

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

**TUESDAY, 23 APRIL 2013  
ROOM 578, CITY HALL  
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair  
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP  
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director  
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

**ALSO PRESENT**

Anne Fadullon, Dale Corporation  
Dave Schultz, DAS Architects  
Morris Clarke, DAS Architects  
Jarred Yaron  
John Trosino, KlingStubbins  
H. Schwartz, Society Hill Civic Association  
George Schaeffer, Kimmel Center  
Claire Allamby, Philadelphia Orchestra  
Elizabeth Barton, Philadelphia Orchestra  
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects  
Adrian Mastrangelo  
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq., Reuter Law Firm LLC  
David Orphanides, Esq., David G. Orphanides & Associates, PC  
David Artman, KSK

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Stein and Mr. Cluver joined her.

**ADDRESS: 249-53 ARCH ST**

Project: Construct rooftop addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jarred Yaron

Applicant: Jarred Yaron, Consequence LLC DBA-Trust

History: 1907; Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust; Seaman's Institute; Newman & Harris, architects

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the construction of a rooftop addition and the installations of banners, wall plaques, planters, and an ADA ramp. The building, a former bank, has had many uses through the years. It is currently vacant. Its exterior and portions of its interior are well conserved.

The building is located at the northeast corner of 3<sup>rd</sup> and Arch Streets. The sidewalks are concrete. The applicant proposes to replace them with bluestone in a regular pattern. The proposed alterations to the facades of the building are minimal. The application proposes to install two wall plaques on the corners of the building, as well as two banners; one banner would face Arch Street, while the second banner would face 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The front entrance to the building retains its original doors, which would be maintained. There is a single step at the entrance, which would be modified with the addition of bilateral ramps to make the entrance ADA accessible. Planters would be placed on the sills of all windows along both 3<sup>rd</sup> and Arch facades.

The application proposes a rooftop addition. The addition would be located towards the rear of the property away from Arch Street. The addition is broken up into several volumes with different cladding materials. A small addition would be located along 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. This addition would allow for the creation of a secondary egress stair. It would be clad in metal. A second addition would be located on the eastern side of the building. This addition would house an elevator overrun. It should be noted that this area of the building already has mechanical and penthouse structures above the roof. A deck area would be created in the center of the building. The space would be enclosed by a glass railing and covered by a metal and acrylic panel canopy. The canopy is designed as a separate element from the visible metal-clad stair addition along 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The canopy may be visible from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, even though it is not shown in the sight line studies. Lastly, an existing mechanical equipment area would be enclosed with a wood slat screen.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the window in the new stairwell addition along 3<sup>rd</sup> Street is redesigned along more traditional lines; the patio roof is simplified to minimize visibility; and the mechanical equipment screen is changed to a simpler, less obtrusive material, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Dave Schultz and Morris Clarke and property owner Jarred Yaron represented the application.

Mr. Schultz distributed revised drawings to the Committee. He explained that they have made some minor amendments to the original submission. The changes included the alteration of an existing basement access for a lift. This basement access door is flush with the sidewalk and would remain unchanged. The other change pertained to the proposed banners. The banners

would attach flat against the wall of the building instead of the originally proposed projecting installation. Mr. Schultz described the proposed interior use of the building. He stated that the interior would be rehabilitated for a gourmet food store. A roof deck would be added for the patrons. He noted that the proposed deck would be located on the northern portion of the roof, away from Arch Street and the mansard roof that covers the main banking space. He explained that there are several mechanical penthouses present, which would be incorporated into this project. The mechanical equipment would be expanded to include a new chiller on an existing mechanical penthouse. Ms. Hawkins asked if the proposed chiller is taller or bigger than the existing equipment. Mr. Clarke answered that it would be larger by a couple of feet.

Mr. Schultz described the alterations to the Arch Street elevation. He noted that the main entrance to the bank has original metal gates that would remain in place. The limestone would be cleaned. He pointed out the change to the attachment of the proposed banners, from projecting banners to flat wall banners. The building currently has wall plaques. Mr. Schultz stated that those would be removed and replaced with new plaques in the same locations.

Mr. Schultz described the rooftop alterations. He stated that the interior stairs at the western side of the building would be extended to the third floor to allow roof access. He noted that the penthouse for this extension has been kept as small as possible. He explained that the stair would open onto the new deck area, which would be enclosed by a glass railing. The glass railing would be set back from the edge of the roof by six feet. Mr. Schultz noted that the proposed copper cladding for the stair penthouse is a more sympathetic material than stucco or other possible materials. He explained that as the copper ages it would patina and be more appropriate to the limestone and aesthetics of the building below. Mr. Cluver asked if the proposed wood-clad enclosure would be on the same plane as the copper cladding of the penthouse. Mr. Schultz answered that it would not. He explained that the stair penthouse is broken into two sections to reduce its mass. The breaking of the rooftop structure into sections reduces the visibility of the stair enclosure from the street. The wood-clad section is set back from the façade and will not be visible from the street. He noted that the front section of the stair enclosure will be the most visible element of the proposed roof alterations. Ms. Hawkins asked why the proposed stair enclosure was so tall. She inquired whether the head height could be diminished. Mr. Schultz answered that it could not, because the landing was located at the southwest corner of the penthouse, which would require the headroom. Mr. Clarke stated that the massing of the penthouse is as small as it can be and still meet code. Ms. Hawkins stated that the use of two materials, copper and wood draw more attention to the penthouse than necessary. Mr. Schultz explained that they were trying to keep the scale down by utilizing different materials. He noted that different materials would diminish the visual presence of the volume. He also pointed out that the pedestrian would not see the wood elements, but only the copper cladding on the penthouse. Ms. Hawkins described the choice of materials as strange. She noted that having a copper roof in front of a wood wall is a very strange juxtaposition. Mr. Schultz explained that he was trying to differentiate the addition from the heavy masonry building below. He again stated that the wood section would not be visible from the street.

Mr. Schultz described the elevator penthouse on the eastern side. He noted that this elevation faces the park adjoining the Betsy Ross House and that it is very difficult to see owing to the thick foliage and matured trees. He explained that the new chiller would be located on the roof adjacent to this elevation. Mr. Schultz presented 3D models that showed the visibility of the proposed alterations. He noted that there would not be any visible changes along the front façade of the building on Arch Street. The models showed that the most visible element would be the copper-clad penthouse addition along 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed chiller is much larger than the one it replaces. He pointed out that the chiller would be placed on a new platform. He asked about the visibility of this element from Arch Street. Mr. Schultz answered that it is not visible because of the thick foliage of the matured trees present in the park. Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed materials on the penthouse along 3<sup>rd</sup> Street are problematic. He stated that the materials are calling more attention to the addition than necessary. He suggested simplifying this part of the design. Mr. Cluver asked if they had studied other masses and materials for the penthouse. Mr. Schultz answered that they had extensively studied other options, and reiterated that the proposed materials are intended to diminish the visual impact of the penthouse on the roof of the building. Mr. Cluver asked about the need for the proposed planters on the window sills. Mr. Schultz answered that the planters would allude to the use of the building as a market with fresh produce. Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed material for the planters. Mr. Clarke answered that they would be bronze. Mr. Cluver expressed his concern in regards to staining on the limestone from dirty water runoff from the planters. Mr. Schultz stated that the planters could be placed in a tub to collect the water runoff. Ms. Stein stated that she would prefer to see the proposed material palette simplified. She noted that it would be too visually overwhelming to see all of these materials on top of a monochromatic limestone building. Mr. Schultz asked for advice on how to simplify it. Mr. Cluver stated that stucco may be the best solution, but stated that he could not design it on the spot.

Mr. Cluver asked the staff about their objection to the canopy over the roof deck. Mr. Danta answered that the staff thought the canopy may be visible from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, even if it is not shown on the 3D models. Mr. Cluver stated that he doubted the canopy would be visible from the street. Mr. Clarke clarified that it would not be visible from the street. He stated that the canopy would be set back by about 12 feet from the edge of the roof. Mr. Farnham clarified that the visibility of the canopy was a concern raised by one staff member at the staff meeting, and not an opinion of the majority. Mr. Schultz stated that his 3D modeling is very accurate and shows that the canopy will not be visible from the street.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the stair penthouse was troubling in her opinion. She stated that the stair penthouse introduces a mansard element on the roof line, which is present over the main bank building, but barely visible from the street. She stated that perhaps stepping the stair penthouse would be a better design solution. She objected to the choice of materials. Ms. Stein stated that a lighter color palette may be more appropriate. She noted that oxidized copper tends to be dark, which may not be appropriate for such a light limestone building. Mr. Cluver asked about the materials for the proposed ramp. Mr. Clarke answered that the ramp would be concrete and it would have bronze railings. Ms. Hawkins asked about the attachment details for the proposed banners and plaques. Mr. Schultz answered that they would be attached to masonry joints.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stair penthouse is redesigned with a simpler massing, fewer materials, and more neutral colors; provided the signage is attached into masonry joints; provided the planters are removable and have internal drainage; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 240 S BROAD ST**

Project: Replace front steps with cast stone  
Review Requested: Final Approval  
Owner: The Philadelphia Orchestra Association  
Applicant: John Trosino, KlingStubbins  
History: 1857; Academy of Music; LeBrun & Runge, architects  
Individual Designation: 5/28/1957  
District Designation: None

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to restore the front steps on the Broad Street façade of the Academy of Music. The steps along Locust Street are not included in this application, and would remain as is. The Academy was constructed in 1857. The original design of the steps consisted of four risers and a threshold within each door opening. This original configuration was changed by 1900 with the expansion of the threshold into a landing, thus increasing the risers to five. The steps were likely changed to concrete at this time. The Academy was fully restored in the mid 1950s. The steps were once again replaced at that time. The 1950s intervention increased the number of risers to six and changed their profile with the introduction of a bull-nose detail and ten bronze hand railings. The 1950s steps are cast stone. They have been coated and painted over the years to match the façade of the academy, also painted. These are the steps in place today. They are, however, severely deteriorated and in need of replacement.

The application proposes to replace the steps. The proposed design is a hybrid. It neither proposes to restore the steps to its 1857 original configuration, nor does it propose to replicate the 1950s design. Instead, the proposal would maintain the existing number of risers, six, while reestablishing the sharp corners of the 1857 design, thus eliminating the bull-nose detail. The railings would also be replaced. The number of railings would diminish from ten to five, and their design simplified. The railings would be centered on each doorway.

The application proposes to replace the steps with color-integral cast stone. The original steps were natural brownstone. Natural brownstone steps have not been present since at least 1900, and for over a century the steps of the Academy have been coated or painted concrete. The Commission has approved the replacement of missing historic fabric with substitute materials, specifically the replacement of missing brownstone with cast stone. The Commission reviewed a very similar application in 2004 for another National Historic Landmark on Broad Street, the Union League. At that time the Commission approved the replacement of the steps on the League's monumental staircase with color-integral cast stone. The color of the steps matched the color of the natural brownstone on the League's façade, which is still in its natural state.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval provided the color of the steps matches the color of the Academy's original natural brownstone, not the color of the painted facade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect John Trosino, George Schaeffer of the Kimmel Center, and Claire Allamby and Elizabeth Barton of the Philadelphia Orchestra represented the application.

Mr. Trosino explained that the color of the paint applied to the façade of the Academy a couple of years ago was based on the unpainted date stone in the center of the pediment. It was subsequently found that the date stone is not original, but a later addition. He stated that the

color of the original brownstone on the façade may have been slightly different. He explained that the hue of the color on the façade today is very similar to the date stone, but that the value changes with the time of day and quality of light. He noted that the intent is to tone down the value of the approved color sample to make it appear darker. Mr. Cluver stated that the Cathedral of Saints Peter & Saint Paul may offer a good idea of the original color of the brownstone. He noted that the Cathedral was designed by the same architect and built at the same time as the Academy. Ms. Hawkins stated that the staff can work with the applicant to identify the appropriate color. Mr. Danta stated that the color was an important discussion point. He stated that the staff would like to locate a piece of original brownstone in the building and have the cast stone match it precisely, rather than using a color fan to determine the color of the cast stone. Mr. Danta stated that the color of the steps is crucial, since they will last for many years, while the color of the paint on the façade can be changed in a decade. He stressed that accuracy was very important in this instance. Mr. Trosino agreed with Mr. Danta's comments. Mr. Cluver also agreed and encouraged the applicant to work with the staff to locate a piece of original brownstone to match.

Mr. Cluver asked why the application retained the existing six steps, rather than returning to the historic four steps as originally designed. Mr. Trosino explained that the primary reason is safety. He explained that the original design had a threshold inset within each of the door opening and was set in by about 18 inches within the door opening. He stated that, if this configuration is recreated, it would create a tripping hazard, especially at times when large crowds of people exit the building. Mr. Cluver agreed and stated that the original configuration should not be restored. Mr. Cluver asked about the lack of extensions on the railings at the bottom and top of the steps. Mr. Trosino explained that the railings, in any configuration, would not be code compliant according to current building codes. He explained that a plans examiner at the Department of Licenses & Inspections advised him to seek the Historical Commission's approval first and then to request the Board of Building Standards' approval. Mr. Cluver stated that he prefers the design as proposed. He stated that the railings without extensions are much more elegant and appropriate for this historic building. He pointed out that the railings at the 15<sup>th</sup> Street entrance of the Union League have extensions and are visually intrusive to the historic façade. He encouraged the applicant to seek the approval of the Board of Building Standards as presented. Ms. Hawkins asked if there is a concern regarding the lack of a railing or extension on the landing at the top of the stairs. Mr. Trosino explained that the proposed design is the least intrusive and creates the least congestion at the landing. He explained that, as patrons exit the Academy, they are obstructed by the handrails, which create a bottleneck effect. He noted that this is another reason why the extensions should not be replicated, nor should the landing be intruded upon. Mr. Cluver stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections can work out those details with the applicant, since these details are more of a code-compliance nature.

Mr. Cluver asked about the difference in the dimensions of the railing's post and the rails. Mr. Trosino acknowledged that it looks strange in the drawing, but that the design was based on the railing at the Second Bank on Walnut Street. He distributed a photograph of the railing at the Second Bank. He stated that the railing looks very elegant in real life, which does not translate very well on to the drawing. Mr. Cluver agreed and stated that the photograph shows that the design would be appropriate.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the color of the steps matches the color of the Academy's original natural brownstone, not the color of the painted facade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**ADDRESS: 138-40 N FRONT ST**

Project: Construct five-story multifamily dwelling  
Review Requested: Final Approval  
Owner: 512-16 S. Front Street LLP  
Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch  
History: vacant lot  
Individual Designation: None  
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003  
Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a five-story building with roof deck and pilot house and six parking bays on the first story. The Commission has plenary jurisdiction over this site; a non-contributing building stood on it at the time of the designation of the district.

The proposed building would be clad in red brick. A four-story, metal-clad, projecting bay would face Front Street. The parking garages and two banks of recessed balconies would face Quarry Street. The windows would be fixed panels and casements in aluminum clad. The roof deck would have a thin horizontal metal rail and a metal-clad pilot house set back from the rooflines.

The rear elevation of this property would be highly visible from Bladen's Court, a courtyard part of Elfreth's Alley, a National Historic Landmark.

In June 2006, the Commission reviewed an application to demolish a non-contributing structure on this lot and construct a building nearly identical to the current proposal. The Commission approved the application, provided the rear metal panels along Bladen's Court are a darker color, with staff to review details.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the rear elevation is clad in red brick and includes no windows, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Mr. Ohler distributed revised drawings and renderings that include the rear elevation. The revisions were based on suggestions from the staff. Mr. Ohler explained that this application was presented to the Commission by a previous architect in 2006. He explained that his client purchased the property with the approved design, but now proposes to eliminate the previously-approved sixth story. He explained that the reduction was motivated by constructability and cost concerns. He stated that the rear elevation that is flush with Bladen's Court would be brick with a four-foot, stucco, set-back at the fifth story. He explained that the rear proposal is similar to that already approved; however, the windows have been deleted from the elevation. He added that both columns of corrugated metal siding are flush within the same plane as the brick. Ms. Hawkins asked Ms. Sell if the revision meets staff recommendation. Ms. Sell stated that it satisfies the staff's concerns.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised submission, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 1914 SHUNK ST**

Project: Replace porch railing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jacqueline Mastrangelo

Applicant: Jacqueline Mastrangelo

History: 1910; John Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace an original wood porch rail. The proposed rail does not match the original in design. The original rail has a curved detail that would not be replicated in the proposal.

The existing portion of the railing is original to the building and a feature of the building noted in the description of building type "L" in the inventory of the Girard Estate Historic District. It should be noted that the entire wooden porch railing was present in the designation photograph taken in 2000. Currently, the west section of the rail and a piece of the north section are missing.

In November 2011, the applicant proposed to replace the rail with a decorative metal rail. The Commission denied the application. Subsequently, the applicant appealed the Commission's decision to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The case was withdrawn in April 2013.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Adrian Mastrangelo represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant why he would like to replace the rail. Mr. Mastrangelo explained that it is rotten, unsafe, and someone fell through a portion of the side rail. He stated that he was at risk of a law suit for a year after the fall because the person was injured. He explained that his property is part of a twin and the adjoining property has an iron rail. He stated that there is a portion of an iron rail and handrail on the front of his property. He explained that he would like his house to match his neighbor's house and be safe. He acknowledged that the Commission denied a previous application for a metal rail. However, he explained, it would cost \$800 for an iron rail that would last 100 years. He claimed that he has contacted six millworking companies and cannot find someone who would duplicate historic rail with the curve or slope. He explained that his current proposal is from a mill in Camden, Ohio. He explained that he is on a fixed income, works two jobs, and has two children and a wife that is ill. He stated that he would like to make the house look nice. He claimed that in the past 18 months he has used one week of vacation time with his current employer to attend Board of License Inspection Review hearings and amassed more than \$100 in parking fees. He expressed his frustration because he works two full-time jobs to pay for his children's tuitions to private schools. He stated that the Commission staff provided him with names of millworkers and that he called every company on the list. He claimed that not many want to be involved with a property that is designated by the Historical Commission. He claimed that they are unfamiliar with the permitting process and shop drawing requirements. He claimed that there is a belief that, if one lives in a historically designated district, then one is wealthy. He claimed that he received a quote for \$5000 to manufacture a new rail to match the existing rail, not including installation and painting. He explained that there are more important priorities to take care of on the interior of the home. He

asserted that he is not wealthy and works two jobs. He added that his wife also works and is due for surgery in two weeks. He noted that the manufacturer in Ohio stated that he could duplicate the thickness and the appearance of the existing rail, but not the slopes. He explained that the manufacturer would need to make \$400 to \$600 in knives to cut the profile of the rail. He explained that cost is driving this application, but his priority is to make the rail safe. He claimed that wood is not a safe material as it deteriorates over time. He stated that he was born in Philadelphia, has lived in the city for 50 years, and does not plan on leaving. He stated that when he retires he will not have the money to replace the rail after it deteriorates again in 15 to 20 years. He claimed that he has obtained estimates on teak and mahogany woods and they were priced at up to \$10,000. He asserted that an iron railing would be more affordable, safer, and match other properties in the district.

Ms. Hawkins asked Ms. Sell about the condition of the current rail. Ms. Sell directed the Committee to photographs in the meeting materials packet and distributed color copies from the file. She acknowledged that the side portion of the rail is missing; a person who fell through it. She explained that the front rail is also in need of repair.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission have different jurisdictions. She apologized for the applicant's frustration and the time taken to work through the process. She explained that the Commission can consider other circumstances beyond architectural design. She continued that the Committee's jurisdiction is limited and can only review the application based on how it duplicates the original rail and if it is historically appropriate. Ms. Sell explained that the Commission meeting is the second of two meetings in this review. She continued that, regardless of what is decided here today, the final determination of approval or denial will be made by the Historical Commission itself.

Ms. Hawkins observed that the railing has deteriorated and is in need of repair. She stated that she understands the applicant's concern with safety, but the existing rail was likely in serviceable working condition for at least 100 years since the house was built. She explained that after 100 years, wood railings need some attention. She opined that maintaining the historic appearance of the front rail is more significant than the side; however, she contended that the railing is an important component of the house.

Mr. Cluver explained that, according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the appropriate replacement is one that is in-kind. He stated that the Committee cannot consider budget concerns; however, the full Commission can look at that information. He expressed disappointment that the applicant is obtaining high-priced quotes from millworkers. He observed that the project does not seem like it is very complicated and that perhaps the applicant is reaching out to inexperienced millwork shops. He stated that the current application proposes a Ponderosa pine wood, which is a type of wood that would not last longer than 10 years. He explained that the radius on the rail seems to be the element that is driving the cost.

Mr. Baron suggested the applicant repair the existing railing and install a metal bar along the inside to reinforce it.

Mr. Cluver asked how many of the historic rails were in the district originally and how many are currently present. Mr. Mastrangelo replied that there are currently three remaining in the district. Ms. Sell stated that she does not have that information at this time. Mr. Cluver stated that the railing is part of the character of the house.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if he has written estimates from the millworkers he has contacted. Ms. Sell stated that she spoke to the applicant at the most recent Board of License & Inspection Review hearing and advised him to bring in all estimates that he has obtained. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Commission can look at cost estimates in relation to the proposals and may provide more flexibility in their decision than the Committee. She explained that, although she understands the applicant wants a metal rail, the wood rail is a strong visual characteristic of this property. She added that the thicker pieces of wood create an almost solid appearance which provides added privacy on the porch that neighbors with metal rails do not have. Mr. Mastrangelo explained that the current submission has balusters with the same thickness as the existing rail. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Commission might be in favor of a straight rail, provided they understand that the curved elements are driving the cost of the project. Mr. Mastrangelo explained that he withdrew the appeal of the Commission's denial of the metal rail because it was a waste of time and his employer is frustrated with him taking time off. He explained that he had surgery last month and is dealing with a resulting infection that caused additional hospital visits. He added that he will need to take more time off for his daughter's doctor appointment. He asked for direction from the Committee because he feels like he is not getting anywhere.

Mr. Cluver explained that the Committee does not have the ability to grant the approval of the rail without the curved elements. He asked the applicant if he talked to Tague Lumber. Mr. Mastrangelo responded that he has talked to their company. Mr. Cluver explained that they have a Spanish cedar rail with a profile similar to the existing profile. He advised that the applicant should not pursue Ponderosa pine because it is not durable. He suggested the applicant talk to Tague Lumber. He also noted that the application drawing shows a U-shape at the bottom rail. He advised that water will collect in that trench and cause rot. He recommended that the bottom rail be shaped to shed water away. He stated that he would like to encourage the Commission to allow for a rail that matches the existing without the curve, if it is cost-prohibitive. Mr. Mastrangelo stated that he would contact Tague Lumber.

Ms. Sell advised the applicant to bring any and all documentation to demonstrate the attempts he has made to obtain estimates from millwork companies.

Mr. Mastrangelo argued that wood rails do not last. Ms. Hawkins stated that many do last up to 100 years with the proper choice in wood and design. She added that a lot of metal does not last as long. She stated that, if one chooses a soft wood or an improper design, rot will be a problem sooner rather than later. Mr. Cluver added that it comes down to craftsmanship and that, if it is done properly and primed appropriately, it will last a very long time.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

**ADDRESS: 138 RACE ST**

Project: Construct a four-story multifamily dwelling  
Review Requested: Review and Comment  
Owner: 512-16 S. Front Street LLP  
Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch  
History: vacant lot  
Individual Designation: None  
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003  
Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a four-story rowhouse on a vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. The lot is considered to be an Undeveloped Site and the Commission's jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The front façade would be clad in brick and have a traditional fenestration pattern. The front door is set at grade to provide ADA access to the building. The rear elevations, which would not be visible from the public rights-of-way would be clad in stucco with single and paired windows on each floor.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff comments that the proposed building is generally compatible with the historic district, pursuant to Standard 9, but the first-floor windows could be taller and the front door could be wider to better relate to the scale, proportion, and rhythm of the surrounding historic buildings.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Mr. Ohler stated that he accepted the staff's comments. He stated that he does not anticipate that his client will object to making the suggested revisions to the design.

Mr. Cluver asked about the pilot house. Mr. Ohler stated that it was set back 30 feet from the front façade and would not be visible from the street. Mr. Cluver stated that the pilot house should be better articulated, but, given that it is not visible from the street, the articulation is not a concern of the Committee's. Ms. Hawkins stated that the first floor windows look like they should be placed higher on the façade. Mr. Ohler replied that, given that the first floor is at grade, the windows are placed accordingly to meet egress requirements.

Mr. Cluver stated that the heads of windows and door do not need to align. He stated that the architect could consider a transom over the door if he wanted the heads of the windows and door to align. Mr. Ohler stated that he and his client will look into that further.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee commented that the proposed building is generally compatible with the historic district, pursuant to Standard 9, but the first-floor windows could be taller and the front door could be wider to better relate to the scale, proportion, and rhythm of the surrounding historic buildings.

**ADDRESS: 538-40 SPRUCE ST**

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Daniel & Catherine Dumoff

Applicant: Leonard Reuter, The Reuter Law Firm, LLC

History: 1798; John Christian Schnyder House; façade rebuilt at 538, 1968

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a one-story rear kitchen addition, a three-story rear elevator addition, and a pergola and storage structure at the ground level. The two rowhouses at the corner of 6<sup>th</sup> and Spruce Streets have been joined as one dwelling. The kitchen addition would have a gabled roof, stucco side walls, and a brick rear wall. The elevator addition would be clad with stucco. The pergola and storage structure would be constructed of brick and have a gabled roof.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Leonard F. Reuter, property owner Catherine Dumoff, and architect Steven Brown represented the application.

Mr. Reuter distributed revised plans that reflect that the dormer is to remain. He stated that the elevator is needed to provide access throughout the building. He stated that the elevator is proposed for the rear. He stated that, upon review of the Commission's file for the property, he and Mr. Danta determined that the rear of these joined houses has been altered and is not original. He stated that they believe the proposed additions are compatible with historic district and do not adversely affect any significant historic fabric of the property.

Mr. Cluver asked about the roofing of the proposed kitchen addition and pergola. Mr. Brown clarified that the proposed roofing is shingle as specified in the notes. Mr. Cluver stated that it appears that a metal cap is proposed for the existing garden wall. Mr. Brown stated that wall is currently topped with a stucco wash; therefore, they are proposing a metal cap. Mr. Reuter stated that wall was constructed after the 1960s.

Ms. Stein asked why a gable roof, and not a shed roof, was proposed for the kitchen addition. Mr. Brown stated that the gable roof provided more space, with a higher ceiling, and light on the inside. Ms. Stein asserted that a shed roof would be more compatible with the historic building. She stated that additions to buildings in this neighborhood often have shed roofs. She stated that the gable roof is more prominent.

Harry K. Schwartz of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the Association supports the staff's comments. He stated that the Association is not opposed to the elevator addition. He opined that, although the Association does not oppose the kitchen addition, it gives the appearance of being part of the original house. He stated that he is concerned that the range will require venting and a cap, which do not appear in the drawings and will most likely be visible from 6<sup>th</sup> Street. He stated that, if they are obtrusive the Association, would object to them. He pointed out inconsistencies in the drawings for the existing door on 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Lastly, he wondered how the rain water runoff will be handled with the kitchen addition.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 APRIL 2013**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Mr. Baron stated that there is a very old violation for vinyl windows at this property. He asked about the material of the proposed windows and if the muntins will have depth. Ms. Dumoff strenuously objected to Mr. Baron's statement and stated that the current windows are wooden and not vinyl.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Brown about the venting required for the range. Mr. Brown stated that the vent is shown in section in the drawings. He stated that the details still need to be developed, but the goal is to install a 10-inch by 10-inch flush-mounted louvered vent that would not project. Mr. Cluver asked about its location on the exterior. Mr. Brown stated that it would be on the stucco portion of the rear wall of the addition as close to the eave as possible. Mr. Reuter asked if the details of the vent could be reviewed by the staff.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the existing 6<sup>th</sup> Street elevation door. Mr. Reuter stated that changes to the door are not proposed. Mr. Brown stated that the drawings could be revised; the inconsistency is merely a drafting error and does not indicate any intention to undertake any work. Ms. Hawkins asked about drainage. Mr. Brown stated that the storm water drainage is detailed in the submitted drawings. He stated that a downspout will be installed at the rear of the existing building, with a new boot, and a new drain will be excavated.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the windows in the addition. Mr. Brown stated that the proposed windows will be aluminum clad and have simulated-divided-light.

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

**ADDRESS: 512 AND 514-16 S FRONT ST**

Project: Construct four-story multifamily dwelling

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 512-16 S. Front Street LLP

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: vacant

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a four-story, four-unit residential building and a four-story, two-unit residential building on vacant lots on S. Front Street in the Society Hill Historic District.

The entry for these lots in the inventory of the Society Hill Historic District is flawed and poses a regulatory question for the Commission. The entry for these properties reads "512-16 Vacant lot. Archaeological potential. Non-contributing." When the Historical Commission designated the Society Hill Historic District in 1999, it found that the district satisfied several Criteria for Designation including Criterion i, the archaeology criterion, which stipulates that the resource "has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history." The inventory entry indicates that the Commission believed that these lots had a potential for archaeological resources. Yet, in direct contradiction to the claim about archaeological potential, the Commission classified the lots as Non-contributing; in other words, it found that the site

“does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the district as defined in the Commission's designation,” to quote the Rules & Regulations. Clearly, if significant archaeological resources related to the district survive at the site, the site would “reflect the historical or architectural character of the district.” The entry in the inventory is flawed. If the Commission intended to protect archaeological resources at the site, it should have classified the property as Contributing.

In light of this flaw in the inventory, the Commission must determine whether this site can be considered an Undeveloped Site in the legal sense. If it is an Undeveloped Site, the Commission has Review-and-Comment authority only over it. If it is not an Undeveloped Site, the Commission has plenary jurisdiction over it and could require the developer to take steps to protect the potential archaeological resources. Section 2.23 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations defines an Undeveloped Site as follows:

An undeveloped site is a property within an historic district which is not individually designated, to which the inventory in the historic district nomination attributes no historical, cultural, or archaeological value, and upon which no building or structure stood at the time of the designation of the historic district. Non-historic foundations and other below-grade constructions; surface parking lots; non-historic parking kiosks and other kiosks, storage sheds, and other impermanent constructions without foundations; and non-historic walls, fences, and gates shall not be construed as buildings or structures for the purposes of this definition.

The inventory entry is contradictory. It attributes the site with “archaeological value” but also states that it “does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the district.”

Section 14-201(14) of the Philadelphia Zoning Code, within which the historic preservation ordinance is located, addresses potentials for ambiguity within the Zoning Code. It states that Where the meaning of a restriction in this Zoning Code is ambiguous and the intent cannot be discerned through the usual rules of statutory construction, the restriction shall be construed in favor of the landowner, provided that the resulting construction does not lead to irrationality in the Zoning Code.

Before the Historical Commission rules on the merits of this application, it must determine whether the site is an Undeveloped Site, or, in other words, whether it will assert Review-and-Comment or plenary jurisdiction over this application.

The Architectural Committee should not seek to answer this question regarding the level of review, but should instead formulate a recommendation to the Commission that could serve for either level of review.

Some quick research indicates that there is a potential for archaeological resources at this site. Map research indicates that a brick rowhouse stood at 512 S. Front Street. The rear portion of the property, which backed up to an alley, was open and is a likely location for a privy pit. Map research indicates that a small brick residential and commercial building stood at the front of the lot at 514-16 S. Front. The middle section of the lot was open and ringed by various light industrial brick and frame buildings. City directories indicate that it was used as a marble yard and cooperage at times in the nineteenth century. A privy pit and other underground resources may exist at the site. Nothing in the quick research indicates that anything unusual or exceptional occurred at these sites. Therefore, while it is likely that archaeological artifacts

would be found at the site, it appears unlikely that they would reveal “important information in pre-history or history.”

The designs of the proposed buildings are generally compatible in scale and materials with the historic district, but could be refined to be more compatible. Although several nearby buildings on S. Front Street have front-loaded garages, the proposed garages are not compatible with the district. The garages should be relocated or the number of the garage entrances reduced. The proposed buildings are taller than the surrounding historic buildings. The masses of the proposed buildings should be reduced with the introduction of mansards or other features, making the proposed buildings more compatible with their neighbors. The scale of the very large second-floor front windows is too large and is inappropriate for the district. The windows should be redesigned to respect the scales of windows in nearby residential buildings.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that, owing to the ambiguity in the Society Hill Historic District inventory entry for this property, the Commission limit itself to Review-and-Comment jurisdiction only, pursuant to Section 14-201(14) of the Philadelphia Zoning Code. The staff comments that the suggested design modifications to the garages, cornice line and upper floor, and windows should be incorporated.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler, attorney David Orphanides, and developer Scott Haffey represented the application.

Mr. Ohler explained that they had examined other options for the garages, but none was feasible. He observed that there are other garages on the block. He added that the Queen Village Neighbors Association specifically requested one parking space for each unit. Discussing the design of the front façades, he said that they had established a cornice on the façades to relate to the cornice line of the older surrounding houses. Ms. Hawkins objected to the industrial scale of the windows on the third-floor front façade. She said that the arched openings should include a brick arch, rather than merely a cut in the wall. Mr. Ohler explained that these windows were for river views and that other houses on the block have large windows. Mr. Orphanides stressed the variety of buildings on the block. Ms. Hawkins said the proposed façades are an amalgam of too many styles. Ms. Stein suggested that the fourth floor should be rendered in a more recessive vocabulary in a different material. She explained that these houses are urban infill and not a stand-alone development like the houses to the north. In such a circumstance, it is important to relate to the surrounding structures. Mr. Cluver explained that the arched windows should have a true arch rather than segmental arch. He said that the cornices should be revised to show a cima molding rather than a square profile. The windows at the fourth floor should be realigned to follow the pattern of the second floor. He asked about the possibility of grouping the entrance doors as well as the garages. He thought the top floor should have some setback. Mr. Ohler said that the Streets Department had asked them to separate the garages to create sidewalk islands as refuges for the protection of pedestrians.

Harvey Schwartz spoke on behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association. He said that the Association supports the staff recommendation regarding the garages. He stated that he is in favor of reducing the scale of the third floor windows and creating a fourth-floor mansard. He stressed the importance of these houses, which comprise part of the face of the neighborhood.

Mr. Haffey expressed a desire to change the windows to follow Committee’s recommendations.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the garages are eliminated from Front Street; the front doorways are combined and windows added; the third-floor arched windows are redesigned; the fourth floor is distinguished with a materials change and perhaps set back; the fourth-floor windows are aligned to the windows below; and the cornices are redesigned, with the staff to review details.

**ADDRESS: 3859-61 LANCASTER AVENUE**

Project: Rehabilitate three-story mixed use building  
Review Requested: Final Approval  
Owner: People's Emergency Center CDC  
Applicant: John Gibbons, KSK Architects, Planners, Historians, Inc.  
History: 1895; Wright & Prentzel, builders  
Individual Designation: 7/5/1984  
District Designation: None  
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** These elaborate mixed-use buildings make up part of a curved complex of buildings along Lancaster Avenue and 39<sup>th</sup> Street. The buildings have been vacant for several years and have lost metal bays and cornices. They are being renovated by the Peoples Emergency Center, a non-profit agency that serves the neighborhood. The agency and its architects have developed three potential levels of intervention, the choice of which will be dependent on costs and funding. This application proposes what is called the Level Two intervention. All levels would restore the tile roofing, metal cornices, and some windows. An ADA ramp would be installed regardless of chosen level. Level One would retain the stucco patches where the bays have been removed. Level Three would replicate the historic bays accurately. Level Two, which this application proposes, would reconstruct the historic, projecting bays in a flatter configuration. With this scheme, a facsimile of the appearance of the historic bays could be restored, but at much less cost than a true restoration. The staff recognizes that reconstructing the bays in a flattened form does not satisfy a strict reading of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but questions whether some restoration is better than none at all and suggests that the Committee and Commission determine whether a special exemption is warranted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the flattened bays, but approval of all other aspects of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect David Artman and owner Lee Stryer represented the application.

Mr. Stryer explained that his organization would like to fully restore the facades, but the extent of restoration will depend on the funding. Mr. Artman explained that there are also zoning issues associated with constructing façade bays so close to the party walls of the building. However, they may be to overcome the zoning issues.

Mr. Cluver said that not reconstructing the bays results in the loss of the rhythm of the façade. He thought that arched windows could be installed to make the proposed flat bays more compatible with the original bays. Ms. Hawkins agreed with Mr. Cluver that, if the new flat bays are modified to better reflect the roof height and fenestration of the projecting bays, then this would be an acceptable compromise.

Mr. Baron explained that, although the staff normally favors internal ramps for ADA access, this property was not conducive to such a treatment because of the amount of fabric that would have to be removed from the exterior stair as well as the lack of space inside. All of the Committee members found the proposed ramp to be acceptable, but suggested that the rail be made either more decorative or simpler.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option Two with the flattened bays, provided the details are revised to better reflect the historic bays, and provided the ramp railing is revised, with the staff to review details.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:26 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 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

Standard 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.