

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

**TUESDAY, 23 NOVEMBER 2010
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

John Cluver
Suzanne Pentz
Rudy D'Alessandro

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

ALSO PRESENT

Fon Wang, UCI Architects, Inc
Ignatius Wang, UCI Architects, Inc
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Don Bitterliche, Keating
Matt McCauley, Ocean
Dennis Weismer
Malcolm Lazin, Industrial
Rebecca Lamb
Donna Lisle, BLTa
Juliet Lee, BLTa
Cuong Tran
Robert Pisani
Agata Reister, Landmark Design
Frank Lauletta, 538 N 19th St. LLC
William L. Wilson, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Ihor Boscun, HACBM Architects Engineers Planners LLC
Gabe Marabella
David Killian
Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects
Thomas M. Holloman, TMH Associates, Inc
Terry A. Necciai, RA
Clarence Fleming, First District AME
Stanley Merenu, TMH Associates, Inc

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Pentz called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. Messrs. Cluver and D'Alessandro joined her.

100 W. SCHOOL HOUSE LANE, PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

Owner: Pennsylvania School for the Deaf

Applicant: Fon Wang, AIA, LEED AP

History: 1760; later additions in 1880 and 1904

Designation: individually designated, 6/26/1956

Project: In concept - Construct addition

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct an addition to a school building on the campus of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf in Germantown. The original school building was constructed in the 1760s and then added to at the rear in 1880 and again in 1904. The original eighteenth-century structure is one of the most historically significant buildings in the city. The proposed addition would connect to the 1904 wing, not the eighteenth-century portion of the building. All three sections of the building are finished in Wissahickon Schist and both the 1880 and 1904 additions were designed in a Colonial Revival style to complement the original Georgian building.

The in-concept design proposes a one-story addition that would require the demolition of a large section of the ground floor of the 1904 rear façade. The Wissahickon stone removed from the demolition would be saved and reused as cladding stone on the new addition. The addition would be articulated with large windows, a standing-seam roof, skylights, and a pediment central entranceway that evokes the pitched roofs found throughout the campus.

Before approving an addition to a building with such great significance, the Commission should determine whether this is the only feasible location to house the needed functions on the campus. If it can be built elsewhere, away from the historic buildings, it should be. If this is the only feasible location for an addition, then it should be designed to be compatible with the eighteenth-century building as well as its additions, which have acquired their own significance. The applicants should provide information about the campus and the long-term plans for it to allow the Commission to better understand the reasons for selecting this location for the addition. The applicants should also provide information about the programmatic needs. For example, what are the needs for additional cafeteria space.

The design of the proposed addition may not comply with the Standards. The proposed addition engulfs the historic 1904 wing, changing its massing and spatial relationships. The two rear corners of the 1904 wing, which now stand free, should be respected to preserve the historic massing and integrity of the complex. A connector between the historic 1904 wing and new addition or a setback at the eastern end of the new addition may help in the retention of the historic massing. The loss of historic stone from the façade of the 1904 wing should be minimized. The main façade of the proposed addition is not compatible with the 1904 wing in features, rhythm, scale, proportions, and massing. The openings in the proposed addition have a different rhythm, proportions, and scale than the openings in the historic building. The broad, tall entranceway proposed for the new addition competes with the historic building behind it.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10 and New Addition Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Fon Wang and Ignatius Wang and William L. Wilson of the Board of Trustees of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf represented the application.

Mr. Danta reminded the Architectural Committee members that the application requested approval in concept. He explained that it would be helpful to give the applicant guidance on scale, rhythm, and other design elements but that the fine details should be left for the final review.

Ms. Wang described the site and its relationship to the overall campus. She noted that there are three buildings listed on the Philadelphia Register on campus. She explained the kitchen for the main cafeteria for the school is currently housed in the basement of the building in question. She described it as a dark and cramped area. She stated one of the main goals of the project is to move the service area up to the ground floor so as to be at the same level as the dining room. She stressed that this area of the campus holds great importance for the students. She explained it is used for more than just sharing meals and that it also serves as a social meeting area during leisure time. Ms. Wang explained that the basement area, which currently houses the kitchen, will then be used for admissions offices, a science classroom, and a conference room. She noted that the science classroom will be used for Life Science, which is a new program recently added to the curriculum.

Ms. Wang presented the proposed elevations of the addition to the Architectural Committee. She stated that the proposed design borrowed elements from the Colonial and Colonial Revival buildings that comprise the majority of the campus. She added that, although they borrow from the historic architecture, they use a contemporary architectural language that is different from but contextual to the original buildings.

Mr. Cluver asked about the extent of the Commission's jurisdiction on the site. Mr. Danta replied that the Commission designated three eighteenth-century buildings on the campus in 1956. He explained, however, that the 1985 preservation ordinance gave the Commission authority over the buildings and their site, which, in this case, would be the entire campus. He added that the Commission reviewed the 1980s rehabilitation of the campus.

Ms. Pentz stated that she found the proposed design problematic. She noted it did not respect the massing, opening sizes, or character of the original buildings.

Mr. Cluver stated that there should be a conversation on the appropriateness of an addition at the proposed location before the merits of the design are addressed. He, nevertheless, stated that, if an addition was acceptable at the proposed location, it should be a one-story porch-like addition, not the proposed addition. He stated that the addition should look like a porch that was enclosed over time. Mr. Cluver stated that the addition should be more light and airy with posts or piers rather than solid walls. He objected to the proposed scale of big openings with picture windows. He also stated that the fenestration should be broken down to reflect or be compatible to the prevalent muntin patterns throughout the campus. He concluded that the history of the site is one of gradual growth and accretion of elements and that a sensitively designed addition could be appropriate.

Ms. Wang stated that the original concept was a porch-like addition that was as open as possible and flooded with daylight. She explained the client objected to this design because the glare would interfere with the students' communication with sign language. She added that the client's objection led them to redesign the addition in its current configuration. Mr. Cluver asked if there was a percentage of interior glare that the client would tolerate. Ms. Wang responded that the acceptable glare levels had not been quantified. She added that the proposed

fenestration had been designed to make it possible to control glare and light through curtains and still maintain a sense of openness.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the addition could be oriented towards the 1980s link or placed in a different location. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the corners of the 1904 wing should be respected and that the proposed addition should not conceal them.

Mr. Cluver asked how the proposed location was chosen and why was it considered the best location for the proposed addition. He noted that there appears to be open space in other areas of the campus where an addition or new building could be built. Ms. Wang answered that the proposed location was chosen because it is considered the core of the campus.

Mr. Wilson stated that there are many challenges in the education of deaf children. He reported that deaf children often face other physical impairments; many are confined to wheelchairs and have difficulty moving about the campus. He stressed that lighting is very important at the school because it impacts signing. Ms. Wang added that the students love the campus and the social opportunities it provides them.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance questioned the proposed location for the addition. He objected and stated that it totally obscures the historic building and destroys its integrity. He stated the design is not appropriate, even in concept. He also said that the program for the new building was very broad and would seem to justify an independent building. He described the program for the addition as ambitious. He also questioned the appropriateness of a porch-like addition, owing to the fact that these buildings did not have porches like domestic buildings would have had. He stated that the addition should defer to the character of the existing building to ensure compatibility. He noted that all of the additions have a consistency of character with masonry walls, small window openings, and related massing. He reiterated that the addition is inappropriate, even at an in-concept level.

Mr. Wilson stated that there is no other location for a standalone building on the campus. He stated that there is a tremendous need for parking at the school and the current parking areas cannot be used as sites for new buildings. He noted the campus has an athletic field, but it cannot be used as a building site. Ms. Wang agreed that the athletic field, which is very important to the students, cannot be sacrificed for a building.

Mr. Cluver asked if this proposal is part of larger long-term campus plan. Ms. Pentz asked if the addition could be relocated to a newer building near the drive into the campus. Ms. Wang explained that the building in question has an elaborate porch and a fine facade and it would not be appropriate to destroy it for an addition.

Mr. Cluver reiterated that he was not against the idea of an addition, but echoed Mr. Gallery's concern about the location and character of the façade. He stated that it could be possible to construct an addition on this side that would be sensitive to the historic surroundings and add to the overall ensemble. He recognized that an addition at the proposed location would permanently alter the rear façade of the 1904 wing, but that such an alteration, if sensitively designed, could work. He characterized the site as tricky and concluded that the proposed addition is not the right answer.

Ms. Pentz said the porch idea could be successful, because the building has the scale of a Quaker meeting house. She noted the 1904 wing has strong quoins, which should not be

obscured. She sympathized with the need for an expansion but questioned if this was the only alternative. Ms. Wang said that stepping the addition back from the corners of the 1904 wing makes sense. She expressed concern about adopting the window patterns of the historic buildings too literally. Mr. D'Alessandro stated he would prefer to see more masonry in the walls. Mr. Cluver stated that siding could be an appropriate cladding material. It would reduce the massing of the walls so as to make the addition appear less bulky. Ms. Pentz called the challenges more of an opportunity than a problem. Mr. D'Alessandro concurred.

Mr. Wilson reiterated that there is no other location on the campus that could be used for the proposed addition. He added that an addition near the main entrance to the campus would not work with the school's program owing to the heavy vehicular traffic on that main driveway and the physical limitations of the students. He stated that they had studied the problem extensively and concluded that this was the only feasible location. The Committee members suggested that the applicants should provide information regarding their analyses and studies that led to this solution.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10 and New Addition Guidelines.

2220 MADISON SQUARE

Owner/Applicant: Dennis Weismer

History: c. 1850

Designation: individually designated, 9/28/1971

Project: Legalize alterations to front facade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize alterations to the front façade of this property on Madison Square. The Commission approved rear alterations for this building, but the scope of the approval was exceeded. The applicant claims in his letter that the vinyl windows on the front façade were not replaced and were present when he purchased the property. The brick pointing is inappropriate and the mixture appears to be very high in Portland cement. The front door is also inappropriate and it does not replicate the original appearance of the original mid nineteenth-century door.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Dennis Weismer represented the application.

Mr. Weismer explained that he had not rehabilitated a historic property before he tackled this one. He stated that the pointing was done to prevent further deterioration. He stated that the door was based on other doors on the block. He distributed photographs to the Committee members that showed various door on nearby properties. He added that only seven houses in the development currently have their original doors. Mr. Danta noted that the original door design for this block would have been a double-leaf door with two panels in each leaf. He added the Commission and the staff have regularly approved a single-leaf door design with an applied astragal down the middle to make it appear as a double-leaf door, but with the operational qualities of a single-leaf door. Mr. Weismer objected to the double-leaf door design. He acknowledged, however, that it is more cumbersome to move furniture in and out of the house with the narrow door. He reiterated that there are 20 different door designs on the neighboring

properties within the block. Mr. Cluver stated that the Commission does not base its decisions on a simple majority, but instead requires replication of the historic elements. He add that, as the original elements are lost, it is more, not less, important to preserve the survivors. He reminded the applicant that, if had applied for a permit, he would have been provided with information about the correct door.

Ms. Pentz opined that the pointing was a major problem. She noted that the historic photographs depict thin sharp butter joints which are characteristic for this style and period. She asked if the mortar had been ground out of the joints. Mr. Weismer responded that he was unaware of the pointing technique. Mr. Cluver stated that, over time, the face of the brick will start to spall, owing to the hardness of the mortar. If the contractor had applied for a permit, the problem would have been averted at no cost.

Mr. Danta stated that a permit was issued for interior work only, but the contractor exceeded the scope of the permit. Mr. Weismer stated that he did not know why the contractor exceeded the permit.

Mr. Cluver inquired about the vinyl windows. Mr. Danta clarified that there is no evidence regarding the date of the installation of the vinyl windows. He explained that the Commission has no designation photographs for this block. Mr. Danta noted that the applicant claimed in his cover letter that the windows were in place when he purchased the property. Mr. Weismer confessed to the installation of the door and the repointing of the wall, but reiterated that he did not install vinyl windows. The Architectural Committee members recommended that he provide photographs to the Historical Commission showing that the windows were in place at the time of his purchase.

Mr. Weismer stated that the front door would be easy to replace, but stated that correcting the pointing could be very damaging to the building. He asked that the Committee to recommend the legalization of the pointing.

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

307 DELANCEY STREET

Owner/Applicant: Malcolm Lazin

History: 1973, Adolf De Roy Mark, architect

Designation: Contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize mosaic on garden wall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of a mosaic that was installed without the Historical Commission's review or approval. The mosaic is located on a garden wall along an alley that runs perpendicularly away from Delancey Street. The mosaic is visible to pedestrians on the sidewalk, but is not visible when looking head on at the front of the house. The house was constructed in 1973 as part of the redevelopment of the area and is classified as Contributing to the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Malcolm Lazin represented the application.

Mr. Lazin distributed photographs to the Committee members depicting the mosaic and showing that it is not highly visible from the street. He explained that he polled all of his neighbors before artist Isaih Zager installed the mosaic and they did not object. He added that some of his neighbors encouraged him to install it. He stated that Mr. Zager is a Philadelphia treasure, whose work is seen all over the City. A documentary film was made about him and his art. He acknowledged that pedestrians can see the mural obliquely when they are walking west towards Three Bears Park. He noted that the wall surface was stucco, not brick before the mosaic was installed.

Mr. Danta asked if the alley where the mosaic is located is a public-right-of-way. Mr. Lazin answered that is gated. He and his neighbors use it to store trash cans.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Historical Commission will consider Isaih Zager's work as significant and historic at some point.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked if the Commission would consider this a mural. He acknowledged that it was a grey area.

Mr. Cluver stated mosaics can either add or detract from the environment. He suggested that the Committee consider its impact on the overall neighborhood. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the neighbors stated their support for the mosaic in writing. Mr. Lazin stated that they had not, but he could obtain a letter from the neighbors giving their support to the project.

Mr. Danta asked inquired if the garden wall originally had a brick return. Mr. Lazin said it only returned the width of one brick. The remainder of the wall was stucco.

Mr. Cluver stated that the mosaic has limited public visibility. Ms. Pentz stated that she approved of the mosaic. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he could support it only if the Society Hill Civic Association supported it. Mr. Gallery said that the mosaic is unprecedented in Society Hill. Approving it might set a negative precedent. Mr. Danta advised the Committee to base its recommendation on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and not on the neighborhood's opinion.

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

510 S. HANCOCK STREET

Owner/Applicant: Jessica Lamb

History: 1814

Designation: Individually designated 6/24/1958

Significant to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Install one-over-one clad windows in front façade.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the windows in the front façade of an early nineteenth-century rowhouse. The house is part of a courtyard development, an eighteenth and early nineteenth-century type of development in which smaller, workers' houses were

constructed around a court at the rear of a larger house facing a main street. The property is classified as Significant in the Society Hill Historic District and is considered part of a fine example of a workers' housing court.

The existing windows in the property are replacements. The original pattern of the front façade windows is known through historic photographs. The applicant proposes to install one-over-one windows rather than replicate the original window pattern. The original pattern on the façade is as follows: first floor: twelve-over-twelve; second floor: six-over-nine; third floor: six-over-six.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Jessica Lamb represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated many of the windows on this courtyard were original at the time of designation. Since designation, many have been replaced, even though the Commission has not reviewed a permit application for front windows in 52 years. Although the existing windows in this building are one-over-one, the Commission has no record of a permit or approval for their replacement. Ms. Lamb stated that the one-over-one wood windows were in place when she purchased the property in 2003. Mr. Baron explained that the original windows would have had 4½ inch wide structural plank frames. The proposed windows do not.

Ms. Pentz explained to Ms. Lamb that the Commission guides owners toward restoration, even if the building in question has been altered from its historic appearance. Ms. Lamb stated that she prefers the one-over-one windows. Being at the end of the courtyard, there is no visibility of her front façade from the public street. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission has always treated the historic courtyards as public rights-of-way, even if they are technically private. Ms. Lamb noted that in a 1957 photograph of the courtyard shows that some of the buildings already had one-over-one windows. Mr. Baron observed that the one-over-one windows are non-historic; they are later changes. He pointed out that this building is not only individually designated, but is also significant to the district. Ms. Pentz stated that the sash had divided lights originally. Mr. Cluver stated that insulated glass would be acceptable, but that the exterior appearance of the divided lights with the correct plank frames should be recreated. Anything else would be inappropriate.

The Committee thanked the applicant for applying before doing the work as opposed to working first and then asking for legalization.

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

135 S. 17TH STREET

Owner: Ocean Properties, LTD

Applicant: Stanley Tang, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects

History: 1907, Latham Apartments

Designation: Significant to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Proposal: Replace storefronts, remove fire balconies, infill openings

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove late twentieth-century stone and aluminum storefronts and install glass and metal storefronts on the 17th and Walnut Street facades of this hotel. The applicants have provided three storefront options, which show different materials for the spandrel area and designs for the transoms.

Originally, the building had small residential windows at the ground floor. Later, the ground floor was converted for retail use. Two different stores with different storefront designs occupied the retail space historically. This space will now be consolidated into one store.

The applicants will retain the Art-Deco stone piers between the windows, which were added during the original retail conversion. Option 3 shows a storefront design using the small transom lights of the historic ornate design of the easternmost shop front on Walnut Street. Option 3 is preferred because it maintains a scale of detail consistent with the upper floors of the building and has a basis in the historic photos. Adding the decorative metal spandrel from Option 2 to Option 3 would make Option 3 even closer to the historic design as seen in the photographic evidence.

The plans show the removal of a non-historic green marble door surround at the main door and its replacement with a glass and metal system. The metal marquee over the door will be maintained. Two options for the skirt below the marquee are provided. One is canvas and the other glass. The staff recommends the canvas option as it is a less permanent intervention.

Black up-lights on the façade would be replaced with new lights that will match the color of the limestone.

The applicants propose to remove the balconies of the Philadelphia fire stair on the visible east façade of the building. These balconies are in very poor condition and would be very expensive to make safe. They propose to create an internal fire stair and close up the old door openings with either brick or metal panels.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the application with Storefront Option 3, the canvas skirt at the entranceway, and either type of infill where the fire stair is removed, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Juliette Lee and Donna Lisle, project manager Dan Bedesem, and hotel manager Matt McCauley represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked for a clarification of Mr. Baron's suggestion that the applicant should add the spandrel panel as shown in Option 2 to the Option 3 design. Mr. Baron explained that Option 2 calls for an ornamental spandrel panel, although it is not drawn in detail. Adding the decorative metal spandrel from Option 2 to Option 3 would make Option 3 even closer to the historic

design as seen in the photographic evidence. It would create a more solid floor line between the first and second floors as seen in the historic photograph.

Ms. Lee said that they drew a glazed spandrel panel in Option 1 and 3 to emphasize the two-story height of the masonry opening. After looking at the historical photograph, Mr. Cluver said that having the solid metal spandrel above the ground-floor storefront gives the second-floor vertical elements a base to rest on visually. He said that the lack of a solid spandrel leaves the second floor unresolved. He favored the idea of combining Option 3 with a more solid spandrel panel as seen in the photograph. He said that the dropped ceiling could be accommodated by creating a soffit behind the window. He said that signage could be incorporated into the solid spandrel. Ms. Pentz agreed.

Ms. Pentz commented that the new lights and the removal of the exterior fire stair were acceptable. The Committee members opined that the door openings should be infilled with brick. They did not recommend metal or stucco.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the Option 3 storefront, provided the skirt on the entrance canopy is canvas, the fire stair openings are infilled with brick, and the Option 3 storefront design is modified with a solid metal spandrel as seen in the historic photograph.

1508 GREEN STREET

Owner: C Tescher L.L.C.

Applicant: Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1852-3, architect Samuel Sloan

Designation: Significant to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Proposal: Legalize vinyl windows.

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize the installation of vinyl windows in this rowhouse, which is classified as Significant in the Spring Garden Historic District. As mitigation, the applicant proposes to install the correct wood brick molding around the windows. The applicant has supplied some economic data regarding the operation of this rental property to support his application, but has not provided a financial hardship application. The limited, incomplete information submitted does not demonstrate that replacing the vinyl windows with the appropriate windows would result in an economic or unnecessary hardship.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Agata Reister represented the application.

Ms. Reister said that the owner has provided an accounting of revenue and expenses. She also noted that the new windows were two-over-two vinyl sash. The condition of the frames under the flashing is unknown. Currently, there are eight double-hung windows on the façade. Ms. Pentz noted that this is a Significant building and contended that the correct windows should be installed. The proposed mitigation is not sufficient. She recommended denial. Ms. Reister stated that the installation was done by another company that only had a permit for interior work. It exceeded the scope of its permit and approval. She stated that her company was hired to reach a compromise and hopefully develop a timeline for the replacements. Mr. Cluver agreed with a

recommendation of denial, but explained that any timeline should be discussed with the Historical Commission, not the Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

617 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Ludwig Fontalvo

Applicant: Cuong Tran

History: c. 1990

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

Project: Cut new window openings, add windows, bay and balconies, replace front and garage doors

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the exterior of this building. The building is classified as Non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District. On the front façade, the applicant proposes to add a third bay of windows between the two extant bays at the second and third floors. The extant window openings would be enlarged. The cornice would be altered. Glass garage and front doors would be installed. A three-story, multi-light, angled bay window would be cut into the side elevation. The plans show balconies for the rear. However, no elevations or renderings have been provided for the rear elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Expediter Cuong Tran and designer Robert Pisani represented the application.

Mr. Pisani explained that the proposed side bay sits within the property line. He stated that he does not plan to install glass in the garage door, but rather a solid panel door with a color to match the front door. He described the proposed façade windows as metal clad. He stated the front door would have sidelights.

Mr. Cluver noted that the existing glass enclosure on the roof is not depicted in the renderings. Mr. Pisani explained that he did not render it because it is not within his scope of work.

Mr. Cluver asked about the existing side elevation. Mr. Pisani stated that there are single window openings. He added that the property line is away from the building. Mr. Cluver clarified that the property line location does not affect the Committee's review of historical appropriateness. Mr. Pisani stated that the protrusion and angle of the bay is to accommodate an interior U-shaped staircase.

Ms. Pentz stated that the application is proposing major changes to the exterior of the building. She noted that the drawings are inconsistent. She noted the differences in the garage door proposal. Mr. Pisani stated that the Committee should disregard the glass in the garage door. Ms. Pentz also noted the third-story addition in the drawing. Mr. Pisani stated that the addition exceeds zoning height restrictions and therefore should also be disregarded. Ms. Pentz explained that the Committee could not approve the documents because they are inconsistent with the actual plan. She added that, regardless of the inconsistencies, the proposal is out of character with the district.

Mr. Cluver explained that the fenestration within the Spring Garden Historic District is predominantly individual sash windows in a brick wall, like what currently exists at the building. He stated that increasing the size of the openings and adding an angled bay is inappropriate within the district.

Mr. Pisani asked if only this street was designated or if the district included other streets in the area, such as Mount Vernon Street. Ms. Sell confirmed that this street is in the center of the Spring Garden Historic District, which extends from Broad Street to Pennsylvania Avenue and from Spring Garden Street to Fairmount Avenue. Mr. Pisani asked the Committee what type of windows would be appropriate for a bay. Mr. Cluver stated that painted wood, simulated or true-divided-light, double-hung sash is an example of an appropriate window type for this district. He stated that a projection would not be appropriate. Mr. Pisani stated that there are many bay windows in the district. Mr. Cluver explained that because the building is non-contributing and the applicant demonstrates a trend of projecting bays in the district, the Committee could consider a compatible bay for the building. He stated that the applicant should submit photographs to describe the context of the building. Mr. Pisani stated that he could provide that documentation.

Mr. Tran stated that the building was erected in 1992 or 1993 and does not understand how it can be viewed as "historic." Mr. Cluver stated that the building itself is not historic, but changes to it must be compatible with the historic district. Ms. Sell explained that because the building is classified as Non-contributing to the district, the Committee reviews the application based on the impact of the proposed work on the district and streetscape. Mr. Tran addressed the phrase "not compatible with the streetscape and district in rhythm, materials, proportions, color, and scale" in the staff overview. He contended that the neighboring property has black windows. Ms. Sell responded that the large amount of glazing, not the color of framing material, is what "color" refers to in this sentence.

Mr. Cluver summarized that the Committee cannot analyze the context of this design without seeing examples from the neighborhood and how the proposal relates to those examples. Mr. Tran stated that they will take more pictures of the neighborhood and provide more consistent renderings.

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

538 N. 19TH STREET

Owner: 538 N. 19th Street LLC

Applicant: Frank Lauletta

History: c. 1859; mansard added, c. 1875

Designation: Contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize replacement of door and reroofing of mansard

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the replacement of a front door and the reroofing of the mansard.

According to the 2001 designation photograph, the building retained the original glazed and paneled double-leaf door and fish-scale slate shingles. In April 2007, the staff observed that a

contemporary single-leaf door had been installed and the shingles had been removed from the roof. The staff photographed the reroofing while it was underway. This work was done without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The staff subsequently requested violations.

At the same time, in April 2007, the staff also requested violations for the adjoining property at 540 N. 19th Street for the same illegal alterations. This application relates to 538 N. 19th Street only.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9, and the Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Frank Lauletta represented the application.

Mr. Lauletta acknowledged that the front door was installed illegally. He said that he is willing to replace it with an approved door. He stated the mansard roof was leaking and he hired a contractor to obtain permits and fix the roof. The contractor replaced the roof with rectangular slate shingles, not scalloped. He stated that there are no other mansard roofs on the block. He requested a compromise to replace the front door, but legalize the mansard roof alterations.

Ms. Pentz stated that it is rare for mansards to leak because of their steep pitches; a gutter or cornice tends to be the location of water infiltration. Mr. Lauletta explained that slates were missing, causing water to drop behind the roof and into the front of the building.

Mr. Cluver acknowledged that repairs may have been needed, but he contended that they should not have been undertaken without the Commission's approval and a permit. Mr. Lauletta stated that the leaks were a hazard and needed to be abated immediately. Mr. Cluver explained that he could have called the staff and received a quick approval for roof replacement, provided the roof was replaced in kind. Mr. Lauletta stated that he that he was unsure how long it would take to procure the replacement slate. Mr. Cluver explained that, if the applicant had submitted an application for roof replacement, the Commission would have guided him to the appropriate fish-scale slate shingle, not a rectangular slate shingle. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that a temporary cover could have been put over the roof while the shingles were obtained. Mr. Cluver agreed that a temporary cover could have been installed and a permit obtained. Mr. Lauletta opined that the new shingles are compatible with the building and that there are no other mansards on the block with fish-scale shingles. Ms. Pentz noted that its uniqueness is what makes these buildings so distinctive. Mr. Lauletta stated that he would like the Committee to accept his compromise. Mr. Cluver reminded the applicant that the Committee makes recommendations to the Commission based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Baron added that the dormers were altered. Ms. Sell stated that asphalt shingles were covering the dormers at the time of designation; those shingles were removed and panning was installed. Ms. Baron noted that that alteration was part of the roof replacement.

Mr. Cluver stated that the installation of the historically appropriate door would benefit the building. Mr. Lauletta asked if the Committee had a recommendation about the door configuration. Mr. Cluver stated that he can advise the staff on the details. Ms. Sell stated that the designation photograph shows the historic door configuration. Mr. Lauletta stated that there was an existing single-leaf door when he purchased building. Ms. Sell stated that the

designation photograph shows the historic door configuration. She explained that the door should have been replaced with a replica of the historic door.

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

2414 PANAMA STREET

Owner & Applicant: Gabriel Marabella

History: c. 1855

Designation: designated within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District 2/8/1995; Contributing

Project: Construct rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition. The addition would extend from the main block and fill in the space next to the rear ell. The roofline of the addition would extend up from the ridge of the roof of the main block, continuing the roof slope of the main block. The rear is landlocked and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The side is visible from Panama Street, owing to the vacant lot adjacent to this building. The addition would be finished with stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the roof does not extend higher than the existing ridge of the main block, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Gabriel Marabella and his father-in-law, Ihor Bojcun, a structural engineer, represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicants if they would agree with the staff recommendation. Mr. Marabella stated he would like to extend the roofline upward above the historic peak. He opined that to continue the roof would be architecturally more appealing than a flat roof. Mr. Cluver asked why the applicant did not want to match the pitch of the existing roofline. Mr. Marabella stated that the existing ceiling height is less than six feet and the room would not be functional, especially for a bathroom.

Ms. Pentz asked what the visibility of the addition would be from Panama Street. Mr. Cluver referenced a photograph of the side elevation and stated that the addition would look like a tower, as proposed. Mr. Marabella said he feels he is being penalized because the neighboring house burned down in the 1960s, making the side of his house visible. He claimed that neighboring homes have rear additions. He would like to add living space and value to his home. He claimed that his request is not unreasonable. He explained that many of his neighbors have added additions on the rears. Mr. D'Alessandro informed the applicant it is not unusual for the Commission to limit additions to the height of the existing roofline. Mr. D'Alessandro contended that the applicant is not being penalized. Mr. Marabella argued that other houses have additions of varying heights.

Ms. Pentz stated that there is a typical hierarchy of additions. They step down as they extend out the rear. Mr. Marabella argued again that, if there were a house in the neighboring lot, then his addition would not be visible. Ms. Pentz noted that sometimes the Architectural Committee has objected to additions that are taller than existing rooflines, even in areas where they are not visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Bojcun stated that Mr. Marabella went to a community

review board and asked if they would have reviewed the application based on similar standards. Mr. Marabella stated that the project was approved by the Center City Residents Association and received a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Ms. Sell clarified that those organizations have different scopes of review than the Historical Commission.

Ms. Pentz restated that there are many instances when the Committee has recommended that an addition be limited to the height of the existing roofline, even where there has not been public visibility. Mr. Marabella argued that that differs from the zoning that permits construction as high as 40 feet. Mr. Cluver clarified that zoning and historic preservation reviews are not always congruent; they have different standards. Ms. Sell added that the staff and the Committee work within the parameters of existing conditions rather than hypothetical conditions. Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee agrees with the staff regarding the height. Mr. Cluver stated that he would be in favor of allowing the roof to extend eight to twelve inches higher than the existing roofline to allow for proper flashing and transitioning. Ms. Sell explained that a flat skylight would be a detail that the staff could review and approve.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the roof of the addition is no more than 12 inches taller than the existing ridge of the main block, pursuant to Standard 9.

1706 PANAMA STREET

Owner: Robert & Jessica Maxwell Nacheman

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer

History: c. 1850

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

Project: Construct rear addition, install windows and door surround.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition with a parapet to hide mechanical equipment. The proposed parapet would rise over the ridge of the main block. The Standards suggest that the parapet should be no higher than the existing ridge. The rear of the property is landlocked and not visible from the public right-of-way. The staff will perform a site visit to determine the level of visibility of the side elevation from Panama Street.

In November 2009, the staff observed that single-light casement windows, door surround, and storm door were installed, paint was removed, and the masonry was pointed without the Historical Commission's approval or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. At that time, the previous owner and his architect approached the staff with a proposal for a rear addition and roof deck. The staff explained the illegal conditions on the façade. The architect stated he would submit an application to the Historical Commission proposing correction of some illegal conditions on the façade and construction of a rear addition. The staff agreed to postpone violations in anticipation of the submission. The application was never submitted and the property was subsequently sold. Now, the new owner and the new architect propose to install the correct historic windows and door surround.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ryan Lohbauer represented the application.

Ms. Sell introduced photographs that illustrate the minimal visibility from Panama Street. She stated that she used a zoom lens to take the photographs. She explained that she had some questions about possible front door replacement, but the site visit confirmed that only the storm door and door surround were replaced.

Mr. Lohbauer introduced the proposal, stating that the addition will include the expansion of the first-floor kitchen, addition of a second-floor bathroom, expansion of a third-floor space, and addition of a third-floor powder room. The addition will not be visible from the front façade. He clarified that the protrusion of the parapet over the roofline is to achieve a thirty-six-inch guard rail height; a safety feature requested by the client. He stated that they plan to rectify the illegal conditions on the front façade.

Ms. Sell stated that, prior to the site visit, she assumed that the railing would be highly visible; at the site visit, she learned that the rail would be less conspicuous. Ms. Pentz asked if the occupant planned to use the space as a roof deck. Mr. Lohbauer stated that the deck will be used to support condensers and the guardrail is a protective feature when accessing the units. Mr. Cluver asked how tall the condensers will be on the roof. Mr. Lohbauer stated that they would be covered by the parapet height. Mr. Cluver advised Mr. Lohbauer to be sure they will not be taller than the parapet once installed. He also suggested that an open railing would be less visually intrusive than a solid wall parapet. Mr. Cluver asked where the parapet would be constructed in relation to the existing chimney. Mr. Lohbauer stated the parapet would be behind the chimney. Ms. Pentz observed that the new addition and parapet would be minimally visible and have minimal impact, if any. Mr. Cluver opined that the new construction will only be perceivable by the neighbor.

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

3509 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: First Episcopal District AME church

Applicant: Thomas M. Holloman, AIA

History: house and carriagehouse c.1855, converted to school

Designation: Individually designated, 4/30/1963

Proposal: Demolish connector, build addition, alter windows and doors

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the conversion of a carriage house into residential units. The property includes an Italianate mansion house connected to the carriage house by a brick and wood structure and a large amount of green open space. The plan shows the demolition of the connector building as well as a single-story wing of the long carriage house. It shows the construction of a new single-story wing in its place of the existing one as well as several townhouse twins and a large parking lot. The façade alterations to the carriage house include closing up doors and windows and cutting new doors and windows in historic walls. It also calls for removing the slate roof and replacing it in asphalt.

The application is incomplete in that it is missing elevations for the end wall of the new addition to the carriage house and for the rear wall of the mansion house where the link building will be removed. It is also missing information about the new town houses which are only shown in the site plan. It provides little information on the parking lot's materials. The elevations that have been provided for the façade of the carriage house do not accurately reflect the existing

conditions and out of scale. The application form is incomplete in that it only cites work to the interior and new addition in the description of work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6, 9, and 10 and owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Stanley Merenu, Clarence Fleming, and architect Tom Holloman represented the application.

The applicants provided new architectural plans and other information to the Committee.

Mr. Baron reviewed the new plans and reported that the town houses are no longer included on the site plan. He added that the applicants have still not provided architectural drawings for the end façade of the addition or the rear elevation of the house. He explained that there is no information about how the mansion will be treated after the connector link is demolished. He said that the proposed plans still show the cutting of a significant amount of original fabric on the rear building. He said that, although the cutting of historic fabric is proposed for the south façade that does not face Brandywine Street, it is seen from the property and from Spring Garden Street across the yard. Mr. Baron explained that a former owner applied for a parking lot at the east end of the site several years ago. The Commission approved the parking application, provided that mature trees were retained and the paving material allowed grass to grow through it. The same solutions may be appropriate here.

In response to a question from Ms. Pentz, Mr. Baron explained that some information regarding the history of the property had been included the application. He said that the long rear building was once a carriage house, but had also been used as a school. Ms. Pentz noted the description that says the developer is seeking control of only the rear building, the carriage house, but the proposed work would impact the mansion house as well, owing to demolition of the link.

Mr. Holloman stated that they no longer are proposing the town houses. They are only proposing the alterations and addition to the carriage house and the parking in the court. To address some of the concerns, he asserted that the walkway link between the mansion and carriage house that will be demolished is not historical. He asserted that it was added in the 1960s or 70s. Mr. Baron stated that it appeared to be much older. He asked the applicants to provide evidence to support that date. Mr. Holloman introduced a State Historic Survey Form completed by the CLIO Group. He said that, although the form labeled the house and carriage house historically significant, it did not mention the link structure. He claimed that, if the walkway had any significance, it would have been mentioned. Mr. Baron said that the survey was not conducted by the Philadelphia Historical Commission. He contended that the lack of specific mention of the link does not mean it is not historic. He said that it would be possible to date the link from atlases. Mr. Holloman said that, if they are allowed to demolish the link, they would either install a door or stucco the opening where it connected to the mansion. Mr. Cluver stated that the drawings lack important details. Mr. Holloman said he did not think there had been windows on the section of the mansion where the link attaches, but he would install windows if the Committee recommended them.

Mr. Holloman said that he will retain the original character without any new openings on the Brandywine Street façade of the carriage house. He said the eaves and gutters are

deteriorating. The roof has some slate, but much of it is gone. He proposes to replace the slate roof with asphalt shingles.

Mr. Baron stated that the windows proposed on Brandywine Street are not based on documentation and do not seem appropriate. He suggested that the arched windows should be two-over-two units based on its Italianate style. He said that the staff could advise the applicants on the appropriate window details. Mr. Holloman said that he was basing the six-over-six windows on what he saw in the main house.

On the south façade of the carriage house, facing Spring Garden Street, Mr. Holloman said that they planned a doorway to each of the eight units. He said that the units are sized to fit the variable windows pattern. He pointed out the infill of the carriage entrances. He said there has already been damage to the façade with the infill. Mr. Holloman said they tried to orientate the doors within the infill. Mr. Baron pointed out that the new openings would not sit within the infill, but would be cut into original fabric. Mr. Holloman said the doors could be moved slightly to fit into the infill. Mr. Cluver said that the proposed rhythm of the doors responds to the interior plan. He said that the new doors should respond to the existing façade of the building. Mr. Holloman said he would follow the Committee's suggestions. Mr. Cluver suggested creating vestibules within the carriage openings to provide access to multiple units, rather than providing an exterior door for each unit. Mr. D'Alessandro said the original openings should dictate more of the plan, rather than the plan dictating the new openings.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Holloman to design the plumbing to minimize the number of penetrations in the roof.

Mr. Baron urged the applicants to work with staff and to try to find documentation for the windows. Mr. Holloman said he visited several archives, but was unable to find any documentation for the site. Mr. Baron explained that this project will also undergo a Section 106 review because it is federally funded. Ms. Ingald of the Commission's staff explained that she conducts Section 106 reviews for projects with federal funding that is channeled through the City's Office of Housing & Community Development. She noted that this building is classified as Significant in the Powelton Village National Register Historic District. Mr. Holloman said he was willing to meet with the staff.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and owing to incompleteness.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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.

New Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Placing functions and services required for the new use in non-character defining interior spaces rather than constructing a new addition;
Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed;
Recommended: Placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

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.