

**THE MINUTES OF THE 616TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2013
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman Jr., Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Joann Jones, Esq., Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Michael Maenner, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

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

ALSO PRESENT

Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Stephanie and Eric Feldman
Andrew Blanda, Sandvold Blanda Architecture & Interiors, LLC
Judy Caldwell
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Joseph Morrison, Beanlab

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Hawkins, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Maenner, Merriman, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 615TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to adopt the minutes of the 615th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 November 2013. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 NOVEMBER 2013

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included only one application: 2210 Rittenhouse Square. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Hawkins stated that the architect for 2210 Rittenhouse Square had incorporated the Architectural Committee's recommendations and the design merited approval. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one asked any questions.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for 2210 Rittenhouse Square. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2210 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark Steinberg & Terri Herman Steinberg

Applicant: Andrew Blanda

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the railing is black metal, and that the brick corbel/molding is maintained with the installation of the new cornice, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: In October 2013, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application that proposed to demolish the rear ell as well as the back half of the main block of this rowhouse and construct a four-story stucco addition on the same footprint. That application was withdrawn before the Historical Commission meeting in November 2013. Based on the Committee's suggestions, the applicant now proposes to retain the rear ell and construct a two-story addition with a roof deck above. The addition would be clad in stucco, set back approximately four feet from the rear façade, and delineated from the existing ell with a new wood cornice. This application proposes

to retain the rear slope of the main block roof and a portion of the cornice, and construct a cricket where the addition will engage with the roof. With the raising of the level of the second floor in the rear ell, this application also proposes to raise the window openings in the ell, but retain the widths of the openings.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 269 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct third-floor addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Melanie Amster

Applicant: Joseph Morrison, Beanlab Architecture and Design

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design presented to the Committee, provided the height of the addition is reduced 15 inches and the updated mock-up is determined to be inconspicuous, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: In July 2013, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved a mansard rooftop addition for this property. The property owner was unable to obtain a zoning approval for that design and therefore proposes a new design for the third-floor addition. It would not be a mansard, but would be set back from the front façade.

Over time, the Historical Commission has enumerated an implicit policy regarding rooftop additions on carriage houses. The Commission has approved two types of rooftop additions for carriage houses: mansard additions that extend up from front façades and are compatible because they look like historic additions; and other additions that are set back from front facades to the point where they are inconspicuous from the street. The addition currently proposed is not a mansard and therefore should be set back from the front facade to the point where it is inconspicuous from the street.

As initially submitted for this round of reviews, the addition was set back eight feet from the front façade of the building and included sun shades over the front windows that projected out toward the front façade. A mock-up of the design was constructed on the roof at the site, which showed that the design would be conspicuous from the street. The architect provided a revised design at the Architectural Committee meeting, in which the height of the addition had been reduced and the sun shades removed. The Committee reviewed the revised design and deemed it conspicuous from the street as well. In response, the architect found a way to lower the height of the addition 15 inches by moving ductwork. The staff reviewed and photographed a revised mock-up, which showed that the second revision of the addition would be inconspicuous from the street.

In April 2012, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved a rooftop addition for the carriage house to the south with a setback of 13'-6". However, that application is not entirely analogous to the current application because that building stands on a corner and its rooftop is much more visible from the street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Joseph Morrison represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the mock-up with the height of the second revision of the addition indicated. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicant has been very responsive to the Architectural Committee's recommendations and has made every effort to make the addition as inconspicuous as possible from the street. The Commissioners agreed that the second revised addition would be inconspicuous from the street. Mr. Morrison stated that he was in agreement with the Architectural Committee's recommendation to approve the second revision.

Judy Caldwell, a neighbor, stated that she did not find the configuration of the windows in the front façade of the addition "in keeping" with the historic building and neighborhood. She asked the Commission to explain how it could consider approving the design. She asked if the addition should be similar to or differentiated from the historic building. She also objected to the proposed color of the stucco on the addition, brick red. She claimed that it would overwhelm the street. Ms. Hawkins responded that most of the front façade of the addition will not be visible from the street. The northern corner of the addition will be slightly visible. One will only be able to see a portion of the single window at the northern corner, not the entire window configuration on the front facade. Therefore, the non-historic configuration, which will not be perceptible from the street, is acceptable. Regarding the color, Ms. Hawkins noted that the Committee was mute about a color choice.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided the height of the addition reduced 15 inches from that of the revised design, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 325 S 18TH ST

Project: Install fences and flower boxes

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Teresa Isabella

Applicant: Teresa Isabella

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the flower boxes, provided the 80-inch flower box is resized to fit under the two adjacent windows; denial of the handrail as proposed, but approval of a revised handrail at the front stair; denial of the metal fence connecting to the handrail and the side bay; and denial of the wood fence as proposed, but approval of an appropriate wood fence; with the staff to review details including shop drawings and attachment methods, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: Initially, this proposal consisted of three applications proposing to install fencing along the front, side, and rear façades of the property located at the corner of S. 18th Street and Delancey Place, in addition to four flower boxes on the front and side façades of the property, and a handrail at the S. 18th Street steps. Following the Architectural Committee meeting, the staff worked with the applicant to develop revised designs that could be approved at the staff

level. As a result of that consultation, the staff has approved amended applications for most of the work.

The first application proposed the installation of a metal handrail, gate, and fencing at the front (S. 18th Street) façade. The handrail would attach to the front steps and connect to a metal fence that would run to a point 4'-7 ½" north past the main block, and turn 90 degrees to a point east where it would meet the existing three-story bay. The handrail section of the application has been revised and approved at the staff level. The fencing section of the application remains outstanding and is the subject of the Commission's review.

The second application proposed the installation of a wooden fence to run along the Delancey Place side yard and Bouvier Street rear yard and parking area. The proposed fence would start at the existing three-story bay, include a fence door that opens into the yard, and then travel east along Delancey Place the length of the building, turning 90 degrees to meet the rear of the building with a doorway included in this span of the fence. An additional fence is proposed to run along the property line at Bouvier Street to enclose the open parking area. A revised version of this application has been approved at the staff level.

The third application proposed the legalization of four flower boxes that have already been installed. All planters are black metal with full copper lining. Two of these 40" long flower boxes are installed below the two first-floor windows on S. 18th Street. An additional 40" long flower box is installed below the second floor window on the new Delancey Place bay. The final flower box was 80" long and was installed between two first-floor windows on the Delancey Place façade, to be hidden from public view by the above proposed fencing along Delancey Place. This box has been redesigned and reconfigured since the Architectural Committee meeting. The staff has approved the revised designs for the flower boxes at the staff level.

Therefore, only the metal fence at the front and side remains for the Commission's review.

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

Ms. Merriman asked if the bay projecting off the north side of the main block legally extends out into the public right-of-way. Mr. Farnham responded that the Streets Department's answer to this question was somewhat ambiguous, but it appears that the bay, which was constructed more than a century ago and then recently reconstructed, is legal.

Mr. Thomas asked if enclosing parts of the sidewalks with fences would be legal. Mr. Baron responded that the Department of Licenses & Inspections and Streets Department would make the final determination, but that it appears that it would be possible to erect a fence legally within the right-of-way, as long as at least eight feet of sidewalk width remains. Mr. Baron acknowledged that the staff had originally raised the right-of-way issues, but now suggested that the Commission leave those issues to the Department of Licenses & Inspections and Streets Department and base its decision on preservation standards.

Mr. Thomas asked about the handrailing. Ms. Broadbent explained that the staff approved a revised handrailing for the front steps. Mr. Thomas asked about the fence design along the Delancey between 18th Street and the projecting bay. Mr. Farnham explained that the applicant is requesting approval even though the gates in the fence have not taken ADA requirements into account. Ms. Hawkins added that the applicant would like to install a door to an elevator in

the bay. The fence would enclose the area in front of that door. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicant take a holistic approach and design the fence with gate at the same time the elevator entranceway is designed. She stated that it is premature to install the fence when the parameters of the elevator are unknown. The elevator entrance may not be able to be made ADA compatible if the fence is installed prematurely. Mr. Thomas encouraged the applicant to propose a complete design for the rehabilitated building with fencing.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to deny the application for the front fence, pursuant to Standard 9, but to encourage the applicant to propose a complete design for the rehabilitated building with fencing. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 9:15 a.m., Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.