

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

**TUESDAY, 25 OCTOBER 2011
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Stephen Bachich, RFR Architect
Raymond Rola, RFR Architect
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G
Vincent Salandria
Betsy Salandria
Lynda Weaver
William G. Middleton, Architect
Eugene Bukh, Perfect Properties Development
Rustin Olher, Harman Deutsch Architects

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mes. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Evans and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 105 N 02ND ST

Project: Rehabilitate buildings for residential and commercial use

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Pottery Works LP

Applicant: Jack Azran, The Pottery Works LP

History: various buildings dating from 1840 to 1925

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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 the rehabilitation several commercial structures along Arch and N. 2nd Streets that have been combined into a single tax parcel. They will be rehabilitated as 36 dwelling units and ground-floor commercial space. The staff has worked with the architects to find appropriate designs for the doors and windows based on old photographs, insurance surveys, and evidence on the buildings. On the easternmost structure, formerly 127 Arch Street, the Historical Commission approved the removal of the fifth story after a fire and the Department of Licenses & Inspections' designation of the building as Imminently Dangerous in 2001. At that time, the permit was conditioned, requiring the reconstruction of the cornice. The reconstruction was never completed. The application proposes a wood bracketed cornice, which never existed on the building. The staff recommends a different design based more closely on the cornice seen in historic photographs. The application proposes the installation of some "composite windows"; however, those may not meet the Standards. Finally, the application proposes masonry cleaning; however, specifications for the cleaning are not provided. The application does not propose additions to the structures. The applicants have indicated that they would prefer to remove the fire escapes to return the buildings to their original appearances. The applicants will need to work closely with staff on the details for the windows, storefronts, and treatment of masonry.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided an appropriate cornice is substituted for the proposed cornice for 127 Arch Street and appropriate windows are substituted, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Stephen Bachich and Raymond Rola represented the application.

Messrs. Bachich and Rola stated that they had removed all references to rear decks on the drawings. Ms. Hawkins asked if the rears of the buildings were visible from the public right-of-ways. The applicants responded that they are not visible. They noted, in fact, that it is almost impossible to photograph them. They presented a revised drawing with changes to wood windows and a brick cornice at 127 Arch Street. The changes were based on a 1930s photograph. Ms. Gutterman stated that the period or point in history of restoration of the buildings was unclear. Mr. Baron showed several newly discovered historic photographs and explained that the buildings dated from different periods and each would be restored to its particular point of significance, typically its date of construction. He said that the staff will work with the applicants to revise some of the storefront details based on evidence in the newly discovered photographs.

Mr. Evans stated that the cornice on 127 Arch Street should not be added where no cornice ever existed. Mr. Baron stated that he attempted to convince the applicants to reconstruct the missing floor on the building. The applicants explained that they could not rebuild the missing floors because of zoning restrictions. Several Committee members suggested that the cornice

on 127 Arch Street should be simplified to corbelled brick without the arch top. The applicants agreed to simplify the cornice.

Ms. Gutterman claimed that the rendering included in the application made the buildings look too uniform. She asked why the brick was being painted the same color on all of the buildings to give them a uniform appearance. Mr. Baron responded that the application does not propose the painting of the brick and the rendering shows that the original brick is at least four different colors. He noted that the brick would be cleaned but not painted. Ms. Gutterman objected to the proposal to paint the trim the same color on all of the buildings. Mr. Baron noted that the trim has been painted a uniform color on all of the buildings for many years because they have been consolidated into one complex. Ms. Gutterman insisted that the trim be painted different colors on the various buildings to maximize the distinctions between the buildings. Mr. Evans opined that the stone sills and lintels should not be painted. Any paint should be removed from lintels and sills.

Mr. Baron reported that the corner building is a remnant of an eighteenth-century building. He explained that the painted sign was not installed until well after 1929, the end of the period of significance for the historic district. He elaborated that, because the painted sign postdates the period of significance, the Commission cannot require its retention; essentially, the Commission determined that the sign was not historic when it created the district with a period of significance ending in 1929. Despite this advice, the Committee members insisted that the 1950s painted sign contributed to the character of the Old City Historic District and should be preserved. The applicants stated that they were not opposed to retaining the 1950s painted signage, but they contended that it would add difficulty to the masonry pointing and cleaning. Mr. Evans acknowledged that they could not require the retention of the sign because it falls outside the district's period of significance. The applicants stated that they would restore the 1950s painted sign. Ms. Gutterman objected and stated that it should not be restored; it should be left alone. Mr. Evans stated that it should be allowed to continue to decay. The applicants expressed surprise and stated that, if retained, they would like to restore it. Mr. Evans asked them to simply leave it alone. He also observed that the painted graphic "107" on 107 N. 2nd Street falls within the period of significance and should be retained.

The applicants stated that they would like to remove the fire escapes. The Committee members stated that the fire escapes, which were installed in the early twentieth century, before 1929, should be preserved. They added that the fire escapes could be removed if they were found to be structurally unsound or not in compliance with the building code. The applicants asked whether the window openings at the fire escapes, which had been converted to doors, should be restored to window openings or retained as doors. The Committee members responded that either retention or restoration was acceptable.

Ms. Gutterman suggested recommending approval in concept. Ms. Hawkins reminded her that the applicants are requesting final approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the storefront designs are revised based on the historic photographs, appropriate wood windows are installed, the cornice at 127 Arch Street is simplified, the fire escapes are retained if structurally sound and allowed by the building code, and the painted graphic "107" on 107 N. 2nd Street and the corner Trenton Pottery sign are preserved, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 46 N FRONT ST

Project: Remove illegal rear bay, alter rear addition, install windows
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Wayne Bishop, Third Federal Bank
Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Group G LLC
History: 1785; storefront piers added by Samuel Wetherill
Individual Designation: 11/29/1960
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the modification of this highly significant merchant's house to partially correct illegal modifications undertaken by a former owner several years ago. In 2001, this house was completely restored with correct windows. After the restoration, a new owner converted the structure to a four-unit residential building. Without seeking the Commission's approval or a permit, the owner added an additional story onto the rear ell and a bay onto the rear façade to accommodate a new stair and hallway. At the request of the Historical Commission, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation and stopped the illegal work. The owner went bankrupt and the Third Federal Bank seized the property.

The current application, which has been submitted by a prospective buyer, seeks to correct many aspects in violation by removing the illegal rear bay and the replacing the illegal vinyl windows with wood windows. The added story on the rear ell would be retained, but its roofline would be modified to reduce its height to a point below the rear cornice of the main block and to regain its sloped shed roof. The application seeks to retain the widened rear door to the deck, but to install doors with muntins. The application also proposes a wood railing for the deck. The deck has existed for many decades. Wood windows with muntins would be installed in the rear ell, replacing vinyl windows. The staff recommends that the rear door be returned to its historic width and location.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the rear door returned to its historic width and location, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Gerry Gutierrez represented the application.

The Committee members asked Mr. Gutierrez to describe the extent of the modifications to the rear ell as well as the circulation within the building. He explained that the added story on the rear ell would be retained, but its roofline would be modified to reduce its height to a point below the rear cornice of the main block and to regain its sloped shed roof. He also explained that the interior circulation would be modified to render the illegal bay unnecessary.

The Committee members discussed the illegally enlarged rear ell and whether it should be restored to its original size. Ultimately, they agreed that the modification was acceptable. They did appreciate that the application proposed altering it to restore its original shed roof shape. Some Committee members agreed with the staff's recommendation that the rear door to the deck should be restored to its original width. Others so no benefit to restoring it to its original width, especially in light of the fact that it was historically a window, not a door. All Committee members agreed that the removal of the illegal rear bay and the restoration of the window was essential.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the doorway to the deck is reduced to its original width, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 411 S 18TH ST

Project: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan Kristian

Applicant: W.G. Middleton, WGM Architects

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize windows installed without a permit at the rowhouse at 411 S. 18th Street. The original windows were four-over-four windows with a wide beaded vertical muntin and a narrow horizontal muntin. A contractor has installed one-over-one windows in subframes within the existing frames. He now proposes to add muntins to the existing windows. It is clear from the photographs that the subframes reduce the glass size and the proposed muntin is not a good match for the historic muntin.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Lynda Weaver and architect William Middleton represented the application.

Using a photograph of the windows, Mr. Baron demonstrated that the drawing provided by Mr. Middleton does not accurately represent the true dimensions of the windows. The subframes of the illegal windows substantially reduce the glass size and increase the width of the frame. In addition, the muntin is a rectangular block in shape, which does not approximate the historic muntin. Mr. Middleton asserted that, when looking from afar, the illegal windows now have the appearance of the historic windows. The Committee members disagreed. They asked that the applicants to measure the glass and frame sizes of the illegal windows and the originals for comparison. Mr. Baron said that he would also visit the site to confirm the historic and illegal window dimensions.

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

ADDRESS: 2123-25 SPRUCE ST

Project: Legalize removal of balcony and window grilles

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Betsy Salandria

Applicant: Betsy Salandria

History: c. 1870; D. Webster Dougherty Residence; Wilson Eyre, Jr., architect of new façade; combined two buildings, constructed new façade, 1900

Individual Designation: 12/6/1979

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the removal of one iron balcony and three ornamental iron window grilles on the front façade of this architecturally significant building. This structure was originally constructed as two separate buildings about 1875. Architect Wilson Eyre Jr. combined the two buildings into one grand structure about 1900. At that time, he replaced the two front facades with the extant Colonial Revival façade. As a rendering executed in 1900 shows, the decorative ironwork balcony and grilles were integral parts of this important architect's Colonial Revival facade.

In April 2011, the staff observed that balcony and window grilles had been removed without the Historical Commission's approval or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. A violation was subsequently issued. According to Google Maps images from 2011, they were present earlier that year. The applicant claims that grilles were removed to scrape and paint the window frames and that the balcony was removed owing to its deteriorated condition. The original balcony and grilles or reproductions of them should be installed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the applications to the Architectural Committee. Owner Betsy Salandria represented the application.

Ms. Salandria explained that the balcony was removed because it was dangerous. Mr. Evans noted that the cover letter submitted by the applicant states that the balcony was stolen. Ms. Salandria clarified that the balcony was removed in December 2009 and reproduced by Colonial Ironworks. She explained that she presumed that the company obtained the necessary permits for the replacement. She then stated that six months after the replacement, she had the balconies and grilles removed for the painting of woodwork around the windows. She stated that they were stored in the building and were subsequently stolen. She added that, after the ironwork was stolen, she had the masonry holes when they attached patched and repaired.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the balconies and grilles are important architectural features of the building and should be reinstalled. Ms. Pentz agreed and noted that there is sufficient photographic evidence to reproduce the ironwork. Mr. McCoubrey stated that they are fundamental elements of Wilson Eyre's design. Ms. Salandria stated that the iron company told her that the ironwork could not be replicated. Mr. Evans suggested she contact other metalwork companies. Ms. Sell offered a list of fabricators that may be able to assist her. Mr. McCoubrey asked if she filed an insurance claim. Ms. Salandria responded that she only has liability insurance. She also asked if the Committee members or staff could estimate the cost of the replacement. Ms. Sell stated that the applicant should contact metalworking companies for estimates.

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

ADDRESS: 1700-02 MELON ST

Project: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1700 Melon Street Partner, 100 Snowflake Road, Huntingdon Valley, PA

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: c. 1863, buildings declared ID and demolished, 2003

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ADDRESS: 1708-10 MELON ST

Project: Construct building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 1700 Melon Street Partner, 100 Snowflake Road, Huntingdon Valley, PA

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: vacant lots

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: These applications propose to construct two residential buildings on vacant lots on Melon Street in the Spring Garden Historic District. Melon Street is a very narrow alley running from 17th Street to Bouvier Street. The current lot lines define four lots, 1700, 1702, 1708, and 1710; they would be redrawn to create two new lots, 1700-02 and 1708-10. The properties that separate these lots, 1704 and 1706, are not involved in these applications.

At the establishment of the Spring Garden Historic District on 11 October 2000, buildings stood at 1700 and 1702. The building at 1700 was a one-story remnant of a three-story Italianate rowhouse and was classified as Non-contributing to the district. The building at 1702 was a three-story Italianate rowhouse and was classified as Contributing to the district. In 2003, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the buildings at 1700 and 1702 Imminently Dangerous and the Historical Commission approved their demolitions. They were demolished and the lots are now vacant. Therefore, the 1700-02 site is not undeveloped; the Commission has full jurisdiction over this application.

The lots at 1708 and 1710 were vacant at the time of designation. However, the Commission's inventory for the Spring Garden Historic District mistakenly locates a one-story, non-contributing garage at 1710-12 Melon Street. The garage is located at what was 1712 Melon, which is now consolidated into a larger property at 1713-27 North Street. It is not located on 1710, the lot in question, which was vacant at the time of designation. The property on which the garage stands is not involved in this application. Therefore, the 1708-10 site is undeveloped; the Commission has review and comment jurisdiction over this application.

The applications propose identical three-story, brick rowhouses for the sites. They would have front-loaded garages, paired and triple double-hung windows, inset terraces at the third floors, and roof decks. The decks and pilot houses are not depicted on the front elevation drawings. The decks are not depicted on the rear elevation drawings. No information is provided about the

side elevations, but they are presumably stucco clad. The proposed buildings are compatible with their context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR 1700-02 MELON STREET: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

STAFF COMMENT FOR 1708-10 MELON STREET: The proposed building is compatible with the context of the Spring Garden Historic District.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the applications to the Architectural Committee. Developer Eugene Bukh and architect Rustin Olher represented the applications.

Ms. Hawkins stated that two separate buildings stood on each of the lots where one building is now proposed for construction. She suggested that the new construction should allude to this historic condition, providing a clue about the two earlier buildings. She acknowledged that the garage opening presents a challenge, but contended that it could be achieved through more careful proportioning of the façade.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the front door with a cross barn design was not appropriate. Mr. Olher clarified that the design had arisen out of the discussions with the community group, but that they were willing to change the design. Ms. Hawkins stated that the sidelights should be redesigned to improve their proportions and pane patterns. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicant work with the staff to redesign the entrance. Mr. Ohler agreed to this suggestion.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed material of the base. Mr. Ohler stated that base would be a cast stone to simulate limestone.

Mr. McCoubrey asked why no windows had been proposed for the side yard. Mr. Ohler stated that the two proposed houses are built to their property lines. There are no proposed side yards. He clarified that the empty spaces between the proposed houses are separate parcels with a different ownership.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR 1700-02 MELON STREET: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT FOR 1708-10 MELON STREET: The proposed building is compatible with the context of the Spring Garden Historic District.

ADDRESS: 2002 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Legalize removal of slate roof and installation of asphalt shingles
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Mark Brownstein
Applicant: Kevin Mallon, Pioneer General Contracting
History: c. 1875
Individual Designation: 5/1/1975
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the removal of slate roofing and installation of asphalt shingles on a mansard roof on a building on Spring Garden Street in the Spring Garden Historic District. The work was undertaken without the Commission's approval or a building permit. A building permit is required for reroofing in Philadelphia, whether the building is designated historic or not. The original slate shingle was hexagonal in shape. The installed asphalt shingle is GAF Timberline, a rectangular shingle that resembles a cedar shake.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the applications to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

The Architectural Committee reviewed the application and agreed with the staff that the installed roofing material does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

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

ADDRESS: 1914 SHUNK ST

Project: Replace wood porch railing with metal railing, install vinyl windows
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Jacqueline Mastrangelo
Applicant: Jacqueline Mastrangelo
History: 1910
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999
Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove an original wood porch railing and install a metal railing. This application also proposes to install vinyl windows. These railing and window applications were submitted separately, but propose work to the same property.

The existing railing is original to the building and part of the description of building type "L" in the designation of the Girard Estate Historic District. It should be noted that the entire wooden porch railing was present in the designation photograph taken in 2000. Currently, the west section of the rail and a piece of the north section are missing.

Currently, there are aluminum windows on the side elevation. The photographs provided by the applicant do not reference the locations of the proposed windows. The front and side elevations are visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6.

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

Ms. Gutterman asked the staff if it had spoken to the owner about the financial hardship process. Ms. Sell responded that she had and forwarded the Rules 7 Regulations as well as the application information for financial hardship to the property owner. The Architectural Committee reviewed the application and agreed with the staff that the proposed railings and vinyl windows do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The Committee members noted that part of the railing has been removed since designation without the Commission's approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:05 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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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

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

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

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