

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

**TUESDAY, 15 NOVEMBER 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development
Ben Sabagh
Eric Robbins
Daniel Vodzak, Vitetta
George Poulin, Strada Architecture
Kris Roscoe, Solar States
Dan Gaidula
Jerry Roller, JKRP Architects
Glenn Werner, JKRP Architects
Kevin McDonnell, Hanson General Contracting
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su
Eric Kassoway, Allan Domb Real Estate
Kevin Huang

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 2141 ST JAMES ST

Proposal: Reconstruct rear vestibule with deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John James

Applicant: Ben Sabagh

History: 1923; English Village; Spencer Roberts, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition on a tertiary façade of this house in English Village. The Historical Commission has approved other visible additions on adjacent properties on the rear. The owner has security concerns about the space behind his garden wall. He would also like to have a larger vestibule to store his bicycle, which he uses for commuting. The proposal involves removing a later addition in this location and adding a new larger addition and roof deck. The addition would be partially hidden with the retention of the existing stone garden wall. It would have a stone base and stucco walls to match the house. The deck would sit on the addition and use an existing window opening for access. The staff recommends that the door to the deck be made to look more like the French doors it would replace, particularly in terms of the proportion of the glass.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Ben Sabagh represented the application.

Mr. Sabagh stated that his main concern is security; people can hide behind his current garden wall. He also explained that the building is not presently practical, and it needs the additional space for storage of garbage.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff was concerned with the proposed covering of several windows. Mr. Baron responded that the windows are presently half-covered and that this is a rear façade. She responded that the location is highly visible from 21st Street. Ms. Stein commented that this application has changed very little from last month's application. She said that she accepts the addition but not the deck, commenting that it is not complementary with the architecture and involves modifying the casement window at the second floor. Mr. McCoubrey commented that he is concerned with the smaller remaining sidewalk.

Mr. Sabagh commented that this addition would match the footprint of the other houses in the row, and the sidewalk is on his property. Ms. Gutterman stated that she finds the addition acceptable but not the deck. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the addition should be scaled back and have a sloped roof. Ms. Pentz commented that the window could be retained if the deck is omitted. Ms. Stein suggested that the roof of the addition sit below the sill of the existing window. She pointed out that the drawing is incorrect in terms of showing the heights of the windows. Ms. Gutterman opined that the addition is acceptable but the roofline should be sloped and the height should be studied to avoid impacting the second-floor windows. She suggested denial of the deck. Mr. Sabagh showed an alternative design with no deck and a sloped roof. Committee members commented that this design was an improvement but that the roof should receive a hip at the north end.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of an addition with a revised, sloped and lowered roofline, and denial of the deck and modification to the second-floor window, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 113-15 ARCH ST

Proposal: Construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 113 Arch Street Development, LLC

Applicant: Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development

History: 113 Arch St, 1915; 115 Arch, 1890

Individual Designation: 8/5/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct three stories of additions and decks on top of these two individually designated, historic structures that also contribute to the Old City Historic District. These additions are out of scale with the existing buildings. Although the owner claims that the additions will be minimally visible from directly across the street, it is clear from the sight line studies that they will be conspicuous when view from angles on the street. The additions will also be visible from an alley at the rear. A garage entrance will be located on the alley at the rear, in place of existing windows. The historic multi-light windows at the rear will be replaced with windows of a different material and configuration. On the Arch Street, the doorways of 115 Arch Street will be cut down and several new doors without the historic appearance installed. Little information has been provided regarding the new windows or doors. Mockups would be helpful to assess the visibility of the proposed additions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Tim Shaaban represented the application.

Mr. Shaaban provided revised drawings that showed the stair house set back farther on the building at 115 Arch Street and revised windows with muntins on the rear façade.

Ms. Stein asked about visibility of the addition from Appletree Street. Mr. Shabaan responded that Appletree Street is a small dead-end court of modern townhouses, and the neighbors face the rear of the Arch Street buildings. He explained that the public will see two stories on top of both 113 and 115 Arch Street and the stair addition when looking from Appletree Street. Nothing will be constructed on the rear parking area. A garage opening and door will be cut into the rear of the buildings. Mr. Baron asked about the color of the material on these new sections. Mr. Shabaan responded that the color has not yet been determined, as the project is in the conceptual stage.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the material of the proposed windows. Mr. Shabaan responded that the material of the windows will be wood where wood windows currently exist, metal where historic metal windows exist, and aluminum at the rear. The Committee members agreed with these materials choices for the windows and the rear garage opening.

Ms. Gutterman stated that mockups should be reviewed to determine the visibility of the proposed additions from Arch Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 15 NOVEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. An unidentified neighbor asked when the project would start. Mr. Shabaan responded that it should begin in early 2017.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design, provided:

1. the applicant works with the staff on the restoration of the front and rear facades,
2. the staff reviews the color of the new addition for approval,
3. the staff confirms the invisibility of the proposed addition from the public right-of-way with mock-ups, and
4. the removal of structural walls is limited to that shown on the revised drawings.

ADDRESS: 111 ELFRETHS ALY

Proposal: Install solar panels on roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan Gaidula & Alix Seif

Applicant: Abiola Adeseho, Solar States

History: 1811

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install solar panels on the roofs and a utility disconnect on the front façade of this significant building located on Elfreth's Alley. Solar panels are proposed for both the main block's front and rear slope, and the rear addition. The panels would rise five inches above the roof. The utility disconnect would be housed in a wooden enclosure with the downspout at the front façade, and would require a small placard on the enclosure to note that the equipment is located within it.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Solar States representative Kris Roscoe and property owner Dan Gaidula represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the solar panels could be omitted from the front slope, and if the disconnect could be located somewhere else. Mr. Roscoe responded that PECO requires a visible disconnect in an accessible location, but there is freedom in the method to conceal it. He explained that his idea is to widen the downspout cover by six inches. Mr. Gaidula distributed photographs of several downspouts on Elfreth's Alley that are double or more than double the width of his six inch wide downspout cover. He noted that the Elfreth's Alley Museum's cover is 15.5 inches wide. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested locating the disconnect in a small vault in the brick sidewalk. Mr. Roscoe responded that the sidewalk option would likely not work for several reasons. Mr. Roscoe explained that the homeowner's goal is to create a net-zero building, and removing the front panels would reduce the capacity of the system. Mr. Gaidula concurred that the front slope is the maximum solar-producing surface, so any subtraction from there is a major loss. Ms. Gutterman agreed, but noted it is the most visible section of the roof. Ms. Stein opined that solar panels should not be approved on the front of any building on Elfreth's Alley, owing to the street's great historical significance. She stated that she is much more receptive to panels in the rear that are only visible to neighbors. Mr. Roscoe asked about the process for revising the application. Ms. Stein explained that he could revise the drawings prior to the Commission meeting. Mr. Gaidula asked about reducing the number of panels on the front slope and keeping

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 15 NOVEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

some panels towards the roof peak. Ms. Gutterman responded that this would result in the panels still being visible from Elfreth's Alley. Ms. Stein commented that this is also precedent-setting for Elfreth's Alley, and the Committee needs to be mindful of that. Mr. Gaidula suggested that he could speak to his neighbor and create one larger cover for both downspouts and the disconnect. Ms. Gutterman responded that he is too far apart from his neighbor for this option. Ms. Stein asked about the appearance of the placard. Mr. Roscoe responded that PECO has no guidelines about its appearance. Mr. Gaidula suggested a small bronze plate with engraved type. Ms. Stein agreed. Mr. Roscoe explained that the disconnect itself is about 4.5 inches wide and not deep. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the cover only widens at the bottom, rather than the entire height. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the staff review a mockup. Mr. Roscoe suggested that he take a disconnect to the site to determine how to make the cover work. Mr. McCoubrey commented that it could also be recessed slightly if it is less deep than the existing cover.

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 solar panels on the front slope on Elfreth's Alley, but approval of installing solar panels on the rear of this property, provided the panels are not visible from the public right-of-way, and approval of a disconnect on the front façade, with the staff to review details including design and location of the disconnect.

ADDRESS: 126 S 16TH ST

Proposal: Remove duct and fan at rear, install exhaust fan at side

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Allan Domb

Applicant: George Poulin, Strada Architecture, LLC

History: 1882; Henry C. Gibson Development House; George W. Hewitt, architect

Individual Designation: 4/13/1994

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove exterior ductwork and a kitchen exhaust fan mounted at the rear of this building, and replace it with an exhaust fan and discharge duct at the side of the building, towards the rear of the property. The staff previously approved the existing equipment, owing to it being located behind the building and not visible from 16th Street. This new proposal, however, would be visible from 16th Street, and would be attached at the location of decorative brick banding along the Moravian Street side.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect George Poulin, restaurant owner Kevin Huang, and Allan Domb Real Estate's Director of Asset Management Eric Kassoway represented the application.

Mr. Poulin provided additional context photographs of Moravian Street. Ms. Gutterman asked why the existing equipment is being removed. Mr. Poulin responded that the current exhaust fan location makes it hard to maintain, and the location of the current exhaust fan is a nuisance to the residential tenants in the building. He noted that this block of Moravian Street has many mechanical pieces of equipment that overhang the public right-of-way. Ms. Stein asked if the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 15 NOVEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

new exhaust fan can be contained on the stucco addition. Mr. Poulin responded that mechanical code requires that exhaust fans be located at least 10 feet away from operable windows, and they are very limited by available real estate to locate all required equipment. Ms. Gutterman asked if it could be flipped to be below the decorative brick band. Mr. Poulin responded that it could possibly be elevated so it is above the brick band, but it would still need to be 10 feet from any operable window. Mr. D'Alessandro voiced concern about the discharge being right against the brick wall. Mr. Poulin commented that the outtake can be rotated 90 degrees so it is going either down or up. Ms. Gutterman asked about it going out, so it is not against the brick wall. She cautioned against staining from grease. Mr. Poulin agreed that it is possible to stain the building if the ductwork is never cleaned, but the goal of this proposal is to make it as accessible as possible to allow for convenient cleaning. Ms. Gutterman mentioned the complaint about noise. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested the fan be moved higher to reduce noise. Mr. Poulin responded that unfortunately there is no internal access to the building's roof, so it is another maintenance challenge if it were to be moved higher. Ms. Stein returned to the idea of containing the equipment to the stucco addition. Mr. Poulin responded that it is likely not possible to keep it just on the stucco portion of the building. He explained that the landlord did not approve of an option to build a platform over the existing equipment to keep it within the footprint of the low roof. He noted that that option addressed maintenance concerns but not noise concerns. He opined that the brick wall creates a buffer visually and acoustically. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the option of going up and then out. Mr. Poulin responded that it is an option. Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the existing duct. Mr. Poulin responded that it is tall to be away from windows at the rear of the building. Mr. McCoubrey commented that his experience with this type of work always requires that it exhaust up to the sky. Mr. Poulin agreed, noting that maybe existing conditions on Moravian Street did not receive approval. Mr. Poulin asked about revising the application to show a platform on the low roof. Ms. Gutterman responded that it may be submitted ahead of the Commission meeting, or, depending on what is proposed, it may be able to be reviewed and approved by the staff.

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

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

ADDRESS: 1645 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Install fume hood exhaust ducts on roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: School District of Philadelphia

Applicant: Daniel Vodzak, Vitetta Group, Inc.

History: 1933; Masterman Public School; Irwin T. Catharine, architect

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct three 10-foot tall, approximately 13-inch diameter fume hood exhaust ducts on the roof of the Masterman School. The ducts would be braced to the roof, and the application offers to coat the ducts to blend with the materials of the building. The ducts would be visible from the approach along Spring Garden from 17th Street. The ducts are necessary to provide ventilation for chemistry classrooms.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the ducts are coated in a matte finish, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Daniel Vodzak represented the application.

Ms. Stein commented that the application proposes two different paint colors, and that she feels the lighter color would be more appropriate. Mr. Vodzak noted that the intent was that the pale color would be compatible with the building's limestone trim. Mr. McCoubrey commented that it should blend with the sky. Ms. Stein suggested that it could be a grey or tan, but that a pale color is the most important element. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the staff had recommended that the duct not be a shiny silver color.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the applicants had explored a variety of different types of stacks and whether this was the most minimally-visible option. Mr. Vodzak responded affirmatively.

Ms. Stein asked whether guide wires are required for this kind of stack. Mr. Vodzak responded that wires will be necessary owing to wind load, but noted that he could consult with the engineers and see whether the ducts could be made of a heavier-gauge metal in order to eliminate the wires.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether additional ductwork would be required elsewhere. It was noted that these types of ducts are for chemistry labs only, and they are not planning any more chemistry labs.

Ms. DiPasquale asked whether it would be possible to combine the stacks into one, but observed that the staff assumed that would not be possible owing to the mixing of different gasses. Mr. Vodzak noted that they had explored one stack instead of three, but that the mechanics of the fume hoods would not allow that, nor would the mechanical code, which requires separate discharges. He noted that if they were able to do that, the duct would become much larger.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the duct renderings coming up the side of the building on page 10 of the application. Mr. Vodzak responded that those renderings were the original concept, which they had discussed with the staff and discarded.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the ducts are painted a pale color, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 150 S INDEPENDENCE W ML

Proposal: Replace exterior doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Abde Mahamedi

Applicant: Glenn Werner, JKRP Architects

History: 1923; Public Ledger Building; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Significant, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing set of brass-framed vestibule doors with frameless glass doors and sidelights. The application offers three frameless alternatives, one that maintains a non-historic brass jamb, one that removes it, and another that applies strips of metal down the middle of frameless doors. Historically, revolving doors with full frames and kickplates and a heavy center pier filled the openings. The staff notes that the rendering submitted as the "original" doors does not accurately reflect the dimensions shown in the original drawings of the original doors.

The Historical Commission reviewed and denied an application for doors in this location at its September 2016 meeting. At that time, the Commission provided advice regarding appropriate doors. This application does not comply with that advice.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, and the Commission's September 2016 denial; approval for doors and sidelights with less substantial frames, provided the frames surround all four sides of the glazing on both the doors and sidelights.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jerry Roller and Glenn Werner represented the application.

Mr. Werner commented that they are looking for an appropriate means to replace doors that are not the original doors. The originals were revolving door assemblies that were 4'-5" wide. He noted that the current doors are 3'-5" wide and, in order to maintain a symmetrical appearance in the opening, there was a considerable amount of brass trim added in each jamb. He opined that that was one arbitrary solution, and that they are hoping to achieve an opening that represents the full 4'-5", but to keep the door itself to three feet. The problem, he opined, is how to do that without affecting the symmetry of what was the revolving door. He noted that they have proposed a few options that treat the opening as a glass opening that fills the 4'-5" opening. He noted that one of the options attempts to address the question of the revolving door by applying bronze trim to solid-glass doors to maintain the symmetry. He stated that his client would prefer Option B, which is a completely clear, plain glass door that fills the full 4'-5" opening with a three-foot door and a sidelight.

Mr. Roller added that the application is not intended to be perverse. He opined that the Commission had expressed that something other than a conventional framed door might be acceptable, and that there was a hole in the building as one looked at it since there was a revolving door. He stated that their client feels very strongly that they need something contemporary in style to help them lease the space, and that the existing entrance reflects an old and tired look that they want to improve upon. He argued that this application is a reasonable adaptation, and that it has been done on other buildings in the city. He opined that the proposal maintains the idea that this was an opening rather than a door in plane, because a door with a frame in plane brings the door forward, which was not what was there.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 15 NOVEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Stein stated that she has difficulty understanding the drawings, because they are not actually drawings, but rather renderings that do not show the details. She noted that they are calling the doors frameless glass doors, but they appear to have bronze trim. Mr. Roller responded that any frameless door will have bottom trim and top trim, but no side trim. Mr. Roller clarified that what appears to be bronze attached to the doors is actually part of the original door opening, not the door. Mr. Roller noted that what is original is rendered as bronze, and what is new or non-original is rendered as brass.

Ms. Pentz asked whether the bronze would be cleaned. Mr. Roller responded that it is not in bad shape, and it is a weathered bronze color, and the intention is to see the building maintained in a weathered bronze color, not a brassy bronze color.

Ms. Stein stated that she is in agreement that the existing brassy doors bring attention to themselves as non-historic, and that more glass is appropriate here, but that the last time they reviewed this project, the Committee had asked for a frame around the entire door, and that she holds to that belief. She noted that it could be a slim frame, but that it should be around the head and sill, as well as the two jambs. Mr. Werner responded that if they are going to do a three-foot door, what happened previously was that there are five or six inches of brass infill around the door. He reiterated that they want to use a three-foot door, but noted that perhaps they could do sidelights on either side of the door to keep it symmetrical, but to put a frame around it would not create the original symmetry.

Mr. Roller reiterated that they want a more contemporary look in the opening, and to start adding a frame around the door and sidelight would create an asymmetrical appearance. He stated that they do not want a four-foot door, because it would be unwieldy, and to move the door to the center would create really small sidelights and look awkward. Mr. D'Alessandro asked who the applicants were using as their hardware supplier. Mr. Roller responded that they have not gotten that far. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he does not understand why they are limited to a three-foot door. Mr. Roller responded that a four-foot door is heavier. Mr. Werner noted that with a three-foot door there needs to be seven feet within the vestibule, and that they would prefer a three-foot door for accessibility.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked how tall the door is. Mr. Werner responded that it is 87.4 inches tall. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that that is not that tall. Mr. Roller responded that that is the original height, and they do not propose to change that. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he does not support a contemporary appearance in a historic building. Ms. DiPasquale noted that this building is listed as Significant in the Society Hill Historic District.

Mr. Werner presented a photograph of the type of frameless glass door they would like to use. He noted that it is in the Widener building, which he found out is not designated as historic. He opined that it is just a glass door and sidelight, and it seems to work, and does not in his opinion detract from the building. Mr. Roller explained that the asymmetrical frameless door and sidelight is exactly the aesthetic they are trying to achieve.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the design of Option A. Mr. Roller explained that, in an attempt to hint at the symmetry of the original doors, they have proposed a strip of trim that could perhaps be a handle, to be placed down the middle of the three-foot door. Ms. Gutterman commented that no panic hardware is shown on the drawings. Mr. Werner responded that that is not necessary since it is an office building. Mr. Roller noted that the push would be the same as the pull.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if all of the elements of the revolving door are gone. Mr. Roller responded affirmatively.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the owners have tried to patina the existing brass doors so they do not appear so garish. Mr. Roller responded that the existing doors are awkward, heavy, and have a balance hinge, and are difficult to handle. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that even very large doors can be made functional if they have the right hardware, especially since these are not very tall doors. Mr. Roller asked whether Mr. D'Alessandro was suggesting a four-foot solid glass door. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that it should have a frame, since they will need hardware. Ms. Gutterman clarified that none of the Committee members is suggesting that a frameless door is appropriate. Mr. Roller expressed his concern that there may be issues with wind with a four-foot door. Ms. Gutterman opined that a four-foot, framed door with a little bit of infill on either side is the most appropriate solution. Mr. Werner opined that he does not think a four-foot wide door would be consistent with a building of this era. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he would say the opposite—that a three-foot door for a building of this scale would be incongruous. He noted that the door to his own home is wider than three feet. Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting that a three-foot door in this opening will look very small, and that the hardware of top and bottom pivots will address the manageability issue.

Mr. Roller asked whether the Committee was in support of essentially Option C, with a four-foot door that is glass with a top and bottom rail only, assuming they can get the appropriate hardware. Ms. Gutterman responded that no, the door should have a frame all the way around it; it needs to have stiles. She suggested that the door can be streamlined and have a narrower profile than exists currently, but that it should be a metal and glass door in a more streamlined metal door. Mr. Roller attempted to walk through the Committee's proposed solution. He looked at Option C again, noting that there is no reason to rip out the existing side infill pieces, as they reduce the opening to approximately four feet. He noted that they could make a door with an inch and a half side frame, stiles and rails, and asked what the minimum top and bottom rail sizes would be. The Committee members agreed that the top rail could be approximately three inches, which the bottom should be a minimum of six inches. Mr. Roller expressed his understanding of the Committee's recommendation for a framed door.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommended denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with a suggestion to consider a fully-framed metal and glass door, with a frame with minimum dimensions of six inches at the bottom, three inches at the top, and 1.5 to two inches on the sides.

ADDRESS: 1916 WAVERLY ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Stuart Sarsen

Applicant: Emily Stromberg, S2 Design

History: 1858; Ringgold Place

Individual Designation: 3/1/1979

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on top of a four-story building. The deck will be approximately 10'-8" deep. The building, considered significant in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District, is located midblock on Ringgold Place, and has a pitched roof that slopes toward Waverly Street. The proposed deck would have a 9' setback, would be accessed through a roof hatch rather than a pilot house, and the railings would consist of black metal in a horizontal configuration. A mockup of the proposed design indicated that the deck would not be visible from Waverly or 19th Street, but the railing would be partially visible from Uber Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, which recommends that rooftop additions be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Stein stated that the deck would be visible from a public way. She opined that while she can appreciate owners of a small residence maximizing their space, the deck would not be appropriate in this context and with such visibility. The deck, she added, appeared to extend more than five feet above the roofline, and the rear photograph illustrates its probable visibility. Ms. Gutterman added that the roof deck would set a bad precedent.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the rear visibility. Ms. Keller responded that the mockup was visible from Uber Street, and a staff photograph was included in the application to illustrate the visibility. Ms. Pentz commented that the mockup shows that the deck would be highly visible.

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

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

ADDRESS: 2030 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ken Young & Jami Young

Applicant: Kevin McDonnell, Hanson General Contracting

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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 legalize new front façade windows, which were installed without staff review or approval of shop drawings. The architect received approval from the staff for replacement of windows as part of a larger renovation project, but failed to submit shop drawings, which are commonly reviewed by the staff for final approval after a permit has been issued for a broader scope of work. The new windows are historically accurate in material and pane configuration, but have a subframe which results in the appearance of a build-down of the masonry opening.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kevin Rasmussen and contractor Kevin McDonnell represented the application.

Ms. Stein inquired about the dimensional difference resulting from the added frame. Mr. Rasmussen answered that the detail adds approximately one inch on each side of the glass opening. Ms. Stein commented that the drawings are not very detailed.

Mr. McCoubrey requested clarification on the element under question and its location within the window system. Ms. Gutterman stated that the added frame would reduce the glass opening by approximately three inches. Mr. Rasmussen responded that three inches would be greater than the actual reduction of glass, although he added that he did not know the exact dimension of the previous glass opening. The differential on the jamb, he continued, is one inch, and the overall change would be two inches.

Ms. Stein asked if the applicant could supply photographs of the property before the windows were installed. Ms. Keller stated that she had images dating to the building's designation and distributed them to the Committee members.

Mr. Rasmussen clarified that the added element is a guide for the upper sash and provides a surface to which the screen is secured at the lower sash. At the upper sash, he continued, the added element sits flush against the sash frame and does not create a difference in plane.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the situation is common and the Committee routinely recommends denial of subframes that reduce the widths of openings. Mr. Rasmussen clarified that several alterations had been made at the interior behind the brick mold, and Mr. McDonnell noted that the housing for the pulley system had been removed. The molding adjacent to the brick opening, Mr. McDonnell continued, was secured by a mortise and tenon joint and the brick mold and bull nose were maintained. Ms. Gutterman requested clarification on where the sash weights were located previously and inquired whether the relationship of the new window to the brick mold was preserved. Mr. Rasmussen answered that, in the drawing, the blank area behind

the brick mold is the remaining structural portion of the weight pockets and is integrated with the existing brick mold. He explained that the trim was in excellent condition and was reused.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the wood sill was reused or installed new. Mr. Rasmussen explained that a new wood sill sits on top of the earlier sill.

Ms. Stein stated that the Committee's task is to review the application as if the windows had not been installed. The full Commission, she continued, holds a different purview and can consider that the windows have been installed with attention to craft detail. The build out on top of existing frames, she continued, thickens the size of the window frame and reduces the glass. Ms. Stein raised the issue of communication and indicated that the Commission may consider whether or not the applicants knew they would need to submit shop drawings. She added that the Committee does not consider that factor.

Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the drawings should include dimensions and should document the differences between the new and old windows. Mr. Rasmussen noted that he understands the dimensional issue, but contested the Committee's use of the term "build-down," stating that it implies new material was placed over existing construction. In this case, he continued, there was an attempt to work within existing materials for the sash to act as a replacement system, and he indicated that it was important to distinguish what the intent was.

Ms. Gutterman reiterated Ms. Stein's previous comment that the Commission may consider extenuating circumstances related to why the windows needed to be replaced. She also suggested that there be some clarity on the dimensional issues of the new glass, frame, and sash as compared to the historic windows.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that no public was present.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:14 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 15 NOVEMBER 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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.