

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

**TUESDAY, 22 MAY 2018
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jon Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

David Blumenfeld, Cross Properties
Jerry Roller, JKRP
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Jerry Boyce, Hagert St LLC
Peter McElhill, Hagert St LLC
William Mangold
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Ivano D'Angela
Sasha Coviello
Ian Cope, Cope Linder Architects
Don Ventresca, Venco
Deidre DeAscanis, JKRP
Katie Brill, JKRP
Kevin Kaminski, Kaminski + Pew
Whitney Joslin, Kaminski + Pew
George Roskam
Joel Spivak

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Mr. D'Alessandro joined him.

ADDRESS: 1601-03 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct three-story additions; restore historic facades

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: CP Acquisitions 23, LP

Applicant: Meghan Brennan, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1914; Cinderella Inn, Apex Beauty School

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove non-historic sections of this building, restore the historic facades, and construct a three-story rear addition and a three-story rooftop addition on this two-story building. The property was mistakenly classified as both contributing and non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The current owner requested that the Historical Commission reclassify the property as non-contributing to correct the mistake, but, in November 2017, the Commission voted to reclassify the property as contributing, owing to new information regarding the use of the property for a short time as a branch of the Apex Beauty College. Before its conversion to the beauty school, the building was used as a bar.

The two-story building has been altered numerous times. Window and door openings have been infilled, windows and doors replaced, brick has been painted and stuccoed, the cornice removed, and an awning-like storefront cornice added. This application will remove the paint and stucco, restore brick, reopen window and door openings, and replace windows and doors. A stone or cast-stone beltcourse above the storefront will be added. Along 16th Street, a non-historic, three-story section, where a significantly altered rowhouse was merged into the larger building, will be removed and a new three-story section clad in brick will be constructed. At the rooftop, a three-story addition will be constructed. It will be set back from the historic facades. It will be clad in metal panels and fenestrated with vinyl windows.

The building in question stands at the northwest corner of 16th and Lombard Streets. The buildings at the southeast and southwest corners are both tall four-story buildings. The buildings at the northeast corner are three-story rowhouses. The building to the north on 16th Street, across Addison Street, is a three-story parking garage, which is being converted for commercial and residential use. The buildings to the west on Lombard and Addison Streets are three-story rowhouses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the window openings and other articulations in the additions are adjusted to relate better to the design, rhythm, and scale of the historic building; and the colors of the brick and metal panels are adjusted to better relate to colors of the historic building; with the staff to review details including window shop drawings, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer David Blumenfeld and architect Jerry Roller represented the application.

Mr. Roller objected to the staff's recommendation that the window openings and other articulations in the additions should be adjusted to relate better to the design, rhythm, and scale of the historic building. He stated that they purposefully designed the additions to be different

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MAY 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

2

from the historic building. Regarding the recommendation related to color, he stated that they have not yet determined the color of the original brick of the historic building. It is covered with many layers of paint as well as stucco. He stated that they will adjust the color selections for the additions once they have uncovered the original brick. He stated that they do not want to match the original brick, but instead want to select colors that are compatible with it. He concluded that they do not want to mimic the historic building.

Mr. Roller presented the architectural plans for a new building at the site that presupposed the demolition of the existing historic building. He stated that the Architectural Committee had “endorsed” this scheme. Mr. Farnham responded that that plan for new construction has never been submitted to the Historical Commission and the Architectural Committee has never reviewed it. He acknowledged that Randy Baron, a staff member, may have commented on it informally, but it has never been formally reviewed.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the “beige” panels. Mr. Roller responded that they are not beige. He said that they will be “some sort of medium gray.” Ms. Gutterman asked if there are other buildings in the neighborhood with similar colors to the proposed colors. Mr. Roller pointed out several tan, brown, and gray buildings in the immediate vicinity. He asserted that this section of the historic district is not a red-brick neighborhood. He stated that they are willing to be flexible with the color choices, but would like to use a gray color. He stated that once they establish the color of the historic brick, they will select a color that is different enough that it does not appear as though they intended to match the historic brick, but that is compatible with the historic brick. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the black shown in the rendering. Mr. Roller stated that they are not intended to use a black brick. He acknowledged that the colors in the printed rendering are not entirely accurate. Mr. Farnham directed the Committee members to an aerial photograph that the staff had included with the application materials, which shows surrounding buildings in many gray and tan buildings.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the appropriateness of the height of the proposed building in its context, which is primarily comprised of three-story buildings. Mr. Roller disagreed with the claim that the surrounding buildings are primarily three stories in height. Using the aerial photograph provided by the staff, he pointed out several taller buildings in the immediate area including those at the southeast and southwest corners of 16th and Lombard, the building at the northeast corner of 17th and Lombard, and the parking garage to the north on 16th Street.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the developer will acknowledge the history of the site as the Apex Beauty School. Mr. Roller stated that they plan to call the building the Apex. He noted that they do not yet have a tenant for the commercial space, so they do not yet have a signage plan. Mr. Blumenfeld stated that they will consider a plaque related to the Apex history.

Mr. D’Alessandro asked about the corner entrance. Mr. Roller stated that they will restore the corner entrance, which was infilled. Mr. Roller stated that they will recreate the double transom at the door, but will need to use a single-leaf door, not a double-leaf door, owing to the need for accessibility. Mr. D’Alessandro asked if they could use a door that better replicated the historic door, albeit with a single leaf. Mr. Roller stated that the door will have a four-inch bottom rail. Ms. Pentz asked about the step at the door. Mr. Roller replied that they will not recreate the step for accessibility reasons. He assured the Committee that there will be no ramp. The corner entrance was completely removed years ago. They will rebuild it, he explained, but to be

accessible and in contemporary materials. The first-floor windows and doors will recall the historic shapes and forms that have been lost. At the second floor, they will restore the windows and window openings. Mr. Blumenfeld stated that his company is very familiar with historic rehabilitation.

Ms. Gutterman asked where the mechanical units would be located. Mr. Roller stated that they will be on the roof and they will not be visible from the street. He also assured her that they will not build an upper roof deck.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the guard rail proposed at the roofline of the historic building. He suggested that, instead of a guard rail, the parapet should be increased in height in masonry to provide the requisite protection from falls. All of the other Committee members strenuously objected to Mr. D'Alessandro's proposal to raise the height of the parapet in masonry. They instead suggested moving the guard rail to the inside of the parapet, rather than on top of the parapet. Mr. Roller agreed to the revision, moving the guard rail to the inside of the parapet.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the guard rail is mounted to the inside of the parapet; the colors of the addition are compatible with the original brick color; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 1706 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Demolish gable roof and construct mansard, rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sasha Coviello

Applicant: Ivano D'Angella, Ivano D'Angella Architects

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the front slope of a gable roof and construct a mansard in its place to provide additional interior headroom at the top floor. The gable has a wide, non-historic dormer. The rear slope of the gable was removed and an addition constructed during an earlier alteration. The application also proposes to construct a rear addition, which will be clad in metal panels. The application also proposes to construct a pilot house to access an existing roof deck. The deck is currently accessed through a hatch. The deck will be expanded in size. The proposed addition and deck will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way through a narrow slot on Panama Street, a small dead-end street that runs east-west to the south of the property. The Historical Commission recently determined that the visibility of a proposed deck and pilot house to the south of Panama through a similar narrow slot was acceptably inconspicuous. More compatible small-pane windows will be installed at the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the removal of the gable roof and construction of the mansard, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, and 5, and the Roofs Guideline; approval of the remainder of the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MAY 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ivano D'Angela and owner Sasha Coviello represented the application.

Mr. D'Angela stated that it is their intention to restore the front façade with the installation of six-over-six windows and the correct base of the building, based on 1708 Delancey Street. He explained that the proposed mansard roof was driven by a desire for more headroom in the upper floor. He explained that they could also construct an enlarged lean-to roof with a dormer. He conceded that the rear stair addition will be minimally visible from Panama Street through a narrow slot. He noted that they are hoping to repair and enlarge the existing deck. Ms. Gutterman questioned the proposed mansard and asked where it was shown in the architectural drawings. Mr. D'Angela directed her to drawing CS-1. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the possible demolition of the chimneys. Mr. D'Angela responded that they will keep the front chimney to the extent that it is not covered by the mansard. Ms. Stein asked if the chimney is active. Mr. D'Angela replied that it is currently active but that they intend to abandon that use and install high-efficiency units that will vent elsewhere.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that this row house was likely built as one of four identical houses, but that a mansard had been added to 1708 Delancey Street at a later date. Ms. Gutterman asked the architect to explain the glass railing on the roof deck. He said that they are proposing a light monitor and cabinets. Mr. McCoubrey asked about creating a sloped rather than square pilothouse. Mr. D'Angela said that they are proposing a square pilot house to allow for new mechanical equipment on the roof. Ms. Stein expressed concern about putting glass so close to the party wall but noted that that is a building code issue. Mr. McCoubrey commented that he does not mind the addition of a mansard because there is a tradition of doing this within this district and the building is only contributing to the district. He opined, however, that a mansard should exactly match the neighboring one at 1708 Delancey Street in shape and materials.

Mr. McCoubrey expressed a concern about the visibility of the enlarged deck and rooftop additions. Mr. Baron noted that the sightline study shows the rail just out of view from a direct head on view but that it would probably be visible from the east on Delancey Street. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the visibility of the deck at 1704 Delancey Street. Mr. Baron said that he thought that that deck was visible from the east as well. Mr. Baron suggested a possible site visit to determine visibility.

Ms. Stein expressed concern about raising the existing chimney, which she does not support. Ms. Pentz noted that she is not in favor of demolishing the current sloped roof. She explained that it involves too much removal of original fabric and shape.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the removal of the gable roof and construction of the mansard as well as the expansion of the roof deck if it proves to be conspicuous in a sight visit, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, and 5, and the Roofs Guideline; approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 520 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Demolish building; construct four-story house

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 2622 West Hagert Street LLC

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez

History: Built in 1860s; 518 Queen Street built at same time

Individual Designation: 8/21/1973

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This review-in-concept application proposes to demolish most of 520 Queen Street and construct a four-story building in its place. At the time of purchase and initial design, the owners were unaware the property was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The owners are seeking design guidance to allow them to add more square footage to the existing property and gain approval from the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the application because it provides no basis, public interest or hardship, for an approval of the demolition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Gerald Boyce and Peter McElhill represented the application.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Historical Commission can only approve demolition for two reasons: the demolition is necessary in the public interest and, owing to economic hardship, the building cannot be feasibly adaptively reused. She noted that neither of these bases applied in this case. Mr. Boyce confirmed that they did not apply under either the public interest or economic hardship bases. He stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections was scheduled to inspect the building for structural issues. He indicated that the photographs included with the application showed that much historic fabric has been changed or removed.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about changes to the front garage door. Ms. Mehley confirmed that the present day and designation photographs from 1973 show that it is the same door with minor alterations. Ms. Stein inquired about the historic and current lot coverage. Ms. Mehley noted that historic maps in the application show the earliest coverage of lot and building configuration. Mr. Boyce confirmed that the current building fully covers the lot. Ms. Stein opined that, if the current rear of the building is not original, it could potentially be rebuilt. Mr. Boyce stated he believed the rear structure had been there since the 1970s. He indicated there is a steel beam holding up the second floor.

Ms. Gutterman inquired as to what material was under the siding on the front façade. Mr. Boyce responded that there is brick behind the front siding but the brick has been removed behind the cornice. He noted that there is wood framing behind cornice. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the front roof slope of the façade and the dormer window are character-defining features. Ms. Gutterman opined that the rear of the building could potentially be demolished and rebuilt while maintaining the two and a half story front portion of the building. Mr. Boyce asked if it was possible to raise it to three stories. Ms. Gutterman responded that that would be problematic under the Commission's preservation standards. She noted that there may be some flexibility in

the floor heights that could allow for an additional floor on the interior where the Committee does not have review authority.

Ms. Stein noted the challenge of use for this building. She asked the Mr. Boyce and Mr. McElhill about the planned use. Mr. Boyce stated it would be a single-family residence. Ms. Stein said one of the challenges is incorporating a front door into the façade. Mr. Boyce responded that the proposed design creates a front door and narrows the width of the garage opening. Ms. Stein opined that because the building is designated, the front façade is a character-defining feature, and the design should work with the volume of the existing garage door. The Committee members indicated there are ways add an entry door within the current design of the garage door and perhaps other design features, such as glazing. Ms. Stein clarified that she meant incorporating the design of the door into the framework of the existing door.

Mr. Boyce asked if he could construct two stories at the rear of the property. Mr. McElhill inquired about adding a roof deck. Mr. McCoubrey said the main concern is visibility. He said that if additional stories are added, there needs to be no or very limited visibility of these additional floors from Queen Street. Ms. Gutterman suggested constructing a physical mock-up to determine visibility from Queen Street.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were additional Committee or public comments.

David Traub of Save Our Sites inquired about the basis of the original designation. Ms. Mehley responded that she had checked the minutes from the 1973 Historical Commission meeting and there was no additional specific information on the criteria for designation. Mr. Traub also commented on the condition of the property and the more recent updates and changes to the building.

Mr. Boyce asked about the original designation and how it came to be added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Mehley stated that it was designated individually along with other buildings on the block in 1973. Mr. Farnham added that earlier documentation of designations was limited. He explained that often the minutes from the Historical Commission meeting listed only the addresses and not the basis for designation. In more recent decades, a more formal process for designation has been adopted, with criteria and supporting documentation. Mr. Boyce inquired why the changes since 1973 were made if it was designated. Ms. Gutterman responded that the owners should have had the proposed changes reviewed but conceded that not everyone follows the process. Mr. Boyce stated that he wanted to go on record that the building currently does not look like it did in 1973. Mr. McCoubrey stated that a building that has an individual designation involves a higher level of scrutiny than a building that is within a historic district.

The Committee suggested that the applicant should inform the Historical Commission's staff regarding the outcome of the inspection by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The applicant should revise the design to include a restoration of the front façade along Queen Street. The applicant should work with the architect to determine how the rear area, behind the front façade, roof, and dormer, can be redesigned or reconstructed to allow for additional living space with limited to no visibility from Queen Street. The applicant should consult with the Historical Commission's staff on proposed design revisions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application because it provides no basis, public interest or hardship, for an approval of the demolition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).

ADDRESS: 2025 CHERRY ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Ryan and Megan Gatto
Applicant: William Mangold
History: 1845
Individual Designation: 4/28/1970
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor rear addition on an existing two-and-a-half story rear addition, and construct a pilot house and roof deck on the rear roof slope. The deck would sit on posts atop the rear roof slope. A frame rear addition first appears at 2025 Cherry Street on a 1931 map.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a mockup demonstrates that the deck is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. William Mangold represented the application.

Ms. Chantry explained that several attempts had been made the week prior to review a mockup to determine visibility, but inclement weather had prevented it from happening. She assured the Committee that a mockup would be reviewed prior to the Commission meeting.

Ms. Gutterman commented on the height of the proposed deck, and asked if it could be one or two feet lower, which would require less overbuild. Mr. Mangold responded that it needs to be that close to the ridge in order to get a reasonably-sized deck. He noted that the property owners wish to have a small garden on the deck. Ms. Gutterman suggested bringing the deck down and cantilevering off of the rear of the building. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Ms. Gutterman commented that it is otherwise too high, and will likely be quite visible from the street. She asked that Mr. Mangold consider bringing the deck down several feet and cantilevering out at the rear.

Ms. Stein commented that the proposal is a lot of construction when there could simply be a deck on the lower roof, which would be an easy approval. She referred to the current proposal as "structural gymnastics." She observed that there is not much deck space gained by building a staircase up to the high roof. She suggested an 8-foot by 8-foot deck on the three-story addition, with a pilot house, which would achieve a deck of similar size without all of the complicated overbuild. She noted that the Committee is interested in visibility from the public right-of-way. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the third-floor addition could be larger, but did not provide specifics as to how this could be achieved. Ms.

Gutterman suggested that the property owners could put boxes on top of the parapet walls to give them more space for planting, so that the plantings would not take away from usable deck space. Mr. Mangold explained that the property owners' desire to get the deck as high as they can, because of the exposure and light. Ms. Stein noted that, even if the deck is held back from the ridge, the owner could put umbrellas or tall hedges on the deck and those would be highly visible from the street. She concluded that a deck on the main roof may not be inconspicuous. Ms. Gutterman asked about visibility of the rear of the building from the public right-of-way. Ms. Chantry responded that it is landlocked and not visible, and directed the Committee's attention to several aerial photographs.

Ms. Pentz asked about a beam that projects from the existing rear addition. Mr. Mangold responded that they are not sure of its purpose, and noted that it runs all the way through the inside. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested it could have been used to bring in furniture, but Mr. Mangold noted that the windows are quite small. Ms. Chantry noted that one of the photographs included in the application appears to show that there were several beams that were cut off, leaving only the one remaining.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the deck as proposed, with the recommendation to consider putting the deck on the third-floor addition with access via the proposed pilot house, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1600 AND 1602 WALLACE ST

Proposal: Construct four, four-story townhouses

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Spring Garden Community Development Group

Applicant: Don Ventresca, Venco Building Group

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct four, four-story rowhouses on two vacant lots within the Spring Garden Historic District. Historically, the two lots contained two rowhouses that fronted on Wallace Street. This application proposes to place the entrances to each of the four buildings on N. 16th Street and provide driveway access at the rears of the properties. The fronts of the buildings would consist of a red brick veneer with a modest cast stone base, aluminum clad two-over-two double-hung windows, a two-story projecting wood bay, and a fourth story clad with fiber cement lap siding. The rears of the properties would be similarly clad in fiber cement lap siding and would feature decks at the second story that would project over the shared driveway.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the first-story windows are enlarged to the same proportions as those at the second story, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ian Cope and developer Don Ventresca represented the application.

Ms. Stein questioned the height and scale of the properties, asking whether a full four-story structure would be appropriate rather than the current three-story front with a fourth-story setback. She added that the location is transitional, being so close to the large-scale buildings of Broad Street. Extra height at this corner, she continued, would be very appropriate. She noted that other four-story buildings stand near the structure. Mr. Cope stated that to the south there are many four-story buildings and commented that mostly three-story structures exist to the north. Ms. Stein asked whether the applicants had considered making the buildings a full four stories. Mr. Cope answered that there was pressure in the neighborhood to keep the front cornice below 38 feet, which is generally the height prescribed in that area. The lots, he continued, are challenging in the east-west direction due to depth. He commented that the buildings are the shallowest he has designed at 30 feet deep. In order to incorporate three bedrooms, he continued, a fourth story was necessary. Ms. Stein responded that her suggestion would add square footage to the plan by extending the façade up to the height of the current fourth story. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, adding that the buildings should be treated as a single series that connects to the neighborhood rather than adding boxes on the top. Mr. McCoubrey added that the design appears as a historic block that was subsequently altered.

Ms. Stein commended the site planning, which places the alley at the rear and moves the garages off the street. She reiterated that the scale of the property, because of its location, can be taller and wants to be taller. Messrs. McCoubrey and D'Alessandro agreed.

Mr. Cope asked the staff to repeat its recommendation, specifically the comment pertaining to windows. Ms. Keller clarified that the staff found that the first-story windows were disproportionately smaller than the windows at the second and third stories. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the largest windows are typically located at the ground floor and that those at the second-story would be the same size or slightly smaller. He noted that with a garage behind the windows, there may be low ceiling height, though he encouraged the applicant to maximize the height of the window. Mr. Cope responded that he may be able to enlarge the windows.

Mr. Cope expressed concern over his ability to heighten the façade. He noted that the neighborhood group was adamant about the cornice not extending above 38 feet. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the fourth-story could become a mansard. She acknowledged that such a design would eliminate the fourth-story decks, but added that the current fourth-story appears out of place contextually with the rest of the building. She then inquired why the neighborhood group asked that the cornice line be limited to 38 feet. Mr. Cope answered that page 2 of the application provides contextual photographs, showing that the neighboring Wallace Street properties are three stories in height. He noted that at 16th and Mount Vernon Streets, there is an entire block of four-story buildings. In general, he continued, the context is of three-story buildings that have cornices at roughly 38 feet from the ground.

Mr. D'Alessandro advocated that the building be designed as either a three-story building or as a four-story building and not as a three-story building with an additional story set back at the top to make it four stories. Mr. McCoubrey supported Ms. Gutterman's suggestion of incorporating a mansard. Ms. Gutterman added that it would allow the cornice to remain in its current location and would mitigate the disconnect between the fourth story and the cornice. She again noted

that the decks would be lost. Ms. Stein commented that the decks could be recreated at the rear. Mr. Cope stated that there is a deck at the second-story rear over the driveway. He added that it is a sizeable deck but does not have great views.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the cornice details. Several Committee members noted that the cornice is identified as being metal. Mr. Cope directed the Committee members to page 5 of the application, adding that it is intended to be metal with a profile and gutter boxes. He remarked that he has used painted wood in the past, but the cornice is difficult to access for maintenance purposes. Ms. Gutterman replied that she wanted to make sure the cornice has detail and shape.

Ms. Pentz asked how deeply recessed the entry doors are. Mr. Cope replied that they are recessed 1 foot 2 inches.

Mr. McCoubrey observed that on the spandrels of the bays, there are two equally horizontal panels. He asked that the spandrels consist of one panel. Mr. Cope responded that the spandrels are larger than normal but that he would rework the panels. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that Mr. Cope incorporate a horizontal element but separate the spandrels vertically.

Ms. Gutterman asked where the mechanical units would be located. Mr. Cope replied that they will not be located on the high roof and would likely be positioned on the second-story rear deck.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee offered the following comments:

- the building façade should extend the full four stories, potentially incorporating a mansard;
- the first-story windows should be enlarged to relate proportionally to the second-story windows;
- the cornice should contain detail and shape; and
- the spandrels of the bays should consist of one panel rather than two.

ADDRESS: 248-50 MARKET ST

Proposal: Install signage and awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: LCP Market Street LLC

Applicant: Richard Crawford, Bartush Signs

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace awnings and to install signage on this corner property, which is both individually designated and is located in the Old City Historic District. The application proposes to recover some existing awnings, and to replace six other existing awnings with two panel signs with illuminated letters. The signs, which would be three feet high

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MAY 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

by approximately 19 and 21 feet in width along Market and 3rd Streets, respectively, would be mounted across existing transoms, open corner entrance, and a portion of the storefront cornice. The signage panels would project approximately four and a half inches from the face of the building, with the individually illuminated letters projecting an additional three inches. The application also proposes a non-illuminated blade sign to be mounted at the second-floor level.

The staff has suggested several signage alternatives to the applicant, including: the inclusion of the company logo and name on new/recovered awnings; signage within the flat signage band of the storefront cornice; and signage behind or as decals on the windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the awnings and non-illuminated blade sign, but denial of the large panel signs, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefronts Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Richard Crawford represented the application.

Mr. Crawford explained that they are proposing staging panels with individual internally illuminated letters. He noted that they were looking for a place to install a sign without obscuring or removing architectural details. He opined that there is not enough room above the awning band to install a sign without covering over portions of the storefront cornice. He opined that installing a sign on the brick did not seem appropriate and would not tie it to the commercial space. AT&T Wireless is looking to have signage, not just awning identification, he noted. He stated that there is a Verizon store across the street, and AT&T is looking for comparable signage with individually internally illuminated letters. He argued that it seems most appropriate to install panels across some of the transom windows. Ms. Stein remarked that the signs appear to be three feet tall. Mr. Crawford responded if that is what is shown on the drawing, then that is the proposed dimension. He stated that that dimension corresponds to the height of the window, the moldings of which the signs will be attached to. Ms. Stein stated that the proposed signs are massive. She explained that there is a tradition in this area, particularly along 3rd Street, of signs hung perpendicular to the façade, to catch the attention of passersby. She noted that the proposed blade sign resonates with that tradition, in a highly trafficked pedestrian area. She explained that the proposed panel signs cover windows, on an individually-designated building. She stated that installing 36-inch panels across those windows changes the architecture of the historic building. Mr. Crawford noted that he found a photograph of the property from 1972 that shows that the building has been altered since then, including through the removal of a fourth floor. He noted that the existing storefront windows were installed after 1972. He conceded that the sign could be smaller, because the panel is only needed to house the conduit to light the letters. He opined that the sign itself is not that large.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the proposed location of the blade sign. Mr. Crawford responded that it would be in the location of the two wood cleats that are attached at the second-floor level of the front façade. Ms. Gutterman noted that there is no drawing of the blade sign location.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that another feature of awnings recommended by the Architectural Committee is that they not be long, continuous awnings, but rather should be broken down to acknowledge the rhythm of the storefront. He noted that, one interesting element of this storefront is the corner entrance, and that he does not feel that awnings are appropriate there. He questioned what is behind the existing awnings. Ms. DiPasquale presented a photograph

taken the day before showing that there are transom windows behind the corner entrance awnings. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that there might be an opportunity for small signage within that area. He noted that it is unusual for transom windows to extend beyond the corner entrance, as these do. He explained that it appears there is a soffit over the corner entrance. Ms. Stein commented that perhaps signs limited to the height and width of the single transom windows at each corner would be more appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey agreed. Ms. Gutterman commented that it might be best to have the sign on the diagonal over the entrance doors. Ms. DiPasquale noted that there are several AT&T stores throughout the city that feature signs behind the storefront windows. Mr. Crawford stated that they are not looking for signs behind the windows, but for signage like that that was approved for Verizon across the street with a panel and internally illuminated letters. Ms. Gutterman responded that that is a different, newly-constructed building. Ms. Stein stated that this is a historic building, which is both individually-designated and in a historic district, so the guidelines and standards for work are different than those on new buildings.

Mr. Crawford noted that the owner would like to re-cover the existing awning frames. He noted that the awnings would be a blue, Sunbrella material with open sides.

Mr. Crawford explained that if the surface-lit letters are an issue, the letters could be back-lit instead. Ms. Gutterman responded that the issue is more with the massiveness of the proposed signs and the covering of features. She stated that it is too large a presence for the scale and character of the building and neighborhood. She opined that utilizing the logo on the awnings or decals on or behind the windows would be more appropriate.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that his personal experience with this type of highly-glazed commercial space is that when the interior is well-lit and there is a large logo or brand name on the interior, it is easy to identify the building. Mr. Crawford responded that the windows are not being changed and there are multiple divisions of windows. He stated that he is only looking for exterior signage, and that his company only uses exterior signage. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the interior signs at other AT&T stores in the city are not graphics on the windows, but are hanging, internally-illuminated signs behind similarly divided storefront windows. Mr. Crawford responded that that is secondary signage.

Ms. DiPasquale asked whether the applicant has received Art Commission approval. He responded that they have not yet sought Art Commission review and approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the awnings and non-illuminated blade sign, but denial of the large panel signs, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefronts Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 123-51 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Modify storefronts; replace windows, construct rooftop additions and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Witherspoon Partners, LP

Applicant: Alyssa Galina, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1895; Witherspoon Building; Presbyterian Board of Publication; Joseph M. Huston

Individual Designation: 11/1/1973, 8/4/1977

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace windows and doors and to construct small rooftop additions to the Witherspoon Building at the corner of Walnut Street and Juniper Street. The application proposes to replace all existing windows. The windows visible from the public right-of-way would closely replicate the appearance and configuration of the historic windows, but would be aluminum. Vinyl windows would be installed in non-visible areas of the building. The application also proposes to replace the existing non-historic, fully-glazed doors in the Juniper Street entrance in kind. The application also proposes to cut a new ADA-accessible door on the Juniper Street elevation and to infill an existing street-level entrance on the same elevation. At the Sansom Street entrance, the application proposes to infill a garage entrance with masonry and to install a set of louvered doors. The application also proposes to construct rooftop stair and elevator overruns and a roof deck. Given the height of the building and the narrowness of the street, it is extremely unlikely that these elements would be visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the window replacement, rooftop additions and deck, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline, and installation of the ADA-accessible door, provided the base of the door and sidelite feature a panel that aligns with the storefront base, pursuant to Standard 2; and denial of the fully-glazed Juniper Street entry doors and the infill of the Sansom Street opening, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Deidre DeAscanis and Katie Brill represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman commented that the application was confusing, and recommended that the applicants revise the packet before submitting to the Historical Commission. She stated that the applicants need to circle, bubble, or annotate each element of the exterior being altered and reviewed. She noted that it is difficult to understand what is being proposed from the drawings that were submitted. Ms. Stein agreed, noting that there is an entire page of proposed window drawings, but nothing that shows the existing window configuration. She noted that there are photographs, but they are taken on such an extreme angle that it is difficult to understand what they are proposing to change. Ms. DeAscanis responded that D1.1 shows a demolition elevation that shows the existing condition of the first floor of the Juniper Street facade. Ms. Stein asked if it is at a different scale that the proposed drawings. Ms. DeAscanis responded affirmatively, and agreed to change the scale to match on the Historical Commission submission.

The Committee members expressed frustration at the lack of orientation on the drawings, noting that there are no street names included, and that the notes are too small to be legible. Mr.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MAY 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

14

D'Alessandro noted that there is an entire list of general demolition notes, and questioned whether the Committee needed to be concerned with those. Ms. DeAscanis apologized, explaining that this is the submission they prepared for the National Park Service. Ms. Gutterman suggested that additional notes be added to connect drawings to one another. Ms. Gutterman noted that the application proposes vinyl windows on inconspicuous areas, but questioned what they consider inconspicuous. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the vinyl windows are proposed on areas that are invisible to the public right-of-way, on an interior court. Ms. Gutterman expressed confusion over the orientation of the building, owing to the fact that no contextual site plan is included. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there was that much of a cost savings between aluminum and vinyl, the latter of which would UV degrade and deteriorate over time. Ms. DeAscanis responded that that is what the contractor has told them, but that they can discuss it further. Ms. DeAscanis explained that the window details provided are for the proposed aluminum windows visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. McCoubrey noted that typically the window drawings would be keyed to an elevation drawing. Ms. DeAscanis responded that they keyed the windows to the floor plan instead because they are doing minimal work to the exterior.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification of all the work being proposed to the exterior. Ms. DeAscanis responded that they are proposing to remove three windows on Juniper Street and to cut a new door; to remove the masonry between eight sets of windows at the second-floor level of the Juniper Street entrance; to infill the garage door on Sansom Street; and to replace the doors on the Juniper Street entrance. Mr. McCoubrey noted that one of the larger proposed changes is to take the pairs of smaller windows at the second floor level and turning them into larger windows. Ms. DeAscanis responded that they feel there was historic precedence for that change. She opined that the historic photographs on EX3.1 show awnings on the historic windows, and that those were single windows at one point and someone came in later and infilled the middle. She noted that in one of the photographs, there is an awning in the middle of the window. Ms. DiPasquale responded that it would have been unusual to install an awning in the middle of a double-hung window. Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff has gone out to inspect the windows and masonry spandrel in person. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she has not, but could.

Ms. Gutterman asked to discuss the garage door opening along Sansom Street. Ms. DeAscanis distributed revised drawings of the Sansom Street opening. She explained that their historical consultant recommended that they infill the opening with metal panels to surround the proposed double doors rather than infill the opening with masonry. Ms. Stein asked if the applicants are proposing to retain the existing metal frame. Ms. DeAscanis responded that they would keep the existing frame and then insert the metal panels. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the proposed double doors are louvered. Ms. DeAscanis responded affirmatively. Mr. D'Alessandro recommended a louvered transom and solid doors rather than louvered doors. Ms. Stein suggested removal of the metal frame and more appropriate infill. She opined that the proposed entry doors do not respond to the historic opening. Ms. DeAscanis responded that they could install wider doors that fill the opening with louvers above. Ms. Stein asked if they are proposing to match the frame profile of the adjacent door. Ms. DeAscanis responded affirmatively. Ms. Stein commented that there is a lack of notations on the drawings that make them difficult to understand. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that he would like to see jamb details showing how the proposed door and infill would fit in the opening.

Committee members again discussed the lack of elevation drawings and recommended reducing the number of drawings in the submission to just the existing versus proposed exterior changes.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the other proposed change is the fully-glazed doors on Juniper Street. Ms. DiPasquale explained that the staff felt that the doors should have stiles and rails, with a larger base frame.

Ms. Stein noted that, for the ADA door, the application is proposing to cut out a portion of the base. Ms. DeAscanis responded that they would match what is there. Ms. Gutterman asked whether it is possible to utilize the existing at-grade door. Ms. DeAscanis responded that the new door is for the residential lobby, while the existing door enters into a different retail space. She noted that the main entrance has steps. Ms. Stein asked how the applicants would accommodate push-plates for the ADA accessible door. Ms. DeAscanis responded that they would install a post with a push-plate.

Mr. McCoubrey summarized the Committee's recommendations that there needs to be additional information and evidence that the second-floor windows were single windows; the loading door along Sansom Street needs to be redesigned with a louvered transom and solid doors that fill the opening; and the Juniper Street entrance doors should be framed rather than frameless.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 413 E CHURCH LN

Proposal: Demolish building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Teresa Buda

Applicant: Teresa Buda

History: Main house built 1910; Carriage house built c.1885

Individual Designation: 11/29/1966

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a Colonial Revival house constructed 1909-1910. The building is in extreme disrepair due to the previous owner failing to maintain the property. A significant portion of the roof is no longer extant and interior floors as well as porches have collapsed. In January 2018, an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections visited the property and issued an "Unsafe" building violation. The collapsing building is an attractive nuisance that poses a significant safety hazard. The issuance of the demolition permit is necessary in the public interest.

The current owner has lived next to this property for over 30 years and purchased the property in January 2018. The owner's application requests to demolish the main house for safety and

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MAY 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

liability reasons and has no intention to construct another building in its place. There is an existing carriage house on the property that dates to 1885. The demolition request does not include the carriage house. The owner intends to rehabilitate and maintain the carriage house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the demolition of the main house as necessary in the public interest, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Teresa Buda represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked when the Department of Licenses & Inspections last visited the property. Ms. Buda stated that it was in January 2018, around the time she purchased the property. She noted that their visit was in response to a request by Historical Commission staff because she had been in contact with the staff about the process of removing the designation in order to demolish the building.

Mr. D'Alessandro inquired if the Athenaeum has copies of the architectural drawings for the house. Ms. Mehley responded that the floorplans included in the application were published in periodicals around the construction date and that she is not aware if any local repository has the drawings.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were additional Committee or public comments.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization does not oppose this demolition. He stated he was concerned about how this property could fall into such a state of disrepair and wished it had been addressed earlier.

David Traub of Save Our Sites questioned the request for demolition in the public interest. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the property had been deemed imminently dangerous. Ms. Buda and Ms. Mehley responded that it has not been deemed imminently dangerous. Mr. Traub expressed his concern that it sets a precedent for requesting demolition in the public interest. Mr. Traub began to question the property owner. Mr. Farnham requested that Mr. Traub address his comments to the Committee rather than the owner, noting that the City's Law Department has repeatedly advised the Historical Commission that public comments should be addressed to the Committee. The Historical Commission does not hold adversarial hearings with cross examination. He stated that Mr. Traub may offer any comments to the Committee, but cannot question others at the table.

Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission has been aware of the condition of this building for many years. He explained that the Historical Commission sought to undertake enforcement actions in the past but the previous owner did not have the capacity to correct the situation. Mr. Farnham explained that at this point the building is so deteriorated that the staff agrees that the only alternative is demolition. Mr. Farnham explained that the reason this building has not been labeled imminently dangerous is owing to the fact that it is so far from the public right-of-way. Mr. Farnham stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections differentiates between unsafe and imminently dangerous as a measure of the risk posed to the public itself. He said that even though this building is away from the public right-of-way, it is an attractive nuisance and is a danger to the public who would trespass.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of the main house as necessary in the public interest, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).

ADDRESS: 739 S 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct roof top addition

Review Requested: In-Concept

Owner: George & Karen Rosskam

Applicant: Joel Spivak

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 3/30/1965

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmit@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a rooftop deck at 739 S. 2nd Street, located at the corner of S. 2nd and Pemberton Streets. There is an existing, visible deck over the garage on Pemberton Street. There is also a small deck off of a room at the top story that is not visible from the public right-of-way.

The staff visited the site to view a mock up, and saw that the railings of the proposed deck would be highly visible from both S. 2nd and Pemberton Streets. This application shows the deck reduced in size from the previous mock up; however, the railings would remain highly visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner George Rosskam and architect Joel Spivak represented the application.

Mr. Spivak asked the Architectural Committee if there is anything they could do to allow the property owner to have this roof deck. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Architectural Committee typically does not approve roof decks on the main blocks of houses, but that it is more typical to allow decks on the wings or secondary areas parts of buildings. Mr. Baron commented that this situation is unusual because there is already a small deck on the main block of the house. Ms. Gutterman asked if it is possible to place a deck on another portion of the rear of the property. Mr. Baron replied that there are already two decks on the house, one on the garage and one that was cut into the rear gabled roof, which is the deck the applicant wants to expand upon. Ms. Gutterman asked for confirmation that this second existing roof deck is currently partially visible, and would become even more visible if expanded. Mr. Baron responded affirmatively.

Mr. Rosskam directed the Architectural Committee members to a diagram in their packets of the existing deck at the third floor, explaining that it would be used to allow access to the new roof deck. He noted that this change would leave the existing third story unusable except for access. He opined that the existing deck is not currently visible from the street. Mr. Rosskam went on to explain that what would be slightly visible would be the railing of the new roof deck from S. 2nd

Street, to which Ms. Gutterman responded that it would be more than slightly visible. Mr. McCoubrey commented that it appears that the existing deck would essentially become a landing for the new deck, and that both decks seem to be about the same size. Mr. Spivak replied that the difference between the existing deck and the new deck was that it is higher and would allow a view of the skyline; the existing deck only provides a view down Pemberton Street. Mr. McCoubrey sought confirmation that there is already an existing deck cut into the rear slope of the building. Mr. Baron responded affirmatively, but noted that the existing deck is hidden from view from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Spivak asked if there is a way to use a transparent material for the railing in order to reduce visibility. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the building has a beautiful silhouette, including the gable and double chimneys, and he thought that the proposal would be visible enough to detract from that. He went on to remark that, given the fact that there is already an existing deck and that the proposed deck would not increase the available deck space, it would be hard to approve another deck that would obviously be highly visible. Ms. Stein agreed, noting that it is a lovely corner property with many extra windows, but that its location on a corner also means that it is highly visible. She commented that its position on a corner makes it visible from many angles in the neighborhood. She explained that one of the criteria the Architectural Committee takes into consideration is whether a deck would be inconspicuous from the street. Ms. Stein opined that the proposed deck would not be inconspicuous because it would be highly visible from all adjacent streets since it is a corner property.

Mr. Roskam reminded the Architectural Committee that they had built a mock-up, and that standing directly in front of the house on S. 2nd Street, the deck would not be visible. He said that a person would have to go to a specific point at the corner of Monroe and S. 2nd Streets before it was visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Roskam noted that heading further north or south on S. 2nd Street the deck would not be visible. He opined that the same is true from Pemberton Street, because standing in front of the house, the deck would not be visible. He explained that it would only be visible from a specific point heading east on Pemberton Street.

Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification about the locations from which some of the photographs in the packet were taken. She commented that although Mr. Roskam was trying to say that the deck would not be visible, the issue is that it would be. She added that the deck would not be inconspicuous, which would set a precedent that the Architectural Committee is not interested in establishing as far as decks and railings. Ms. Gutterman acknowledged that Mr. Roskam would be gaining a view with the proposed roof deck, but there were already other decks that provided outdoor space at the property, so that in her mind, the proposal was not a benefit to the house. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. McCoubrey commented that there is already a large deck at the rear of the property, which is where the Architectural Committee would typically approve a deck. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the existing decks are not for observation the way that the proposed roof deck is. Mr. Roskam agreed that there is no view from the existing deck above the garage.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 2028 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct roof top addition

Review Requested: Final

Owner: Marisa Rosenthal

Applicant: Kevin Kaminski

History: c. 1870; leaded glass and window alterations c. 1895

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmit@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application for 2028 Delancey Street, a contributing building within the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, includes paint removal, cleaning and repairs at the front façade, the installation of an elevator, the removal of an addition at the rear, and the construction of a carport and terrace. The property owner intends to revert the current multi-family building to a single-family residence.

The application proposes to clean and remove paint from the marble water table and door surround at the front façade. The front steps are to be reset and a new metal railing is to be installed. The two-over-two double-hung wood dormer windows, sills and frames at the fourth story are to be replaced.

At the rear of the property, the application proposes to remove the existing glass vestibule, as well as the existing first-story rear addition, patio, fence and garage door, which would be replaced with a new carport and terrace. The application further proposes to remove the existing second-story bay to accommodate two new glazed openings. The mansard roof at the fourth floor would be extended and a new dormer added in order to enclose a new elevator. At the west and south facades, the application proposes to construct parapet wall at the third floor, and replace the existing windows, frames and sills.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the façade repair, with the staff to review paint removal and cleaning protocol; approval of the new carport, terrace, and extension of the mansard; and denial of the proposed removal of the second-story bay and increased parapet height at the west and south facades, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Kevin Kaminski and Whitney Joslin represented the application.

Mr. Kaminski asked the Architectural Committee members where they should begin. Mr. McCoubrey said that the staff recommended approval for the changes proposed at the front façade. Mr. Baron said that he had a comment about this scope, remarking that the proposal showed the existing, correctly-shaped dormers and dormer windows were to be removed and replaced with incorrectly-shaped dormers and windows with the wrong muntin pattern. Mr. Baron said that the staff could support the replacement as long as it was with the correctly-shaped dormers and the correct windows, rather than how it was shown on the drawings. He continued on, saying that the staff would prefer to see the dormers repaired rather than removed because the existing mouldings are very elaborate, and that the staff would not approve the drawings as they were currently, but could with these modifications.

Mr. Kaminski said that he was aware of these issues and had been discussing it with the staff and that he had brought photographs of the existing dormers. Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Kaminski if he was willing to make the changes that the staff was requesting, to which Mr. Kaminski replied yes. Mr. McCoubrey said therefore they could move on, but that it would be noted that these changes were not currently shown, but that they would be on sheet A.07.

Mr. Kaminski told the Architectural Committee that the other piece to be addressed was the parapet, which he figured may cause some concern, and that they were prepared to keep the existing roofline. Mr. McCoubrey described the existing roofline as a character-defining feature of the house. Mr. Kaminski said that they had produced a new drawing showing the parapet being removed, the retention of the existing roofline, the expansion of the mansard portion of the roof to allow for the elevator overrun, and then building up the portion below with masonry. He explained that the main reason they had considered building up the parapet wall was to make it appear more unified, but that they understood and respected the historic language of the street and wanted to be as sensitive as possible.

Mr. Kaminski stated that they had proposed the removal of the bay mainly to provide access to the space above the carport. Ms. Gutterman commented that the removal of the entire bay was not necessary for access, because they could always simply remove just a window instead. Mr. Kaminski replied that they had looked at that alternative, and that they had a drawing to show what it would look like. He explained that this approach would reduce light at the first floor and would take up more lot area. Ms. Stein asked if the deck was the full width of the ell, and Mr. Kaminski confirmed that it was. He showed the Architectural Committee a mock up of what it would look like to leave the bay and install doors that would provide access to the top of the carport. Ms. Stein sought confirmation that, with this alternative, one would walk out through the bay and on to the deck, to which Mr. Kaminski replied yes. She also asked if there was an existing door at the side that they were planning on relocating, to which Mr. Kaminski replied yes.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether it was thought that the bay could be original, despite having been re-clad. Mr. Kaminski responded that they did believe the bay to be original. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the existing aluminum siding would be removed if they had to retain the bay. Mr. Kaminski responded that, if they had to keep the bay which was not their preference, they would research what might be the appropriate material for new cladding. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the balcony would be removed in both schemes, and Mr. Kaminski confirmed that this was the case. Ms. Gutterman asked if historically there had been two punched windows at the location of the balcony that they were proposing to put back, to which Mr. Kaminski responded yes.

Ms. Pentz asked if there was any information about the age of the one-story addition. Mr. Kaminski said that they did not know specifically, but that their best guess was that it was added some time in the 1950s.

Ms. Stein asked if the new diagram they had received at the meeting still showed the parapet extension. Mr. Kaminski said yes, explaining that they had pulled it together very quickly, and in so doing, they had failed to remove it from the drawing, but that it would remain as existing in any new scheme. He apologized for the drawing, and Ms. Stein said that she was actually going

to commend them on their drawings because of how well they showed both the existing and proposed conditions. Mr. Kaminski thanked Ms. Stein.

Mr. McCoubrey said that with the removal of the parapet, the return of the shed roof, two of the main issues of the day had been addressed. He then asked if the existing window at the balcony was just one single, large opening. Ms. Joslin explained that believed that there had been two windows previously, but at some point, a center door had been added in order to step out on to the little balcony. Mr. McCoubrey mentioned that he had been wondering if the bay had extended up higher originally, but thought it unlikely. Ms. Gutterman agreed that it looked like just a one-story bay.

Mr. D'Alessandro said that he noticed that they were replacing the railing at the front door. Mr. Kaminski replied yes, because it had been eaten away and no longer connected to the base. Mr. D'Alessandro told Mr. Kaminski that the railing could be retrofitted by removing the rotted section and replacing it with stainless steel so that the rail could be embedded back where it was without failing. He asked Mr. Kaminski about the replacement for the existing railing, and Mr. Kaminski explained it would be replaced in kind with a new wrought iron rail. Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated that the existing railing could be retrofitted unless it was completely rotted, and Mr. Kaminski replied that it was only rotted in certain sections, and that the recommendation to reuse it was a good one. Mr. D'Alessandro said that rather than throwing the entire railing out, he could try and repair it, and Mr. Kaminski said he was sure that the homeowner would appreciate saving some money if possible. Mr. D'Alessandro replied that he was not suggesting that it would be less expensive to retrofit the existing railing, just that it was common to do so in restoration work. Mr. Kaminski said it was their intent to do as much restoration as possible on this project, and Mr. D'Alessandro said that is why he made the suggestion about the railing, adding that Dutchman repairs could also be done to the existing marble steps.

Ms. Pentz asked what existed at the property line that would support the beams for the carport. Mr. Kaminski asked for clarification on the question. Ms. Pentz asked what kind of wall existed at the property line at the rear of the property. Mr. Kaminski explained that one of the adjacent neighbors had installed a new carport and deck, and the walls were made of masonry. Ms. Joslin asked Ms. Pentz if she wanted to know what ran along the property line at the length of the side yard, to which Ms. Pentz replied that she wanted to know what the beams of the carport would be landing on. Mr. Kaminski replied that he did not yet know specifically but that they would tie into the structure of the carport.

Ms. Gutterman asked what the applicants were envisioning for the garage door, wanting to know if it would be a plain metal door or paneled, and were they considering using any glass or wood. Mr. Kaminski said that they were not going to use any glass, and that they were planning on doing a design similar to what the adjacent neighbors had done with their new carport. He said that a panelized wood door would be their preference.

Ms. Pentz said it looked like they had pushed their door opening all the way over to the property line, and Mr. Kaminski said that was correct because they were trying to get two-car parking in the new carport. Ms. Pentz mentioned that it was still not clear what would support the wall in the corner, and Mr. Kaminski clarified that it would be a masonry pier. Ms. Pentz asked if they would be using salvaged brick for economic reasons, or so that it would blend in better with

what was adjacent. Mr. Kaminski explained that because they were planning on removing the addition, they could salvage that brick which would be the appropriate size and scale to match the original home. He said that they saw it as both an environmental benefit as well as a way to keep within the context of the neighboring community.

Mr. McCoubrey said that, given that there was an existing large opening already on the third floor at the rear, if they were to replace the windows, they would need to consider what kind of windows would have been there in the past. He continued on to say that, however, because there was this big opening there now, they could also infill it since it has already been changed. Ms. Gutterman said that if the applicant was going to put back the window width of what would have been there historically, casement windows were not going to work. She said that most likely, they would have been some kind of double-hung window, perhaps with a divided light, but she would leave those details up to the staff. Ms. Gutterman said that she agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that casement windows would not work unless they were planning on putting back a non-original window opening size. Mr. Kaminski said that they would likely be increasing the size of the window opening, to which Ms. Gutterman responded that they should really consider how these windows were going to look head on, since the bay was now to remain. She commented that if the windows were to get too wide, there would not be enough mass between them, and it could become uncomfortable. Mr. Kaminski said he realized that they had not sufficiently studied the elevation with the scenario of the bay remaining.

Mr. Kaminski asked if it was safe to assume that the bay would have to remain. Ms. Gutterman said that was her recommendation. Mr. Kaminski asked how he could be granted approval for the removal of the addition, but not the bay. Ms. Gutterman responded that since the addition was below the bay, it was less conspicuous. She also said that the addition was not original, and that the bay was much more visible to someone walking down the alley than the ground-floor addition that was sitting behind a wall. Mr. McCoubrey added that, often times, these bays at the rears became character-defining features and were visible from the street. He said that it was possible that this had been a two-story bay, and maybe there were some examples of these on the street. Mr. Kaminski said that, if the bay needed to stay, they would certainly look at opportunities to consider the layout a little bit more, and that perhaps a two-story bay would eliminate some of the challenges with some of the masonry openings, which could perhaps produce a cleaner end result.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of raising the parapet wall, the removal of the bay, and installation of the window boxes, but approval of the remainder of the application, with the suggestion to study the rear elevation and its windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:50 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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs—their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roof material such as slate, wood, clay, tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning. 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.

Storefronts Guideline: Not Recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building.

14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish.

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.