

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

**TUESDAY, 26 AUGUST 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

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

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
Jeff Watson, Harman Deutsch
Adam Montalbano, Moto Design Shop
Jeff McGinnis, Pennsylvania Center for Adapted Sports
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Leslie Puchowitz
Sara Puchowitz
Jason Birl, Ambit Architecture
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Jeff Hayes, Jeffrey Hayes Architect
Francis Graff, MFD Developers LLC
Nick Masser, Digsau
Molly Baum, Digsau
George Murphy, Digsau
Bobby H. Fike, Noelker & Hull Associates
Norman Rokeach, Marquis Health Services, Tryko Partners
Paul Boni, Esq., Boni Law

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Pentz and Stein and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 1606 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Alter storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Estate of Howard Winig & Susan Lewin

Applicant: Jason Winig, HW & Associates Realty Corp

History: 1890; Thackara Manufacturing, Isaac S. Miller Store, Claflin Shoe Store; Albert W. Dilks, architect

Individual Designation: 9/12/1990

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to alter the facade of the mixed-use building at 1606 Chestnut Street.

At the ground floor, the front façade is comprised of a storefront window at the right and a recessed, open vestibule with doors to the ground-floor retail space and upper-floor residential space at the left. The application proposes to insert a door in the center of the storefront to provide a direct entrance to the retail space. Although the retail space was originally accessed through the side door in the vestibule, it did have a doorway in this location in the 1990s at the time of designation. The application also seeks to lower the internal floor to make the entrance accessible. The application also proposes the glazing of the open vestibule. The owner explains that people often use this recessed, open vestibule for illicit activities, making it unsafe and unsanitary for the residents. The application proposes restoring finials at the roofline, based on the historic photographs.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Jason Winig represented the application.

Ms. Pentz praised the owners' restoration of the finials and recommended he look into restoring the brownstone at the bottom of the bay as well. Mr. Winig explained that the finials can be easily fabricated from a substitute material and attached on top of the cornice, but that the repair of the brownstone would be much more difficult to accomplish.

The Committee members did not object to reinserting the storefront door; however, they questioned whether the proposed location is the best location. Mr. Cluver suggested that it may be better to move the new door to one side or the other in order to save more of the decorative metal grate that runs along the base of the storefront. Mr. Winig noted that the metal grate was removed many years ago and only recently rediscovered in the basement and reinstalled. Ms. Hawkins commented that the slope of the sidewalk, which allows entrance to the retail space without a step, may preclude moving the storefront door to one side or another. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance suggested that, if the grate is original, it may be better to shift the door to one side of the opening in order to cut the grate at a natural break in the design. Mr. Cluver suggested that the staff could work with the applicant in the field to determine the best location for the door, based on the grate, sidewalk, and other factors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, especially the placement of the door within the storefront, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 2200-04 E NORRIS ST

Project: Construct pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: TVG 2200 Norris Street LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects

History: 1860; Friendship Fire Company

Individual Designation: 5/26/1964

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enlarge a rooftop penthouse to allow an elevator and stair to run to the roof, construct a roof deck, and install rooftop mechanical equipment. The staff has already approved a permit application to restore the facades of this historic firehouse. To ensure that the deck is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, the staff should review a mock-up of the deck; the location of the deck railing should be adjusted if necessary to reduce visibility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review a mock-up to ensure that the deck with railing is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Rustin Ohler and Jeff Watson represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins questioned the use of stucco versus brick for the cladding of the elevator and stair addition. Mr. Cluver suggested approval, provided three sides of the penthouse are clad in brick. Mr. Ohler asked the Committee to limit the requirement for brick to the two walls that would rest on the bearing walls because the third side could not be well supported on the roof rafters. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that metal panels were often used for stairtower additions. His fellow Committee members agreed that metal panels would be a good cladding material.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the penthouse is clad in grey metal panels, with the staff to review a mock-up to ensure that the deck with railing is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 2214 LOCUST ST

Project: Construct third-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Liza Herzog & Paul Curci

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-story addition over the existing two-story rear ell of a mid-block row house. The addition would be set back nearly 23 feet from the rear façade of the existing ell and nearly 50 feet from Latimer Street, the rear service alley. Owing to limited headroom, the proposed addition would extend above the rear cornice of the three-story main block and onto the rear slope of the main roof. The ell of the neighboring house to the west, with which the subject property shares a party wall, is three stories in height throughout and is longer than the ell of the subject property. The addition would be minimally visible from the east along Latimer Street, a service alley. It would not be visible from Locust Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Rustin Ohler and Jeff Watson represented the application.

Ms. Stein asked about the height of the third-story addition as it relates to the head height of the floor. Mr. Ohler responded that they are proposing an eight-foot ceiling in the addition, and that they are proposing to frame above the existing rafters in the second-floor ceiling because the homeowners wish to keep the vaulted ceiling of their master bedroom on the second-floor rear, below the proposed addition. He confirmed that there is currently one step down into the master bedroom in the ell from the main block. Mr. Cluver asked about the ceiling height if the proposed cornice met the existing rear cornice. Mr. Ohler responded that it would result in an approximately seven-foot ceiling height, assuming a flat ceiling across the entire room.

Mr. Cluver objected to the alteration of the rear slope of the roof on the main block and suggested a sloped roof at the third floor to give the room a more attic-like feel. Mr. Ohler responded that the alteration that Mr. Cluver is referencing is down a narrow side yard more than 70 feet away from Latimer Street, a service alley, and will therefore not be visible to anyone except the next door neighbor. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Committee's jurisdiction is not limited to elements of buildings visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Ohler questioned the Historical Commission's interest in a minor part of a building that the public will never see.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested a modification that would affect the ceiling in the second-floor master bedroom, and Mr. Ohler responded that he is not authorized by the client to alter the ceiling, as the budget for the project is based on no work to the second-floor bedroom ceiling. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the Committee cannot base its decisions on costs. The Committee is concerned about preservation, not cost. Ms. Hawkins asked why the third floor cannot have a step down into it, like the existing second floor does. Mr. Ohler responded that it cannot unless they alter the vaulted ceiling below, which would be costly.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 AUGUST 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Stein asked if the addition will be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Ohler directed her to view the photographs included with the packet, which show that the addition will be minimally visible at a great distance from Latimer Street, a rear service alley. Mr. Ohler added that the proposed addition will be stucco. He noted that the proposed addition is aligned with the height of the existing roof of the main block of the house.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about access to the proposed addition. Mr. Ohler responded that they are proposing to cut the sill of the rear window down to the floor level for the doorway.

Ms. Stein asked if the top roof of the addition can be angled so that a portion of the room inside would have a seven-foot ceiling and would then level out at an eight-foot height. Mr. Watson responded that the height would be less than seven feet. Mr. Ohler responded that they would have to look at the drawings on the computer to determine feasibility.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested an alternative option, where there would be two rooflines, and the roof would drop and engage with the existing cornice over the area that is proposed to have closets and a washer and dryer, where ceiling height is less critical.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, contingent upon one of the following, with the staff to review details:

1. the cornice of the addition aligns with or is below the cornice of the existing building; or,
2. the new roof drops and engages with the existing cornice.

ADDRESS: 304 CHERRY ST

Project: Construct multi-family dwelling

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Kenneth Lesko

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story multi-family building on a parking lot in the Old City Historic District. The lot was vacant at the time of the district designation, is therefore an “undeveloped site,” and the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction is limited to “review and comment.” The narrow lot fronts on Cherry Street; a narrow, private alley runs along its eastern boundary to an open courtyard at the rear. The proposed building would have a lobby and parking on the ground floor and residential units above. The lobby and parking would be accessed from the private alley. A pilot house on the roof would provide access to a roof deck. The architectural plans lack annotations regarding exterior materials, but they appear to depict brick facades.

STAFF COMMENT: The architectural drawings offer little more than a massing plan. The design should be refined. This site offers an opportunity for a building with contemporary styling that is nonetheless compatible with the surrounding historic district.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano explained that he has been limited by the owner of the site to produce only the minimal zoning drawings at this time. He intends to redesign the exterior of the building to address the connection of the façade to the ground at Cherry Street, the façade articulation, and exterior materials. He noted that the original proposal brought to the staff showed the building cantilevering over the alley, but the staff recommended that it be pulled back to be in line with the curb line of the alley. He added that the size of the pilot house will be decreased upon redesign.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Farnham if this application can be considered a preliminary review, owing to the limited detail of the drawings. Mr. Farnham responded that the level of detail required for a “review and comment” submission is undefined. He noted that he could only recall one example in which the Commission required a second round of reviews for a “review and comment” application. In that case, the design for the new building was significantly altered after the first review. He stated that the Commission itself has the ultimate authority to determine whether an application meets the submission requirements. He noted that the Committee could recommend to the Commission that the application is incomplete, but cautioned that the attorneys would likely recommend that a “review and comment” submission simply provides an opportunity to discuss the project with an applicant and provide advice regarding the design, but has no regulatory teeth; therefore, the Commission should not impose strict submission requirements on a property that it cannot actually regulate. Mr. Farnham reported that one may seek the Historical Commission’s approval and a zoning variance at the same time, but noted that the Zoning Board sometimes requires evidence of the Historical Commission’s approval before it will consider an application. He suggested that the Committee members offer the applicant the best guidance they can based on the information presented. If the construction drawings that are submitted for the final approval stamp are similar in massing, scale, and volume to those presented for comment, then the staff will approve the application without additional review; if the construction and comment drawings differ substantially, then the staff will forward the construction drawings to the Architectural Committee and Commission for comment. Mr. Montalbano noted that he has been encouraging the owner to authorize him to develop more detailed drawings prior to the Historical Commission meeting.

Ms. Stein asked if the project has by-right zoning approval. Mr. Montalbano responded that there were two zoning refusals issued, one for open space and one for parking.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the parapet looked very tall and asked about the fifth-floor ceiling height. Mr. Montalbano responded that he added two feet to assume for roof pitch, but that it may be lowered. She commented that the parapet acting as the railing for the roof deck makes the top story look very tall, and the addition of some level of articulation, or even a railing system set back a couple feet, would improve the appearance of the building, which currently looks top heavy.

Ms. Stein commented that the open, under-building parking takes away from the character of the block, and it would be better if enclosed. Mr. Montalbano responded that he has to further refine the details of the Cherry Street façade and its connection to the ground.

Mr. Cluver commented that the stagger of the windows between the third and fourth floors of the side elevation appears random and should be cleaned up. He also commented that there should be more windows on the large blank section of the side facade, perhaps bays to create a rhythm.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to concur with the staff's comments supplemented with the comments offered during the review and the assertion that the design of the building should be refined so that it is compatible with the streetscape and the historic district.

ADDRESS: 4 BOATHOUSE ROW

Project: Install lift and ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pennsylvania Barge Club

Applicant: Jeff McGinnis, Pennsylvania Center for Adapted Sports

History: 1892; Pennsylvania Barge Club; Louis Hickman, architect; second floor added by C.E. Schermerhorn, 1912

Individual Designation: 1/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a porch chair lift and ramp for the Pennsylvania Center for Adapted Sports, located at 4 Boathouse Row. The project is intended to make the building accessible. The chair lift will be located on the side of the porch and will require the removal of a small section of non-historic wrought-iron fence. The ramp will be located at the front entrance on the porch and will have wood benches at its sides that will serve as railings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jeff McGinnis of the Pennsylvania Center for Adapted Sports represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked if the location of the chair lift can be moved from the front edge of the side of the porch to the rear edge. Mr. McGinnis responded that there are boat racks at the rear edge of the porch that cannot be relocated. Mr. Cluver commented that the proposed ramp cuts the porch in half, and suggested turning the ramp so that it points towards the chair lift, rather than projecting straight out from the front door. Mr. McGinnis commented that the proposed benches along the ramp are intended to increase the use of the porch. Mr. McCoubrey noted that this ramp does not require a railing, owing to its limited height. Mr. Cluver suggested that a bench may still be placed along the back edge of the ramp. Ms. Hawkins asked about the tree that is currently at the front corner of the porch, and will partially shield the chair lift from view. She noted that the lift would be more conspicuous if the tree died. She observed that the Committee always assumes that trees will die. Mr. McGinnis responded that a new tree will be planted, should the current tree die, as Ms. Hawkins assumed. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the color of the chair lift, and Mr. McGinnis responded that it is available in various colors, including dark gray. Ms. Hawkins suggested a dark color.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, with the staff to review details, provided the following suggestions are considered:

1. moving the chair lift back from the front edge of the porch;
2. turning the ramp on the porch 90 degrees to point towards the chair lift; and,
3. selecting a dark, neutral tone for the chair lift so that it blends with the building.

ADDRESS: 2119 SPRUCE ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Leslie Puchowitz and Susan Puchowitz

Applicant: Leslie Puchowitz

History: 1860; metal bays added, 1900

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a three-story rear stair-tower addition, which was constructed around 1916 and is not original to the building, and construct a four-story addition. The addition would have a person door and a garage at the first floor, a bay window at the second floor. On the third floor, the addition would step back and have a roof deck. The proposed materials are brick veneer, PVC trim, and cement board. This application also proposes to cut a window for a new door on Van Pelt Street in the original portion of the building. The staff contends that the addition should be clad in real brick, not a veneer, and should be trimmed with a more appropriate material for a street façade, not PVC.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the addition is clad in real brick and the trim materials are appropriate, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Richard Villa and Jason Birl and owners Butch and Susan Puchowitz represented the application.

Mr. Birl showed the Architectural Committee members a sample of the brick veneer. He stated that this veneer is installed unit by unit and pointed; it is not a panel system. He stated that this system was used on another project at 20th and Pine Streets. He pointed out that this veneer will not be installed near the existing brick, to avoid issues in coursing and slight deviations in color. Mr. Villa stated that the Committee has previously recommended approval of this material, which has been installed and looks appropriate. He showed the Committee photographs of the completed project. Mr. Baron observed that this sample shows a rough brick with a faux-Colonial feel. He stated that this building has Victorian brick with smooth crisp edges. Mr. Birl stated that the veneer comes in many different colors and textures. Mr. McCoubrey asked how the corners would be treated with this veneer. Mr. Birl stated that it can design the corners appropriately. Mr. Birl stated that the reason they have opted to use this veneer was because they need every inch of space possible for the interior of the garage and they do not want to lose space by using traditional brick.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the PVC trim. Mr. Birl stated that the trim would be placed on the addition above the garage on floors two through four, as stiles and rails. He stated that it is meant to be respectful of the trim on the existing metal bays on the building. He added that they would also match the color of the bays, which are light in color. Mr. Cluver stated that dark color PVC does not weather well. Ms. Hawkins asked if they considered doing a metal panel system for the addition. Mr. Birls said that that would be cost-prohibitive.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she is not comfortable with the panel material given its proximity to the road and it being in the line of sight. She stated that she approves of the brick system. Ms. Stein stated that she concurred with Mr. Baron's comments concerning the brick style. She suggested the brick be hard-edged and the right color to match as closely as possible the existing brick. Mr. Cluver stated that the PVC trim can be a quality material but it ages differently from wood. He stated that the PVC material is a fine visual substitute for wood. Mr. Cluver suggested placing bottom rails on the panels.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the windows. Mr. Birl stated that they are looking at aluminum-clad windows. He stated that most of the windows would be fixed.

Ms. Pentz asked about the brick return next to the garage door. Mr. Birl stated that that return will be twelve inches. Ms. Hawkins suggested that it should at least be a brick and a half to avoid using small pieces of brick. Mr. McCoubrey suggested adding some stiles and rails to finish the pattern. He also suggested that a brick pier be placed between the person door and the garage door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a brick pier is placed between the person door and the garage door, the PVC trim is painted a light color, and the brick veneer matches the existing brick, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 427 SPRUCE ST

Project: Construct rear dormer and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Antonio & Georgine Atacan

Applicant: Antonio Atacan

History: 1791; French Consul's Residence; William Williams, house carpenter

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a deck on a non-historic rear ell of this significant row house on Spruce Street in Society Hill. A new dormer with a door would be constructed on the rear slope of the historic main roof of the building to access the deck. Also, an HVAC condenser would be relocated to the main roof. In 2004, the Commission denied a proposal for this property to alter the historic rear dormer into a door and add a roof deck. The staff contends that a deck on the rear ell would be appropriate, given that it is not historic, but the roof of the main block of this very significant house should not be altered.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Antonio Atacan and architect Rich Villa represented the application.

Mr. Villa stated that the crux of this proposal is to leave the existing dormer intact and install a new dormer to the west to access the deck that would be on the rear ell. He stated that the deck is set back five feet to minimize view from Manning Street. He stated that the deck would be wood with a black metal picket railing.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the exhaust fans on the rear ell roof. Mr. Villa stated that one of the exhaust fans is obsolete and the other would be rerouted. Mr. Cluver asked if they considered bringing a stair up in the rear ell so as to not have to go through the historic main roof. Mr. Villa stated that they have not discussed that and pointed to where the main stair is located in the rear ell. Mr. Cluver asked about extending that stair. Mr. Atacan stated that the stair is a gorgeous historical piece and cannot be touched.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance holds a preservation easement on the property and it covers interior portions as well as the front façade, of the building. He stated that the easement does not include the rear slope of the main roof. He stated that the Alliance objects to the proposal based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards and the proposed removal of historic fabric.

Ms. Pentz pointed out that this building is listed individually on the Philadelphia Register and is classified as significant to the Society Hill Historic District. She stated that it is significant because it was the residence of the French Consul and it was designed and constructed by an early architect/carpenter member of the Carpenter's Society. She stated that an addition to the original roof slope of the building would be inappropriate. She noted the Commission denied a similar application in the past and opined that she personally objects to major alterations to particularly rare and significant houses.

Mr. Atacan informed the Committee that he presented his proposal to the neighborhood association. Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that she is representing the Association's committee and not her personal point of view. She explained that the committee's discussion focused on visibility from the secondary street at the rear. She stated that the deck will not be visible because of a tree obstructing the view; she noted, however, it may be visible when the tree loses its leaves. She stated that the committee did not oppose the construction of the deck. Ms. Hawkins observed that the Architectural Committee does not take tree into account when evaluating visibility because trees are ephemeral and can die..

Paul Boni, an attorney representing Yves Quintin and Rosanne Loesch, the owners of the adjacent building at 425 Spruce Street, observed that the rear ell in question was constructed in the 1960s. He objected to the proposal. He contended that property owners in historic districts are entitled to roof decks and opined that the installation of a fake dormer would be inappropriate. He stated that the deck would be visible to the many people who walk on Manning Street as well as many neighbors from their properties. He opined that visibility from the public right-of-way should not factor into Historical Commission decisions on alteration applications. He asserted that views from other properties are important as well. He provided

photographs to add to the record, showing different views of the rear ell. He stated that his clients oppose the proposal.

Mr. Atacan stated he values his house and the history associated with it. He stated that he would like to have a deck, as many of his neighbors do. He stated that the previous proposal was denied because of the alterations to the historic rear dormer. He stated that this proposal does not touch the dormer. Ms. Pentz stated that the proposal for a new dormer also affects the historic fabric.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she was troubled that an interior stair with a pilothouse on the rear ell has not been explored. Mr. Villa asked about the visibility of a pilothouse. Ms. Hawkins opined that a pilothouse on the non-historic rear ell would be more appropriate than altering the historic slope of main roof. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that one could also access a deck on the rear ell from the outside. Ms. Hawkins stated that it appears that the Committee is not opposed to the deck on the non-historic rear ell; it is opposed to the access of a deck through the historic roof.

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

ADDRESS: 21 SUMMIT ST

Project: Construct two-story front entrance porch

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bill & Jane Farran

Applicant: Jeffery Hayes, Jeffery Hayes Architect

History: 1857; Samuel Austin, original owner; alterations and additions in 1896, 1900, 1901, 1922, 1958

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic metal hood and stone steps at the front façade of this Italianate house and replace them with a two-story porch. The appearance of the original entrance is unknown; the staff was unable to locate a photograph or rendering of this building as originally constructed. However, scars in the masonry indicate that there was likely a two-story porch on the house at one time. A photograph of the now demolished 25 Summit Street was located. There are several similarities between the two buildings. Given the scars found on 21 Summit Street and the size and placement of the second-floor central window, the staff believes that the entrance to 21 Summit Street looked very much like the two-story portico entrance that stood at 25 Summit Street. An undated but early photograph of 21 Summit shows that a one-story Queen Anne Style porch was added to the front façade and a Queen Anne Style window was installed in the second-floor center window. The Queen Anne porch likely replaced the original two-story Italianate porch. According to a zoning permit, the Queen Anne porch was removed in 1958. The rebuilding of the one-story Queen Anne porch would satisfy the Standards.

As originally proposed, the new porch would have paired columns at the first floor, single columns at the second floor, a balcony at the second floor, and a standing-seam metal gable roof. The Queen Anne style window at the second floor would be removed and the opening

enlarged for French doors to access the balcony of the new porch. The new porch roof would align with the scars in the masonry, which is assumed to be the roofline of the original porch.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jeffrey Hayes represented the application.

Mr. Hayes stated that his clients have owned this house for about 15 years. He stated that the building was previously used as a group home. He stated they have completed several projects at the house including restoring the cornice. He stated that they came to him to redesign the front. He stated that he initially proposed a central bay on the second floor, but determined, after speaking with the Commission's staff, that the bay window was not appropriate. He stated that the staff pointed him to the historic entrance porch on the adjacent house at 25 Summit Street, which was demolished years ago. Mr. Hayes stated that he did not understand why the staff would advise him to reproduce the porch on the house next door when there is no evidence that the property in question had such a porch. He stated that the owners wanted something other than a grand two-story portico. He therefore developed the proposed porch design, which emulates the top of the portico at the neighboring house. He stated that he included round columns, which are on the larger side, 18 inches in diameter. He stated that instead of proposing a 30-foot tall column, which his clients deemed bombastic, he proposed columns at each floor of the porch with a balcony between them. He stated that he added the second column at the first floor to avoid the awkwardness of one line of columns from the ground to the top of the second floor. He opined that the portico that stood at 25 Summit looked gangly and awkward.

Ms. Pentz stated that she has no objection to a porch of this shape or size or to the balcony. Ms. Pentz stated that it appears that the staff is recommending two options, either a very robust large Greek Revival/Italianate Style portico or a delicate one-story Queen Anne Style porch. Mr. Hayes asked if the staff was suggesting rebuilding the Queen Anne porch. Ms. Coté stated that the reconstruction of the one-story Queen Anne porch would meet the Standards, but the staff was not recommending that approach over the construction of a two-story porch that corresponded to the physical evidence on the facade. Mr. Hayes stated that he was unaware that the staff considered the rebuilding of the one-story Queen Anne porch to be appropriate.

Mr. Cluver stated that the history of this property is one of new porches and this would be at least the fourth generation of porch entry at this house. He concurred with Ms. Pentz and does not object to the concept of a two-story porch broken into smaller elements than that shown on 25 Summit Street. However, he questioned the detailing of the proposed porch. He asked if this is a literal interpretation or a more modern interpretation of a classically designed porch. He observed that the entablature looks heavy and is lacking an architrave and the columns are lacking bases. Ms. Hawkins agreed and thought that using the second-level space is appropriate. She stated that it does not look like the assemblage of parts holds up that roof. She stated that she thought that this particular project is a tricky one. She stated that the grand nature of the columns, which may be grander than the owners want, is important to giving the impression that the roof is supported. She also stated that the scale of the grand two-story columns is appropriate. She stated that the balcony could float behind the columns; it could be attached but not fully engaged. She stated that she understands how difficult it can be to achieve the correct classical proportions at that scale.

Ms. Pentz asked about the note on the drawings referencing the heavy timber rafters. She suggested rafters should be smaller than the ones found on the main roof. Mr. Hayes stated that he would consider that suggestion. Mr. Cluver stated that the design of the two-story porch needs to be refined, but is headed in the right direction.

Mr. Hayes stated that the staff did not advise him successfully, but added that he appreciates the discussion with the Committee and has found it helpful. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the drawing technique detracts from the proposal because the classical orders require precision and the freehand technique used for the drawings with the application cannot achieve the requisite precision. She stated that the details of the proportions and geometry are critical to the proposal's success. She observed that the proportions of the base to the capital are incorrect and suggested that the double columns are not successful. Mr. Hayes asked if the design should have round columns. Mr. Cluver replied that any number of column shapes could work. Ms. Hawkins recommended using 25 Summit Street as a guide to help with finding the right proportions. She stated that, for example, the bottom of the entablature aligns with the meeting rails of the second-floor windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed porch, but approval of a reconstructed Queen Anne porch, a porch based on the design of the historic porch at 25 Summit Street, or a compatible, two-story porch as discussed during the review, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2033 WALLACE ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Francis Graff

Applicant: Francis Graff

History: 1862

Individual Designation: 7/6/1972

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct the rear and side walls of the rear ell at the second and third floors, as previously approved by the staff, but to expand the first floor by approximately six feet and install new bi-fold doors with sidelites. The new doors would open onto a new brick patio, elevated approximately two and a half feet above grade. The proposed addition would not be visible from the public right of way along North Street, as there is an existing solid garage door and fence along the rear of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Francis Graff represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked about the use of the proposed addition, and Mr. Graff responded that it would allow more space in the kitchen and dining room. Mr. Graff noted that the rear ell has already

been demolished, owing to its structural instability. The current proposal is to widen the first floor of the new rear ell.

The Architectural Committee members discussed the proposal and determined that it satisfies the Standards, especially given that the widened section of the ell will not be visible from the street.

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

ADDRESS: 201 S 18TH ST

Project: Alter window openings, install green roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Clardige LP

Applicant: Robert Gilberg, Kaiserman Company

History: 1955; Rittenhouse Claridge; Samuel O'Shiver, architect

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 the removal of existing ribbon windows, the cutting down of the masonry below the windows, and the installation of a new glazing system at the second floor of the building above the main entrance to the apartment lobby on 18th Street. The entrance canopy below the windows to be altered obscures views of the windows; the staff conducted a site visit and determined that the alteration would not be visible when close to the building, but that the upper sections of the windows in question including the meeting rails and mullions are visible on the opposite side of 18th Street, west on Walnut Street, and within Rittenhouse Square. The new glazing system would include the vertical but not horizontal mullions of the original windows. The application also proposes the installation of a green roof in place of the gravel ballast on the flat roof of the entrance canopy to the apartment lobby. The new green roof system would require additional structural reinforcement along one beam within the below-grade garage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Nick Masser, Molly Baum, and George Murphy represented the application.

Ms. DiPasquale noted that she had conducted a site visit to determine visibility. She stated that she observed that the alteration would not be visible when close to the building, but the meeting rails and horizontal mullions of the windows in question are visible on the across 18th Street, west on Walnut Street, and within Rittenhouse Square.

Ms. Hawkins asked for a clarification regarding the horizontal mullions and meeting rails. Mr. Musser responded that the ribbon of windows in question is made up of a combination of double-hung windows with meeting rails and single-light windows with applied horizontal mullions in line with the meeting rails of the double-hung windows. The mullions are narrower than the meeting rails.

Ms. Stein asked why the applicant desired the proposed changes. Mr. Murphy responded that the owner is renovating an amenities space behind these windows, and would like a better view onto the proposed green roof and into Rittenhouse Square.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the location of the floor level in relation to the current window sill. Mr. Murphy responded that the floor is 27 inches below the existing sill, and would be 12 inches below the proposed sill when the alteration is completed.

Ms. Pentz asked whether it would be possible to go out the windows onto the green roof. Mr. Murphy responded that the green roof would not be accessible.

Mr. Cluver noted that the ribbon windows proposed for replacement are part of a larger set of windows that continues onto adjacent facades. He asked whether the windows on the other facades would be changed as well. Mr. Murphy responded that they would not be altered. Ms. Stein asked why they were not also proposing to cut down the side windows. Mr. Murphy responded that the windows open into different interior spaces, where the enhanced view is not needed.

Mr. Cluver asked if the meeting rail was not included in the new larger windows to improve the view. Mr. Musser acknowledged that the meeting rail was not included in the new windows because it would block views. He reported that the meeting rail is currently at 5'-5" above the floor, making it directly in the line of vision of a person of average height.

Ms. Pentz noted that she did not see the below-grade beam reinforcement on the drawings. Mr. Musser responded that it is shown on the structural pages, S001-S101, the last page of the packet. Mr. Murphy commented that the reinforcement would occur in the interior, below grade in the parking area, and would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Stein opined that the transitions at the corners, where the facades meet, between the altered windows and the existing windows would be awkward. She noted that the sills project beyond the plane of the façade; therefore, the projecting sills of the unaltered windows would project out in front of the glass of the altered windows at the corners. The framing details would also be complex. She stated that it would be cleaner architecturally to either continue the window alterations onto the side facades or leave the end bays of windows unaltered on the main façade. Mr. Cluver noted that, if the Committee were to recommend altering the windows on the side facades as well, the change would be considerably more visible from the street.

Mr. Cluver commented that there is a strong rhythm to the windows that would be disrupted by the alteration. He also opined that little would be gained by dropping the sill. Mr. Cluver remarked that the enlarged windows would not bring light in deeper to the space. He restated that he was not sold on the benefits of dropping the sills. Mr. Murphy noted that the sill is not visible from most locations on 18th Street and Rittenhouse Square. He asserted that the change would be inconspicuous from the street. Ms. Stein asked Mr. Cluver if he thought it would be beneficial to add a horizontal mullion to the new windows at the location of the current sill. Mr. Cluver responded that he thought that would look odd from the inside. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the existing horizontal meeting rails and mullions are not actually centered vertically in the windows, as shown on the architectural drawings, but are, in fact, below the center line.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Ms. DiPasquale if the meeting rails/horizontal mullions are visible from the public right-of-way, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that they are visible from Rittenhouse Square, as well as some points along 18th Street.

Ms. Hawkins polled the Committee members on the proposed alterations. Ms. Stein responded that she would support some of the windows being altered. Ms. Pentz stated that she was still pondering the question. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he approved of dropping the sill and enlarging the windows, but that he objected to the removal of the meeting rails and horizontal mullions. Mr. Cluver objected to the proposal because it was counter to the architectural intent and clean lines of the building, which may have been the reason for its designation.

Ms. Pentz asked for clarification about whether the property was part of a district or was individually designated. Ms. DiPasquale confirmed that the building is not individually designated and is classified as contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. It was noted that no period of significance was established for the historic district; therefore, newer buildings such as this one were classified as contributing, even if they would not have qualified for designation otherwise.

Mr. Cluver amended his earlier comment and stated that he now understood that dropping the sill would allow for a view of the green roof; he acknowledged that he understood the applicants' desire for increased glazing.

Ms. Hawkins opined that the ribbon windows are an important aspect of this building. She stated that she is troubled by the idea of dropping the sill. She noted that, if it were a matter of dropping the sill in one or two bays to access to the roof, she might find that acceptable. However, she objected to dropping of the sill across the entire facade. She also noted that she agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that the horizontal element is important.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment. None was offered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

ADDRESS: 2100 N 49TH ST

Project: Construct two-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kearsley Equities LP

Applicant: Bobby H. Fike, Noelker & Hull Associates

History: 1856; Kearsley House/Christ Church Hospital; John M. Gries, architect; alterations by George Appleton Robbins, 1933

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a new structure on the campus of the historic Christ Church Hospital, now the Kearsley Rehabilitation Center. The new building would be constructed on a site where a non-historic structure stood, but was demolished in 2010 with

the approval of the Historical Commission. The site is off to the side of the historic building and the new structure would not obstruct views of the historic building. The new building would feature an approximately 24,000 square foot primary level with a 10,000 square foot “walk out” lower level opening to the rear of the site. The new structure would not attach to the historic Christ Church building, but would connect to existing additions constructed in 1981 and 1995. The structure would have a gable roof, and would feature several gable fronts, reminiscent of the shape of the historic Christ Church building. Additional information about exterior materials should be provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the exterior materials are appropriate, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Bob Fike and owner Norman Rokeach represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed materials. Mr. Fike replied that the initial plan was to use a stone veneer that matched the historic building’s stone, but that he was having difficulty finding a stone that matched in terms of color and unit size, so he would like to use a complementary stone instead. The vertical elements would be accentuated by smooth panels, possibly EFIS or a cementitious material. The sills would be constructed of EFIS designed to resemble stone.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Farnham to explain the Commission’s jurisdiction over the proposed project. Mr. Farnham replied that, since the proposed structure does not connect directly to the historic building, there is no concern over removal or alteration of historic material. Therefore, the Committee and Commission are tasked with determining whether the proposed building is compatible with the historic structure and its context. Mr. Farnham noted that the proposed building would be located where a non-historic building was demolished a few years ago. It would respect the front lawn and not block views of the historic building.

Ms. Pentz questioned how the proposed building would be connected to the historic building, and Mr. Fike replied that he is proposing a single-story connector that would link to an existing, non-historic walkway system. The new building would not connect directly to the historic building.

Ms. Stein noted that the proposed structure would be on a campus of existing buildings, all of which have their own phases of development, and that the proposed structure would be yet another phase. She pondered which phase of development the proposed materials relate to, and asked the Committee which phase would be the most appropriate for the new structure to relate to, the historic building or its subsequent additions. Mr. Fike responded that the intent was for the new building to be compatible with the historic building, but to also stand on its own. He noted that the choice of materials includes some stone. The flat panels and gable peaks break up the façade and give indications of the individual rooms behind the walls.

Ms. Hawkins commended Mr. Fike for not using one continuous roof line, and for the changes of materials and changes of plane in the design. She noted, based on Ms. Stein’s comment, that it would also be possible to explore other materials. She opined that a material with the weight of stone, like split-face stone, might be an option. Mr. Cluver noted that he did not see a reason why stone should not be incorporated, and thought it would be an appropriate element to use.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the design would benefit from having an established base that is consistent across the whole building, as it would give weight to the structure and allow the applicant to play with the materials and design above.

Mr. Cluver asked about the construction system for the building. Mr. Fike responded that it would have a steel frame with load-bearing metal studs.

Ms. Pentz asked if the existing historic building is all schist or if it has any sandstone, and Mr. Fike responded that he was unsure.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the other item she would recommend exploring further is the design of the louvers on the gable ends, which are currently proposed as square and rectangular. The historic building, she noted, has a variety of such louvers, and she would recommend exploring different shapes and proportions of louvers in the new design as well.

Ms. Pentz asked whether the new stone would be coursed or uncoursed, and Mr. Fike responded that it would be uncoursed, with a struck joint.

Mr. Cluver questioned the site plan, noting that it appeared that there would be a new circle and parking. Mr. Fike explained that an existing gravel turn around and parking lot would be paved and lead to the new building. There would be landscaping behind the sidewalk, with a service driveway around the back of the new building. Mr. Cluver asked whether there was anything historic or character-defining that would be impacted, and Mr. Fike responded that the current island is a bit overgrown, and that the new building would not be visible from the initial approach to the historic building, as it is set back and behind the wooded area.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor for public comment. There was none.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the Committee recommend approval, noting that the stonework proposed is appropriate. He noted that the rhythm of the louvered vents could be studied to increase variation. Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant had heard a variety of suggestions, and advised that the Committee offer a recommendation that allows the applicant to work with the staff on the range of options and suggestions made during the meeting.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:43 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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.

DRAFT