

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

**TUESDAY, 22 APRIL 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop
Angie Koo
Jessica Beers
Stephen Beers
Chris Deemer, Berzinsky Architects
Greg Berzinsky, Berzinsky Architects
Bob Wautlet, E. Allen Reeves, Inc.
Ernie Freeman, First Presbyterian Church
Peter Smith, First Presbyterian Church
Emily Crane, French & Crane Architects
Donna Dirkson
Hyon Kang, KCA
Nick Rudolph
Mark Fink
Doug Seiler, Seiler Drury Architects
Larry Giglio
Shawn Bullard
Sandy Mustica

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Stein and Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 115-19 CUTHBERT ST, UNIT E

Project: Construct one-story rooftop addition

Review Requested: Final approval

Owner: Stephen Beers

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop

History: 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a small, one-story rooftop addition with roof deck on a residential multi-family building located within the Old City Historic District. The former light-industrial building was a box factory built about 1920; it was altered and added to in the 1980s. The design of the proposed addition is Modern in style, not to exceed 65 feet in height, and would be set back about four feet from Mascher Street. The addition would meet the parapet of the historic building along Cuthbert Street for a length of about 19 feet, with the remaining span along Cuthbert Street set back about three feet. Cuthbert and Mascher Streets are very narrow and views of the addition from the public right-of-way would be limited.

This project has come before the Architectural Committee twice this year as in-concept reviews. The initial recommendation of the Committee was for a simplification of colors and materials, additional glazing, and reduction of visibility. The applicant then submitted a revised proposal to reflect simplified materials and colors, and the addition of glazing, but the overall massing remained relatively the same as the first submission. Upon second review, the Committee recommended approval of the in-concept application, provided an exterior stair is substituted for the pilot house, the railing is metal, and the addition is dark gray in color; with the staff to review details. The current revised proposal, requesting final approval, addresses those concerns.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and property owners Stephen and Jessica Beers represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano distributed revised drawings to show an update to the window pattern on the rooftop addition. Ms. Hawkins asked if there would be a railing along the parapet of the existing building. Mr. Montalbano responded that there would be no railing, owing to the five-foot zoning setback. He also confirmed that the color choice for the addition is dark gray. Ms. Gutterman noted that the rendering should be updated because it still shows a glass railing from the previous submission. Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicants for working closely with the Committee over the past several months, and observed that the revised proposal is a better solution than that originally proposed. Mr. Cluver agreed that the project has evolved nicely.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 319 S CAMAC ST

Project: Construct two-story rear addition and deck

Review Requested: Final approval

Owner: Patrick and Shelly Baldasare

Applicant: Chris Deemer, Berzinsky Architects

History: 1828

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition with third-floor roof deck on a private residence. The existing one-story rear addition with third-floor roof deck will be removed. The new addition will be built using red brick where it faces South Fawn Street and will include doors on the first floor and casement windows on the second floor. The third-floor deck with metal railing will be set back on the addition about seven feet. The addition is visible from South Fawn Street at the rear, but not from South Camac Street.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Chris Deemer and Greg Berzinsky represented the application.

Mr. Berzinsky clarified that the existing rear addition is one story with a third-floor deck, with nothing on the second story other than the lattice infill. He explained that the proposed windows for the addition are aluminum clad with an applied muntin system. He also clarified that the existing third-floor window will likely be replaced with a larger window and that a new air conditioning unit will sit outside of that window on the new deck. This modified window and air conditioning unit will not be visible from South Fawn Street. There is an existing air conditioning unit in the wall below the existing window, which will be removed and the new window opening will be cut down to fill that space. Mr. Berzinsky also noted that the entire third floor was a later addition to the building, possibly done around 1980. He clarified that a second-floor window will be cut down to create a doorway into the new addition, but that the opening will not be made wider.

Ms. Hawkins voiced her concern that the glazing pattern, as shown on the drawings, is horizontally oriented on the new second-floor windows. She explained that the glazing should have a vertical orientation rather than horizontal orientation. She also expressed concern about the alignment as shown in the drawings for the new sliding doors and windows, and suggested a more consistent proportion. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the proposed second-floor windows be double-hung windows rather than casement windows, since double-hung windows are traditionally found on the rear of historic houses. Ms. Hawkins agreed with that suggestion.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the deck railing, and Mr. Berzinsky stated that it will be painted wrought iron. Mr. Berzinsky confirmed that the cornice at the deck level will be fabricated out of Azek.

Ms. Gutterman asked the staff to explain why it was not concerned about the visibility of the addition from South Fawn Street. Ms. Broadbent explained that South Fawn Street is quite narrow, and there are no front-facing buildings on the block at this location that would face the

addition on this property. Mr. Baron added that the staff did acknowledge the visibility of the addition by deciding to have the project reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission, and that the staff felt that it was an improvement over the existing rear that is currently visible from South Fawn Street. Mr. Berzinsky clarified that there is an existing historic wall at the rear of this property, so that the view from South Fawn Street is limited to the rear of the building above the first floor. He also confirmed that his clients have no intention of adding a parking space to the rear yard.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that alterations to existing window or door openings do not widen the openings, and the glazing orientation on all new windows and doors is vertically oriented rather than horizontally oriented, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 546 QUEEN ST

Project: Construct second-story addition with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Halle Borges

Applicant: Hyon Kang, KCA

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story addition with a roof deck over an existing non-historic rear one-story addition at this building at the corner of 6th and Queen Streets. The addition would be clad in brick or stucco as an alternate and would be recessed two inches to be differentiated. The deck would have brick piers at each corner with a metal railing in between. The deck would be accessed by the third-floor window cut down for a six-panel solid wood door. A soldier-course lintel would be installed above the door. A door with the upper portion glazed with six panes and no soldier-course lintel would be more appropriate. This application also proposed to install aluminum-clad six-over-six simulated-divided-light windows with 7/8 inch-wide muntins.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the deck access door is glazed in the upper portion with six panes and the soldier-course lintel is not installed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Hyon Kang represented the application.

Ms. Stein asked why this property is designated as historic. She noted that a portion of the façade had been rebuilt. Mr. Kang stated that only the second and third-floor facades are historic; at some point, the first floor was refaced with stamped concrete. Mr. Baron stated that the cladding is similar to Garden State brick face. He stated that he thinks that there are areas of historic brick under the Garden State brick.

Mr. Cluver asked if the proposed access door would be the same width as the existing opening. Mr. Kang affirmed that it would and stated that they will use a door that fits that width. Ms. Gutterman asked about the relation of the floor level to that of the window sills on the third floor. She stated that the windows appear low. Mr. Kang stated that the ceiling heights are approximately eight feet. He stated that the height of the sill height is about 24 inches above the floor. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether there is sufficient room for an addition. Mr. Kang stated that there is enough space. He noted that a structural engineer will design the structural details.

Mr. Cluver asked why they proposed the soldier course over the door. Mr. Kang said that they designed it that way to work with the building, but they are open to omitting the soldier course from the design. Mr. McCoubrey asked if they are replacing all of the windows. Mr. Kang affirmed that they would be replacing the windows and stated that the existing doors will remain. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the two flanking windows on the first floor have a one-over-one pane configuration because they are too narrow for six-over-six. Ms. Cote stated that the staff concurs. Mr. Cluver asked about the reason for selecting an aluminum-clad window. Ms. Cote stated that the staff felt that, given the changes to this building and the fact that the window openings may not be historic, the aluminum-clad six-over-six windows would be appropriate.

Mr. Cluver asked if there would be a cap on the brick piers. Mr. Kang responded that it would be brick. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that it should be capped to avoid water infiltration of the brick joints. Ms. Stein asked why they propose a soldier course on the rear elevation between the first and second floor. Mr. Kang stated that that detail was proposed to correspond to the existing decorative brick on the side. Mr. Cluver suggested leaving the existing brick there and building up without installing the soldier course.

Mr. Cluver noted that the use of aluminum-clad windows in this case is acceptable because the existing windows are aluminum and because the building has significant lost integrity.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the existing width of the third-floor opening is maintained; the door to the deck is glazed in the upper portion with six panes; no new soldier courses are added; the first floor flanking windows are one-over-one; and the piers are capped with a solid material such as cast stone, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 7-43 W CHELTEN AVE

Project: Construct ADA access ramp, alter historic doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: First Presbyterian Church

Applicant: Robert Wautlet, E. Allen Reeves, Inc

History: 1871; First Presbyterian Church of Germantown; 1888, 1891, 1937

Individual Designation: 1/25/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA-accessible ramp at the rear of the building, and to replace two sets of exterior doors. The proposed ramp would be of wood construction. The first set of doors, which is visible from W. Cheltenham Avenue, would be replaced in kind. The second set of doors, which is visible from Vernon Park, would be replaced with an ADA-accessible metal door and sidelight. The stained glass and decorative wood transoms would remain.

Although it is unclear whether the set of doors facing W. Cheltenham Avenue is original, an 1895 photograph of the property indicates that the style of the existing doors is consistent with that of the historic doors. The rear doors facing Vernon Park appear to be original, and as such, the staff recommends that the applicant retain them in a permanently open position, while installing an ADA-accessible door in the opening.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, conditional upon the retention of the historic doors, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Project manager Bob Wautlet, and Ernie Freeman and Peter Smith, members of the First Presbyterian Church of Germantown, represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the applicant had explored the possibility of retaining the historic doors in a perpetually-open position. Mr. Wautlet responded that the doors appear to be in extremely poor condition and are likely to fall apart when opened. He noted that, if they were to open them as suggested, they would restrict access to the interior vestibule and new office space. Ms. Stein clarified that there are two sets of doors in question, the red doors facing W. Cheltenham Avenue, and the white doors facing Vernon Park. Mr. Wautlet noted that both sets of doors are currently wood. Ms. Gutterman asked if the applied trim on the white doors was separating from the door or if the whole door itself was falling apart. Mr. Wautlet responded that the doors are inoperable and appear as though they would fall apart if opened. Mr. Wautlet noted that the new doors would be installed below the transoms, and that the transoms would be retained in place. Mr. Smith noted that, since he joined the church in 1986, they have not opened the white doors for any reason. Ms. Gutterman asked if the reason for opening the doors now was to construct the ramp, and Mr. Wautlet responded that affirmatively, explaining that, the ramp and door would provide ADA access to new office space they plan to construct on the interior. Ms. Stein asked if they chose the back entrance for a reason, and Mr. Smith responded that the ramp is necessary to accommodate the expansion of one of the church's programs, the Germantown Avenue Crisis Ministry. He provided a brief overview of the program, noting that it is currently housed in the basement office on the other side of the building, by Cheltenham Avenue. The church desires to move the program to a space on the first

floor near Vernon Park, where it would have more direct access and people would not have to go up and down steps, as there is no elevator.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the ramp would only provide access to these offices or if it would provide access to the whole church. Mr. Smith responded that there is access to the church from the east side, which is ground level, but that this ramp would provide access to the church on the west side and access to the sanctuary. He noted that there is an elevator lift in the middle of the building that allows people to go up and down one level, but that this ramp would allow access on the same level as the sanctuary. He continued that their main purpose, however, is for program access for the Crisis Ministry.

Mr. Cluver asked for clarification on the key plan for the location of the ramp. He commented that it is not on a main façade. Ms. Stein noted that it would be located at the rear of the church building, adjacent to Vernon Park. Ms. Stein asked if the reason they chose to locate the ramp on the rear was so that it would be out of the way, and Mr. Smith responded affirmatively, that they sought to locate it out of the way. Mr. Cluver asked about the grading of the current access patterns. Mr. Smith responded that people access this area off of Cheltenham Avenue. Mr. Cluver asked if it would be possible to do grading work to create a sloped walkway, and Ms. Stein countered that there are four risers to the door. Mr. Wautlet noted that it would create additional site work, and there would also be issues of runoff. Mr. Baron asked if the proposed ramp would be metal or wood, and Mr. Wautlet responded that it would be wood construction. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the applicant would keep the existing steps underneath the proposed ramp, and the applicant responded that they would.

Mr. Cluver questioned whether the red doors facing W. Cheltenham Avenue were in poor condition as well, and Mr. Wautlet responded that they are in poor condition but operable. Mr. Smith opined that he was not sure they could sustain daily use. Mr. Wautlet noted that one reason they wanted to use metal doors was for security purposes. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the material of the extant red doors, and Mr. Wautlet responded that they are wood.

Mr. Cluver asked about the width of the doors, and Mr. Wautlet responded that the doorways are 56.5 inches wide, and the proposed new red doors are 28 inches wide each. The red doors facing W. Cheltenham Avenue are seven feet two inches tall, while the white doors facing Vernon Park are seven feet four inches tall.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that it is a shame to lose the historic white doors. Ms. Gutterman recommended that the applicant carefully remove the white doors and store them, if possible, for future conservation. She opined that they could be used as an art object, as they are possibly the last of the building's original doors. She recommended that the applicant not dispose of the doors.

Ms. Stein commented that she believed the ramp could be reconfigured to allow better access. In its current proposed configuration, she noted, one would have to walk all the way around the ramp to get to the access point, but if it was flipped, it would be more accessible for people who need to use it. Ms. Stein continued that, based on the photograph, it looks as though people would be approaching the ramp from the parking lot and walking back towards the corner near Vernon Park. Mr. Wautlet noted, if the ramp were flipped, it would require a bigger landing. Ms. Hawkins suggested the possibility of rotating the ramp ninety degrees, which would also decrease its visibility from the street and make it a more pleasant and equal arrival for its users.

Mr. Wautlet addressed a suggestion offered by the staff regarding the proposed HVAC unit. He noted that the staff had recommended surrounding the unit with bushes, but he countered that the area is paved and the unit is very small.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee recommend approval of the application, with the staff to review details, and the recommendation to retain and store the white doors, and for the applicant to study rotating the ramp to make it more concealed by the building. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with her suggestion.

Mr. Cluver questioned the material choice for the proposed doors, and Ms. Hawkins responded that both sets are proposed as metal. Mr. Cluver stated that he would like to amend Ms. Gutterman's recommendation to require wood doors. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Cluver noted that, regardless of materials, an attempt should be made to model both sets of doors on the historic wood-paneled red doors. Mr. Smith asked for clarification about the recommendations, and Ms. Hawkins replied that the recommendation would include a panel at the bottom of the operable door, and panel at the bottom of the sidelight, if possible, similar to what is shown on the drawing. Rather than glass on the bottom, she noted, the door and sidelight would have solid bottom panels. The red doors facing W. Chelton Avenue would be replaced in-kind.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, and suggested that the white doors should be retained and stored on site, the applicant should explore rotating the ramp, and both sets of doors should be paneled at the bottom and glazed above, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 2139 CYPRESS ST

Project: Construct addition, alter front doorway, replace front windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Anthony Tran

Applicant: Joseph DelCasale, DelCasale Custom Builders, LLC

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition with roof deck. The addition would span the entire rear of the property, and would require the demolition of a non-historic greenhouse. The materials of the addition would be stucco at the first floor, and Hardie-board siding on the second and third floors. The proposed addition would be visible from S. 22nd Street. The proposed roof deck would cover the roof of the third floor of the addition, as well as a large portion of the existing main block. It would be set back 12 feet from Cypress Street and approximately four feet from the east façade to minimize visibility from the approach westward along Cypress. Other proposed changes include new windows on the front façade, and the widening of the front door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the proposed door widening, and approval of the addition, provided that the roof deck is restricted to the addition, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Emily Crane represented the application.

Ms. Crane asked whether there was any possibility of an approval of the widening of the door, and Ms. Hawkins responded that an approval for the widening was extremely unlikely. Ms. Stein noted that the door on the proposed addition is approximately six feet wide, so there would not be as great a need to move furniture in through the front door. Ms. Crane responded that the house is not accessible from the rear alley, and the side alley is three feet wide; therefore, if the proposed addition is approved, the owner would be able to use the side alley to bring large items into the house.

Mr. Cluver questioned the proposed changes in window configuration, and Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the windows would be of wood construction, and that the change in configuration was intended to bring the windows into keeping with the Italianate style of the building. Ms. Crane noted that the current windows are in fair condition, and that the owner may or may not go through with their replacement.

Ms. Stein noted that the proposal for the roof deck seemed to be asking for an approval in-concept, as the roof plan and third-floor plans did not correspond with one another. Ms. Crane apologized, noting that she had not updated the plan. Ms. Crane further noted that they have not yet had the opportunity to access the roof, but that she believes there is a parapet along the front facade. Ms. Hawkins noted that it is very rare for the Commission to approve a deck that sits on the main block of the house, and that decks are generally limited to rear-ells or rear additions. Ms. Gutterman noted that a deck on the addition would be very small.

Mr. Cluver noted that, given the information presented, it was his opinion that the Committee could not recommend approval of the deck. However, the applicant could submit a more accurate depiction of the proposed deck existing roof conditions and the deck could be reviewed at a later point in light of that additional information. He further noted that, in concept, he would not be in favor of locating a deck on the main block.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the adjacent building is two-stories, so the Committee would need to review the deck from all angles. Ms. Crane added that it would also be partially visible from 22nd Street. Ms. Gutterman asked how visible the rear addition would be from the alley, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that it would be very visible from 22nd Street.

Mr. Baron commented that the addition would not require the demolition of a rear ell. Ms. Hawkins noted that it is unusual for an addition to be clad in Hardie Plank in the city, and Ms. Crane responded that the owner would be amenable to a full stucco addition, if the Committee preferred.

Ms. Hawkins asked why the windows on the proposed addition were shown as casements, and Ms. Crane responded that casements provide better egress from the bedroom. To obtain the same egress capacity with double-hung windows, the windows would need to be very large.

Ms. Stein asked if the second and third floors were set back to comply with zoning. Ms. Crane responded that they were. She added that they obtained an exception for the first floor in light of the small size of the lot. They needed extra open space on the second floor for zoning purposes. The third floor setback is intended for access to the roof deck. Mr. Cluver noted that, if the deck is limited in size to that of the addition, then it might be simpler located the deck at the third-floor level off of the study, not at the roof. Either way, the deck would have approximately the same area. The Committee members noted that, if the application proposed a two-story addition with a third-floor deck, the application would likely meet the standards.

Ms. Stein asked if the addition was limited to two stories, whether the second floor still be required to have the odd setback. Ms. Crane responded that she believes that the setback would still be required.

Mr. Cluver noted that it appeared that the proposed addition requires the removal of the entire rear wall. Ms. Crane responded that the rear wall would be removed. Ms. Crane noted that she had the addition engineered two ways, one with the partial demolition of the wall, and the other with a steel beam that would allow the retention of the back wall. Mr. Cluver commented that one of the criteria by which the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission review projects is in terms of reversibility. In this case, the preferable plan would allow the future removal of the addition and the restoration of the property to its original condition. The removal of the second and third-floor walls, he continued, is not easily reversible. If the walls and window openings were retained, the project would be much more compliant with the standards.

Ms. Hawkins commented that there appear to be many open questions that Ms. Crane should discuss with her client. In summary, she stated that the Committee cannot recommend approval of the widening of the front door; the deck should not encroach on the main part of the roof; the existing rear wall should be preserved as much as possible; and connections between the existing building and the new addition should utilize, to the greatest extent possible, existing openings. It would also be preferable, Ms. Hawkins noted, to keep the addition to two stories with access to a deck through a modified window opening. If a three-story addition is necessary, it would be preferable to keep the roof of the addition below the cornice line of the existing building.

Ms. Crane added that it may be possible to move the first floor of the addition back to be flush with the setback.

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

ADDRESS: 668 N 19TH ST

Project: Legalize replacement of windows and alteration of bays

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Haleh Kadkhoda

Applicant: Kevin O'Neill, KJO Architecture LLC

History: 1895

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes replacing windows and copper bays. The Commission has had a long history with this owner and property. In 2004, the owner replaced the windows in the property with one-over-one vinyl windows without a permit or approval. A violation was issued, which was appealed to the Commission and the Board of License & Inspection Review. The application and appeal were denied. In 2010, the same owner replaced a roof deck without a permit or approval. Again, a violation was issued. The owner applied to the Commission for the legalization of the deck. The Commission approved the legalization of the deck, provided the illegal windows were replaced with the appropriate windows. The replacement was never undertaken. Recently, the replacement of the side bays was begun without a permit or approval. The current plans propose installing wood windows. The current plans propose incorrect two-over-two windows on the side façade; however, the applicant has revised the application and hopes to have plans for the correct Queen Anne windows and an accurate bay in time for the Architecture Committee meeting. Although the deck is marked on the plans as existing, it is currently not legal because the conditions for approval were never met.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as submitted, but approval, provided the window and bay plans are modified appropriately, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

Mr. Baron explained the history of the property and its alterations. He said that, although the elevation drawing shows two-over-two windows for the side, the window details indicate a variety of possible window types. He said that the staff does not recommend two-over-two windows because they would be appropriate for an 1850s Italianate building, but not this Queen Anne building. Nine-over-one pane Queen Anne sash would be appropriate for the side façade. Mr. Cluver asked why they should not require the seventeen-over-one pane sash found on the front façade. Mr. Baron explained that the nine-over-one sash is a typical Queen Anne sash and that, lacking evidence to the contrary, the less expensive, more common sash would be acceptable. It was noted that the window types found on the detail page seem out of scale; for example, some of the panes appear too wide. Also, with Queen Anne windows, the top sash is divided into small panes, but the bottom sash is not; the bottom sash should have a single pane of glass. Mr. Baron explained that these were some of the reasons why the proposed design is not acceptable, but could easily be revised to something acceptable. Mr. Baron also explained that the details for replacing the copper bays are not yet correct. The staff is working with the contractor to correct the details. The Committee members asked Mr. Baron to obtain photographs of the other windows in this 19th Street development row to verify the appropriateness of the selected window types.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval, provided the window and bay plans are modified appropriately, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 1921 DIAMOND ST

Project: Legalize alterations

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mansion Lofts LLC

Applicant: Shawn Bullard

History: 1889; Willis Hale, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Significant, 1/29/1986

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing illegal work as well as granting approval of new work. In October of 2006, the applicant obtained a permit to work on a chimney and roof. He exceeded that permit with the following work:

1. demolition of two metal-clad bays on the side façade, which were replaced with flat stucco infill with sliding doors and railings;
2. application of stucco over the front metal bay and removal of a railing;
3. installation of inappropriate vinyl windows on all three facades;
4. installation of an inappropriate front door;
5. painting of exterior brick;
6. construction of new garden wall in cinderblock; and,
7. new door at basement level opening to street.
8. Infill of front basement window with tiles.

The applicant now proposes to modify and legalize this work in the following ways:

1. remove the paint and repair the brick and brownstone walls, base, and stairs, but no specifications have been provided;
2. remove the stucco from the front bay and replace it with red vertical seam metal siding;
3. remove the stucco and French doors from the area of the side bays and replace them with windows and brick infill;
4. install rustic red asphalt shingles on the mansard; and,
5. convert side third-floor door into a window.

The paint removal and masonry repair could be an improvement if done correctly. The rest of the work involves replacing one inappropriate treatment for another. The building would still have its inappropriate windows and would be shorn of its decorative bays, balconies, and doors.

The Committee and Commission reviewed a very similar proposal in November 2012 and denied most of the work, except the masonry restoration. The violations have been enforced in court and fines are currently in place.

The applicant mentions some issues in his cover letter which could contribute to a hardship application, but he has not provided such an application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the masonry restoration and new roof shingles, with the staff to review specifications; denial of all other aspects of the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Shawn Bullard and his contractor Sandy Mustica represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained how the new proposed work substitutes one inappropriate material and design for another. Mr. Bullard read the cover letter that he submitted with his application. He contended that the building was already painted when he bought it. He also said that the bays were in very poor condition and that the metal cladding had been removed, leaving the wood structure exposed. He removed the structure of the side bays and lower front bay, but clad over the wood structure on the upper front bay. The Committee considered the designation photographs and later Google Streetview images, but determined that they did not establish these facts. The Committee members asked Mr. Bullard to provide all photographs in his possession of the building before he began working on it. Mr. Bullard claimed that he saved it from demolition, spending \$290,000 on it. Ms. Hawkins reviewed the list of work in the staff overview with Mr. Bullard to establish what he had done. He conceded that he did all of the listed work except for the paint. However, he argued that many elements such as windows and doors were missing or infilled with plywood at the time he started his work.

The Committee members agreed that they would recommend denial of most of the work. They also suggested that Mr. Bullard could consider filing a hardship application. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee adopt the staff recommendation, with the staff to review samples and mock-ups of the paint removal and roofing. Mr. Cluver agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the masonry restoration and new roof shingles, with the staff to review specifications and samples; denial of all other aspects of the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9.

ADDRESS: 17-19 N 02ND ST

Project: Construct rear stair tower, infill window, cut door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: F&F Real Estate Partners No. 1 LP

Applicant: Mark Fink, Mark Fink Real Estate

History: 1785

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations needed to combine two structures into one for use as a hostel. The 2nd and Church Street facades are being restored under separate permit approved by staff. The work proposed in the current application would take place at the east or rear facade. A three-story stair tower would be added at the rear of 19 N. 2nd Street; it would preserve the existing rear wall and leave the rear cornice exposed. The stair tower would be clad in stucco. A new door would be cut in a previously stuccoed portion of the rear façade of 17

and a window opening would be infilled with a reveal. Views of the rear façades will soon be obscured by townhouses that will be built on the adjacent lot on Church Street.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Doug Seiler and developer Mark Fink represented the application.

The applicants explained the restoration of the property and the need for a fire stair for egress for the new use. Mr. Cluver questioned the placement of the windows in the new stair. He asked if the windows could be made to align with the others on the rear of 17 N. 2nd Street. The architect said the suggested revision was feasible.

Ms. Hawkins called for public comment.

Larry Giglio of 11 N. 2nd said that he was opposed to the use of the property as a hostel and noted that the roof had been poorly patched over time.

Donna Dirksen from 21 N. 2nd Street expressed her concern about the new rear addition in conjunction with the new townhouses, which are slated to be built on the surface parking lot to the east. She stated that the new construction would create a canyon effect along her five-foot-wide easement, which she uses to access her property to the north. The Committee members noted that the owner cannot building into the easement. Ms. Dirksen acknowledged that the applicant is not proposing to building on the easement, but only near it, to which she objected.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested approving the project with the modified locations of the rear windows and the staff to review details. Mr. Cluver agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the window locations are modified as suggested, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 3: Each property will 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 elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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

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

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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

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

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.