

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

**TUESDAY, 23 MAY 2017  
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029  
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair  
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP  
Nan Gutterman, FAIA  
Suzanne Pentz  
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director  
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner I

**ALSO PRESENT**

Karen Thompson, Delaware River Waterfront Corporation  
Tom Fein, NV5  
Theresa Stuhlman, Philadelphia Parks & Recreation  
Joe Forkin, Delaware River Waterfront Corporation  
Dani Leiman, Blackney Hayes Architects  
Darin Jellison, Blackney Hayes Architects  
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects  
Robert Palladino, Landmark Architectural Design  
Nicholas McLyles  
Robert Woods, Mr. Contractor  
Robert Volpe  
Ray Rola, Raymond R. Rola, Architect  
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker + Partners Architects  
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker + Partners Architects  
Nicholas Connolly, Cecil Baker + Partners Architects  
Vincent Krakauskas  
Eric Heidel, (Re)Work Architecture & Design  
Ian Toner, Toner Architects  
Sara Shonk, Toner Architects  
Brent Zerr, Kleckner Laucks Architects  
Sarah Labov  
Bill O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office  
David S. Traub, AIA, Save Our Sites  
Paul Ryan, Ryan's Pub  
Cyndi Meadows, Ryan's Pub  
Pat Ryan, Ryan's Pub

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**ADDRESS: 1227-37, 1301 BEACH ST AND 1201-11 N DELAWARE AVE**

Proposal: Renovate path

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia Department of Public Property

Applicant: Michael Connor, NV5

History: 1827; Penn Treaty Park

Individual Designation: 3/9/2012

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to make numerous site improvements to Penn Treaty Park. The majority of the ground disturbance would be limited to portions of the park that built on disturbed land or fill from the 1987 expansion of the park. The application proposes to construct a promenade that will feature lighting, seating, and an asphalt path. Fill will be added to create a bermed lawn. The majority of ground disturbance appears to be limited to approximately three feet in depth for footings required to anchor fixtures such as lighting and benches. New trees and meadow plantings will also be added along the perimeter of the site.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided a professional archaeologist confirms that the ground disturbance will not adversely impact archaeological resources, pursuant to Standard 8.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Consultants Tom Fein of NV5, Karen Thompson and Joe Forkin of the Delaware River Waterfront Corporation (DRWC), and Theresa Stuhlman of the Department of Parks and Recreation represented the application.

Mr. Fein stated that he would like to present all of the project images. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he could do so briefly, but not in depth, as the Committee had already had a chance to review the materials. Mr. Fein distributed a revised Sheet 11.

Mr. Cluver asked the staff whether Penn Treaty Park was designated under the archaeological criterion. Ms. DiPasquale responded affirmatively, noting that it was designated under several Criteria, one of which was Criterion I. Mr. Cluver asked about the other Criteria under which the property was designated. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she believes the other Criteria relate to the significance around the Treaty Elm and the monument. Mr. Fein noted that those elements would not be disturbed by the proposed work. Mr. Fein explained that there is ongoing work for the monument and the playground that was previously reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission.

Mr. Fein drew the Committee's attention to a depiction of the former bulkhead line, noting that the deeper excavation proposed for the current project is limited to the area of fill below the former bulkhead line. Mr. Fein explained that that area along the shoreline was continually changed from the 1960s to the 1980s renovation of the park, so they are certain that they are

not disturbing areas that have not already been disturbed. He noted that the project would connect to a trail to the southwest as well as to the north. The northern connection would run along the former PECO station line in an area that was previously paved, while the southern connection would run off to the Sugar House Casino. Both areas are adjacent private parcels. The main design change within the park in this area is the large 30-foot wide promenade, which is lined by a low retaining wall that is designed to provide seating. There is a bicycle connection path just to the east that runs up to the paved area at Beach Street. The small change to the plans at Beach Street in the revised Sheet 11 results from an ongoing coordination with the Streets Department to provide a safe connection to the Beach Street bike lane. Mr. McCoubrey asked whether it would be a designated bike lane. Mr. Fein responded affirmatively.

Mr. Cluver commented that he believes the majority of the area of proposed work is outside of the bulkhead line, and asked when that was constructed. Mr. Fein responded that their records indicate that there were changes to that area up until the 1970s. Mr. Cluver explained that, since the project is being undertaken in a disturbed area and is not impacting the tree or monument or other parts of the site that seem to be critical to the significance of the property, he does not have any additional comments about the project.

Ms. Stein asked whether the applicants had hired an archaeologist to evaluate the potential impact of the project. Mr. Fein responded that they have not, but have been working with Parks and Recreation to accumulate documentation. Ms. Stein asked Ms. DiPasquale about the staff's recommendation of approval provided the applicants consult with a professional archaeologist. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Historical Commission does not have a professional archaeologist on staff, but agrees that the potential for the project to impact archaeological resources seems very low. Ms. Stuhlman noted that Parks and Recreation submitted documentation a few years ago for the playground project and the record documentation is pretty clear that much of what is now the park was heavily bulldozed in the mid to late-twentieth century. Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff would like the applicants to conduct an archaeological assessment now or whether the staff is suggesting that the work be monitored by an archaeologist while it is under construction. Mr. Farnham responded that, at the time the staff wrote the staff recommendation, the staff was unclear as to the amount of disturbance that had taken place at the site. Upon further review and the testimony of the applicants, he continued, it appears that the site is greatly disturbed, particularly where the excavation for the pathway would be conducted. The staff, he stated, would be willing to withdraw the recommendation that a professional archaeologist review the application provided that there is confirmation from the applicants that the areas of ground disturbance were previously disturbed. Ms. Stein questioned the depth of the ground disturbance. Mr. Fein responded that they would be limiting the ground disturbance to three-and-a-half feet for the light poles and the seating. Mr. Cluver noted that trenching would also be necessary for electrical conduit. Mr. Fein responded that the lighting is solar powered and would require no trenching. Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification about the location of the fill. Ms. Stuhlman explained it to her visually, noting the location of a pier historically. Ms. Gutterman asked if the piers were removed or if the space between them was infilled. Mr. McCoubrey noted that he was having difficulty understanding where exactly the bulkhead line was in relation to the proposed work. Mr. Fein directed the Committee members to Sheet 2, pointing to the paths for orientation. Mr. Fein noted that the majority of the proposed work is near the existing shoreline, which was constructed on riprap.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 8.

**ADDRESS: 2301 MADISON SQ**

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Nicholas Melisiotis

Applicant: Christopher Stromberg, S2 Design

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 9/28/1971

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to demolish the rear walls of this corner property on Madison Square and to construct a two-story addition that would occupy nearly the entire parcel. The application proposes to demolish and reconstruct an historic wood-frame portion of the building and construct an addition filling in below and to the rear of the frame section. The first-floor rear wall would be demolished for the addition. The new addition would be clad at the first floor in limestone panels, and at the second floor in metal panels. The addition would be readily visible from S. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street.

The unusually-shaped existing frame portion of the building appears to be original to the building, as this form is evident on nearly all similar Madison Square properties. The Historical Commission has previously approved the infill of the first-floor notch below the frame portion, provided the cladding of that infill is distinguished from the cladding above.

The application also proposes to restore many elements of the building to their historic appearances, including the restoration of the masonry and the replacement of windows and doors. The staff notes that the details of the doors and windows may not all be correct as shown, and will need to work with the applicant to revise some details.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the demolition of the rear walls and construction of the addition, except the infill of the first-floor notch below the existing frame portion of the building, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9 and 10; and approval of all restoration work, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Christopher Stromberg and owner Nicholas Melisiotis, who arrived approximately halfway through the review, represented the application.

Mr. Stromberg distributed revised floor plans. He explained that the revised drawings include the retention of the majority of the existing exterior walls, which would be encapsulated within the addition, in the event that the addition would be removed in the future. He noted that they have attempted to cut down the existing window openings as passageways, with one new opening through the first-floor wall. He noted that they also propose to align the addition with the existing wood frame portion of the rear, which would be removed and reconstructed. He directed the Committee's attention to Sheet Z.1, the proposed north elevation, noting that the cladding and cornice of the existing frame portion of the building would be reinstalled after the

structure is reconstructed. He explained that the limestone and the metal panels of the addition would be constructed in the same plane as the existing frame portion of the building, but there will be a four-inch reveal separating the pieces. A new six-inch wood post would be expressed in place of the existing historic support for the frame portion of the building. The rear yard fence would be removed and replaced with a sliding barn door.

Mr. Stromberg explained that they are doing considerable restoration work to the building as well, including accurate replacement windows and masonry restoration, the removal of non-historic shutters, the re-opening of three blocked-up basement windows. He noted that they are also proposing to replace the front door with a true double-door, not a single door that looks like a double door. Ms. DiPasquale noted that there are some details shown that do not replicate the historic doors, but the staff can work with the applicant to refine them.

Mr. Stromberg noted that they understand that it is a corner property and that the addition would be visible, but that one of the goals is to go to great lengths to restore the other facades. The addition would be set back six inches from the main plane of the building, and be clad in light materials so that the colors do not compete with the red brick or the dark grey scalloped frame portion of the building, Mr. Stromberg explained.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the siding on the frame portion of the building is original. Mr. Stromberg replied that it appears original, as does the four-inch wood siding of the first-floor frame section of the building. Mr. Stromberg noted that they assume it is original because many pieces of the historic building are intact, and that sort of siding is found on other buildings on the block. Mr. Cluver opined that it would be unusual for 150 year old wood siding to be intact, but that it is clearly old. Ms. DiPasquale noted that there are other frame additions like these, most of which have the lap siding.

Mr. Cluver stated that the one thing that strikes him when looking at this proposal versus the 2330 Madison Square example the applicants have used is that 2330 is much “calmer”; there is a single thought for the frame portion and frame addition. Mr. Cluver opined that the current proposal is “jumpy,” with numerous types of materials used in a small area. He opined that he would feel more comfortable if all the moves could be calmed down. He suggested that perhaps a better design would be to leave the existing notch intact and to construct a coherent two-story addition along the property line, in place of the currently proposed open area. He noted that that would retain the memory of the historic entrance. He observed that it would not change too much of the function of the space, except perhaps precluding the ability to have a grill outside. He noted that a grill should not be located under an addition. Mr. Stromberg responded that one of his original thoughts was to keep the notch, but the client’s programmatic desire is to have an enclosed area off the kitchen as a mud room. He noted that they would be willing to explore Mr. Cluver’s suggestion.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff feels limestone is an appropriate material for this neighborhood. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff does not believe the cladding material is appropriate, nor the general massing of the addition, which destroys historic spatial relationships. Mr. McCoubrey asked if Kauffman Street is a public right-of-way. Ms. DiPasquale responded that it is a service alley, but is publicly accessible. Mr. Stromberg noted that they are not wed to the use of limestone, but was an attempt at using a light-colored material.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he agrees with the staff's recommendation that this building has a characteristic shape that is unique and that the relationship of the wood frame to the L-shaped main block is a significant feature of the block. He also noted that the addition would be highly visible.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the neighboring building on Kauffman Street. Mr. Melisiotis responded that the neighboring property has a stuccoed first-floor addition nearly built out to the property line. Ms. DiPasquale asked if the applicants had received their zoning variance for lot coverage yet. Mr. Stromberg responded that they are getting ready to submit for a zoning approval, but wanted to go through the Historical Commission process so that there would not be too many revisions during the zoning process.

Ms. Stein discussed the aerial photograph that shows the context of the neighborhood. She stated that she is in agreement with Mr. McCoubrey that the notches in the footprints of the buildings all along the Madison Square are a significant feature, and that the proposed addition destroys that spatial relationship. She noted that this property is individually designated. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that each building along the block is individually designated, forming a sort of de facto historic district. She explained that they were designated in the early 1970s, before the Historical Commission had the authority to designate districts. Ms. Stein stated that she opposes the alteration of the original design of the building. She noted that she understands that approvals have been made for the infill at the first floor below the frame portion of other buildings, and that she would accept that, but the current proposal completely changes the architecture of the building.

Mr. Stromberg opined that this is a small property, and that they are trying to gain second-floor square footage. He argued that other additions have been constructed along the block. He opined that the project attempts to respect the architecture of the existing building but still gain additional square footage. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she believes that most, if not all, of the additions along the block were constructed prior to designation, with the exception of the approved first-floor infill at 2330 Madison Square. She stated that she did not see any evidence of Historical Commission approvals of additions of this scale. Mr. Stromberg argued that there are other additions on the block. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she would be happy to look back through the Commission's files again, but that those additions appear to have been constructed prior to designation. Mr. Stromberg clarified that he did not mean that the additions were approved by the Commission.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that this property is nearly in its original form. Mr. Stromberg opined that they are offsetting the negative impact of the addition by restoring the other facades of the building.

Mr. Melisiotis stated that he has lived in other houses on this block for six years, and that there are few buildings that have remained original. He argued that many people have filled in the notch underneath the frame portion of their houses, others have expanded the second floor as well, and half way down the block there are some three-story buildings. He opined that it is difficult to live in a small building and that, by constructing the addition at the back, the interior configuration will flow better. He reiterated the intent to restore the other facades. Mr. McCoubrey responded that those details can be worked out with the staff, but that the Committee needs to focus on the proposed addition. Mr. Stromberg responded that he believes it is important for the Committee to look at how much of the existing masonry walls are

proposed to be retained within the addition. He opined that the revised plans show the addition attaching as delicately as possible to the existing house.

Ms. Stein noted that she had concerns about two other elements of the application, the expansion of the basement wall, and the removal of the chimney. She noted that the chimney appears to be a significant architectural feature, and that the current proposal seems to remove a significant amount of that fabric. Mr. Melisiotis responded that his intention is to restore the chimney at the roof level, taking it down brick by brick and rebuilding it. Mr. Stromberg clarified that the chimney is not necessary on the interior anymore, so it would be removed on the interior and reinforced at the roof level.

Ms. Gutterman reiterated Ms. Stein's question about the basement wall. Mr. Stromberg responded that the first-floor masonry wall would be supported by a steel beam, and that the expansion of the basement is to create a flow around the basement stair. Ms. Stein noted that the basement would be above-grade, so if the addition was not approved, that portion of the basement would not be allowed. Mr. Stromberg noted that the basement rises 2'-6" above grade.

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

At Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Cluver's suggestion, the Committee members unanimously agreed that they would recommend denial of the addition portion of the application, except for the infill of the first-floor notch below the existing second-floor frame portion of the building. Mr. Cluver solely clarified that his vote of denial was based on design as presented. He asked whether his fellow Committee members shared his opinion that a solid two-story addition may be appropriate. Ms. Gutterman replied negatively, noting that she believes that infilling the historically open space from the ground up fundamentally changes the design of the building and sets a bad precedent for future projects. She opined that infill of the notch below the existing frame portion of the building does not fundamentally change the historic building, but that she is opposed to the construction of an addition in what is now open space. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Gutterman, noting that the massing of the existing building is a character-defining feature. He also noted that he also recommended denial owing to the high visibility of the proposed addition. All Committee members except for Mr. Cluver agreed with Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey.

Mr. Melisiotis argued that he does not understand how this addition takes away from the neighborhood, and that every single house on this block has been modified. Ms. Gutterman responded that that is all the more reason to retain the original character of this building, and that it is likely that the buildings were modified prior to designation. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Committee's recommendation is consistent with previous Historical Commission approvals. Ms. DiPasquale clarified for Mr. Melisiotis that, before he arrived, she had noted that the only application and approval for an addition that she saw in the Commission's files for these blocks was for the infill of the first-floor notch at 2330 Madison Square. Mr. Melisiotis expressed his shock at the Committee's recommendation, and stated that he feels he is being penalized, when everyone else has gotten to do something and opined that other property owners circumvented this process. Ms. DiPasquale responded that other additions may have been constructed prior to designation and been grandfathered in. Ms. Gutterman noted that the Architectural Committee's recommendation is advisory to the full Commission.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration portion of the application, including the reconstruction of the chimney, with the staff to review details; and denial of the addition portion of the application; pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9 and 10.

**ADDRESS: 2400 PINE ST**

Proposal: Demolish building, construct new building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Jacob Cooper and Natalie Aronson

Applicant: Jacob Cooper

History: 1963; Norman Rice home and office; Norman Rice, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to demolish the existing non-contributing one and two-story building that runs between Pine and Waverly Streets along S. 24<sup>th</sup> Street and to construct a two and three-story building in its place. The application seeks in-concept review of the design for the new construction. The proposed building would be two stories in height along Pine Street, with a third-floor stepping up approximately one-third of the way along 24<sup>th</sup> Street. A deck would be located on the second-floor roof. The proposed building would be clad in white brick and feature large steel windows and large zinc-clad projections into which would be set aluminum curtain-wall windows and slatted shading devices. The building would be combined with the property at 2403-05 Waverly Street, which is outside of the historic district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the overall height and massing of the proposed building, but denial of the cladding, fenestration, and other features, which are not compatible in materials, color, size, scale, and proportion with the historic residential buildings in the historic district. The proposed building appears to find inspiration in industrial buildings, but the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District is largely devoid of such buildings. While the Standards require new construction to be both differentiated from and compatible with the surrounding historic environment, the proposed building favors differentiation. The design should be revised to be more compatible with the surrounding historic district.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Darin Jellison and Dani Leiman represented the application.

Mr. Jellison noted that the fabric of the neighborhood is characterized by two- and three-story residential buildings, and the massing of this proposal respects those characteristics. He opined that the neighborhood is also somewhat of a patchwork quilt in size, scale, rhythm, and proportion. With a building of this size in the neighborhood, he noted, they are trying to break up the massing. He noted that the staff comment about the industrial nature of the project is accurate in that the owner is inspired by some more industrial projects around the neighborhood, particularly the 2400 block of Lombard Street, outside the historic district. Being a young couple, the owners are interested in making an intervention that speaks to their new generation. Mr. Jellison explained that the owners have been actively engaging the neighbors to understand their feelings, and the plan and elevations presented are part of that ongoing dialogue.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the property is already accessible from 24<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Jellison responded that the existing building has nine garage doors along 24<sup>th</sup> Street.

Ms. Gutterman noted that what would normally be the front of the proposed house along Pine Street is actually the rear in this proposed design. She asked whether the staff had any opinion on the appropriateness of the use of the second-floor roof along Pine Street as a deck and its relationship to the houses along Pine Street and visibility from Fidler Square. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff did not have an opinion on the deck or massing so much as with the materials and fenestration. Mr. McCoubrey noted that one would expect three stories as opposed to two stories along Pine Street. Mr. Jellison responded that the deck was in response to the owner's desire to participate with Fidler Square from the outside. Ms. Gutterman opined that it sets a precedent for property owners who want decks on the front of their houses. Ms. DiPasquale responded that this will be a new building, not a historic building, and a deck should not be automatically precluded. The Historical Commission objects to the construction of a deck on a historic building when the deck would adversely impact the appearance of the historic building, but the Historical Commission is not inherently opposed to decks. Decks, including decks that are visible from the public right-of-way, may be acceptable on new construction. Ms. Gutterman agreed, but noted that this is a corner property on 24<sup>th</sup> and Pine, the more prominent corner, where one would expect the larger, primary massing of a building. Pine Street should be treated as the front of the house, not the rear. Mr. Jellison responded that the width of the lot at Pine Street is only 16 feet, which makes a residential project difficult to program.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant had any response to the staff's comments about the industrial nature of the proposed design and materials. Mr. Jellison responded that they are trying to break the project up into smaller pieces. He noted that 24<sup>th</sup> Street is a wide street that is largely flat and without detail, and that it is his client's desire to create a more modern intervention that pokes its head out on each façade. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff appreciates the attempt to break up the façade, but felt that the massing of the elements was too heavy-handed for the residential district. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the massing on Waverly Street is done nicely. Mr. Cluver agreed with the staff that the zinc-clad two-story element along 24<sup>th</sup> Street is a big move on a relatively intimately-scaled street. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the thickness of the zinc framing is part of the issue, and that a thinner expression of that element might be more appropriate.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the use of white brick, noting that Philadelphia is a city of red brick. He opined that white brick is overly stark. Mr. Jellison responded that clean and crisp is the goal. He noted that they are considering a coating for the brick, but that the client is very set on white brick. Ms. Gutterman responded that the materials need to be appropriate to the district, which is characterized more by red brick and light trim than by large, white structures. She noted that she appreciates the presence of a door along the Pine Street elevation, even though she does not quite understand its purpose if it is going into a bedroom. She opined that it feels forced. Mr. Jellison responded that he understands the impression of the neighborhood as red brick, but noted that several nearby buildings along Waverly Street have been painted white. Ms. Gutterman responded that those are also painted brick, and that she would not recommend using a white brick or painting brick white. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the district boundary jogs around this property, and the examples Mr. Jellison is citing are outside of the district. Regarding the Pine Street door, Mr. Jellison explained that they are in the early stage of the design process, but the rationale right now is the possibility of an au pair suite or guest

entrance. Mr. Jellison asked whether painted white brick would be preferable to solid white brick. Ms. Gutterman responded that she believes that painting masonry is a bad idea in general. She questioned whether a buff-colored brick would accomplish the client's goal without the inappropriate starkness of white. She noted that the building that the client likes at 24<sup>th</sup> and Lombard is a dark tan color as opposed to white. Mr. Jellison responded that they have had that discussion, but that the owner prefers white. Ms. Gutterman commented that it is a very large volume to be bright white, when the examples they have provided are of a much smaller scale.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there were any other options considered for the industrial-looking curtain walls. She noted that she does not understand the combination of the curtain walls with the punched openings. Mr. Jellison responded that they could do some refinement to make it less heavy.

Ms. Stein commented that it would be helpful to see these elevations rendered with the surrounding context in order to better understand the scale, fenestration, and materials in relation to the neighboring buildings. She noted that the Waverly Street elevation seems more appropriately scaled. She noted that the 24<sup>th</sup> Street elevation is the size of eight rowhouses. She explained that this is a review in-concept, and that she thinks the applicant is hearing the same thing from all of the Committee members, and that is that the proposed design needs additional work to help it relate better to the context of the historic district. She noted that neighbors may not understand the drawings fully until the building is built.

Mr. McCoubrey explained that he understands the programmatic reasons for the design, but that, contextually, he would prefer to see more massing on the Pine Street side, perhaps with a lower hyphen in the middle, and then taller massing again along Waverly Street. He reiterated the appreciation for the modulation of the building.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Neighbor and architect Charles Loomis commented that the reason many of the nearby buildings are painted is that they have salmon brick, so the options are to paint and maintain or to stucco the brick. He noted that he has met with the owner, but has not seen plans nearly as developed as the one presented to the Committee. He noted that he and his wife do not necessarily oppose the construction. He noted that the current nine garages detract from the pedestrian life of the street. He stated that it will be a positive for the neighborhood to gain some trees and parking. However, he argued that the construction of an overscaled, white brick commercial-type building is not appropriate in this neighborhood. He expressed a desire for a design that feels more residential. He noted that one of the precedents cited on Lombard Street is an old carriage house, which is a heavy timber building and has a whole different kind of language than the proposed building. He explained that there is a language to the industrial infrastructure that remains in the neighborhood, which is, from a quick glance, very different from this design. He noted that, while he does not have a problem with the existing building being demolished, there was a language to express the materials and structure when the Norman Rice building was constructed, and, even though there are a several garages, the design was a gift to the city. He challenged the architects to make sure that they make a gift back to the city, and not another big white building with metal bays. He asserted that this is an opportunity to develop a significant, heroic building at a residential scale, which is different than other buildings being constructed.

After Mr. Cluver's motion to accept the staff recommendation, Ms. Gutterman reiterated her preference to see the primary massing shifted from Waverly Street to Pine Street. Mr. Cluver agreed that that would be better, but also accepted the current massing.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the overall height and massing of the proposed building, but denial of the cladding, fenestration, and other features, which are not compatible in materials, color, size, scale, and proportion with the historic residential buildings in the historic district. The proposed building appears to find inspiration in industrial buildings, but the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District is largely devoid of such buildings. While the Standards require new construction to be both differentiated from and compatible with the surrounding historic environment, the proposed building favors differentiation. The design should be revised to be more compatible with the surrounding historic district.

**ADDRESS: 1116 PINE ST**

Proposal: Construct decks at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Redworth Dev. LLC

Applicant: Ken Spector, Mr. Contractor

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 6/16/1970

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize work that has commenced and to allow for the completion of the construction of two decks at the rear of this property along Waverly Street. Several changes to the rear of the building have occurred over the last several years without review by the Commission. A deck at the second-floor rear was removed circa 2015, and it appears that the second-floor rear window opening was partially infilled at that time. It appears that the current doors at the second and third floors were installed circa 2013, at which time this property's half of the chimney at the third floor was also removed. The current siding at the rear appears to have been installed in 2016.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the two rear decks, provided the second-floor window opening is restored to its original size and a historically appropriate window installed, and the siding is removed and the walls returned to stucco, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Rob Woodson represented the application. Mr. Woodson noted that he was sitting in for contractor Ken Spector, who was unable to attend. He stated that he would observe but not participate.

Mr. Cluver noted that the staff recommendation does not address the removal of the chimney. Ms. DiPasquale noted that she was not familiar with that part of the application. Ms. Gutterman inquired about the staff recommendation for approval of the decks, and whether that was owing to the fact that the staff would have recommended approval had the applicant come to the Commission prior to commencing construction. Ms. DiPasquale replied affirmatively. Mr. Cluver

noted that the Commission typically would not approve the removal of a chimney, and questioned whether the chimney was visible from the street. Ms. DiPasquale responded that it appears that the chimney is visible from the street, but that it was not an elaborate chimney, nor was it one of the primary chimneys of the building. Ms. Pentz asked if there was a photograph of the chimney removed. Ms. DiPasquale directed her to the photographs in the application materials.

Ms. Stein inquired whether there were drawings of the proposed deck railing. Ms. DiPasquale directed her to the last sheet of the materials and the note that indicates four-inch spindle spacing. Ms. Gutterman noted that there is no elevation. Ms. Stein commented that it does not appear that the ends of the deck joists are capped, and that she would be opposed to leaving the ends exposed. She also noted that it appears the deck might cantilever over the edge of the addition below. Ms. DiPasquale noted that it appears there is an addition and then a steel beam that sits out from the addition. Ms. Stein asked whether that beam was added. Mr. Woodson responded that it is existing and was used to support the deck that was there previously.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the decking shown in the photographs is for the new deck. Mr. Woodson responded affirmatively. Ms. DiPasquale noted that it is her understanding that much of the work was completed by a previous contractor.

Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the second-floor deck would align with the deck of the neighboring property. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she is not sure exactly how the two decks would align, but that it appears it is proposed to be a six or eight foot deck. Mr. Woodson replied that he believes it is under six feet. Mr. Cluver noted that the drawings appear to show a six-foot second-floor deck and a twelve-foot first-floor deck. Mr. Cluver opined that he would not anticipate that the second-floor deck would extend past the existing neighboring deck. Ms. Gutterman noted that the deck plan says five feet six inches in one place and six feet in another.

Ms. DiPasquale noted that the rear of the property had been stuccoed before, so presumably the siding could be removed and the stucco reexposed and repaired, if necessary. Ms. Gutterman asked if the building was also stuccoed at the first floor. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she does not know, as it is tucked away and difficult to see from the street.

Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification as to whether the applicants intended to reinstall the lattice that had been on the previous deck. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she does not believe so; it is her understanding that the deck would only be enclosed by a wood spindle railing.

Ms. Pentz opined that the addition of the decks is something that the Committee might consider acceptable, but not the changes to the openings or the adding of siding.

Ms. Gutterman noted that it appears that the chimney was cut in half. Mr. Cluver replied that that is the chimney that was mentioned in the overview.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the two rear decks, provided the second-floor window opening is restored to its original size and a historically appropriate window installed, and the siding is removed and the walls returned to stucco, the removed chimney is reconstructed in masonry or

stuccoed with an alternative interior framing structure, that the deck at the second-floor not extend beyond the neighboring deck, and that the decks include a cap board at the end of the joists, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**ADDRESS: 101 W HIGHLAND AVE**

Proposal: Construct addition; renovate historic building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia Department of Public Property

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker and Partners

History: 1894; Chestnut Hill Fire Station; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 7/10/2015

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to renovate the historic Engine 37 fire station and construct an addition on adjacent land to house modern apparatus. The proposed addition is a one-story, two-bay structure that is linked to the existing building with a connector. An existing window opening will be enlarged vertically to allow passage from the connector to the existing building. The volume of the new addition will be clad primarily in a smooth stone similar to the banding on the existing building. The connector is primarily glass, allowing for visibility of the street from the watch room. The historic building currently contains non-historic doors in its two narrow bays. This application proposes to install reproductions of the original bay doors, with one leaf remaining operable to allow for the public to enter the fire station.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Cecil Baker, Eric Leighton, and Nicholas Connolly of Cecil Baker + Partners and Vince Krakauskas of Capital Programs, City of Philadelphia, represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee members are familiar with the submitted materials and reminded the applicants that they have 15 minutes for the review.

Mr. Baker remarked that the Windrim building is very beautiful and noted that he and his team wanted to adjust the contemporary building blocks that were part of the Windrim architecture, which, he described, is an architecture that “plays symmetry against asymmetry.” The façade, he continued, is very rich and he did not want to “ape” the major forms, angles, or curves. Instead, Mr. Baker stated, he took the simple orthogonals of the building and reflected them as if the building were being reflected in pools of rain. He asserted that he knew it would be a low building next to a relatively tall building and that the addition would be quiet to address very basic motions. The most important aspect to the front elevation, he explained, was maintaining the idea of the gap that used to exist between the original fire house and the now-demolished police station. Mr. Baker further clarified that he wanted the space to be absolutely solid glass with no other materials, so it appears as a void, despite the inside space being the key to the fire station. It would also be the one piece of the fire station that would be lit day and night as a beach to the neighborhood, he noted.

Mr. Leighton presented specific aspects of the scheme to the Committee. He clarified Mr. Baker's reference to the police station that previously adjoined the fire station and explained how his team arrived at the present scheme. Mr. Leighton stated that his team worked with the Philadelphia Fire Department and Department of Public Property and that the project evolved from their initial proposal, which was a two-story addition directly adjoining the historic structure in order to accommodate program-required parking for the fire department. He added that they then considered no parking, which was met with strong opposition from the Fire Department staff. The result, he continued, was to pull the apparatus bays as far from the historic building as possible and then insert a lower connecting element between the new bay and existing structure. Mr. Leighton detailed their work with the community, including the Chestnut Hill Civic Association and Chestnut Hill Conservancy, which he described as positive. The result is the current scheme, he stated, which accommodates the parking requirements between the new building and the property line with minimal impact. He contended that, at many fire stations around the city, firefighters park vehicles on the site, squeezed in as tightly as possible and argued that firefighters are familiar with moving the vehicles in these tight conditions, especially given the existing building. The placement of the parking area, he continued, allowed the team to keep the apparatus apron as far from the historic structure as possible and then introduce the low program elements in the middle. Mr. Leighton noted that the existing overhead doors at the historic fire house would be removed and the original doors would be recreated based on photographs and staff input. He explained that the doors closer to Shawnee Street would remain in a permanently closed position with a wall at the interior, as would the right leaf of the adjacent set of doors. The left leaf, he added, would be hinged and kept in an open position to create an entry porch that will lead to a vestibule. Mr. Leighton then described some of the interior spaces proposed in the application.

Mr. Cluver observed that in the rendering, the thresholds of the entry doors appear to slope to the apron. He asked whether the slope is an actual condition or a rendering error. Mr. Leighton responded that he is in the early stages of working with a landscape architect and civil engineer to mitigate the grade. Right now, he continued, the apron extends from the sill of the entry doors to the street, and the existing slab is pitched toward the door to the inside. He remarked that he will need to address that issue and manage the grade with the sidewalk, though the change is a matter of inches.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether the wood leaf would be fixed in an open position at the building interior. Mr. Leighton confirmed that it would be positioned behind the front façade wall. He then directed the Committee members to the application and described how the door would be hinged and positioned. He added that he found photographic evidence to indicate that the door was hinged and swung to the interior.

Mr. Cluver asked about the stone type of the historic building. Mr. Leighton answered that it consists of Wissahickon schist with sandstone banding. The grid within the gable, he added, is a checkerboard of the schist and sandstone, with the schist being a bit more tooled.

Mr. Cluver observed that the plans show the addition of furred out walls on the interior, presumably for insulation. He asked whether any studies have been conducted on dew points and temperature impact, because the addition of walls could increase freeze-thaw cycles and contribute to masonry deterioration. He expressed concern over the impact and durability of the existing masonry. Mr. Leighton replied that he has not completed that specific study but noted that his team has hired Campbell Thomas & Co. as a consultant for the preservation of the

exterior. He added that they will identify, prioritize, and analyze the wall, explaining that they want to ensure that the walls are structurally sound. Much of the stone, he continued, is in poor condition, and they need to identify what to replace. He clarified that the consultant will approach the issue by considering structural issues first, then issues related to weather-tightness, and finally aesthetic issues.

Referring to the all-glass connector, Mr. Cluver stated that he understands the concept but has two concerns. First, he explained, the main glass wall is south-facing and could heat up like an oven, so it would require a significant HVAC system to handle the temperature. Second, he continued, once desks are installed within the interior, the space could get very sloppy, and it is a very visually prominent and unshielded space. Mr. Cluver noted his concern that reality would not match the concept.

Mr. Baker responded that the lower and upper portions of the watch room would be fritted. Mr. Cluver remarked that the space would still be backlit with shadows from cables and other equipment. Mr. Leighton expanded on Mr. Baker's description of fritted glass and added that they are considering different frit patterns that can be frosted below the desk surface. He further explained that they would like to introduce the pattern again at the top portion of the glass. The fritted glass, he continued, would help them manage the use of window blinds at the interior. Additionally, he commented, the two glass walls are currently part of the conversation about where the One Percent for Art would be installed. Mr. Baker added that they are conscious of Mr. Cluver's concerns.

Ms. Stein asked why the clarity of the glass is important to the firehouse. Mr. Baker explained that it functions as the watch where firefighters sit and observe the neighborhood. It is normally a very positive part of the fire station that allows eyes onto the street, he added. Ms. Gutterman observed that even with the frit pattern, one could still see through it, since the glass is not frosted for opacity. Mr. Baker responded that there is concern over whether the firefighters will be able to see out. Ms. Gutterman replied that, in addition, there is visual banding. She noted that Mr. Baker initially indicated that the watch room would be a clear, transparent piece, but now it is being described as fritted glass with bands. She stated that the glass will not be as transparent as initially described, since some of it will be more opaque. Ms. Gutterman noted that it would need to be considered and reviewed.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the stone veneer. Mr. Leighton responded that they have been working with a masonry supplier to identify options for the stone and that they have been considering real, quarried stone, since it seems that a cast concrete product cannot meet the dimensional requirements. He showed several samples and stated that part of the selection process will need to be done once the existing stone of the historic structure is cleaned in order to get a true representation of the original material. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the intent is to match the clean sandstone on the building. Mr. Leighton clarified that they will match the sandstone bands of the historic structure.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the mechanical equipment is hidden by a masonry screen or metal louver screen. She also wondered why the screen is so tall. Mr. Leighton returned to Mr. Baker's earlier description of viewing the existing building as a reflection in a rain puddle. He explained that the new building, including the rooftop mechanical equipment, reflects the historic structure. He stated that the space for the mechanical systems rises up like the hose tower on the existing building and reflects that mass. Around the corner, he continued, brick surrounds a

louver that allows for airflow. Samples of the materials were made available to the Committee members. Mr. Leighton then noted that the mechanical equipment would be positioned at the midpoint of the roof, and he described various iterations of the design and positioning of the systems. The current location, he asserted, was chosen to appease the neighbors. Ms. Gutterman asked if the top has a metal cap. Mr. Leighton replied that they will need to develop a flashing detail on top of the walls, adding that they are hoping the detail allows the stone to extend to the sky. He clarified that they will need to detail the flashing so the metal of the coping ties in and connects with the roof membrane behind the face of the stone.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the selection of Kalwall. Mr. Leighton responded that the Fire Department has expressed a desire to have as much daylight in the space as possible and that the Kalwall is a good material choice, because it allows diffused light to pass through, while managing the building's interior temperature. Regarding the pattern, he continued, the intention is to specify different insulated values and create different coloration. Ms. Gutterman stated her confusion over incorporating Kalwall in one area with a standard window several feet away, noting that there is more Kalwall in other areas and stone banding around the windows. She clarified that she is trying to understand the vocabulary and selection of materials. Mr. Leighton replied that the design reflects features of the historic building, such as the windows and dormer. Mr. Baker interjected that he and his team have completed two other fire stations in the city that incorporated both Kalwall and standard windows, and he argued that Kalwall offers a beautiful translucent light at the interior. Ms. Gutterman responded that her concern is the combination of Kalwall and windows, adding that she is trying to understand the variety of materials proposed.

Ms. Stein asked why a metal band was introduced in the design of the new building, stating that the historic firehouse is all masonry, very solid and very handsome. She opined that it seemed awkward to have stone veneer set above the metal band placed at the base of the building. Mr. Baker countered that the purpose is to make the building appear as objects and that they are reversing what is normal. He argued that the stone floats and that the metal acts as the element that cups the stone. He explained that the corner pieces of steel along the outside edges, an element typical of firehouse, take much abuse. Mr. Baker contended that the metal banding extends the idea of the protective metal at the corners. Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether the metal panel identified on the drawings is intended to consist of a solid metal and not aluminum. Mr. Leighton suggested that the historic building has very heavy masonry, and it is readily apparent that the structure is doing the work. He asserted that, in the new building, though his team is not free of the gravity loads, they are free to work in different ways with those loads, and he noted that they chose a very light-weight steel structure on which the stone will hang.

Mr. Leighton summarized other work to the historic structure, including roof replacement, currently underway. He noted that the project is nearing completion and that the slate and copper gutters and downspouts are being replaced. He showed samples of the slate. Mr. Leighton also noted that, after uncovering some trim in the eaves, a paint analysis of several of the property's painted features was completed. That analysis, he continued, resulted in the identification of the original paint of the eaves, window sashes and frames, transoms, and doors. Mr. Leighton had swatches of the colors and stated that he is very pleased to learn of the original colors, because they are more appropriate, given the range of materials, than the current green and white paint scheme that dates to the 1980s.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the restraint and simplicity of the design is a very appropriate neighbor to the existing firehouse and maintains the right relationship. He added that he approves of the metal as long as it is a substantial material. Ms. Stein asked whether the metal sample provided is representative of the metal that will be installed. Mr. Leighton clarified that the metal sample only indicates the coloration but not the weight. He explained that he was drawn to that particular metal finish because in the sunlight against the schist it picks up the sparkle of the mica in the stone. He noted that they would need to work with a metal worker to create a more robust and durable material.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia commented that he appreciates the level of thought that has gone into the proposal and applauded the Fire Department and City of Philadelphia for being committed to maintaining their historic building. Windrim, he added, designed a number of firehouses in this period, including one in South Philadelphia that the Alliance recently nominated. Being open to maintaining and respecting this historic facility and resource while planning a vision for a modern use, he concluded, is a great model that should continue in the future.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, with the following comments:

- An analysis of the thermodynamic properties of the wall should be undertaken to ensure that adding insulation at the interior does not contribute to any long-term masonry damage;
- The slope at the entry should be reviewed to ensure that any grade change does not affect the building's historic character; and,
- The design of the watch room should be further reviewed, with the suggestion that the current all-glass structure potentially incorporate metal banding at the base or another detail.

**ADDRESS: 419 S 20TH ST**

Proposal: Remove rear roof, construct rear addition, replace slate roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Shabs LLC

Applicant: Eric Heidel, (re)work Architecture & Design LLC

History: 1870; storefront added c. 1880

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to remove the rear shed roof and a single dormer at the fourth story of 419 S. 20<sup>th</sup> Street and to construct a rear mansard roof with two dormers to loosely replicate the appearance of the front roofline. The rear addition would be visible from Waverly Street. The addition would feature asphalt shingles and two aluminum clad two-over-two double-hung sash windows. A new window and doors would be installed at the third story. The application also proposes to install wood two-over-two double-hung sash windows at the second through fourth stories of the front façade. The historic beveled slate shingles currently installed at the front mansard roof would be replaced with slate shingles in a rectangular shape.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the rear addition, rear windows and doors, and front façade windows, with staff to review details, but denial of the slate replacement at the front facade, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Eric Heidel represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether Mr. Heidel intends to take the existing mansard roof and extend it out to create space at the fourth story. Mr. Heidel replied that the shed roof occupies the rear third of the building. The proposal, he continued, is to remove the shed roof and extend the fourth story to the rear wall of the structure. He noted that the neighboring property to the north has a mansard roof that wraps the side and rear and that he would copy that massing. The Committee asked whether 419 S. 20<sup>th</sup> Street is the second building from Waverly Street. Mr. Heidel affirmed and added that page 3 of the photographs in the application shows a red brick building, which is the northern neighbor and which currently blocks the visibility of the building's fourth story. Ms. Gutterman replied that the addition would make the rear of 419 S. 20<sup>th</sup> Street highly visible from a public right-of-way. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the addition would bring the building in line with the adjacent building's mansard roof. Mr. Heidel stated that it would.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff recommended approval because the property is not immediately on the corner. Ms. Keller stated that the building appears on the 1858-60 atlas and that the mansard was a later addition. She noted that the staff agreed that the roof could be extended with the change to a shed roof at the rear, even though it would be visible from Waverly Street.

Ms. Gutterman asked how the current fourth floor transitions from the main block to the rear ell and whether there is a photograph to illustrate the transition. Mr. Heidel answered that it is difficult to capture in a photograph, but he included an image taken from a lower rear deck looking up at the shed roof.

Ms. Stein inquired whether, because both mansard roofs cant in slightly, there would be a small gap between the addition of this property and the north property that is not represented in the drawings. Mr. Heidel explained that there is no cant on the south side of the neighboring property and that the wall is flashed in sheet metal. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that Mr. Heidel is describing the party wall. Ms. Stein asked whether the two roofs would align. Mr. Heidel affirmed and noted that there would be a party wall. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the party wall currently extends to the top of the mansard.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether the property to the south has a similar shed roof dormer. Mr. Heidel answered that he believed it was the original condition of all five houses to the south, though one or two had been extended. Mr. McCoubrey noted that it is helpful to the Committee if some context is provided. Ms. Gutterman requested the inclusion of an aerial image or site plan in the application. She then asked if the goal of the proposed work is just to extend the fourth-floor living space. Mr. Heidel affirmed.

Mr. Cluver asked if there is any mechanical equipment being placed on the roof. Mr. Heidel replied that the location of the condenser has not been determined, but the existing condenser is located on the ground. Ms. Stein responded that a condenser on the ground would be

acceptable to the Committee. What would not be acceptable, she continued, would be a unit visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Cluver asked if Mr. Heidel had identified a matching brick veneer yet, since that process can be difficult. Mr. Heidel stated that the existing brick is painted and going to remain. He added that he would paint the new brick veneer. Ms. Stein stated that the addition would all be highly visible and opposed the change and lack of detail at the cornice line. Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is typical for a corner property to be taller than a mid-block property. Ms. Gutterman agreed with Ms. Stein that the addition would be very visible, given the building's location from Waverly Street.

Ms. Pentz asked why the slate on the front mansard is being replaced. Mr. Heidel answered that the slate is in poor condition and is leaking. Ms. Pentz asked if the applicant has investigated the availability of a slate to match the shape of the existing roofing material. Mr. Heidel replied that it can be obtained, and added that the client proposed the rectangular shingles to save costs. Ms. Pentz responded that the slate roof is a character-defining feature that should be retained.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the condition at the rear of the building where a new aluminum clad French door is proposed. Mr. Heidel responded that a vinyl sliding door currently exists in the opening. Ms. Gutterman clarified that it is currently a door and will remain a door, and then asked if there will be any change to the dimensions of the opening. Mr. Heidel stated that there will be no change.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 1 to recommend denial of the rear addition and slate replacement at the front roof as proposed but approval of the restoration work at the front façade and replacement of the slate roof in kind, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

**ADDRESS: 313-15 S CHADWICK ST**

Proposal: Revise design of previously-approved doors and windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robert and Josephine Volpe

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design, LLC

History: 1860; Women's SPCA of Pennsylvania

Individual Designation: 10/5/1978

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install new garage and entry doors and second-story doors with guardrails at a former carriage house. An application for a third-story addition with roof deck and the restoration of the front façade, including new doors, was approved by the Historical Commission on 13 January 2017. At that time, the application included garage and second-story doors designed to match the written descriptions of two insurance surveys of the building dated 1873 and 1875. The previously approved design included cross-lined panel doors at the garage and second-story openings, which also included segmental heads and board and

batten shutters. The second-story openings did not include guardrails. The insurance survey indicates that the entry door should consist of a cross-lined panel bottom with glass above and a three-light transom. The current application proposes to change the configuration of all doors to include a simplified raised-panel design and to install guardrails at the second-story doors. Two options for the entry door are included.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Robert Palladino and owner Robert Volpe represented the application.

Ms. Stein asked the applicant to describe why he is submitting a new application to change the door design. Mr. Palladino explained that the second-story doors are essentially the same style, aside from the replacement of the cross-lined panels with a single raised panel. He indicated that the guardrails are proposed, because the interior plan changed and the space will now be a bedroom. The original design, he continued, showed a bathroom, which did not require any egress. Mr. Palladino clarified that there is now an egress requirement and that the owner is hoping to have the doors swing in, in which case a rail would be required. The proposed rail, he added, is the same rail that was previously approved for the roof deck. He contended that the door design itself, aside from the single raised panel at the bottom, is the same as the previously approved design. The front door, he continued, was previously approved as a single glass door with two sidelights. He noted that the staff preferred double doors to a single door. The reason for the change to the front door, he stated, was to gain privacy from the solid panel door. Mr. Palladino explained that the owner prefers the single panel style and that he would retain the transom. At the garage, he noted that the proposed design change is to maintain uniformity with the other doors.

Ms. Stein commented that the property is individually designated, and that the original approved design was based on historic documentation. She argued that the Committee could not vary from that approval. She added that she expected the applicant to present new information, such as a recently discovered historic photograph that would change the understanding of the doors. Mr. Palladino responded that the earliest extant photograph dates to 1976, when the building functioned as an SPCA. In that photograph, he added, the doors were not original. Mr. Palladino stated that he was under the impression that the front entry door was not mentioned in the insurance survey. Ms. Keller responded that the door was mentioned in the survey, but that the staff had previously interpreted the entry door as a second-story door, because of the survey's confusing language. She explained that that misunderstanding is why the entry door in the previous application did not reflect the door described in the insurance survey. She clarified that the staff now understands what the historic appearance was, explaining that it should resemble the doors at the second story, though it would not have been arched. It also would have contained a three-light transom, she added.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the entry door should have a panel bottom and glass above. Ms. Keller replied that the door should have a cross-lined panel at the bottom with a glass panel above, in addition to the three-light transom. Ms. Stein asked if there was a drawing that showed the design. Ms. Keller said there is no drawing, only a written description in the insurance survey. Ms. Stein stated that, if the door features glass, it could potentially include a glass that is not clear, to allow for privacy. Mr. Volpe responded that there are parking garages across the street and argued that no entry doors on the block have glass panels. Others disagreed. He then

claimed that the block consists of solid six-panel doors and further maintained that his building would be the only one with glass in the front door. Ms. Stein replied that the door could contain a laminated glass to improve security. Mr. Volpe replied that he lives across the street from garages with metal garage doors and retorted that the Committee is “holding [his] feet to the fire,” even though the garage doors have been replaced with aluminum and are also visible from the public right-of-way. He demanded that the Committee give him a good answer for the discrepancy. Ms. Gutterman responded that the garage doors could have been installed without a permit. Mr. Volpe argued that they are in the public right-of-way. Ms. Gutterman countered that the Committee is not here to review those garage doors. Mr. Volpe replied that he understands that. Ms. Gutterman opined that, though she understands the need for the addition of the balcony rail, the new proposal alters the design described in the fire insurance survey, and she does not understand the need to change from the cross-lined panel to the plain raised panel at the second-story doors. She also questioned the decision to simplify the garage door. For the entry door, she continued, the question is whether or not one can create a panelized door that does not incorporate glass but instead contains a wood panel to address the owner’s security concerns while still offering some degree of the building’s historic character. Mr. Volpe responded that he is willing to install a two-panel, three-panel, or six-panel door, but that he settled on a two-panel door for the application. Ms. Gutterman stated that the solution may be a two-panel door with crosses on the bottom and a single panel above. Ms. Stein added that there are true security issues. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that she is trying to find the balance between the style described in the insurance survey and the proposed design that offers security.

Mr. Cluver commented that the second-story doors functioned to hoist materials into the building, so the concept of it being a door is reasonable, though he noted that the Committee typically advises against Juliet balconies in historic districts. He stated that while he understands the need for the railing, he wondered if there was an alternative to placing the railing across the outside of the door. Mr. Palladino responded that he explored the idea of a Dutch-style door where the bottom panel would be fixed at the 36-inch minimum, but he felt the proportions were wrong. Mr. Cluver asked why 36 inches is the minimum. Mr. Palladino answered that a balcony needs a guardrail, if the opening is to function as a door, even if it is Dutch-style. Mr. Cluver responded that Mr. Palladino should not think of it as a Dutch-style door but rather as a fixed panel, which is in essence a wall, with a double casement window above. In this arrangement, Mr. Cluver continued, the window sill can be lower than 36 inches. Mr. Palladino asserted that his original design matched what Mr. Cluver described, and contended that the casing size and glazing size do not meet egress requirements. Mr. Cluver observed, that in the original design, the casement was placed inside the rail and stile of the door. Mr. Cluver explained that in the alternative option, the bottom panel would be a fixed piece with two panes that are essentially doors that are placed two feet off the ground. Mr. Palladino argued that the configuration would result in the same issue, because the bottom pane of that window is about 28 inches, and it needs to be 36 inches. Mr. Cluver countered that he still does not understand where the 36-inch requirement is coming from. Mr. Palladino stated that the building code stipulates a 36-inch height if it is to act as a guardrail. Mr. Cluver asked why a guardrail is necessary. Mr. Palladino answered that a guardrail is necessary because the door would open to the interior. Mr. Cluver clarified that the feature would function as a window rather than a door, adding that a window sill can be positioned at 24 inches off the floor. Mr. Cluver then urged Mr. Palladino to think of the feature as a window rather than a door. Mr. Palladino stated that he would be afraid with an opening that large that someone could fall out. Ms. Gutterman questioned the difference between an opening in that configuration and the next window, which she noted was equivalent in size when the lower sash is open. Mr. Cluver observed that the bedroom has another

operable window in the bedroom and asked whether it meets the egress requirements. Mr. Palladino answered that it does not.

Mr. Cluver stated that he is torn between the solutions, because the original opening functioned as a door. He opined that, if it remains a door, the narrative is visible, even if it is used differently. Mr. McCoubrey agreed and argued against installing a lower panel and casement windows. In this particular case, he continued, he would rather see doors with railings. Mr. Cluver asked whether the railings were set within the masonry opening rather than protruding from the face of the wall. Mr. Palladino stated that they would be positioned within the masonry opening and asked if the rail is appropriate or if the Committee had a different preference. He suggested glass. Mr. Cluver replied that painted metal is most appropriate.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the garage door as presented, but approval of the metal railing at the second-story doors, with the design of the doors reflecting the design approved by the Historical Commission on 13 January 2017, and approval of a solid entry door with a cross-lined panel base, solid panel above, and a three-light transom over the door slab, with staff to review details.

**ADDRESS: 1629 WALLACE ST**

Proposal: Modify previously approved rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1422 Front LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application is a resubmission of a proposal to construct a rear addition to the property at 1629 Wallace Street. The previous application proposed to convert an existing vacant shell into a five-family dwelling and included the restoration of the front façade and the construction of a rear three-story addition. The Historical Commission voted to approve that application on 9 September 2016. Owing to access issues along the western property line, the location of the addition has been modified and the current application proposes to construct a similar three-story addition located along the eastern property line. Like the original design, the visible north and west elevations of the addition would be clad in brick. However, because the west wall will no longer function as a party wall, one-over-one aluminum clad windows, similar to those previously approved at the north façade, are proposed along the west elevation.

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

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Ian Toner and Sara Shonk represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to explain the change to the original plans. Mr. Toner stated that the logical plan would be to extend the rear ell and to carry the roof slope of the existing building, which is what was previously proposed. He explained that the project had support from the neighbors and he had submitted for building permits. The process was initiated, he continued, and they were ready to begin construction when the contractor spoke with the western neighbor, who then refused to allow access to the property. Mr. Toner asserted that they tried to negotiate in good faith with that neighbor, but the neighbor no longer answers their phone calls. He described an attempt to meet with the Spring Garden Civic Association to broker an agreement, but the neighbor did not attend. The result, he continued, was that Spring Garden Civic Association was displeased at the project team for not notifying them of the project from the start and obtaining their approval. The only option to move the project forward, he added, would be to shift the addition to the other side of the property, since they are on better terms with the eastern neighbor, who has agreed to allow access for scaffolding and brickwork. Mr. Toner noted that the shift in placement is the reason the application is before the Architectural Committee again.

Ms. Gutterman clarified that the proposed materials have not changed and that it is just a matter of moving the location of the addition from the western property line to the eastern property line. Mr. Toner affirmed, adding that the windows that had been proposed for the east elevation will now be located on the west elevation and will be visible from 17<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Toner asked that the aluminum clad windows approved for the north elevation be approved for west elevation. Ms. Gutterman asked whether shop drawings of the proposed windows were included. Mr. Toner answered that he had submitted shop drawings for the original windows, and the windows at the west elevation would be the same. Ms. Keller provided the Committee members with a copy of the approved shop drawings. Mr. Toner explained that the sizes of the proposed windows are to match the size of the windows along the original ell. The windows proposed for the west elevation, he elaborated, are the same size as the original windows on the rear ell's east elevation. He contended that he is trying to maintain that character, even though the windows would not be side-by-side.

Mr. Cluver stated his preference for including windows on the west façade rather than leaving it a blank brick wall visible from the street. He asked whether the intent of the brick was to match the brick of the existing building. Mr. Toner responded that it is, though it may not be an exact match, and added that he is proposing a molded brick that has a little variation like the existing back wall. He noted that he has not yet submitted a sample for approval by the staff, but that the intent is to match the historic brick.

Mr. Cluver questioned the relationship of the windows on the two elevations of the addition, observing that the west elevation contains Type H windows and the north elevation contains Type E windows. He asked how they compare. Mr. Toner explained that the windows at the north elevation of the addition are slightly smaller and replicate the dimensions of the windows at the north elevation of the existing ell. He noted that they matched the windows, though the existing north wall will be removed. Mr. Cluver responded that the two different window types will now be seen together, even though they were not viewed together in the past. Mr. Toner replied that he copied the opening sizes of the existing building, explaining that the east and north walls contain two different window sizes, so the proposed west and north walls will carry those dimensions. Mr. Cluver asserted that the existing east and north windows are not viewed as a whole and recommended adjusting the window size to make the dimensions uniform. Mr. Toner agreed that he could enlarge the rear windows and reiterated that he was only taking

cues from the existing structure when choosing the initial dimensions. Mr. Cluver stated that his comments were a reaction to the north windows appearing squat and wide. He noted his preference for the proportions of the narrower west elevation windows. Mr. Cluver suggested that the north elevation windows carry the head and sill heights of the east elevation windows. Mr. Toner agreed.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the suggestion that the windows at the addition's side and rear be made uniform in head height, sill height, and width, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 4146-48 PARKSIDE AVE**

Proposal: Construct apartment building on vacant lot

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 4148 Parkside LP

Applicant: Steven Bachich, Raymond F. Rola, Architect

History:

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/11/2009

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a six-story apartment building on a vacant lot in a row of buildings on Parkside Avenue. The Historical Commission's authority over this site is review-and-comment jurisdiction only because the lot was undeveloped at the time of designation. The Historical Commission has previously commented on a proposal for the site that was much less compatible with the historic district than the current proposal. The current proposal is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing of the historic buildings in the district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Raymond Rola represented the project.

Mr. Rola explained that the project conforms to the zoning of the site. He inherited the project from another architect and has redesigned the building. It will now no longer have the "rocket-like" stair tower on the front façade and the front deck has been removed. The access to the units is from the sides, although there is an enhanced doorway at the front. He said that they are trying to find a brick to match the Roman brick and will use cast stone to match the brownstone of other buildings in the row. They will return the brick at the corners and then transition to a brick red stucco on the sides.

The Architectural Committee members opined that the design was improved over the past design, but offered suggestions for improving it further. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the porch should be extended to be the full width of the building to have more presence. He recommended that the columns should be longer and the bases shorter. Ms. Gutterman

recommended somewhat wider balusters and windows that would be either wood or metal clad, but not vinyl.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT:** The Architectural Committee commented that the design satisfies the Standards in massing, color, and materials, but suggested that the columns should be longer, the railing heavier, the porch wider, and the windows made of a material other than vinyl.

**ADDRESS: 204 N 35TH ST**

Proposal: Legalize windows; install additional windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Teresa Labov

Applicant: Teresa Labov

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 3/25/1969

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize one-over-one vinyl windows that were installed in this house without a permit or the Historical Commission's approval and to approve one-over-one vinyl windows that are not yet installed. After neighbors complained about the window replacement, the work was stopped. The building originally would have had four-over-four windows with thicker vertical muntins, beaded to create the appearance of casement windows, as is typical of Italianate structures and found on the similar adjacent houses. This house was modified with the removal of its front porch and the addition of a Colonial Revival doorway. The windows for that period would have typically been six-over-one or six-over-six. All four sides of this house are visible from public rights-of-way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Sarah Labov, the daughter of the property owner, represented the application.

Ms. Labov submitted additional information at the meeting. Mr. Baron mentioned that, in addition to the installation of the vinyl windows, the window frames were capped in aluminum and the shutter hardware was removed. Ms. Labov displayed photographs showing the differences before and after the work. She said that the contractor added Azek on top of the existing frames. She said that there are two different issues to consider; the first is the failure to obtain an approval and permit. She explained that her mother used to obtain all permits in accordance with the process, but is no longer able to do so, so she has taken on that job for her mother. She said that she thought that the designation precluded altering the appearance of the front façade, but she has since learned that that is not the only limitation. She noted a community member alerted the contractor and Historical Commission that the work was being undertaken without an approval or permit, but one was required. The contractor claimed that he did not know that an approval and permit were needed. The second issue is the design of the windows. She spoke in favor of one-over-one windows. She said that there are window sash

scars showing that indeed these windows originally had two-over-two panes with a wide muntin. It is the opinion of her architect Arlene Matzkin that the muntins were purposely removed at the end of the nineteenth century. She said that they have already spent \$16,000 on these windows and they would like to keep them and they want the one-over-one appearance. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the replacement windows are smaller than the originals and have less glass. Ms. Labov responded that she thinks that the glass size is similar between the original and replacement windows.

Mr. Baron stated that the original frames have been covered in aluminum not Azek, but, regardless of the material, the original frames are flat plank frames with curved and stepped bed molding. He posited that that molding survives under the covering. He displayed a photograph showing the shutter hardware, which was likely removed during the window replacement. On the design of the windows, he asserted that, regardless of the correct muntin pattern, the vinyl windows have no depth and no shadow line between the glass and the stiles and rails and are therefore inappropriate. He noted that the staff had offered the property owner a compromise to allow the installation of the vinyl windows on the somewhat visible rear facade while replacing the windows in wood on the two most visible facades. He explained that a number of owners of similar houses in Powelton have asked to legalize vinyl windows, but have been denied and have had to replace their windows in wood. He asserted that there is a question of fairness. Ms. Labov said that she would be willing to explore removing the capping, although she does not know how difficult it might be to remove. She said that the rear and side façade are partially hidden by foliage during much of the year.

Ms. Stein observed that the Architectural Committee must review the application as if the applicant were requesting permission in advance rather than forgiveness after the fact. Ms. Gutterman said that it would set a serious negative precedent to approve vinyl windows on the front façade. She said that Ms. Labov might explore the question of a compromise with the Historical Commission.

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

**ADDRESS: 4301 MAIN ST**

Proposal: Legalize alterations

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: MNYK Realty, LLC

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

**OVERVIEW:** The staff of the Historical Commission approved work to this corner commercial property in November 2016. The contractor has exceeded the approved work and the owner is now seeking to legalize that work. The illegal work includes the installation of mechanical equipment on the rear two-story ell. Previously, condensers had been located on a one-story addition at the rear closest to Station Street. The architectural plans approved by the Historical

Commission's staff did not include any mechanical equipment. The staff visited the site and determined that the mechanical equipment is highly visible from the public right-of-way.

In addition to the mechanical equipment, the illegal work includes the addition of decorative brackets to the main cornice of the building. The approved plans call for the removal of non-historic siding from the cornice and a consultation with the staff to determine the design of any additional cornice elements. The building is a simple Greek Revival structure and modillions as shown on the plan might have been appropriate. Instead, the contractor failed to consult with the staff and installed Fypon Italianate brackets, which are inappropriate for the style of the building and not in compliance with the approved drawing.

The storefront cornice was rebuilt and a hood added over the side doors, neither of which was included on the approved plans. Windows were installed without the requisite review and approval of shop drawings. The window facing Main Street does not fit its opening. The applicant proposes to add a layer of brick and a bullnose sill. Several courses of brick may be needed to fill the gap below the smaller window.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney William O'Brien, design consultant Cynthia Meadows, architect Brett Zerr, and property owners Paul and Patrick Ryan represented the application.

Mr. O'Brien claimed his clients submitted plans to the Department of Licenses & Inspections and were held up for eight months because of an error at the department. He explained that this circumstance is important because it frames the state of mind of the applicants regarding this project. The Ryans have a long history in the restaurant business and Manayunk is lucky to get one of their restaurants. He reported that there have been discussions with the staff and there are disagreements in three areas. He noted there seems to be agreement in other areas such as the idea of cutting the existing large cornice brackets to make them shorter. Mr. Baron said that the staff thinks that they should be replaced with modillion blocks similar to what is on the drawings.

Mr. O'Brien explained a second issue involves the storefront windows. The applicant now proposes to add several courses of brick and a bullnose sill. Mr. Baron said that the staff is in favor of this solution, instead of the addition of an infill board under the Main Street window.

Mr. O'Brien mentioned removing the stucco on the rear wall and painting the wall. Mr. Baron pointed out that the drawings do not indicate the removal of the stucco or painting of the brick; therefore, the staff did not consider this work to be a part of the application and has not commented on it. Ms. Meadows observed that the wall is soft sewer brick and contended that something will need to be done to it. Mr. Baron suggested that the brick should be cleaned and pointed. The staff has seen no evidence that the brick beneath the removed stucco is either weak or damaged, he noted. He said that the staff should inspect the wall in the field to make a recommendation. Mr. O'Brien countered that he mentioned the brick in his letter. Ms. Gutterman noted that the letter has a description, but not a prescription or a treatment. She said that the applicant should have the staff inspect the wall.

Mr. O'Brien mentioned the door at second-floor porch. Mr. Baron responded that the staff should review a shop drawing. Mr. O'Brien mentioned the paint on the one-story rear addition. He said that the staff has asked him to leave the paint in its existing condition. Mr. Baron explained that the staff would prefer that the paint is removed, but he noted that it is an existing, grandfathered condition and may be retained.

The discussion turned to the outstanding issues. Mr. O'Brien stated that the condensers and hood over the side doors were the two main points of contention. Regarding the hood, he reported that there are two exits, one of which is a handicap exit. He noted that the hood or canopy has a metal roof. Ms. Gutterman asked why the hood was added. Ms. Meadows replied that it was added because of the juncture between two sections of the building and to provide lighting and flashing. Ms. Gutterman opined that the hood should not span across the sections of the building. Lighting could be provided by sconces. She recommended reestablishing the cornice and flashing that existed before they removed it to build the hood. She also suggested that the side piers should be removed and the punched openings reestablished.

Mr. O'Brien remarked that the other issue is the location of the condensers. He observed that the kitchen has had an exhaust for a long time. Mr. Baron pointed out that the building already had the one exhaust in a 2003 photograph; however, that exhaust was not as tall. The intake vent is a new addition. Mr. O'Brien explained that the tall exhaust stack had to be raised in order to meet code. He said that the air-conditioning units were formerly on the one-story addition closer to Station Street, but that they now propose to consolidate four air-conditioning units in this new higher location on a dunnage hidden by a screen. This relocation will keep the units away from residential units on Station Street, while not bothering the next door neighbor to the north. Mr. Baron observed that the screen just mentioned is not shown on the architectural elevation drawings. He asked about the height and material of the screen. Ms. Stein noted she would be in favor of a screen, but asked that the units could be pushed back to the north. Mr. Baron asked if it would be better to box in the tall vent to look like a chimney. The Architectural Committee members rejected Mr. Baron's suggestion, asserting that it would not look like a chimney. They asked about moving the HVAC to the one-story section at back, but the applicants dismissed that suggestion. The idea of a screen was questioned because of the slope of the roof and the height of the dunnage; an effective screen would have to be about seven feet tall. Mr. O'Brien claimed that, because of the sight lines, the equipment will not be seen. He reported that one can see mechanical equipment on roofs all over Manayunk, as Mr. McCoubrey, who works in the neighborhood, knows.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Baron for his opinion about cutting the brackets on the cornice. Mr. Baron responded that, rather than trimming the large brackets, it would be better to retain the small brackets and replace the large brackets with large wood modillions. Ms. Gutterman disagreed, stating that she would accept the cutting of the brackets. Mr. O'Brien interjected that the applicants should be given credit for storing the trash within the building rather than using a dumpster.

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

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would make a motion for denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs Guidelines, but also would also make suggestions for revisions that, if implemented, could be presented to the Historical Commission with a request for approval. Ms. Pentz agreed. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicants revise the application to propose:

- trimming the modillions on the cornice shorter than the bargeboard;
- installing a baluster screen to conceal the mechanical equipment;
- removing the hood and pilasters around the doors on Roxborough Avenue and reinstalling the flashing above the doors;
- installing brick and a sill under the storefront window on Main Street and sills on Roxborough Avenue.
- no stuccoeing or painting the brick walls; and,
- reviewing the new door and other details.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs Guideline.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:44 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 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 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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.