

**THE MINUTES OF THE 592ND STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 9 DECEMBER 2011
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Duane Bumb, Commerce Department
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA

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

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
J. Albert Calluso
William C. Jamouneau, Esq.
Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture
Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design
Mark Leuzzi
Sarah Leuzzi
Melanie Ellison Roach
Belinda Fields
Leon Fields
V. Chapman Smith
Greg James
Michael Lemley
Pat Carney
Matt McClure, Esq.
Herbert Jeschke
Diane M. Calkins
Morgan Cephas, Office of Councilman Curtis Jones Jr.
Ed Fischer
Jacqueline J. Cruse
Barbara Carey
Mary D. Allen
Kathleen Kelly
Elizabeth J. Backer

Albert Philip Handel
Maureen Handel
Carol Hammarberg
Tully Speaker
Cliff Eubanks
Virginia Trosino
Deborah Cianfrani
Anthony Cianfrani
Robert L. Carfrey
Jonathan Kopcsik
Dennis T. Kelly
D.V. Selkow
Ramble Krohn
Holly Otterbein, Daily News
Virginia Duerr
Martha Poller
Carol Carr
Ed Boe
Jeffrey Wright
Lincoln Trower
Tami Perkins
George Arthur
Timothy J. LaBarie
Salvatore Sandene
William Boyer
Emanuel Lambert
Kimya Johnson

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Bumb, Dilworth, Hawkins, Jones, Leonard, Palantino, Quinn, Schaaf, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 591ST STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to adopt the minutes of the 591st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 November 2011. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 15 NOVEMBER 2011

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

ADDRESS: 2525 S GARNET ST

Project: Restucco exterior, replace roof, convert window to door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark Leuzzi

Applicant: Vincent Mancino, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1910; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: No

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the installation of the side door with a change in opening dimension to match the width of the new door, and application of new stucco, provided the old stucco is removed and the new stucco is installed with a textured finish, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, and denial of the replacement of the roof as proposed, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restucco the exterior, replace the roof, and cut down a side window into a door.

The proposed stucco would be applied to the building using a wire lath and a smooth finish. The original stucco is known as “pebble-dash” stucco; a stucco system created in which pebbles or small rocks are thrown against the wall surface so that they stick to the wet stucco finish. The staff suggests the old layer of stucco be removed prior to installation of new stucco. The new stucco should be applied directly to the building with a pebble-dash finish.

Currently, there is a small jalousie window on the bottom of the side wall projection. The applicant proposes to cut down the window to install a door. The door would maintain the current width of the window. The grade would be lowered one foot to accommodate the new door.

The building and its twin retain the original flat terracotta tile roof. The applicant proposes to remove the terracotta tiles on the front and rear slopes of the roof and install a square synthetic slate shingle. No information has been provided regarding the condition of the original tiles. The staff suggests individual tile repair rather than replacement.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Owners Sarah and Mark Leuzzi and architect Vincent Mancini represented the application.

Mr. Mancini stated that the proposal has three components: the replacement of the terracotta tile roof with a synthetic slate roof; the installation of a side door with the opening to be the width of the replacement door; and the installation of new stucco over wire lathe on the entire house. He explained that the owners have agreed upon installation of the side door with the specified

width, but that they do not agree with the Committee's recommendation of denial of the roof replacement or the stucco installation.

Ms. Hawkins summarized the Architectural Committee's contention that the applicant had not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the roofing had failed and needed replacement. She explained that the dislodged tiles that can be seen in one of the submitted, recent photographs are the same dislodged tiles that can be seen in the designation photograph taken in 2000. She stated that adding stucco over wire lathe will increase the thickness of the walls, bring the plane of the front façade out beyond the plane of the attached, neighboring property. She added that an increased wall thickness would alter the relationship between the wall and the window and door frames.

Mr. Mancini argued that the integrity of the roofing tiles cannot be judged with photographs. He asserted that qualified roofers have determined that they are in poor condition. He stated that a roofing company provided a cost estimate for the work to remove the tiles and replace them. He contended that the cost is not reasonable. He noted that he is proposing a tile that would be a suitable replacement for the historic material.

Mr. Sherman asked if the stucco was currently leaking or cracking. Mr. Leuzzi asserted that the stucco is failing owing to water infiltration. The water is causing cracks and leaks. He stated that he wants the alterations to be maintenance-free for 20 to 30 years.

Ms. Hawkins contended that, if the stucco is peeling or cracking, the addition of new stucco on top of it without removal of the original layer would merely cover problems and cause the stucco wall to deteriorate at a faster rate. She claimed that undertaking the proposed stucco work might improve the building aesthetically, but it will not solve the water infiltration and deterioration problems. She explained that the Architectural Committee suggested relocating ties from the rear slopes of the roof to the front slopes, within the public view, and installing an alternative material at the rear.

Mr. Mancini asked if the Commission would consider approving the removal of all of the stucco and installation of new stucco in its place. Ms. Hawkins affirmed that the Committee had recommended complete removal and replacement, but the owner rejected the proposal. Mr. Leuzzi stated that he is an experienced mason and claimed that it would cost \$30,000 to completely remove the stucco. Ms. Hawkins stated that he could repair the existing stucco or submit a financial hardship application requesting approval of the new stucco over old because the complete removal would be financially infeasible. Ms. Leuzzi argued that to do the work required by the Commission would not yield a reasonable return. She contended that she would not recuperate the cost of complete removal when she sold the house. She acknowledged the historic value of the home, but stated that she does not want to live in a house with patchwork stucco repairs and different roofing treatments.

Mr. Farnham explained that the staff has reviewed many applications to replace tile roofs in the Girard Estate Historic District. He described the other houses where tile roofs have been replaced as very similar in style, material, and workmanship to the house in question. He noted that over the last 10 years the Commission has received about four or five applications proposing the replacement of terracotta tile roofs like the one in question. The staff, he explained, spent significant time with applicants and roofers in the field examining the condition of the roofs. He asserted that, after investigation and discussion with professional roofers, the former executive director of the Historical Commission and he determined that these tile roofs are at the ends of their lives. He observed that the tile roofs can no longer be repaired, but must be replaced. He added that moving terracotta tiles around roofs is very labor intensive and

therefore very expensive. He explained that most of the cost of working on such a roof is labor, not materials. Mr. Tyler and he concluded that it is not feasible to require extensive repairs of terracotta tile roofs on houses of this value. It is unrealistic to expect homeowners to invest in roofing work that will cost one-third of the total value of their properties. Mr. Farnham acknowledged that these tile or terracotta roofs are important character-defining features that contribute significantly to the historic value of these houses, but he opined that mandating such a costly roof repair is unreasonable. He explained that the Commission's staff has searched for replacement materials that match the tiles in shape, size, and color, but found nothing that recreates the look of this unusual tile. He asserted that there are no synthetic or asphalt options that mimic the appearance of these very unusual roofs. He stated that, given all of the parameters, the Commission determined in the past that it should allow the replacement of the roof with the best artificial material available. He explained that the applicants have proposed a material that is much more expensive than what has been approved on the other houses that had similar roofs in Girard Estate.

Mr. Dilworth asked the staff why it had recommended denial. Mr. Farnham explained that the staff had not been provided with complete information about the condition of the historic roof and the potential costs of repair at the time it formulated its recommendation. He noted that the requisite information had been provided at the Architectural Committee meeting.

Mr. Sherman agreed with Mr. Farnham's assertions. Mr. Thomas also agreed with Mr. Farnham, explaining that he has been involved with similar roofing problems at the historic houses along Parkside Avenue.

Mr. Sherman suggested that the Commissioners provide guidance to the homeowner about the stucco portion of his proposal. Mr. Farnham offered a compromise; he asked the owner if it would be possible to completely remove and replace the stucco from the front façade only and install the stucco as proposed on the side and rear elevations. Mr. Leuzzi argued that stucco removal is labor intensive and could take up to a month to complete. He explained that the columns are poured concrete coated with an inch and a half of stucco that tapers off and it would be difficult to remove it all. He stated that the only area of good stucco left is under the porch. He argued that repairing the stucco would leave mismatched areas. Mr. Sherman asked if it would be possible to paint the stucco since it is painted currently. Mr. Leuzzi explained that he wants to use a color-integral stucco that would not require paint.

Ms. Jones asked if stuccoing as proposed would create an awkward seam where the front façade connects with the attached twin. Ms. Hawkins asserted there would be a change in plane of about three-quarters to one inch at the intersection with the neighboring house. She stated that the new stucco would extend out beyond the plane of the brick trim around the windows. Mr. Leuzzi stated that he can remove the stucco around the windows and feather in the new stucco to retain the relationship of the window trim to the wall.

Ms. Hawkins offered a motion to approve the installation of a side door in an opening of the width of the replacement door, the installation of a synthetic roof, and application of new stucco, provided the old stucco is completely removed from the front façade only and the new stucco is installed with a textured finish. No one seconded the motion.

Mr. Dilworth asked if there would be a preservation issue if the stucco could be feathered into the window surrounds. Ms. Hawkins stated that it will change the relationship to the wall and window surrounds. She added that this change would also alter the drip edges around the windows, which could make the walls susceptible to water infiltration.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 1617 LOMBARD ST

Project: Restucco façade, add balconies, cornice, quoins, transom, and planter

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: J. Albert Calluso

Applicant: Albert Calluso

History: 1850; front façade rebuilt, 1984

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the front façade of this residential property in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The property was constructed c. 1840. The original nineteenth-century brick front façade was very significantly altered when the building was modernized in the 1960s. The Modern 1960s façade was subsequently replaced in 1984 and a more traditional front façade constructed. This new façade, however, did not replicate the original design or material of the original facade.

Today, the front façade has oddly proportioned window openings and a failing stucco surface. The proposed alterations would remove the failing stucco and apply new scored stucco with the addition of corner quoins. The proposed corner quoins, however, would protrude from the plane of the wall in what is an otherwise consistent street façade. A new cornice would be installed; the building lacks a cornice currently. Metal railings attached to create the appearance of balconies would be installed at the second and third-story windows. Lastly, a planter would be constructed at the ground floor. The planter, which likely would project into the public-right-of-way, may require an ordinance.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Albert Calluso and architect Anthony Bruttaniti represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that the applicant had received the Street Department's approval for a planter than originally proposed.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that the belt course delineating the ground from the second floor should be extended to span the entire width of the façade. Mr. Bruttaniti did not object to extending the belt course.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission on 9 December 2011, provided the belt course delineating the ground floor from the second floor spans the full width of the front facade, with the staff to review details. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 256-58 S 20TH ST

Project: Legalize awning with fans

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Salvatore D'Angelo

Applicant: Dennis Torres

History: 1860; 256: façade stuccoed, 1964, storefront, nd; 258: Queen Anne storefront, c. 1885

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the recent installation of an awning without approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The awning is consists of a metal structure and a canvas cover with closed sides. The large awning spans across the facades of two buildings and covers a historic wood storefront cornice. Lighting and electric fans hang from the awning.

This property owner is aware of the Commission's jurisdiction over this property and its processes and procedures. In February 2000, this owner received a violation for alterations to the storefront undertaken without the Commission's approval or a permit. The owner submitted an application to legalize the alterations. After a lengthy review process and many meetings between the current applicant and the staff, the Commission approved a partial restoration of the storefront in September 2003.

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

The Commissioners reviewed the application and agreed with the Architectural Committee that the illegal work did not satisfy preservation standards.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 30 NOVEMBER 2011

Richardson Dilworth III, chair

OVERBROOK FARMS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner: Various

Nominator: The Overbrook Farms Club

Proposal: Nomination district designation

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Overbrook Farms Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation (a, c, d, e, f, h, and j) and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with the following revisions to the nomination: a section on the history of the apartment buildings and the sources of the illustrations should be added the Statement of Significance; and 6300 Woodbine Avenue, 6000 Overbrook Avenue, and 5898 Woodbine Avenue are classified as contributing and 2095-97 N. 63rd street is classified as non-contributing.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the designation of the Overbrook Farms Historic District. Overbrook Farms is a suburban residential development of 497 properties located on the western edge of the City of Philadelphia and centered on the Main Line of the former Pennsylvania Railroad. The proposed boundaries are predicated on the residential development that was laid out in the early 1890s.

The period of significance of the Overbrook Farms Historic District spans from 1850, when the trains first stopped at the Overbrook Station, to 1929, when the last of the original buildings of the development was constructed and the first of the original buildings demolished.

The nomination contends that the Overbrook Farms Historic District satisfies seven Criteria for Designation (a, c, d, e, f, h, and j) and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham explained to the Commission and audience that Councilman Curtis Jones Jr., whose councilmanic district includes the proposed Overbrook Farms Historic District, had requested in writing that the Commission table the nomination until its February 2012 meeting to allow the community additional time to discuss the nomination and better understand the implications of designation. Mr. Sherman stated that he supported the Councilman's request. Mr. Dilworth, the chair of the Committee on Historic Designation, stated that he likewise supported the request.

Several members of the audience spoke out of order, without being recognized by the chair. Mr. Sherman assured them that they would have an opportunity to address the Commission on the merits of the nomination at the February 2012 meeting.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved table consideration of the Overbrook Farms Historic District nomination until the Historical Commission's meeting of 10 February 2012. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Mr. Sherman moved to adjourn at 10:15 a.m. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

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.