

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

**TUESDAY, 26 JANUARY 2016
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Jeffrey Stocklos, Fluent Design LLC
Mark Lopercolo, Remodeling Concepts LLC
Jackie Gusic, inHabit LLC
Harry S. Murray, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Hal Kessler, Mt. Alto Design + Drafting
James Bowman, Bowman Architecture & Design
Matt Bremner
Joe Serratore, Jos. Serratore & Co.

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Stein and Mr. D'Alessandro joined her. Ms. Pentz arrived at the start of the second review.

ADDRESS: 521 DELANCEY ST

Proposal: Alter rear dormer and construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kathleen & Austin Mathis

Applicant: Jackie Gusic, InHabit, LLC

History: 1796; rear alts. 1965, 1979

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the circa 1979 rear addition of this significant building located in the Society Hill Historic District. Access to the roof deck would be achieved by significantly altering the historic rear dormer, which is visible from Cypress Street at the rear of the property. Currently, a large piece of mechanical equipment partially blocks the view of the dormer from the street. The mechanical equipment would be relocated to a spot near the new roof deck. The existing slope of a section of the 1979 rear addition would be extended to create a flat roof to accommodate the new roof deck. A glass railing system is proposed for the deck. The existing roofline of the addition that is closest to Cypress Street would remain unchanged.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9. The rear dormer is a character-defining feature. Its significant alteration does not comply with the Standards.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jackie Gusic represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission have reviewed similar proposals for alterations to rear dormers. In one case, in which the rear dormer was not visible from a public right-of-way, the Commission denied the proposal, owing to the alteration of dormer, considered character-defining historic fabric. Mr. D'Alessandro asked for the construction date of the rear ell. Ms. Broadbent responded that one section dates to 1965, and the remainder was added in 1979. Ms. Hawkins noted that the 1965 portion dates from the Redevelopment Era, which is considered significant to the history of the Society Hill Historic District.

Ms. Gusic directed the Committee's attention to photographs showing neighboring rear dormers with gable roofs, whereas the dormer at 521 Delancey Street is a shed dormer. She suggested that the dormer may have been previously altered. Ms. Broadbent responded that the building was restored in 1965, and there is a note on the drawings from 1965 that states that both the front and rear dormer are to be repaired by removing all material down to original construction on roof and sides. Ms. Gutterman asked if there are other options for accessing the proposed roof deck. Ms. Gusic responded that an exterior stair from an existing deck was considered, but the idea made the property owner uneasy, as the stair would not be able to be contained entirely over the existing deck. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the rear ell contains several existing decks. Ms. Gusic responded that the existing decks are very small. Ms. Hawkins commented that the property owner is fortunate to have a deck, and there are many properties in Center City without decks. She stated that the two issues are the modification of the dormer, and the proposal for an additional deck with glass railing. Ms. Gutterman commented that half of the rear roof slope would also be modified, in addition to the dormer. Ms. Gusic explained that the roof will remain as-is in the location of the existing mechanical equipment, and stairs will be built

up and across that existing roof. Half of the sloped roof on the rear ell going back towards Cypress Street would be modified. She stated that she pulled the deck back in order to retain the existing profile of the rear ell that is seen from Cypress Street. Ms. Stein noted that the rear ell is already the tallest on the block, and asked if the height of the rear ell will change. Ms. Gusic confirmed that currently the top of the sloped roof is 34.5 feet in height, and she is proposing that the middle section be built up to the same height.

Ms. Gusic asked if the Committee would favorably review a proposal that retains the existing rear dormer, and adds a new dormer next to it to be used as a door. Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Hawkins responded negatively, stating that a second dormer still alters the rear slope of the main roof significantly. Ms. Gusic asked if the Committee would favorably review a proposal for a deck over the existing sloped roof of the rear ell, if the roof itself was not altered. Ms. Hawkins responded that she would need to see the drawing, but that a deck that is lighter and more temporary in nature, versus a wall extension, is preferable. She noted that access to the deck would still need to be addressed. Ms. Gutterman stated that all proposed changes should be contained to the rear ell.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she is confused about the relocation of the condenser units. Ms. Gusic responded that there would be a parapet wall built around the units, and the roof would be lowered and flattened at that location.

Ms. Hawkins commented that some of the proposed changes are subtle, so it would be easier to understand those changes if the existing and proposed plans are on the same page of the drawings. She suggested a dashed line to show the existing roof line on the proposed drawing. Ms. Gutterman suggested that a building section be drawn.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

ADDRESS: 52 S 02ND ST

Proposal: Install metal door and concrete steps
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 2nd Street Partners LLC
Applicant: Hal Kessler, Mt. Alto Design + Drafting
History: 1834; new storefront, 2000
Individual Designation: 10/7/1976
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 add concrete steps and relocate a metal door at the rear or Strawberry Street emergency exit of this contributing building in the Old City Historic District. The staff has already approved the restoration of the front façade of the building on S. 2nd Street, including the rebuilding of the front brick façade, new windows and a storefront. The staff has also approved new windows for the Strawberry Street façade.

At the rear, on Strawberry Street, a door opening would be raised several inches from its current location, owing to the raising of the interior floor level. Concrete steps would be added to access the raised door opening, encapsulating the existing stone step and landing. A new metal door like the existing metal door would be installed in the raised opening. Like the existing opening, the new door opening would not align with the transom bars in the adjacent openings.

Although an insurance survey for this building is available, it does not address the opening in question. It describes a two-leaf rear door with multiple lites, but, owing to the narrowness of this opening, it is likely the insurance survey is referring to a nearby, wider rear door opening, not this opening.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6. The door opening should respect the line of the transom bar and the door itself should be compatible with the historic storefront.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Stein asked what door would be acceptable for this opening. Ms. Broadbent responded that the door should be a narrower version of what is described in the insurance survey, which would also be compatible with the new storefront doors being installed on the front of the building. It would be a wood door with multiple lites on the top and a panel on the bottom. The transom would align with the existing transom line that is carried through on the other openings between the columns. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the opening should be reframed and a custom door with transom be installed. Ms. Hawkins stated that the door does not need to be metal or fire-rated by code.

Ms. Pentz stated that she is concerned about encapsulating the existing granite step, but commented that the low step looks to be a replacement. Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the contractors did not consider these concerns before they poured the slab. Ms. Broadbent responded that her understanding is that there was a partial collapse of the floor when it was being worked on. Ms. Pentz opined that the Committee may have been able to formulate an interior solution if floor plans had been provided. Ms. Broadbent responded that her understanding is that the applicant has been in contact with the City to see if there is a solution that can be achieved on the interior. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the contractors used poor planning when they decided to do a quick fix for the floor. Ms. Stein opined that the steps may not be approvable by other City agencies, owing to the bottom tread projecting into the public way.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee's recommendation should be for denial, but that if the applicant wants to know how to fix the situation, they should come to the Committee with more information. She stated that the new door should be compatible with the design of the new storefront doors on the South 2nd Street façade, and the transom bar should align with the existing transom line. She stated that more information is needed regarding the steps.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 1903 SPRUCE ST, UNIT 3E

Proposal: Construct two roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Greg Kubicek

Applicant: Dave Martin, Remodeling Concepts, LLC

History: 1875

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 two roof decks. The first, or lower, roof deck would be located on the western portion of the third floor of the rear ell in a notch between the main block and the five-story portion of the rear ell. The proposed lower deck would likely be invisible from the public right-of-way. The application proposes a metal spiral staircase rising from the lower deck to an upper deck on the five-story portion of the rear ell. The deck, which would be set back from the more visible, eastern edge of the roof by 2.5 feet, would measure 12 feet in width by 15 feet in length. Both the upper and lower roof decks would be constructed of pressure-treated wood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the railing of the upper deck is a simple, transparent metal picket railing, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Project consultant Mark Lopergolo and designer Jeffrey Stocklos represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman expressed confusion over the orientation of the drawings, and the location of the cornice line. Mr. Lopergolo explained that the cornice was located along the inner side of the rear ell, along an alley between the building and the adjacent property. Mr. Lopergolo noted that it is a narrow alley with several fire escapes.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the photographs be labeled with directions to better key them to the drawings.

Ms. Pentz asked how the new joists would be supported. Mr. Stocklos responded that there is a parapet that extends approximately eight inches, and they would pocket into the CMU wall on that side and then post down on the mansard roof side. Ms. Pentz asked if there was room to do the pocketing. Mr. Stocklos responded that their firm is a structural engineering firm, so they will put two beams in to support the joists that go across and post down. He noted that the staff recommended pulling the deck in from the side of the building in order to reduce visibility.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff had visited the site to look at the proposed deck. Ms. DiPasquale responded that it had not. Ms. DiPasquale asked the applicants if they would be able to erect a mock-up of the deck railing if necessary. The applicants questioned the kind of mock-up. Ms. Hawkins responded that it should be a 3-D mock-up, on site, showing the height and location of the deck railing. Mr. Stocklos noted that the lower deck would not be visible from the street, as it is covered by a parapet wall.

Ms. Pentz asked if the applicants would accept a metal picket railing instead of wood. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the metal railing should be used for both decks. The applicants responded that metal picket railings would be acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. Lopergolo asked if the spiral staircase should be a particular color. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the spiral staircase and railings should be black metal. Ms. Hawkins noted that the key is to minimize reflectivity.

Mr. Stocklos questioned the location of the deck and the setback from the street. Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Hawkins noted that the more visible angle of the proposed deck would be the front elevation, and that, depending on the mock-up, the deck may need to be notched so that there is a setback from both the front and side elevations. Mr. Lopergolo asked if the mock-up needed to be completed before the Commission meeting. Ms. Hawkins responded that that would not be necessary, as the weather was not currently in their favor.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the railings of both decks have simple black metal pickets and a mock-up demonstrates that the decks are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1229 RODMAN ST

Proposal: Demolish one-story rear addition; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Matt Bremner

Applicant: Matt Bremner

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 2/3/1964

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish an existing one-story addition and construct a larger, three-story addition at the rear of the property. The addition would extend across approximately two-thirds of the width of the building and would rise to meet the cornice of the existing three-story rear wall, and would leave approximately one-third of the rear wall of the main block intact. The addition would be clad in wheat-colored stucco and feature white vinyl windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the windows on the main block of the building are replaced with wood or aluminum-clad windows that replicate the appearance of the historic windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Matt Bremner and architect James Bowman represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked if there is an existing chimney in the main block of the building. She noted that the demolition plans show the removal of a chimney. Mr. Bremner noted that the chimney was non-functioning and that he already got a permit to remove the chimney. Ms. Hawkins asked if they received the demolition permit for the chimney without the Historical Commission's approval. Mr. Bremner responded that he was not aware he needed Historical Commission's approval to remove the chimney, and that he believed only the front façade of his building was designated. Ms. Hawkins clarified that work to any part of the exterior envelope of the building, including the roof and rear of the property, is subject to Historical Commission's review. Mr.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Bremner responded that he is aware of that now, but had thought that, if he followed Historical Commission's guidelines for the front façade, he could do whatever he wanted to the rest of the building. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the owner needs to be especially careful with demolition, as that constitutes the removal of historic fabric. Ms. Pentz noted that, even if the chimney was non-functioning, chimney breasts tend to strengthen the wall, and that they should be careful that the wall remains stable if the chimney is removed. Mr. Bremner responded that he hired a structural engineer to underpin the basement, and, as a result, the chimney could not be supported. Ms. DiPasquale presented the permit application for the basement underpinning, noting that it included the stipulations "no changes to exterior" and "no work to windows or doors."

Ms. Hawkins asked if it is necessary to remove so much of the rear wall for the construction of the addition. She noted that it appears they are proposing door openings where there are existing door openings. Ms. Hawkins noted that they could widen the first-floor opening to achieve the same objective, without demolishing two-thirds of the rear wall. Mr. Bowman responded that their primary concern is getting access to basement mechanical equipment. Ms. Hawkins asked why they could not put in a door opening for such access. Mr. Bowman responded that the basement floor will be significantly lower than the crawl space floor. Ms. Hawkins asked him to clarify. Mr. Bowman noted that there would be a crawl space below the new addition. Ms. Hawkins responded that she did not understand why the rear wall at the first floor could not be retained. Mr. Bowman responded that they are proposing to take the whole rear wall down to the foundation so that it does not need to be supported; then they can install mechanical equipment in the crawl space and route lines up into the addition. Ms. Gutterman asked if they are removing the entire rear wall to install mechanical equipment. Mr. Bowman responded affirmatively, adding that they would remove the wall to widen the rear wall openings as well.

The Committee members discussed the locations of the existing versus proposed openings in the rear wall, noting that it appears the stairway to the basement is being demolished and reconstructed. Mr. Bowman concurred that it is. Ms. Hawkins responded that access to mechanical equipment does not justify removing 60% of a historic wall, when there are other ways to achieve the same goal that do not involve the removal of significant amounts of historic fabric. She noted that a hole or a door in a basement wall could allow sufficient access. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that custom mechanical equipment could also be ordered. Mr. Bowman responded that the wall has been an exterior wall for the better part of 100 years and is in poor condition. Ms. Hawkins noted that the Historical Commission exists to protect such walls.

Ms. Stein noted that it helps the stability of the wall to retain the corners of the existing walls.

Ms. Pentz asked about the property lines, noting that it appears the applicants are assuming they own half of the party wall on one side and not the other. Mr. Bowman responded that there is an existing garden wall at the rear, which measurements show they do not own.

Ms. Hawkins noted that all of the windows and sliding door in the addition are proposed to be vinyl and that they are proposing a new stucco finish. She asked if any Committee members had comments on the materials, noting that the staff had recommended that the windows on rear wall of the existing main block of the building be aluminum clad or wood. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with the staff recommendation. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that they should be true or simulated-divided-lite windows. Ms. Hawkins responded that they are shown as one-over-one windows on the drawings. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the windows are shown differently in the axonometric drawing on the front page than on the elevation drawings. Ms.

Gutterman asked if they are proposing one-over-one or six-over-six windows. Ms. DiPasquale noted that six-over-six would be appropriate for the main block of this building. Mr. Bowman responded that they could be six-over-six. Ms. Hawkins noted that the windows appear narrow in the elevation drawing, and thus six-over-six may not fit proportionally. Mr. Bremner noted that they are happy to accommodate the Committee's recommendations for the windows on the main block.

Ms. Hawkins asked if it was true that there is no window on the third floor, as she did not see one in plan, but one is shown in section on A-300. Mr. Bowman responded that that is a mistake in the section.

Ms. Pentz asked if there is a window being covered on the first floor. Mr. Bowman responded that the proposed addition features a notch to allow the retention of the window. Mr. Bowman noted that the window on the second floor may narrow slightly, but not significantly. Ms. Hawkins recommended that the applicants work with the staff to determine the appropriate proportions of the windows on the main block.

Mr. Bremner questioned the recommendation that the rear wall be retained, noting that he was concerned with the loss of space, given that the existing wall is 18 inches thick. In a small home, he noted, that is a significant amount of space. He opined that he is doing a service to the neighborhood by renovating the house, and was hoping to remove the rear wall, but that he understands that runs contrary to the Historical Commission's regulations. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Committee is made up of architects and engineers, so the applicants get the best advice they can give, but that the applicant is welcome to pursue this matter at the Commission level. Ms. Gutterman noted that, if the wall really is in terrible condition, the applicant could also bring a letter to the Commission meeting from an engineer stating that the wall must be rebuilt. Mr. Bremner noted that he wishes to avoid a denial from the Commission, which would hold the project up. Ms. Hawkins responded that the best he can do is provide as much information to the Commission as possible. Ms. Hawkins noted that the Commission is fairly flexible in letting the applicant work with the staff to determine final details.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the windows of the main block are wood or aluminum clad and match the appearance of the historic windows, and that the majority of the rear wall of the main block maintained, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 1516 GREEN ST

Proposal: Construct three-story apartment building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael Alhadad

Applicant: Robert Thomas, Campbell Thomas & Company Architects

History: 1886; historic building demolished, 2014

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct a building on the site of a c. 1855 rowhouse, which was demolished in 2014. The new building will be a wood frame structure with a brick veneer façade based on the historic façade. As a six-unit building, the new structure will be required to be accessible to disabled persons. Two options have been proposed to achieve

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

accessibility. Alternate 1 proposes a long ramp in the front yard and a doorway that is lower on the façade than the historic doorway. Alternate 2 proposes to utilize a wheelchair lift and would match the historic building in terms of locations of openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Alternate 2, which allows the façade to more closely match the original, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to the Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Harry S. Murray represented the application.

Mr. Baron recounted the history of proposals to redevelop this site. The Architecture Committee and Commission have reviewed many applications for this property. Mr. Baron explained how Alternate 2 would recreate more accurately the appearance of the demolished historic building. He explained that Ms. Di Pasquale had accurately measured the façade in the field before the building was demolished so that it could be accurately reconstructed. He showed the annotated photograph with the measurements to the Committee and applicants. The Committee members asked Mr. Murray which alternate he preferred. He stated that he preferred Alternate 2 as well. He said that he and the owner had also explored but rejected the idea of a freestanding chair lift. The Committee members asked Mr. Murray if he had considered having the accessible entrance along the east side of the building. He explained that the walkway on that side is not wide enough to provide the requisite accessibility. Ms. Stein asked about the possibility of having a chairlift that would lower down into a well and take the accessible entrance to the basement level. Mr. Murray explained that there will not be any units in the basement. Mr. Baron asked whether the Committee members thought the side profile of the building should be notched as proposed, or slope gradually toward the rear. The Committee members responded that either detail would be acceptable. Several Committee members did object to the use of EFIS for the side façade. They said that stucco would be more durable and look more appropriate. Mr. Murray said that that the design could be revised to specify stucco instead of EFIS.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the Alternate 2, provided that the non-brick portions of the exterior walls are covered with stucco, not EFIS, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 1513 NORTH ST

Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct new rear addition with roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Damien Breen

Applicant: Joseph Serratore, Jos. Serratore & Co. Archs

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the existing two-story rear ell as well as the three-story rear wall of the main block, and to construct a three-story addition with a roof deck and pilot house. The building is located mid-block on North Street in the Spring Garden Historic District. Its rear is not visible from a public right-of-way. However, the existing rear ells of 1513 and 1515 North Street each contain a four-foot setback from the shared property line. Although the proposed addition would maintain the rear plane of the neighboring buildings, it would be

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

constructed to the western property line, eliminating part of the setback shared with 1515 North Street.

The proposed roof deck would be set back 12 feet from the front façade and extend to the rear wall of the new addition. The rear windows of the addition would likely be aluminum clad two-over-two double-hung sash.

The application also proposes to rehabilitate the interior of the main block and to install new two-over-two wood windows and a new wood door at the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. The staff does not object to the demolition of the rear ell, but the rear wall of the main block should be retained. The new rear ell should maintain the four-foot sideyard. The roofdeck should be located on the rear ell, not the main block.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Joseph Serratore represented the application.

Mr. Serratore explained that the Spring Garden Civic Association sold the property to the present owner on the basis that it would be used as a single-family residence. Because the property remained vacant for several years, the condition of the rear ell is poor. Mr. Serratore distributed a photograph to the Committee members to show its condition. He stated that the rear ell had not been properly sealed and that an engineer's report deemed it unsafe. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the engineer's report indicated that the rear wall of the main block was also unsafe. Mr. Serratore confirmed that the engineer found only the rear ell and not the rear wall of the main block to be unsafe. He then stated that the rear wall would be "consumed" into the addition, rendering the wall obsolete. Ms. Gutterman replied that "consumed" and "demolished" are distinctly different concepts and that, even with the addition of a new rear ell, the existing rear wall of the main block should be considered historic fabric to be maintained; however, punched openings to allow circulation between the existing structure and addition would be appropriate.

Mr. Serratore stated that the wall in question is not load-bearing. Ms. Stein and Ms. Hawkins responded that the rear wall is providing stability to the party walls by maintaining the corners shared with the neighboring properties of the row. Mr. Serratore acknowledged that the corners where brick is tied into the party walls would need to be retained. Ms. Pentz noted that the drawings do not indicate any retention of brick at the corners and instead show full demolition of the rear wall and ell. Mr. Serratore concurred, but added that the drawings are not final and a few corrections would be made to show the areas of retained brick and the existing setback of the rear ell of the adjacent property at 1515 North Street. He continued to explain that the property owners feel the only way to gain value from the proposed project is to construct a three-story addition the full width of the property, which would eliminate the setback. He also stated that the project's initial conception involved full demolition of the property with only the front façade retained. This plan was modified after speaking with Historical Commission staff, who informed Mr. Serratore that the floor levels would need to remain in the same location to align with the window openings of the front façade. Mr. Serratore persuaded the property owner to rehabilitate the main block and demolish and reconstruct the rear ell.

Ms. Pentz and Ms. Hawkins reminded Mr. Serratore that the proposed plans call for demolition of both the rear two-story ell and the main block's three-story rear wall. Mr. Serratore asked for clarification on the difference between partial and full demolition, to which Ms. Hawkins replied

that the type of demolition does not need to be classified. She commented that the drawings show the rear ell and the rear wall of the main block being removed. Ms. Hawkins recounted the earlier application for 1229 Rodman Street, where the applicant proposed to remove the rear, three-story wall and to construct an addition. She said the Committee's recommendation was to retain the wall for structural support. At the 1513 North Street property, although the studs and joists do not tie into the rear wall of the main block, Ms. Hawkins felt the wall should be maintained, though with new openings to establish a connection between the main house and ell. She suggested that Mr. Serratore modify the plan to allow the wall to remain in place. Ms. Hawkins also stated her disapproval of constructing the addition the full width of the property, stating it was too wide, and asked other Committee members to comment on the issue.

Ms. Gutterman agreed with Ms. Hawkins and added that she felt the roof deck was too large and should be limited to the rear ell. She said there was too much overbuild and too much loss of original fabric. She then noted that the Committee does not typically approve decks on the fronts of residences. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the interior stairs of the main block were being relocated. Mr. Serratore confirmed that the stairs would be relocated and a new stair to the roof deck would be constructed. Ms. Gutterman replied that relocating the stairs of the main block would require the removal of some floor framing and would result in the loss of more original fabric.

Mr. Serratore stated that deck setbacks are typically 5 feet from the front of the structure, but the proposed setback would be 12 feet. Ms. Gutterman replied that the Historical Commission does not typically allow roof decks on the fronts of residences. Ms. Hawkins inquired about the length of the deck, and Ms. Gutterman indicated that the drawings show it spanning more than 40 feet. Ms. Pentz stated that the deck should be confined to the addition.

Mr. Serratore commented that the rear wall of the main block would not be seen, even if maintained structurally. Ms. Hawkins responded that her recommendation is to maintain the setback at the side of the property and that doing so would expose a portion of the existing rear wall. Ms. Pentz agreed that the setback and rear wall should be retained.

Ms. Stein inquired whether the building was a flat roof structure, and Mr. Serratore verified that the existing roof is flat. He then remarked that the current footprint of the rear ell, being 11 feet wide, is restrictive and asked whether it would be necessary to maintain the existing setback from the side property line if he revised the plan to retain the rear wall of the main block. Ms. Hawkins replied that she felt it was necessary to retain both setback and rear wall, but asked other Committee members for comments. Ms. Stein agreed with Ms. Hawkins, stating that the rear wall of the main block should not be removed and that the setback from the property line allows the building to receive light and air, in addition to easing the solidity of the building from the back. She also commented about the height of the pilot house and its location. She felt it made the property appear much taller from the rear.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant could reduce the height of the pilot house. Mr. Serratore replied that it could be reduced to 8 feet, but that pilot houses can be constructed up to 10 feet in height. He then commented that the stair could be designed as a straight run rather than in an ell configuration. Ms. Hawkins added that straight run stairs typically parallel the side wall of the house and are more successful because they are less prominent. However, she did note that due to its midblock location there would be some flexibility in the positioning of the pilot house.

Mr. Serratore then mentioned that the neighboring property has a three-story addition. Ms. Hawkins responded that no Committee member has objected to the three-story addition. She

said the issues raised by Committee members concerned the width of the addition, the removal of the rear wall of the main block, and the positioning and overbuild of the stair leading to the roof deck.

Mr. D'Alessandro added that the application documents need to reflect the actual conditions. Specifically, the setback of 1515 North Street from the shared property line is not shown in plan and needs to be corrected. In addition, Mr. D'Alessandro asked that the applicant revise the demolition schedule to include only those portions of the structure that will be demolished.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with the following suggestions for revision:

- the rear wall of the main block should be retained, although openings to access the new addition may be punched into it;
- the existing rear ell may be demolished, and a new rear ell may be constructed, provided the existing four-foot alleyway between 1513 and 1515 North Streets is maintained;
- the deck should be limited to the roof of the rear ell; and
- the pilot house should be reduced in height and presence, potentially by modifying the proposed stair design to be a straight run stair.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:23 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 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.