates but it makes his eyes jump around too much to appreciate the whole of the design.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he is not bothered by the aspects of the design cited by Mr. Cluver, but that the proposed exterior colors are problematic. He pointed out that the black façade of the historic building Mr. Villa references in Old City is painted black and that cast iron buildings such as this would have historically been gray with a sand mixed into the paint to replicate stone. He commented again on the darkness of the exterior material and asked if less contrast between the cladding materials and windows would help.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the cement board siding shown as exterior cladding in the renderings.
 - Mr. Villa replied that it is a shiplap siding and has a flush reveal. He stated that they can control the reveal and therefore the shadow line. He noted there is less of a shadow line with the shiplap versus clapboard.
- Mr. Detwiler addressed the top of the building. He suggested the addition of something more above the cornice line, such as a parapet.
 - Mr. Villa replied that there is a two-foot parapet as proposed, but he can look at raising it.

- Mr. Cluver opined that a higher parapet would not achieve what Mr. Detwiler was asking for. He asked about increasing the space between the top of the sixth-floor windows and the cornice to give it more of an entablature and add depth to this area of the building.
- Mr. Villa described the windows size by floor and pointed out that the sixth-floor windows are shorter than the other floors. He stated that he likes the proportions of these windows being shorter. He stated that he could raise the cornice but would then lose the parapet.
- Mr. Cluver responded that he does not recommend making the sixth-floor windows any taller as there is a grand tradition of the top floor windows being shorter. He suggested taking the heavier cornice between the fourth and fifth floors and moving it between the fifth and sixth floors so that it reads as a base.
- Mr. Villa responded that he has explored this scheme but will revisit it. He stated that he likes the top two floors together.
- Mr. Detwiler reiterated that the thickness at the top of the building shown in the current design is too small.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the black historic building that Mr. Villa referenced is only painted black on the front façade and the rest of the building is red brick.
 - Mr. Villa stated that he explored other colors and was not satisfied with how they looked and that is how he settled on a dark gray-black color.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested a medium gray tone like a granite color to make it less severe.
 - Mr. McCoubrey added that the color scheme suggested by Mr. Detwiler would highlight the light and shadows that the cornices are casting. He continued that there is probably a gray to be found that will give the design the sense of solidity that the black gives it but would be less ominous and oppressive.
 - Mr. Villa agreed to look into this color option.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the openings on the first floor, specifically the west elevation wall that encloses the parking garage. He noted the façade wall as shown is very blank.
 - Mr. Villa responded that he would like to put more windows on this elevation but is limited on openings because of the proximity to the property line. He pointed out the door in the center of the first-floor elevation that allows tenants to access the side yard.
 - Mr. Detwiler recommended that the first-floor wall could be visually broken down. He suggested bringing the vertical elements of the upper floors down to the ground to create a more panelized look that will break up the first-floor wall.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Eric Flocco, Vice President of Real Estate and Public Affairs at Clear Channel Outdoor, commented that Clear Channel Outdoor has a billboard on the building northeast of this site. He explained that their billboard will be completely blocked if the proposed building is more than five stories in height. He asked the Committee to recommend a reduction in height of the building to fifty feet.
- Chandler Brenneman, speaking on behalf of the Franklin Bridge North Neighbors RCO, commented that the community organization is concerned about the proposed dark color and is hoping for an exterior color scheme that is more compatible with the red brick industrial buildings in the nearby area. He inquired about the parking in the building and how it conforms with the City's requirements.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing 1-story building was constructed circa 1940 and is classified as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. The demolition of the existing non-contributing can be approved without a hardship or public necessity finding.
- The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.
- The design of the top of the building should be reconsidered to be more substantial.
- The dark exterior color is not compatible with the surrounding buildings and the Old City Historic District.
- The design of the first-floor west elevation should be further developed. It currently reads as a blank wall and this elevation will be highly visible from N. 5th Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The massing, size, and scale of the proposed building are compatible with nearby industrial buildings in the historic district and surrounding neighborhood. In terms of architectural features and details, specific aspects of the design should be reconsidered. If the application is revised to reflect the Architectural Committee’s comments regarding the exterior color scheme, design of the top of the building, and detailing of the first-floor west elevation, the application could satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 416-24 VINE ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				X
Rudy D’Alessandro					
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:57:00

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:57 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.

DRAFT