

**THE MINUTES OF THE 588TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**12 AUGUST 2011
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Duane Bumb, Commerce Department
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Hal Fichandler, Office of City Council President
Dominique Hawkins
Susan Jaffe
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Robert Thomas, AIA

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Heather Lutzker, Grayboyes Windows
Frank Mallas, Friday Architects
Juliet Geldi, North Street Design, LLC
Vic Barr, VLBJR Architects
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Jhanel Wilson, Nel Estates

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Bumb, Dilworth, Fichandler, Hawkins, Jaffe, Jones, Mattioni, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 587TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Schlotterbeck moved to adopt the minutes of the 587th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 July 2011. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2011

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Baron introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 2330 Pine Street and 642-48 N Broad Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 2330 Pine Street and 642-48 N Broad Street. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2107 SPRUCE STREET

Project: Replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadeline LP

Applicant: Frank Mallas, Friday Architects/Planners Inc

History: 1869; front façade altered in Moderne style, c. 1935

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: No

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to address an outstanding violation for the illegal installation of vinyl windows in the ground and second-floor window openings of this mid nineteenth-century townhouse. The property was significantly altered c. 1935 with the refacing of the ground-floor façade in a Moderne Style and the addition of a second-floor bay. The Moderne style façade showcased steel casement windows at ground and second floors. The steel casement windows were illegally removed in April 2010 and a violation issued soon after.

This is the second application presented to the Commission that proposes to address the violation. The applicant submitted an application in June 2011, which proposed the installation of one-over-one windows in the Moderne portion of the façade. The Architectural Committee recommended denial of this proposal and the Commission denied it. The applicant missed the Commission meeting and did not participate in the discussion.

The current application incorporates some of the comments received by the applicant at the first Architectural Committee meeting. The current proposal, however, falls short of meeting several key rehabilitation Standards. The proposal includes the installation of wood awning windows in the second-floor bay and wood double-hung windows at ground floor. All new windows would replicate the original muntin pattern. The applicant has not submitted any details of the original dimensions and profiles of the Moderne windows, even though evidence survives; the steel entry door and transoms in the bay are extant. The staff cannot determine how closely the proposed muntin and jamb details replicate the Moderne windows without more information. That key portion of the application is incomplete. It is safe to assume, however, that a wood window would not replicate the dimensions of steel windows. This difference would be quite

evident at ground floor, where the triple window is in close proximity to the Moderne steel entry door and both are at eye level along the public-right-of-way. The current proposal recreates an overall pattern, but presumably fails to replicate the proportions, profiles, and dimensions of the c. 1935 steel windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Frank Mallas represented the application.

Mr. Sherman asked if the application had been revised. Mr. Mallas responded that the application had been revised to conform to the recommendations of the Architectural Committee. He noted that he was distributing new information to the Commissioners for their review. He stated he proposed to replace the windows in the second-floor bay with new wood windows replicating the pattern of the 1995 photograph. He noted that the first-floor windows would be replaced with replica aluminum casement windows. Mr. Mallas clarified that they are installing two large casements rather than four smaller casements, which will make the project more economically feasible. Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicant for revising the application. She noted that the revisions addressed the concerns of the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application presented to the Historical Commission at its 12 August 2011 meeting, with the staff to review details. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 209-25 N 18TH ST

Project: Install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cathedral Basilica of Sts. Peter and Paul

Applicant: Robert Koochagian, O'Donnell & Naccarato, Inc.

History: 1846; Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul; John Notman and Napoleon LeBrun, architects

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: No

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace all windows that have clear glass with new extruded metal windows throughout the rectory of the Cathedral Basilica of Sts. Peter and Paul. Windows with stained-glass would not be replaced. The Roman Catholic Archdiocese proposed the identical replacement in May 2010. The application was presented to the Architectural Committee. The Committee recommended denial and the application was subsequently withdrawn prior to the Commission meeting.

The rectory is a fine example of Renaissance Revival architecture. The existing windows are double hung one-over-one wood windows. Several of them contain stained glass. The building sits on a prominent location at the intersection of Race Street and the Benjamin Franklin Parkway. The rectory along with the Basilica is part of the Parkway's architectural ensemble of grand public, civic, and religious buildings. Three of the rectory's facades are clearly visible from the public right-of-way; two of the facades are visible from the Parkway. The north façade is not visible from any public right-of-way.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards recommend the retention of historic fabric or its replacement in kind, if the material has reached its useful life. These windows could be successfully replaced in kind. The applicant notes in his cover letter that the extruded metal windows are proposed because they are the cheaper option and would require less maintenance.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Project manager Robert Koochagian represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant had not presented any evidence on the condition of the existing windows at the Architectural Committee meeting. She asked the applicant if he had any further documentation to submit. Mr. Koochagian responded that the application had not been augmented since the Architectural Committee meeting.

Mr. Koochagian stated that the windows needed to be replaced. He added that many sash are inoperable, and that the storm windows in front of the wooden windows were falling apart and pose a safety hazard to pedestrians. He stated that the replacement of these windows needed to be done in the near future. Mr. Koochagian stated that the Historical Commission had granted an approval for the replacement of the Basilica's storm windows and that the current application proposed to replace the Rectory's windows with the same window type in order to create a unified campus between the two main properties on the site.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant had looked at the possibility of replacing the windows with wood windows. Mr. Koochagians answered that the Architectural Committee had suggested that approach during the first review of this application and that they had looked into this option. He stated that the price difference between the proposed aluminum windows and wood windows was very significant. He also noted that the maintenance costs would be higher with the wood windows, which require regular maintenance.

Ms. Hawkins stated that an important concern raised at the Architectural Committee meeting was the fact that the rectory is an individually designated landmark building. She noted that the Commission has regularly required wood replacement windows in rowhouses, which are similar in scale to the rectory. She also noted that the pedestrian experience of the rectory is very different from that of the Basilica. Mr. Sherman agreed with Ms. Hawkins.

Mr. Koochagian asked if they replaced the windows with wood windows whether they would be permitted to install exterior storm windows over the new wood windows. Mr. Thomas answered that, typically, storm windows are permitted when the historic windows are maintained in place. He encouraged the applicant not to do this, since the new windows would be energy efficient and would not necessitate the installation of storms. Mr. Thomas stated that, owing to the one-over-one configuration of the windows, many manufacturers would be able to provide energy efficient windows that also meet the historical requirements. Mr. Baron offered to give the applicant a list of manufacturers of such windows.

Mr. Koochagian clarified that, owing to the size of the windows, they would have to be custom milled. He stated that the likely approach, if the aluminum windows are denied, would be to try to repair some of the existing windows and fabricate custom wood replacements for the others at a great cost.

Mr. Dilworth asked if the Archdiocese was contending that installing the appropriate windows would constitute a financial hardship Mr. Baron observed that no documents claiming financial hardship had been submitted.

Mr. Danta stated that the change in materials from the original wood to metal posed problems. He noted that the detailing of the window and the brick molding cannot be accurately recreated in aluminum, owing to the limitations of the material and the visible seams, which do not occur in wood.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant had financial and maintenance concerns as well as a desire to improve the energy efficiency of the windows. She noted that many of those issues could be addressed by retaining and upgrading the existing fabric or replacing the windows in kind, or with a combination of the two.

Mr. Koochagian said they are trying to maintain a level of consistency on all buildings. He noted that the shop drawings provided show a matching brick mold around all the windows.

Mr. Danta clarified that the proposed brick mold would be a stock profile, and that it does not replicate the dimensions of the original molding. Mr. Danta also clarified that the Historical Commission reviewed and approved new windows for the Cathedral, but those windows were protective storms over the stained glass windows located in the clerestory, the drum of the dome, and the apse. He noted that those windows were of a massive scale and very high off the ground. He stated that those windows could not be compared to the rectory windows since they are of a completely difference scale and design.

Mr. Sherman asked if a cost comparison had been done. Mr. Koochagian noted that the replacement of the windows in kind would cost an additional \$40,000. Mr. Danta reiterated that this application did not provide the requisite documents for consideration of financial hardship.

Mr. Thomas stated that, although part of the same complex, the rectory and the basilica are two very different buildings that read individually.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2330 PINE ST

Project: Restore exterior

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Owen Carton

Applicant: Andrew Curtis

History: 1855; major alterations, 1962

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: No

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate a rowhouse at the southeast corner of Pine and S. 24th Streets. The rowhouse dates to about 1855, but was radically altered in a Modernist style in 1962.

This is the second application submitted by the owner of this property. The first application was submitted on April 2011. That application proposed a hybrid design, which retained some of the Modernist features of the building while restoring some elements of the original mid-nineteenth century building. The hybrid approach was rejected both by the staff and the Architectural Committee. Instead, the Committee guided the applicant to choose between the retention of the Modernist alterations or a restoration of the mid-nineteenth century appearance of the building. The owner strongly wishes to restore his property to its mid-nineteenth century appearance. The owner has followed the Committee's guidance from the first review and now proposes a revised application that restores the building to its mid-nineteenth century appearance as close as possible.

The current proposal complies with the Committee's guidance and satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The revised design eliminates the Modernist double chimney on the Pine Street elevation. It retains one chimney, which is pushed back away from the cornice. The location of the relocated chimney restores an unbroken cornice line along Pine Street. Window openings on Pine Street would be reopened based on the evidence found in the historic masonry. The first-floor front façade on Pine had a storefront at one time, but traces of it were completely destroyed during the 1962 rehabilitation. The Pine Street elevation would be restored to a typical residential appearance. The 24th Street elevation would also be restored. Window openings would be reopened based on the evidence found in the masonry walls. The rear portion of the building dates entirely from 1962; the original rear ell was probably demolished at that time. The applicant proposes to create window openings along 24th Street that have the same proportions and pattern of the mid-nineteenth century windows in the rest of the building, thus unifying the entire elevation along 24th Street. The entrance to the building would remain on 24th Street. This configuration is supported by countless historic corner buildings, whose main entrances are located on the side elevations. The entire building would be restuccoed in a smooth stucco finish.

ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2003 DELANCEY PLACE

Project: Alter exterior

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Francine & Roberto Sella

Applicant: Juliet Geldi, North Street Design LLC

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the garage and greenhouse option H3, but denial of the infill of the rear openings and the installation of two-over-two windows and simplified French doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes work to the front and rear façades of this townhouse. The house was built in 1865 as part of a row. The prominent firm of Stewardson & Page altered in 1912 the house for then-owner George L. Harrison Jr. The alterations transformed the exterior of the building from its mid-nineteenth century Italianate appearance to an elegant Colonial Revival appearance.

The application proposes work to both front and rear facades. The front façade would retain its 1912 alterations and all window replacements would replicate the six-over-six pane configurations installed at that time. The fine Adamesque fanlight over the front door would be retained and restored.

The application proposes two designs for the rear alterations: an owner preferred design on page H3 and an alternative on page H7. The preferred design (H3) proposes to replace an existing and unsightly roll up gate with a garage. The garage would occupy the ground-floor of the property and have garage doors and a person door. The entire garage would be finished in red brick. The roof over the garage would be treated as an open-air deck with a small greenhouse addition to the east. The alternative option (H7) proposes a garage of the similar design, with the exception that the railing on the deck would be metal rather than solid masonry and the garage would be finished in stucco rather than red brick. The greenhouse remains the same in the alternative option. The garage faces Cypress Street, which is lined with garages and rear yards of myriad styles and designs.

Both options propose to alter rear façade masonry openings and the replace windows. These alterations are the proposed in the same way in both options. The alterations involve the replacement of six-over-six windows, which date to the 1912 Colonial Revival redesign, with two-over-two windows. The rear façade has triple double-hung windows at ground floor and triple French doors with a balcony at the second floor. The second-floor balcony and French doors are visible from 20th Street. The applicant proposes to infill the middle portion of these triple windows to create two independent windows. The muntin pattern on the French doors would be simplified and the existing balcony would be retained.

The 1912 alterations by Stewardson & Page are significant. The alterations were carried out holistically and incorporate both front and rear facades in a unified composition. If the 1912 Colonial Revival alteration is maintained at the front façade, it should also be maintained at the rear, especially, given that the rear façade is highly visible from 20th Street. The two-over-two pattern proposed for the rear façade windows is inappropriate because the rear façade itself probably dates to the 1912 alteration. Maps dating to 1910 and 1921 show that the building was

extended between those dates. The proposed pattern would create a false sense of history and style.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Juliet Geldi represented the application.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicant if she agreed with the recommendations of the Architectural Committee. Ms. Geldi answered her client is anxious to move forward with scheme H3 as recommended.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the garage and greenhouse option H3, but deny the infill of the rear openings and the installation of two-over-two windows and simplified French doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1710 WALNUT ST

Project: Install blade sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joan Keiser & Barbara Wasberg

Applicant: Betty Mon, Mon & Associates Consulting, Inc.

History: 1840; H.W. Catherwood House; alts, Furness & Hewitt, 1874; storefront, 1930

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: No

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 install a blade sign on the façade of this building on Walnut Street. The sign would be made of wood and mounted to an existing pole. However, the pole was not approved by the Historical Commission and is an illegal condition.

Projecting blade signs are not compatible along this Walnut Street commercial corridor. Additionally, the Art Commission prohibits all projecting signage along Walnut Street from river to river.

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

Ms. Sell distributed current photographs from 10 August 2011 of the property with the proposed sign installed onto the existing illegal pole and an additional bolt drilled into the façade. Mr. Schaaf noted that the property is within C-5 zoning that does not permit projecting signage.

Ms. Schlotterbeck asked if the Department of Licenses & Inspections would remove the sign. Ms. Sell stated that if the proposal were denied by the Historical Commission today, she would request that the Department perform an inspection and issue a violation for the illegal condition.

Mr. Sherman asked Ms. Sell if the existing McDonald's banners were legal. Ms. Sell responded that some banners on the block predate the designation; others are illegal.

Mr. Reuter asked Ms. Sell if this application was submitted in response to a violation. Ms. Sell responded that the application was submitted as a proposal for signage to the Architectural Committee. The installation of the signage occurred between the Architectural Committee meeting on 26 July 2011 and 10 August 2011.

Ms. Hawkins clarified that the existing pole was installed illegally by a previous tenant for a banner sign. She explained that the applicant proposed to reuse the pole for their sign, but was told at the meeting that the pole was illegal, and the Architectural Committee recommended denial. She added that the applicant chose to install the sign without the requisite approvals.

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

ADDRESS: 2136-42 E DAUPHIN ST

Project: Renovate building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2136 Dauphin Street Ventures, LLC

Applicant: Victor Barr Jr., VLBJR Architects, Inc.

History: 1896; 26th District Police Station; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 7/5/1984

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: No

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the door in the vestibule is wood and the front door is designed to reflect the original door seen in the 1900 photograph, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate the 26th District Police Station at the southwest corner of Dauphin and Trenton Streets in the Fishtown neighborhood. The building has been vacant since the 1970s. Although the building is sealed, the openings are missing windows and doors and the masonry has severely deteriorated at several places. This application proposes to create a first-story commercial space, nine residential condominium units on the second and third stories, and accessory spaces in the basement level.

The renovation proposes installation of wood windows, doors, and gates. The proposed windows would match the historic materials and configurations. On the front elevation, a photograph from 1900 shows some evidence of a wood double door with glazing and grates. The applicant proposes to install a glazed wood door with panels and sidelights. On the side elevation, the pedestrian entry doors were originally recessed into a vestibule with a gate at the masonry opening. The applicant proposes to install recessed full-light aluminum doors at the top of the vestibule stairs and a picket gate at the opening to maintain the historic entry configuration. The proposed gate is compatible with the building. The side elevation vehicular entrance was historically open. The applicant proposes to enclose it with glass and butt-glazed doors. There is little evidence of the historic door design.

The northern rear elevation historically shared a party wall with a three-story house. The house was demolished sometime after 1984. The outline on the party wall would be stuccoed. A stair

tower would be constructed in the courtyard at the southern rear elevation. An entry door with stairs would also be cut into the rear elevation within the courtyard. Two windows on the rear elevation would be infilled.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Victor Barr Jr. represented the application.

Ms. Sell distributed copies of the revised front door proposal. Ms. Hawkins noted that the revised front door design reflects the door in the 1900 photograph. Ms. Sell clarified that there is a modification to the original design owing to width constraints. She continued that the photograph depicts a double-door configuration with diamond panels and the applicant proposes a single door with a diamond panel and sidelights.

Mr. Barr explained that the width of the opening is not wide enough for a double-door that will create a code-mandated swing opening of 36 inches. He stated they tried to design a single-leaf simulated double-door, but it was not possible. He explained that they designed an alternative using the details of the diamond and glazing proportions of the original doors.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that, instead of a central door with two flanking sidelights, the applicant design a single door with one sidelight that is more portionally similar to the historic doors. She explained that the 36-inch door width could be maintained and the remainder width become one sidelight. Mr. Barr agreed to the suggested modification.

Mr. Thomas suggested the applicant visit the south side of the Reading Terminal Market where there is a good example of this type of door. It was installed owing to similar width constraints.

Ms. Schlotterback asked the applicant if he was the current owner. Mr. Barr answered the owner is under an agreement and will close shortly. He added that this approval is a contingency within the agreement prior to closing.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided the designs of the doors are amended as agreed upon at the Historical Commission meeting of 12 August 2011, with the staff to review details. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 421 S CARLISLE ST

Project: Legalize windows, shutters, and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kirsten Hontz

Applicant: Anthony Phelps, Delaware Valley Design

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 9/28/1965

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

Preservation Easement: No

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of wood windows within sub-frames and wood six-over-six muntins attached to face of the glass. The muntins are deeper

than the stiles and rails and there are no interior muntins or spacer bars. The sub-frame decreases the pane proportions. The application also proposes to legalize the installation of a non-historic two-panel wood front door and shutters. No manufacturer or specification information has been provided.

In July 2011, the staff observed the alterations in progress without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. A violation was subsequently issued.

The 1996 designation photograph shows the building with six-over-six wood windows, six-panel door, and historic three-panel wood shutters at the first story. The building also had two historic fire markers that were removed.

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

The Commissioners discussed the application and the Architectural Committee's recommendation and agreed that the proposal does not meet the Standards.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 411 S 18TH ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan Kristian

Applicant: William Middleton, WGM Architect

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: No

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, unless a mock up demonstrates that the deck and stair house would be invisible from all public rights-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a roof deck with stair house on the main block of the rowhouse at 411 S. 18th Street. The roof deck would cover most of the roof. It would be set back six feet from the front facade and would not be set back from the rear facade. The house is located in the middle of a short row of three houses. The row is bounded by streets on three sides. The staff contends that this deck will be conspicuous from public rights-of-way. The house currently has a deck at the second-floor rear.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the staff had received a telephone call from the applicant requesting a continuance; however, the request was for a different address, for which no application had been received. The staff directed the applicant to put the request in writing, but no letter, fax, or

email was received. Mr. Baron suggested that the Commission might grant a one-month continuance to allow the applicant to follow up on the request. Ms. Hawkins noted that, without a formal request, the Commission should act on the application.

Mr. Sherman asked if a Commissioner wanted to offer a tabling motion.

Ms. Schlotterbeck asked for more information about the application. Mr. Baron answered that he visited the site to inspect a mock up on the roof, but, after venturing to the roof, discovered that no mock up had been erected. He also noted that no one attended the Architectural Committee meeting to represent the application. The Committee recommended denial of roof deck unless a mock up shows that the deck would not be visible from the public right of way.

Ms. Jaffe asked if the Committee should have recommended denial of the deck unless a mock up shows that a deck would be inconspicuous, not invisible. Mr. Baron explained that the Committee recommended “invisible,” a stricter standard, because of the proposed location on the main block of the house.

Mr. Mattioni and Ms. Schlotterbeck stated that, with no applicant in attendance, the Historical Commission should simply adopt the Committee’s recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Schlotterbeck moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 14 S 03RD ST

Project: Construct building on site of demolished building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Binyan 14 South 3rd St. LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: 1894; Henry D. Dagit, architect; demolished after fire, 2004

Individual Designation: 5/5/1977

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a building on a vacant lot in Old City. A three-story, roman-brick, Renaissance Revival building stood on the lot. It was built in 1894 by architect Henry D. Dagit for John M. Doyle. In 1977, the building was individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It was classified as contributing to the Old City Historic District in 2003. The building was destroyed by fire and demolished in January 2004. The lot has remained vacant. The Commission has plenary jurisdiction, not review-and-comment jurisdiction, because the lot is not “undeveloped.”

The application proposes the construction of a five-story building. The first story of the front facade would be clad with metal panels for the storefront. The upper stories of the front façade would be clad in brick veneer and have one-over-one aluminum clad windows.

Stucco, sliders, and balconies are proposed for the rear façade. The north or side façade would be parged in stucco with scoring. Aluminum-clad one-over-one windows and an entry door are proposed for this façade as well.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mattioni recused owing to his firm's involvement with the property.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Historical Commission. He explained that the revised proposal was based on the Architectural Committee's comments. Attorney Michael Mattioni and architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated the revised design addresses all of the concerns raised by the Committee and thanked the applicant for his efforts.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the revised application as presented at the Historical Commission meeting of 12 August 2011, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 4259 VIOLA ST

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Nel Estates LLC

Applicant: Jhanel Wilson

History: 1895

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Contributing, 12/11/2009

Preservation Easement: No

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize recently-installed vinyl windows. Original wood windows, some with round and pointed arch tops, were removed without a permit or approval and vinyl windows with square heads, regardless of the opening shapes, were installed in their places. Numerous people called and one wrote to the Commission to complain about the installation of the inappropriate windows. A neighbor reportedly salvaged some of the original windows. The staff requested a violation, which has been issued.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Owner and developer Jhanel Wilson represented the application.

Using a photograph, Mr. Baron showed how the square windows cut across the arched window tops. He also pointed out the window material, vinyl, which does not meet the standards.

Ms. Wilson stated she had examined the original windows, which were saved by a neighbor, and concluded that they are deteriorated beyond repair. She provided several photographs of them. She also described the features missing from the windows. Ms. Wilson also displayed photographs of the neighboring properties and claimed saying the majority have vinyl windows. Some have wood windows. Others properties are vacant.

Mr. Baron noted the Commission recently designated the historic district. Any vinyl windows that predate the designation are grandfathered. The windows in question were replaced illegally after the designation of the historic district. Mr. Baron explained that as the grandfathered vinyl windows wear out, those owners will be required to replace them with wood windows of the

original design. In other cases in which vinyl windows have been installed since the district designation, then the Commission will request that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue violations. He asked Ms. Wilson to provide copies of the photographs so that he could compare them with the designation photographs to determine which, if any vinyl windows seen in them are illegal.

The applicant asked if anyone was permitted to retain illegal vinyl windows. Mr. Sherman responded that vinyl windows do not satisfy the Commission's standards.

Ms. Wilson explained that she had purchased the house in April 2011. She added the properties in the area are not expensive and that she has spent considerable money maintaining the property. She claimed that no one ever explained to her that the property was designated as historic. Ms. Wilson suggested that the previous owner did not know about the designation because the owner purchased the property as part of a large group of properties. Mr. Sherman stated that the seller should have disclosed this information. He also noted that Ms. Wilson should have learned of the designation as part of her due diligence as a real estate developer. Ms. Jaffe stated that Ms. Wilson would have learned of the designation if she had obtained a permit for the work. Ms. Wilson said that the only major work she undertook was the reconnection of the water and sewer lines.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she prepared the documentation for the Parkside Historic District. She opined that buildings in the district are a fabulous collection of houses. She told the applicant that she appreciated her efforts to maintain the house, but observed that one of the distinctive features of the house is the unusual shape of the windows. She explained to Ms. Wilson that the neighborhood organization is seeking to maintain the historic character of the buildings. Ms. Hawkins suggested that, if there are financial considerations, then perhaps the Commission can develop a plan that allows the applicant to replace them over time.

Ms. Wilson asked if she could retain the square-head windows on the first floor. Ms. Hawkins explained that they are highly visible from the public right-of-way and are not appropriate from a preservation perspective.

Mr. Baron suggested that Ms. Wilson retain the remnants of the original windows for a window manufacturer to use as a template or perhaps to repair for reuse.

Mr. Reuter advised the applicant that she will have an opportunity to appeal the Commission's decision if she disagrees with it.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 642-48 N BROAD ST

Project: Install windows and panning

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Corp. for the Aging

Applicant: Heather Lutzker, Graboyes Commercial Window Company

History: 1904; Snellenburg Clothing Factory; Francis Bros. & Jellett, engineers

Individual Designation: 4/29/1987

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the windows on the front façade of this large former industrial building with aluminum windows. The staff approved similar windows for the less significant north façade of the building several months ago. Wooden frames would be panned with an aluminum extrusion that matches the general form of the existing frames. The masonry to glass dimensions and the muntin sizes of the old and new windows would match one another closely. The current mix of various non-historic windows would be replaced in aluminum to match the original historic configurations. On large buildings, the Commission has sometimes required wood windows in place of historic wood windows up to a horizontal break that corresponds to the height of a rowhouse and allowed aluminum or other replacement material windows above. In this case, however, the historic windows do not exist at those levels; they were replaced with incorrect aluminum windows before designation. The original window material is also in some question; the building was described at construction as “fireproof,” which may mean that it had metal windows. For these reasons, an aluminum window that matches the historic design may be appropriate.

ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn at 10:02 a.m. Mr. Schaaf 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 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 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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

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

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

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.