MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 19 FEBRUARY 2013
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR

PRESENT
Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Amy Stein
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Roberto Sella
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Gram Ferguson, Powers & Co.
Kim Miller, Drexel University
Kevin Aires, BLT Architects
Michael Prifti, BLT Architects
Geoff Klein, BLT Architects
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Kit Leary
Russ Troyer
Adrienne Mendell
Anne Cook
Ori Feibush, OCF Café
Justino Navarro, Spring Garden Civic Association
Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio
Gabrielle Canno, CANNO Design
Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO Design

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

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 2003 DELANCEY PL
Project: Construct basement entry, replace railings
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Roberto and Francine Sella
Applicant: Michael Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr LLP
History: 1865; rehabbed in Colonial Revial style, 1912
Individual Designation: 1/6/1972
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a new basement entrance and the replacement of railings at the front of this townhouse. The house was built in 1865 as part of a row. The property was altered in the Colonial Revival style in 1912 by the prominent firm of Stewardson & Page. The Commission approved an application in July 2011 that included the restoration of the front façade and the addition of a garage at the rear. In February 2012, the applicant presented a proposal to alter the front steps and construct a new basement entrance. The applicant withdrew the application before the Commission reviewed it.

The applicant has redesigned the basement entrance, reducing its scope and complexity. The revised design proposes a smaller opening at grade; the retention of the marble steps in place; and the elimination of a previously-proposed planter. The new design for the entrance would involve the removal of small section and the replacement of a small section of marble on the side wall of the steps. The stair well would be enclosed by a simple metal railing.

The application also proposes the replacement of the metal railings on the steps leading to the front door. The application claims that the railings are "modern," but no documentation of their age is provided. The Commission's files contain a photograph from 1963 that shows the railings in place. The railings do not date to the original construction of the house in 1865, but may date to the Stewardson & Page alteration. Unless the railings are shown to be a non-historic addition, they should be retained or replicated in kind. The new railing for the basement entranceway could be designed to match the existing railings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the basement entrance, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the replacement of the front stoop railings as proposed, unless they are shown to be non-historic, but approval of their replacement in kind, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 4.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Michael Sklaroff and property owner Roberto Sella represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff distributed an undated photograph showing that one of the stoop railings was missing. He opined that the railings do not appear to be original or associated with the Colonial Revival rehabilitation. Ms. Gutterman asked for the reasons for replacing the railings. Mr. Sella answered that the railings are not in good condition. He explained that he had spoken to a metal fabricator who explained that fixing the existing railings and creating new ones would cost about the same amounts. Mr. Sella noted that the attachment points are corroded and that the railings had been installed without lead fittings, which damaged the marble steps. Ms. Sklaroff noted that the railings do not appear to have any historical significance.

Mr. Cluver asked if the creation of the doorway beneath the stairs would necessitate enlarging the existing opening beyond its current width. Mr. Sklaroff answered that the existing window opening would need to be widened slightly. Ms. Gutterman noted that the window in the steps was not original. She asked if the date of the addition of the window was known. Mr. Farnham answered that it was probably done in the 1970s. He also noted that alteration to the opening would include the removal of a small amount of damaged marble at the side, but also the restoration of some marble at the top of the opening. The amount of marble removed would approximately equal the amount of marble restored.

Mr. Cluver asked about the parging finish on the inside of the stairs. Mr. Sklaroff answered that it would probably be stucco. He stated that they will work with the staff on the final details of the parging to ensure that its color and texture are appropriate.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the building code required the railings to be 46 inches tall, or if they could be 36. She also asked if a gate at the top of the new basement stairs would be required. Mr. Sklaroff answered that they would comply with the requirements of the code. Mr. Cluver noted that a 36-inch railing would be acceptable in this situation. Mr. Farnham noted that the staff would ensure that the shortest code-compliant railings are used.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the railings that are present there are very decorative, while the railings that are being proposed are very utilitarian. She claimed that the existing railings are appropriate and have significance. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the existing railings are not historically significant, even if they are aesthetically pleasing. Ms. Gutterman contended that the railings are historic fabric, because they were present at the time of designation. Mr. Sklaroff objected and explained that an air conditioner that is present at the time of designation is not historic or significant by mere virtue of its presence. Ms. Gutterman explained that it all depends on whether the non-original feature contributes to the significance to the house. Ms. Hawkins noted that in this case the feature may also contribute to the district.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that his client would reconsider the railing replacement and then work with the staff on its retention or replication. Mr. Cluver asked that the cost differential between retention and replication is factoring into the owner's decisions regarding the railings. Mr. Sklaroff objected to the question and asserted that the Committee should not be considering cost or aesthetics, but should base its railing decision on their historical significance or lack thereof. He stated that the Committee members should not be basing their recommendation on whether they find the railings to be aesthetically pleasing or not. He stated that they must be guided by the railings' historical significance. Ms. Hawkins stated that the period of significance of the district must also be considered. Mr. Farnham stated that the nomination for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District does not define a period of significance. He stated that the failure to define a period of significance makes it impossible to determine with certainty whether later alterations have historic significance. He also stated that the staff would investigate the existing railings to determine whether they date to the Stewardson & Page alterations of 1912.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the basement entrance, with the staff to review details; and denial of the replacement of the railings on the steps, pursuant to Standards 2 and 4.

ADDRESS: 3509 SPRING GARDEN ST
Project: Renovate house and carriage house, remove link, construct link
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Drexel University
Applicant: Kevin Aires, BLT Architects
History: 1860; James P. Bruner House
Individual Designation: 4/30/1963
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate a grand Italianate house and large carriage house at 3509 Spring Garden Street as part of the Dana and David Dornsife Center for Neighborhood Partnerships, through which Drexel University will interact with the surrounding community. It will be funded with a $10 million gift to the University. The complex occupies the entire city block bounded by Spring Garden, 35th, 36th, and Brandywine Streets. The mid twentieth-century school building at the western edge of the block will be incorporated into the Center, but is not designated as historic and is therefore not part of this review.

The grand Italianate house was constructed in the 1850s for textile manufacturer James. P. Bruner. The very large carriage house, which is referred to as a stable and coach house in early deeds, was constructed soon thereafter, probably in the 1860s. A one-story link was constructed between the house and carriage house at some point between 1927 and 1939.

This application proposes to restore the exterior envelopes of the two buildings. The restoration would include masonry repair, window replacement, and the removal of a fire escape and non-historic shed addition on the house. The restoration of the missing cupola on the carriage house is proposed as an option. The one-story link between the house and carriage house would be removed. In December 2010, the Commission approved a proposal to convert the two historic buildings to residential use. At that time, the Commission determined that the removal of the link would not constitute a demolition in the legal sense. The 2010 project was not executed. A small Italianate portico at the rear of the house may also be removed.

A two- and three-story link building with an elevator and stair would be constructed between the house and the carriage house to provide ADA access and egress for the complex. Limited historic fabric would be removed where the link would connect to the house and carriage house. The link would be visible from the public right-of-way, but would not adversely impact views of the primary facades of the buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the small Italianate portico at the rear of the house is documented before it is removed with photographs and measured drawings deposited with the Philadelphia Historical Commission, with the staff to review details including window shop drawings and masonry repair and cleaning specifications, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Michael Prifti and Kevin Aires, historic preservation consultant Robert Powers, and Kimberley Miller of Drexel University represented the application.

Ms. Miller explained that the building is located on the boundary of Powleton Village and Mantua, which is a neighborhood with significant challenges and needs. Through this project, Drexel is seeking to reach out to its surrounding neighborhoods. The structures will house a law

clinic, wellness center, computer classrooms, wood-working shop as well as other programs. The link between the house and the carriage house is necessary to integrate these programs with each other as well as provide access and egress for all floors of the buildings. The historic front door of the house will be used as the main entrance to the complex. The entrance in the new link will be a secondary entrance. Mr. Prifti explained that the decision to locate the elevator in the new link and not in the Italianate house was, in part, driven by a desire to preserve significant interiors in the house.

Mr. Powers summarized the restoration aspects of the project including the potential reconstruction of the cupola on the carriage house. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the preservation of the grounds. Ms. Miller explained that some of the grounds may be used for community gardening, but most of it will remain open and undisturbed. Mr. McCoubrey praised the program and congratulated the applicants on the preservation of these important buildings that have been awaiting rehabilitation.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the cladding materials for the link. The applicants responded that the link will be clad in metal panels and glass. They explained that they have undertaken a paint analysis of the historic house and determined that it was originally a beige-yellow color. They propose to repaint the house the original color and fabricate the metal panels to match that color. Mr. Prifti explained that, at Mr. Baron's suggestion, they are revising the design of the panels and windows in the link so that they better correspond to the existing building's fenestration, which is vertically oriented. Ms. Hawkins asked about the base of the link, which is shown in a darker color in the rendering. The applicants responded that the base would be concrete, perhaps with an aluminum capping. Ms. Pentz asked about the heights of the various sections of the link. Mr. Prifti explained that the link, with the exception of the elevator tower, would be shorter than the main cornice height on the house. Ms. Stein asked about the locations of proposed mechanical equipment. The applicants responded that the mechanical equipment would be located at the non-historic school building. The Committee asked about a loading dock. Mr. Prifti replied that a loading dock was not needed. Owing to the program, which does not include food service, the amounts of materials moving in and out would be minimal and limited primarily to office supplies.

Mr. Cluver asked if the applicants had provided drawings showing the revised, more vertically-oriented windows and panels on the link. The architects explained that they had prepared drawings with the minor revisions suggested by Mr. Baron, but had not yet provided them to the Commission. Mr. Cluver explained that he understood the need for a link and approved of its design in concept. He stated that he was troubled by the third-floor portion of the link that runs across a lower section of the roof of the rear of the house. He stated that providing elevator access to the third floor of the house meant that the elevator tower would be the tallest part of the complex. Mr. Cluver suggested that they redesign the project, limiting the use of the third floor and obviating the need for the taller elevator. Ms. Miller explained that they could not afford to limit the use of the third floor. She also stated that, owing to the use as an open and welcoming community center, it is critical for Drexel to provide access to all persons to all areas of the complex. Preventing disabled people from using parts of the complex would run counter to the center's mission. Mr. Cluver asked if the elevator cab would be visible from the exterior. Mr. Prifiti explained that the elevator tower would be glazed and the cab would be visible from the exterior.

The Committee asked for public comment, but none was offered.

Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee that the Commission has reviewed several projects for this site, none of which have reached fruition. He stated that this property has proved difficult to feasibly reuse and observed that this project, which is funded by a large gift, will allow for a rehabilitation of these important buildings that might not be possible in the for-profit world. He asserted that the positives far outweigh the negatives with this project. He noted that this site is very similar to the infamous 400 S. 40th Street in many ways. Both include large Italianate houses in West Philadelphia on the edges of college campuses. Both houses are difficult and expensive to adapt for new uses. He reminded the Committee members that, during the demolition review for 400 S. 40th Street, the neighbors repeatedly asked the owner, the University of Pennsylvania, to restore the Italianate house as "a gift to neighborhood." He observed that that is exactly what Drexel is proposing to do in this instance. He asked the Committee to overlook so minor concerns and act favorably on this project. A denial of this application may lead to another 400 S. 40th Street.

Mr. Cluver stated that he is in favor of the concept, but contended that the architectural drawings are not complete because they do not include the revisions to the glass and panels to give them a vertical orientation. He also objected to the visibility of the elevator cab and suggested that the third-floor section of the link should be better integrated into the whole. He suggested a recommendation of denial owing to incompleteness. Ms. Gutterman agreed. The applicants strenuously objected to a recommendation of denial owing to incompleteness based simply on the minor change to the orientation of the cladding that Mr. Baron had suggested. Mr. Powers asserted that the change was minimal and could be reviewed at the staff level. Mr. Farnham agreed that the change was very minor and suggested by the staff. Mr. Cluver countered that he needed to see elevation drawings with the change to determine if the appearance was appropriate. The applicants again stated that the change would not only be minimal but also positive. They asked the Committee to consider the complete plans that had been provided. Ms. Miller stated that a delay in an approval could put the New Market and historic tax credits at risk, threatening the entire project. She asked the Committee to reconsider, especially since its concern was limited to a minor aesthetic change suggested by the staff. Mr. Cluver suggested that Ms. Hawkins could review the revised plans with the vertically-oriented windows and panels at the Commission meeting based on the Committee's expressed concerns and update the recommendation at the Commission meeting if warranted. The Committee members agreed that that was an acceptable approach, given the applicants' short timetable and the limited concerns of the Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing incompleteness. The Committee authorized Ms. Hawkins to review the revised plans at the Commission meeting based on the Committee's expressed concerns and update the recommendation at that time if warranted.

DRAFT

2100 FAIRMOUNT AVE
Project: Alter and install doors, windows, and railings at first floor
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 2100 Fairmount Avenue LLC
Applicant: Ori Feibush, OCF Café LLC
History: 1898; Dominguez Brothers Cigar Factory
Individual Designation: 12/6/1979
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace ground-floor windows and doors that were installed without approvals or permits, to bring them into compliance, in the mixed-use building at the southwest corner of 21st Street and Fairmount Avenue.

The building was constructed about 1898 for the Dominguez Brothers Cigar Company, which occupied it until 1904. It housed various light industrial uses throughout the first half of the twentieth century. In 1965, the ground floor facades were significantly altered. The windows were removed, masonry openings altered, a garage door installed in one opening and glass block in others, and stucco applied to the ground-floor street elevations. The ground floor was significantly altered for a second time at some point between the late 1970s and the late 1990s. The glass block and garage door were removed and non-historic doors and windows with brick sills were installed in non-historic openings in some bays on 21st and Fairmount. The work was undertaken without the Historical Commission's review, either before designation in 1979 or afterwards illegally. The ground floor was significantly altered for a third time in 2004, when a coffee shop named Mug Shots renovated the ground-floor space. The Historical Commission approved the Mug Shots project, which included cutting the window openings down below the levels of the historic sills and installing aluminum windows and doors that were compatible with the windows in the upper stories. For financial reasons, the Mug Shots project was not carried out to its fully-approved extent; the as-built project differed slightly from the approved project.

The ground-floor street facades of 2100 Fairmount were significantly altered for a fourth time in 2012. In July 2012, the Commission approved the exploratory removal of stucco for the current tenant to allow for an examination of the ground-floor façade. The tenant exceeded the permit and began installing new windows and doors. At the Commission's request, the Department of Licenses & Inspections stopped the illegal work, which was partially complete. The Commission reviewed and denied an application to legalize the windows and doors in December 2012. At that time, the Commission provided guidance to the applicant regarding correcting the illegal conditions. After the Commission denied the legalization, the Court of Common Pleas issued an order allowing the applicant to complete the window and door installation and open his business, provided he sought the Commission's approval for appropriate windows and doors, installed them on a schedule, and posted a bond ensuring the completion of the work. The applicant completed the installation, opened the business, and now seeks to bring the ground floor into compliance as required by the court order.

The applicant proposes windows and doors that follow the Commission's guidance provided during the December 2012 review and that are similar to those approved by the Commission in 2004. With the revised design, the enlarged openings down to floor level would be maintained and the inappropriate storefront systems would be altered, with transom bars and thicker mullions added. The garage doors would be retained in the interior and folding doors would be installed in front of them at the plane of the fixed windows. Simple metal railings would be

installed at the folding doors. The color of the window and door systems would be matte black, in place of the existing aluminum grey.

The Storefront Rehabilitation Guidelines in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards address this situation precisely. They allow for two options when "the historic storefront is completely missing," as it has been in this case since 1965. The Standards allow for "an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation" or "a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building." In light of the Commission's 2004 approval for Mug Shots and its December 2012 advice to the applicant, the proposed design satisfies the standards set forth in the second of the two acceptable options: the new design is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Storefront Rehabilitation Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Business owner Ori Feibush represented the application.

Mr. Danta distributed a letter from the Spring Garden Civic Association, dated 14 February 2013.

Mr. Cluver asked if the report from Powers & Company included in the copies to the Committee members was part of the application or provided by an interested party. Mr. Danta answered that the document had been submitted by an interested third party; it is not part of the original application. Mr. Danta clarified that the staff had included a copy of the report in the Committee's meeting materials as supplemental information provided by an interested party.

Mr. Feibush described the property and his business as an asset to the neighborhood. He offered a correction to the staff's overview. He stated that the existing garage doors are recessed two-and-a-half feet from the outer plane of the façade. He stated that he is proposing to install the new accordion doors flush with the outer plane of the wall to align them with the fixed windows on the façade. He stated that the garage doors would remain in place, but they would become interior features. Ms. Hawkins asked for clarification regarding the proposed installation of the accordion windows. She asked if the windows would be installed flush with the outer plane of the façade, or slightly set back into the openings to accommodate brick mouldings. Mr. Feibush answered that they would be slightly set back to accommodate brick mouldings. He noted that the other windows on the façade have a set back of an inch-and-a-half, which would be replicated at the accordion windows.

Mr. Cluver pointed out that the staff described the 2004 approval for new windows at the retail space as "compatible" with the windows in the upper stories. Mr. Cluver asked about the finish on those windows in relation to the upper stories. Mr. Danta answered that the windows proposed for the retail space in 2004 had the same pattern as the windows in the upper stories, yet they were not exact replicas. He explained that the windows approved for the retail space were larger than the upper story windows, but they included transom bars and vertical mullions that replicated the proportions of the upper windows. Mr. Cluver asked if the finish on the windows was ever discussed in 2004. Mr. Danta answered that it was not discussed. Mr. Feibush stated that the finish on the windows approved in 2004 was a matte black finish; he stated that he is proposing the same finish for the windows as was approved in 2004. Mr. Feibush stated that the windows in the upper stories are aluminum. Mr. Danta clarified that the

windows are capped with either aluminum or vinyl and the sash are vinyl. He noted that the windows and the capping are illegal, but it was done many years ago, likely with the conversion of the building to residential use. Ms. Gutterman asked if the proposed windows for the retail space would replicate the dimensions of the mullions in the upper stories. Mr. Danta answered that they would not. He stated that the upper story windows are capped and, as such, the dimensions of the mullions are not the original dimensions. He explained that the applicant is not trying to replicate the original dimensions, because they are not known. Instead the proposed design aims to make the retail space windows compatible with the windows above. Mr. Feibush stated that he is not trying to replicate the original windows, but that, if in the future someone wishes to replicate those windows, he could easily do so because the original masonry opening has been exposed. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the openings are accurate in width, but not in height. Mr. Feibush agreed, but noted that the sill heights he encountered while undertaking the demolition varied and had clearly been altered. He stated that the lowered sill height is reflective of a historic period, but not of the design depicted in the earliest photograph.

Ms. Hawkins asked for an explanation of the landings, rails and stairs that are proposed for the façade of the building. Mr. Feibush explained that the former tenant had an illegal ramp on the eastern end of the building along Fairmount Avenue. He stated that the illegal ramp was taken out and a new legal ramp installed on the western end along the same elevation, which allowed for a ramp with the code-mandated slope. He noted that the railings have been replaced, per the staff's suggestion and approval. This change unified the railing design on the façade, which previously had several unrelated railings. Ms. Gutterman asked how the use of the space related to the locations of the ramps and steps. Mr. Feibush explained that there are two entrances to the coffee shop along Fairmount Avenue; a main entrance on the eastern side of the façade and a second entrance along the western end of the facade, where the disabled entrance is located. Ms. Hawkins referred to the proposed rendering and asked for clarification on the juxtaposition of railings in the central bays where the garage doors are currently located. Mr. Feibush explained that there is an illegal basement entrance at this location, which is directly in front of the bays with the garage doors. He noted that the railing around that basement well has been replaced to be uniform with the new railings at the property. Ms. Gutterman asked if the accordion windows would be operable even if the garage doors remained in place behind them. Mr. Feibush answered that the intent would be to keep the garage doors permanently open and operate the accordion windows depending on the weather. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the drawing shows some infill below the lintels at the accordion windows. Mr. Feibush explained that the infill is necessary in order to clear the garage doors, but that the infill would not be visible from the exterior. Ms. Hawkins asked for clarification on this point. Mr. Feibush elaborated that the garage doors are set back two-and-a-half feet from the plane of the façade, and that the accordion windows would only be set back a few inches, thus eliminating the need for the infill piece on the exterior. Mr. McCoubrey expressed confusion by the explanation. Mr. Feibush noted that the drawing is incorrect and that it is not drawn accurately. Mr. Feibush then corrected himself and stated that the infill would be necessary in order to operate the windows. He explained that the infill was not necessary to clear the garage doors, but it was part of the track that allowed the windows to operate. Mr. Cluver asked for further clarifications. He asked if the transoms are fixed and only the folding windows below would be operable. Mr. Feibush explained that the entire height of the windows would be operable, and that the infill is the track is necessary for the entire windows to operate and clear the garage doors in the interior. Ms. Hawkins asked for the proposed material of the infill piece for the track. Mr. Feibush answered that it would be black matte aluminum to match the other window frames.

Robert Powers, a preservation consultant, stated that he was a resident of the neighborhood and was working with the community pro bono. He stated that his main objection with the proposal rested on allowing storefronts in a building that never had storefronts. He stated that the question is not whether the storefronts are compatible, but a question of allowing residential-scaled windows to be changed into storefronts. He stated that "we" never allow the conversion of residential scale buildings into storefronts. He asserted that this change should not even be entertained. He further stated that this project has made a sham of the Historical Commission process. He stated that the applicant has circumvented the entire Historical Commission process and ignored it. He stated that the Preservation Alliance sees this behavior as precedent-setting that could be used by other developers to get their way. Mr. Powers stated that if this application is successful he would advice his clients to follow this illegal path and alter the building at will and then plead for leniency. Mr. Powers stated that much had been said about the 2004 proposal and approval, but that new documentation had surfaced since then and that the previous approval was based on inaccurate and incomplete information. Mr. Feibush stated that the 2004 plans were executed in part. He stated that the previous tenant had floor-to-ceiling storefronts installed at the entrance to the café. He acknowledged that he had not followed the process, and because of it had paid an exceptionally severe price. He stated that he was not asking for forgiveness, but that he was trying to propose a design based on comments and recommendations provided by the Historical Commission and its staff. He stated that he is open to suggestions from the Committee.

Kit Leary, a neighbor, stated that he had spent time studying the files for this property and the standards that have been cited. He stated that there is a lot of misinformation on this project that raises many questions about the current application. He stated that staff described the proposed windows as a "replacement." He explained that, out of nine openings, only two windows would be installed; the other seven would be altered, but not replaced. He described the drawing submitted with the application as misleading and asserted that the notation on the drawing should be changed to accurately reflect the scope of work. Mr. Leary noted that an email exchange between the applicant and the Commission staff documented in the file clarified that most windows would not be replaced. He stated that he had carefully studied the 2004 approved plans, and that the approved drawings stated that the windows would be Pella double-hung windows in existing window openings that were eight feet tall. He claimed that Mr. Feibush had installed aluminum windows that are 10 feet tall. He distributed photographs of the building prior to the alterations carried out by the previous tenant in 2004, and pointed out that many of the openings were covered by stucco. He asserted that when the previous tenant did the preliminary stucco removal and installed their windows, the openings they encountered must have been the original window openings. He stated that there has been a lot of talk about how the building has been modified and openings modified, but that this building suffered no modifications for the first 70 years of its life. He stated that only three modifications have been undertaken to the building over the years. He explained that since there are nine bays on the façade and only three modification campaigns then a total of 27 chances for masonry-removal could have taken place. He noted that only one opportunity was taken advantage of, in 1975, when a garage door was installed along Fairmount Avenue. He stated that there is no evidence that the sills of all the other windows were ever cut down before Mr. Feibush altered the façade. He stated that the Commission should not approve 10-foot tall windows, when only eight-foot tall windows were previously approved. He closed by stating that something was wrong. Ms. Hawkins thanked Mr. Leary for his research, but stated that the Committee could not revisit the 2004 approval and could only focus on the information presented today.

Anne Cook, a neighbor, agreed with Mr. Leary's presentation. She stated that the community needed to investigate the 2004 approval in order to fully understand what had been approved. She noted that the previous approval allowed for the installation of metal windows, but not aluminum, which is what Mr. Feibush installed. Regarding the illegal windows in the upper stories, she stated that those modifications had been done in the 1970s when the notion of illegal windows did not exist and that someone will hopefully replace those at some point. She noted that the original windows were one-over-one and not the six-over-six that are currently found in the upper stories. She stated that the community had a meeting with Mr. Feibush three weeks ago, and that there were four important points to be made based on the discussion at that meeting. She reported that Mr. Feibush had stated at the community meeting that "he does not do process". She stated that the windows that were installed are his brand and that he had no intention of replacing the existing windows, except for the garage doors, and that the modifications would be add-ons to the existing windows. She stated that Mr. Feibush flatly opposed making any changes to the existing window openings, even when Mr. Powers provided him with a sketch of what the ground-floor openings should look like.

Antoinette Levitt, president of the Spring Garden Association, expressed her support for the association's February 14 letter and noted that she had asked Mr. Powers to speak on behalf of the community.

Benjamin Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that he agreed with everything Mr. Powers had stated earlier. He noted that the Alliance is internally discussing the implications for the integrity of the Historical Commission process based on the actions of this applicant. He described the application as "very dangerous" and asked the Committee not support a proposal that includes faking muntin bars, which would never be considered at a single-family home. He asserted that this commercial property should not be treated any differently.

Mr. Farnham stated that the staff has endeavored to consider the merits of the current application only and not become embroiled in the disagreements between Mr. Feibush and the neighbors. He stated that the staff's recommendation is based on the application, not Mr. Feibush's behavior. Mr. Farnham acknowledged that alterations had been undertaken illegally, but noted that the Commission confronts illegal work regularly and strives to bring illegally altered buildings back into compliance. He stated that the staff recommendation is based on the Rehabilitation Standards and long-established Commission practices, which allow altering window openings when those openings are already altered. He explained that the ground-floor of this particular property underwent numerous changes from the mid 1960s to 2004. He noted that, by 2004, the historic sills were encased in stucco or completely lost and windows in non-historic openings with non-historic sills were present. Mr. Farnham noted that the interested parties had claimed that this sort of alteration of window openings is never approved, but he contended that that claim is incorrect. He noted that, at its most recent meeting, the Commission had approved a very similar alteration to enlarge a window opening in the front façade of a building on the 500 block of Spruce Street. He observed that the application was listed on the Commission's consent agenda and did not generate any discussion. He listed several other similar projects that the Commission had approved in recent months and years including 1602 Spruce Street, 135 S. 18th Street, the French and pizza restaurants in the building at 18th and Locust Streets, the Wanamaker Starbuck's, and 1714 Walnut Street. In these projects and many others, the Commission had approved altering masonry openings and installing larger windows in commercial spaces in commercial and mixed-use buildings. He concluded that the Commission has a very long record of approving alterations to storefronts and facades that have already been altered. He asserted that the claims by Messrs. Powers

and Leech that an approval in this case would be unprecedented are simply untrue. Ms. Hawkins agreed with Mr. Farnham and stated that, in her role as Commissioner and chair of the Architectural Committee, she routinely sees approvals of these sorts of applications.

Russell Troyer, a neighbor, stated that there seems to be an incredible amount of pressure to approve this application. He stated that he was present at the community meeting noted by his wife, Ms. Cook. He stated that the meeting had ended with an accord between the applicant and the community that the plans he would submit to the Committee today were not for approval, but that would only be submitted to meet the court-stipulated deadline. He stated that Mr. Feibush would then enter into a "collaborative process with the neighbors." Mr. Troyer stated that he had stood up at the meeting and looked Mr. Feibush in the eye and repeated this accord to him. Ms. Hawkins summarized the Committee's role. She explained that the Committee sole task is guide applications based on their merits and the review standards. She stated that agreements and accords may between third parties are irrelevant to the Committee's review.

Ms. McCoubrey objected to the proposed matte black color. He described the difference in the dimensions of the mullions between the storefronts and the windows above as troublesome. Ms. Hawkins questioned how 10-foot tall windows would operate effectively without thicker frames. She stated that the drawing does not represent an accurate frame for the operable accordion windows. Ms. Gutterman concurred. Mr. Cluver stated that, if the application had been presented to the Committee before any work took place, he would have been receptive to the proposed alterations of the openings, but he stated that he would not have endorsed the design as presented. He stated that the design could achieve more openness while at the same time being more respectful of the historic height of the original sills. Mr. Cluver stated that he did not understand the ramp and steps configurations, and that a plan was necessary for him to understand how those elements worked with the plan of the café. Ms. Gutterman added that the accordion windows do not necessarily have to be brought down to the level of the floor and that could have had a base that was more in keeping with the height of the original sills. Mr. Feibush stated that he could move the railings at the center bays to the interior. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee could only review the materials presented. Ms. Pentz stated that she was confused and not sure what had transpired. She agreed with Mr. Cluver and stated that the project would have probably not been approved had it been presented to the Committee prior to the work taking place. Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether the ramp railing design was too busy. Mr. Feibush stated that he is proposing window frames that are thinner than the windows above because, once those windows are restored and made historically accurate, the mullions will be thinner. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicant must first understand how the windows will function and document their true dimensions before the Committee can make a determination. She described the drawing as unrealistic. She stated that the components as presented may all change. The implemented windows will differ from the current design.

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

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 345 N FRONT ST
Project: Construct four-story, four-unit residential building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Anthony Soprano
Applicant: Plato Marinakos, Plato Marinakos Jr Architect LLC
History: 1950
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 demolish a non-contributing, one-story garage and construct a four-story, four-unit building with a pilot house and roof decks on a vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. The existing garage is brick with a metal roll-down door and was constructed in the 1950's.

The new building would be clad in brick and have two projecting bays clad in vertical metal siding. The bays would have casement windows and Juliette balconies and would be topped with patios with a metal rails. The windows would be aluminum-clad casements.

In November 2012, the Commission reviewed and commented on an application to construct an identical building on an adjoining vacant lot at 343 N. Front Street. The lot was considered to be undeveloped and the Commission's jurisdiction was Review-and-Comment only.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Plato Marinakos and developer Tiago Patricio represented the application.

Mr. Marinakos explained that they are duplicating a development that will be constructed on an adjoining lot. He explained that they intend to be consistent with that development, which the Commission has already reviewed. He opined that the new construction will improve the streetscape and will be better for the street than the existing, unattractive, one-story garage.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicant to clarify whether the west elevation would face Front Street. Mr. Marinokos confirmed that the west, four-story elevation is the Front Street elevation.

Ms. Hawkins reminded the Committee that they have full jurisdiction over this application.

Mr. Patricio explained that they responded to the Architectural Committee's comments from the 343 N. Front Street review. He noted that they revised the rectangular window to two vertically-oriented windows on the first story to be consistent with the windows on the remainder of the elevation and streetscape. He noted that, on the top story, they continued the fourth bay of windows up to maintain a consistent rhythm of windows and to animate the brick void on the top floor.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the sidelight is part of the door assembly. Mr. Marinakos confirmed that it is part of the door assembly, similar to the east elevation, and that the brick pier shown in the drawing is an error. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the thin horizonal bars over the doors represent lintels or transoms. Mr. Patricio stated that they represent transoms. Ms. Gutterman stated that

the opening looks almost too narrow to be glazed. Mr. Marinokos stated that the opening is eight to 10 inches tall.

Mr. Partricio stated that the brick will be red and similar to the brick he has used on projects in the Spring Garden Historic District. He added that the bays and penthouse will be clad with grey standing-seam metal. He noted that the streetscape lacks the historic character that one finds in the rest of the Old City Historic District. He explained that the dominant materials used on the block are stucco and brick. Ms. Sell agreed and stated that the staff also found that this block lacks a historic streetscape and includes several contemporary structures of varying heights and designs. Mr. Patricio stated that he is proposing a design that is similar to one approved on Fairmount Avenue within the Spring Garden Historic District. Ms. Hawkins noted that this is a different historic district. Mr. Patricio stated that he believes he is proposing an appropriate design.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the thin transoms are proposed because the door is stock. Mr. Patricion stated that they want to maximize the light. Ms. Hawkins opined that there might not be much open glazing after they are installed. Mr. Patricio asserted that it is a design feature they have used before and it has a Modern aesthetic. Ms. Gutterman suggested using a taller door.

Mr. Cluver suggested moving the window in the first bay on the first floor over to align with the windows on the fourth floor because it currently appears awkwardly forced over to align with the upper stories. Mr. Patricio agreed.

Ms. Stein asked how rain water is handled and where HVAC equipment is located. Mr. Marinakos stated that the rainwater conductors will be internal and there is a recessed space behind a parapet, on the deck space, next to the pilot house, for condensors to be tucked away. They will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Cluver opined that balconies do not seem to be consisent with this historic district. Ms. Hawkins stated that some new development projects in this district do have balconies. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the early twentieth-century buildings soetimes include balconies. Mr. Marinakos expalined that they are occupying 100% of the lot and they wanted to provide some outdoor space for the residents below the top floor. Ms. Sell stated that several other buildings along this block have balconies. Mr. Patricio added that the east elevation faces the river and the proposed balconies are consistent with other buildings on this block. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the balconies will be within the jambs or wrapping the outside. Mr. Marinakos stated that they will be within the jambs and that the way it is shown on the west elevation is a graphic error.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there will be a curb around the window well. Mr. Marinakos stated that the window well will be a flush, grated system. Mr. McCoubrey suggested increasing the height of the doors to fill the openings and eliminating the transoms.

Mr. Cluver stated that he would recommend approval of this design because there is so little historic context in the immediate area; however, some design elements would not be appropriate in other areas in this district.

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

ADDRESS: 2120 PINE ST
Project: Construct deck with stair enclosure
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Chris and Natalie Nagele
Applicant: John Weckerly, Boxwood Architects
History: 1865
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, Rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck with pilot house and trellis. The guard rail of the deck would be set back six feet and ten inches from the front façade. The pilot house and trellis would be set back ten feet and three inches from the front façade. A mock up should be erected to determine if the rooftop additions will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

The application also includes alterations to a rear elevation. The rear elevation has been previously altered and is land-locked and not visible from any public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a mock up demonstrates that the roof alterations will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect John Weckerly and owners Chris and Natalie Nagele represented the application.

Mr. Weckerly stated that he could erect a mock up to demonstrate the visibility of the structures from the public right-of-way. Ms. Hawkins asked if all other roof equiment would be set back sufficiently from the facades to limit or preclude visibility from the public right-of-way. Mr. Weckerly responded that any new equipment would not be visible to the public. Mr. Cluver asked why there is no mansard on this roof. Ms. Nagele noted that there are several other houses on the block that are only three stories without mansards. She noted that the staff had explained that mansards are often later additions. Mr. Cluver stated that the visibility from the public right-of-way should be assessed, but the fact that the building is tucked between two mansards presents a unique opportunity for this type of project. Mr. Weckerly noted that the trellis will not project further than the southern brick wall of the adjacent property. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the trellis should be invisible from the public right-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mock up demonstrates that the roof alterations will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 2419 SPRUCE ST
Project: Construct deck with stair enclosure
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Alison and Josh Goldblum
Applicant: Gabrielle Canno, CANNOdesign
History: 1875
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing a roof deck and stair enclosure on the main block of the rowhouse at 2419 Spruce Street. A sight-line study included in the application indicates that the deck would not be visible from the street at a point directly in front of the house. The deck may, however, be visible from the east and west on Spruce Street. The staff suggests substituting the flat roof of the stair enclosure with a sloped roof to reduce its visibility. The staff also suggests that it review a mock up of the deck and stair enclosure to ensure that they would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. If the mock up indicates that the railing would be visible from the public right of way, it should be implemented as a simple metal vertical picket to increase transparency and reduce visibility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the roof of the stair enclosure is sloped and a mock up demonstrates that the deck and stair enclosure would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Gabrielle Canno and Carey Jackson Younce represented the application.

Ms. Canno provided additional information including photographs of a mockup of the deck and stair enclosure on the building. The photographs showed that the structures would be visible from the public right-of-way from a significant distance from the building. Mr. Cluver asserted that the stair enclosure would be tall at 10 feet and long at 25 feet. Ms. Canno explained that stair enclosure was designed to provide natural light to the stair hall. Mr. Cluver asserted that the stair enclosure should be reduced in size. Other Committee members agreed and added that, if the railing is visible from the street, it should be a simple metal vertical picket railing. Mr. Cluver opined that any plantings should not exceed the height of the railing around the deck.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stair house is reduced in size and its roof is sloped to reduce visibility and the railing is transparent if visible from the street, with the staff to review a mock up and details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:00 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 4: Changes to a property that acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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.

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.

Storefront Rehabilitation Guideline: Recommended: Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

DRAFT