

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

**TUESDAY, 22 JUNE 2010
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins
John Cluver
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Carmelita Martell
Joseph Grace, Franklin Engineering, Inc.
Richard Rosene
Alon Barzilay
Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners
Joe Serratore, Joseph Serratore Architect
Mara Eskin, SHCA
Steve Fischer, Baby Blues BBQ
Matt Tomeo, Mercury Solar Systems
David Sharrow, Ray Angelini, Inc
Jeannie McMullern
Siraik Zakarin
Eric Dean
Nick Meli Jr., Nick Meli Contracting
Michael Loonstyn
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su Architects
Cornelia Soifer
Peter Mar
Sonja Bijelic, ArchSTUDIO2227
Vojislav Ristic, ArchSTUDIO2227
David Guinn, Mural Arts Program
Amy Johnston, Mural Art Program
Kevin Brown, Mural Art Program

Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program
Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program
Megan Smith
Jill Morrone
Robert Duggan
Joe Serratore
Ray Brogden, Architect
Luca Sena
Jessica Litt

CALL TO ORDER

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

1830 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE

Owner: Richard W. Rosene
Applicant: Richard W. Rosene
History: 1912
Designation: individually designated, 5/4/1972
Project: Construct penthouse addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a penthouse addition with deck. The addition would face south and would not be visible from Rittenhouse Square. The addition would be minimally visible from the blocks directly adjacent to the property owing to the height of the building. The deck would not be visible, except from a very great distance. The applicant proposes to clad the addition with a cast material to match the color of the terracotta found in the upper stories of this building. The application also proposes to enlarge the flanking windows facing south. One would be converted into French doors to access the deck.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Richard Rosene and engineer Joseph Graci represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to explain the terraces and the access to them. Mr. Rosene stated that one will be accessed from the sun room; the other will be accessed from a bedroom. The terraces are set a few feet below the main floor level of the unit. Mr. Cluver asked about the railings at the terraces. Mr. Rosene replied that the parapet walls will provide most of the railing height. The railings themselves will be attached to the parapets and extend slightly above them. He showed photographs of possible railings. Ms. Hawkins asked if the railings would be 2-inch pipe railings. The applicants stated that they could use those, but would happily substitute something else if the Committee deemed another choice more appropriate. Mr. Cluver suggested a thin, light railing.

Mr. McCoubrey asked why they were proposing arched windows when the building has square-head windows in this area. Mr. Evans noted that the proposed terra cotta over the arches was unconventional. He suggested a revision. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. McCoubrey agreed. Mr.

McCoubrey suggested that the addition should appear more like a light pavilion than a section of the historic building. Ms. Hawkins asked if they would be amenable to redesigning the addition. The applicants said that they would. Mr. Cluver suggested something with a more appropriate rhythm, perhaps a central bay with smaller flanking bays. Ms. Hawkins suggested a metal cornice rather than the heavy terra cotta parapet. The Committee members proposed a lighter addition that is more metal than terra cotta. They stated that any masonry should be limited to the base of the addition.

Mr. Cluver asked about the process for reviewing significant design revisions. He asked if the Committee felt comfortable having the Commission review the revised design at its next meeting or if the revised design should be resubmitted to the Committee for a subsequent review. Ms. Hawkins and Gutterman opined that they would be comfortable with a Commission review along with the staff review of the details. The Committee members advised the applicants to revise the design of the addition before the Commission meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval of the application, with the staff to review details, provided the addition is redesigned so that:

1. all new window openings have square heads;
2. the addition has piers at the corners, and perhaps intermediate piers;
3. the addition has a simple metal cornice;
4. any new masonry is limited to the base of the addition with metal above; and,
5. and the terrace railings are simple, light, open, and metal.

Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1326-28 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: 1326 Chestnut Street Associates; Barzilai Development

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners

History: Keystone National Bank, 1887, extended to Sansom Street, 1891, Willis Hale, architect storefront altered c. 1900, c. 1920, c. 1940, c. 1960

Designation: Individually designated, 12/6/1973

Project: Rehabilitate front façade, construct entranceway

OVERVIEW: In December 2009, the Historical Commission approved an application to rehabilitate the Keystone National Bank building at 1326-28 Chestnut Street as a hotel with restaurant at the first floor. During that review, the Commission elected not to approve the proposed restoration of the Chestnut Street façade and installation of a glass canopy at the Chestnut Street storefront, but instead asked the applicants to submit a revised design for that section of the project. In February 2010, the Commission reviewed a revised design. That in-concept application proposed to restore the masonry and add a glass entrance canopy at the front façade that would refer to the c. 1900 storefront by including an image of the historic storefront in laser-cut stainless steel, etched glass, or an applied graphic. The Commission did not approve the storefront with the historic image, but it did grant an in-concept approval to a glass and masonry storefront.

The current application proposes to clad the base of the turret or stair tower at the western edge of the front façade with rusticated masonry that is compatible with the historic masonry. It also proposes to erect a masonry-clad frame for the storefront that would have the same massing as

the lost c. 1900 storefront. The storefront would be fenestrated with a frameless glass and stainless steel curtain wall system. A glass railing and glass logo sign would mount to the top of the storefront. The storefront would have a metal base.

The Storefronts Guideline in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines is on point. It states:

Storefronts Guideline: Recommended: Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

The building was designed by famed architect Willis Hale and constructed in 1887 for the Keystone National Bank. In the early 1890s, Hale added to and extended the building to south to Sansom Street in the same style. The storefront on Chestnut Street, which served as a barometer of prevailing taste for a century, has been replaced numerous times. The building originally had a rusticated stone, arched entranceway with gable at Chestnut Street that was appropriate for the bank, but not for the building's later retail uses. The original entranceway was removed and replaced with a one-story, balustraded, Beaux-Arts storefront about 1900 by Hale when he built the Garrick Theater to the west. The Garrick was stylistically related to the Hale Building and created an ensemble with the central stair tower or turret linking the two buildings. The c. 1900 storefront was removed and replaced about 1920 with a two-story, Renaissance storefront with a tile roof. The c. 1920 storefront was removed and replaced with a streamlined, Art Moderne storefront matching the neighboring Woolworth Building when the Garrick was demolished about 1940. The c. 1940 storefront was removed and replaced with a Modern storefront about 1960. Although altered, the c. 1960 storefront remains in place today.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission's February 2010 approval in concept, Standard 9, and the Storefronts Guideline. The proposed storefront strikes a balance between the developer's desire for an entranceway with contemporary styling and the strict preservationist's desire for the reconstruction of one of this building's many historic storefronts. The proposed storefront is compatible, but not historicist.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Alon Barzilay and architect Jonathan Broh represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the location and dimensions of the curve of the turret or tower at the western edge of the front façade may not be depicted precisely in the architectural drawings. She asked Mr. Broh if he would be able to construct the proposed fire stair in the tower if he discovered that the tower was, in fact, narrower than depicted when he undertook a detailed survey of the building. Mr. Broh stated that he has enough room to pull the stair toward the interior of the building if his survey of the existing conditions reveals that the tower is slightly smaller than current depicted. He noted that his client does not yet own the building and he has not yet been able to access all areas or remove non-historic accretions. Ms. Hawkins asked if his current survey is adequate. Mr. Broh replied that his representation is close enough to the existing conditions to undertake the design.

Mr. Evans asked if the new east pier and the cornice at the storefront would stand out beyond the plane of the historic wall at the west. Mr. Broh stated that a civil engineer is still attempting to determine the location of the property line. He stated that the new storefront masonry would be

within the property line. If the face of the turret is behind the property line, as it currently appears it is, he would like to situate the new masonry of the storefront slightly proud or north of the historic face; if the turret extends out to the property line, then the storefront will be situated in the same plane. Mr. Evans asked Mr. Broh about the distance between the plane of the historic façade at the east and at the west. Mr. Broh replied that it is more than the three or four feet claimed by the Preservation Alliance. He stated that it was about six feet, but was difficult to measure currently, owing to many non-historic accretions. Mr. Evans agreed. He added that the Commission should assume that the drawings are accurate and, after the non-historic storefront is removed, if significant discrepancies are discovered that would alter the design in profound ways, then the applicant would be required to present a revised design to the Commission. Mr. Broh conceded that there will be some unknowns until the current storefront is removed. He offered to work on the details that depend on those unknowns with the staff.

Mr. Cluver asked if the new stone would match the historic stone. Mr. Broh stated that it would match the color of the historic store. He explained that it would be banded like the historic façade above. He offered to consider making it rough like the tower above, but currently it is proposed to be smooth with banding. Mr. Cluver objected to the awkward, narrow, interior space that would be created where the tower and storefront meet. Mr. Broh stated that the base of the tower was removed when the c. 1900 storefront was installed. He stated that they would like to reclad the tower, in part because they need to use it as an emergency stair. He agreed that the intersection of the storefront and the tower was complicated, but he asserted that they had studied numerous options and concluded that their design presented the best option, given the existing conditions. Mr. Barzilay stated that they have invested significant time and money studying the storefront problem, which is complicated by numerous alterations and accretions as well as a need to satisfy several regulatory agencies. He stated that the design they are proposing will be compatible with and respectful of the historic building. Mr. Evans asked them to confirm that the new stone cladding will match in color and texture, but may be tooled differently to indicate that it is not original. Mr. Broh stated that that was true. Mr. Evans stated that he believes that the architect has done an excellent job complying with the Commission's recommendation with a building and set of circumstances that are extremely complicated. He stated that he deemed the proposal a success. He stated that his only concerns involve minor details, such as the sealing of the storefront glass at the point where it intersects the stone.

Mr. Barzilay explained that his business requires a dramatic, transparent storefront. He stated that the current design is 60% masonry, 40% glass. Their original proposal was 100% glass.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance questioned Mr. Broh, asking him if he had provided the photograph of the c. 1900 storefront to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission when it reviewed the project for federal tax credits. Mr. Broh replied that he had not, but noted that the Historical Commission's staff did not discover the photograph until after that review had been completed. Mr. Gallery claimed that the architectural drawings were inaccurate. He claimed that the distance from the face of the east side of the front façade to the face of the west side of the front façade was two or three feet, not six or seven feet as the applicant claims. Mr. Gallery suggested alterations to the design of the east façade of the building along Juniper Street based on the photograph of the c. 1900 storefront. He proposed alterations to the window scheme for the first bay along the east façade. It was noted that the Commission has already approved the east façade. Regarding the front façade, he claimed that Mr. Barzilay's assertion that the Commission had suggested a storefront with 2010 styling was not correct. He asserted that the Commission had suggested a storefront that would be compatible with the historic

building. Mr. Gallery again claimed that the drawings were inaccurate. He objected to the overlap of the storefront glass onto new masonry. He presented a sketch of his preferred storefront, which was a slightly abstracted version of the c. 1900 storefront. Mr. Gallery also objected to the glass railing above the storefront. He objected to the material. He stated that glass was inappropriate. He suggested masonry. He posited that it could be an abstracted version of the masonry balustrade, but contended that it should be masonry, not glass. He presented his “doodles,” as he called them, to the Committee of a masonry balustrade. He claimed that the glass had no relationship to the front façade. He stated that there was no reason for it to be glass. Glass was not appropriate. It should be masonry. He concluded that there was not a balance between historic and contemporary architecture in the proposal. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Gallery how he was planning to accommodate the fire stair in his proposal for the storefront. Mr. Gallery stated that he did not know how to accommodate the fire stair and retain a symmetrical storefront in any way other than the design the applicants are proposing. Mr. Cluver suggested setting the stair tower back and not bringing the massing of the historic tower down to the ground. He stated that that would be more in keeping with the c. 1900 storefront. Mr. Evans asked his fellow Committee members to stop basing their review on the 1900 storefront and to review the proposed design on its merits. Mr. Evans contended that the 1900 storefront design worked because the extant building had a twin to the west. That building, the theater, is gone. Therefore, the applicants can base a design for a new storefront on the massing of the 1900 storefront, but they cannot replicate it because the other half of the building has been demolished. He concluded that the conditions have changed since 1900. A “watered down traditional architecture approach” will not work given the existing conditions.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the doors could be recessed to accommodate the curve of the tower. Ms. Hawkins observed that the curve of the tower is not located accurately on the renderings. In reality, the curve is located slightly to the east. The design around the curve and the doors will need to be revised slightly after its precise location is determined.

Mr. Barzilay stated that their design is driven by both architectural concerns and a need for the storefront to have a “presence.” The storefront needs to be seen by pedestrians and drivers. Mr. Barzilay added that the Commission has already approved the windows on Juniper Street that Mr. Gallery is now suggesting should be revised. He concluded that his design complies completely with the Commission’s approval in concept. It includes the masonry required; it is both compatible and contemporary. He stated that he has been working on this project for 18 months and needs to bring it to a resolution. He stated that he has undergone numerous reviews by myriad regulatory agencies, all with differing ideas. He noted that some are now trying to undo decisions that have already been made. He asked the Committee to be reasonable and consider his design as presented. He stated that he has compromised as the Commission requested. Mr. Broh noted that the current conditions at the building make precise survey nearly impossible. Mr. Evans stated that he would be willing to recommend approval and allow the staff to work out the minor survey details as the project continues. He stated that the staff could require an additional review before the Committee and Commission if it determined that the survey was so far off that the design would need to change in a consequential way. He asserted that the Committee must find a way to bring this review to closure. Ms. Hawkins agreed that the review should be concluded. She made suggestions for determining missing dimensions before the Commission meeting. She also suggested that the architect design a clean termination for the storefront glass at the masonry. Mr. Barzilay observed that he has spent a great deal of money on architectural services trying to finalize this design before he has full access to the building. He remarked that the survey may be slightly inaccurate, which will

cause the design to shift slightly, but he asserted that those shifts will be insignificant. He asked the Committee to define the bounds within which he may work so that this will not become an endlessly iterative process. For example, if the curve starts a few inches to the east from where it is currently shown and the width of the storefront glass is reduced by those few inches, is that acceptable? The Committee agreed that minor shifts like that were acceptable.

Mr. Gallery “strongly urged” the Committee to require the submission of revised plans for another round of Committee and Commission reviews. He contended that the dimension from the face of the east side of the front façade to the face of the tower may not be as large as is currently believed; if it is smaller, resulting interior space behind the storefront will be smaller and difficult to use. He asked the Committee to recommend denial and require a new submission. Mr. Barzilay objected strenuously to additional delays. He reminded the Committee that he is proposing to restore an important building that has been allowed to decay for years. He stated that he cannot afford to explore other options, especially when they have no bearing on the design of the storefront from a compatibility standpoint. He declared that the window of opportunity for this project is closing. If he does not obtain the approvals soon, he will be forced to abandon the project. He stated that he did not submit construction drawings, but only a final plan. He acknowledged that dimensions will change slightly as they take control of the building, do final survey work, and develop the construction drawings. However, he asserted that the plans will not change significantly. The storefront they will build will look like the storefront they are proposing. He “implored” the Committee to allow the project to move forward and not delay it because a slight shift in dimensions may slightly alter an interior space. He acknowledged that any approval would be subject to the staff’s review of details. He agreed that he would return to the Commission with any significant design changes. Ms. Hawkins asked why they have not determined the precise location of the curve of the tower if the Committee has been discussing it with them for 18 months. Mr. Broh responded that this is the first time the Committee or the public has ever raised questions about the shape or location of the curve. He contended that the target is moved with every review.

Mr. Cluver suggested revising the detail where the east pier meets the storefront cornice. He stated that the cornice should sit on the pier, not rise up through it. Mr. Broh stated that he could revise that portion of the design.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee should recommend approval. She stated that potential dimensional discrepancies are minimal and do not raise historic preservation concerns. She asserted that the Committee should support this project and allow it to move forward. Mr. Evans agreed. He stated that they are not attempting to replicate a historic design; it is a new design. A slight change in dimensions would not fundamentally change the design approach; the design would continue to be compatible. Mr. Evans suggested that the applicants verify the dimensions before the Commission meeting. Ms. Gutterman asserted that the storefront glass should not be placed directly in front of masonry. However, she also asserted that the Committee should allow this project to move forward. Mr. Cluver noted that the location of the double doors could shift if the dimensions of the glass to the west change. Such a shift would not fundamentally change the design.

Mr. McCoubrey objected to the glass railing above the storefront. Mr. Cluver responded that it commemorates the balustrade of the c. 1900 storefront. Mr. Barzilay noted that the glass rail relates to the rail already approved for the deck on the roof. Mr. Cluver suggested removing the

rail. The signage could remain as proposed. He also stated that the staff should review the replacement stone for compatibility with the existing stone.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Evans moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, provided the glass railing above the storefront is removed, with the staff to review details including the replacement stone, pursuant to the Commission's February 2010 approval in concept, Standard 9, and the Storefronts Guideline. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3402 & 3404 SANSOM STREET

Owner: 3404 Sansom Street Associates

Applicant: Betty Mon

History: c. 1870

Designation: individually designated, 12/6/1979

Project: Alter façades including adding signage, awnings, and shutters

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate two former residential row houses into a single restaurant at ground-floor. The properties are currently used for commercial activities at ground-floor. The applicant has met with the staff several times. The applicant proposes to install copper awnings and shutters. The evidence in this row suggests that these buildings did not have exterior shutters historically. There is no evidence of shutter hardware on the facades. Furthermore, the proposed combination of shutters and awnings at the same windows is awkward and historically inconsistent; the shutters could not be closed with the awnings in place. The applicant also proposes to install light fixtures and metal fence. The most significant alteration to the façade on Sansom Street would be the addition of an illuminated sign. The applicant proposes two versions of the same sign; one would be 10 feet tall; the other 7 feet. The applicant hopes to utilize existing plates on the façade. Such a sign would have an adverse effect on this historic property. The sign is too large and of completely different character than the historic house and its setting within the row. The proposed sign would be appropriate for a much larger Art Deco or Moderne building, not for the subject two-and-half story Second Empire row house. The applicant also proposes alterations to the rear, which faces a service alley, yet it is widely use by patrons. The applicant proposes a blade sign and wall sign on areas of the building that are non-historic additions or greatly altered sections of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of Sansom Street façade alterations, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9; approval of rear alterations, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Business owner Steve Fisher represented the application.

Mr. Evans stated that the drawings are "completely impossible to follow." He asked the applicant to guide the Committee through them. He stated that there are no annotations or labels differentiating the existing conditions from the proposed alterations. Ms. Hawkins asked about the extent of the work at the rear. Mr. Danta stated that some minor work to the rear had already been approved at the staff level. He noted that a large addition was constructed at the rear several years ago with the Commission's approval. He stated that the current application is proposing signage only for the rear. The Committee members asked about changes to non-historic windows at the rear that had been approved by the staff. Mr. Fisher stated that he was

unaware of the details of those changes, but could inquire with his architect. He also informed the Committee members that he was ill, but would nonetheless attempt to answer their questions.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the signage on the front façade is not appropriate; she said that it would be more appropriate for a shopping center than a historic building. She stated that, in terms of size, the sign proposed for the rear is more appropriate. Mr. Cluver stated that this block of Sansom Street has a very special character. He claimed that the proposed sign would have a significant negative impact on the street. He compared the proposed sign to the White Dog sign and observed that the White Dog sign does not “scream for attention” in the way that this sign would. The White Dog sign is much more appropriate for the character of the street. He also noted that the proposed awnings were inappropriate for the building. He added that, from a historical perspective, awnings do not make sense on a north-facing façade. He stated an awning would be acceptable over a door, but not the windows. Ms. Hawkins contended that the shutters were not appropriate, especially because they are not the same shape as the window openings. Historically, the shape of the shutters matched the shape of the window openings.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the lighting fixtures were not well documented in the application. She asked for information about them. Mr. Danta explained that the applicant had shown him a photograph of the fixture, but had not submitted it with the application. Mr. Fisher apologized that his architect had not submitted the documents on the fixture with the application. He explained that they would be 10-inch tall sconces. Ms. Hawkins noted that they are shown about two feet tall in the elevation drawing. Mr. Danta noted that the fixtures are medieval or Tudor in style and not compatible with the style of the building.

Ms. Gutterman stated that, between the awnings, shutters, lights, and signage, too much is being added to this façade. She suggested that the proposed elements should be composed as a group, not simply selected from a catalog and attached to the façade.

Mr. Evans and Ms. Hawkins asked about the meaning of the vertical lines on the elevation drawings. They stated that they could not determine what the lines indicate. Mr. Cluver stated that the application should be resubmitted with better documentation including annotated drawings. He remarked that the Committee can only guess at what is proposed in the current drawings. Mr. Danta directed the Committee's attention to a cover letter from the applicant that clarifies the various proposals. Messrs. Cluver and Evans stated that the information needed to be included on the drawings. Mr. Cluver read the letter and concluded that it did not answer all of his questions.

Mr. Evans stated that, although outside the Commission's purview, he found the logo for the restaurant depicting a scantily clad woman kneeling and drinking to be offensive. Mr. Fisher explained that the bottle contains barbeque sauce, not alcohol.

The Committee members stated that the railings and fence were appropriate. They concluded that the projecting sign, shutters, awnings, and lights were inappropriate. They especially objected to the projecting sign. Mr. Fisher noted that La Terrasse, a restaurant on the same block, has a projecting sign. Ms. Gutterman stated that that sign is very different and is located on the corner, not in the middle of the block. Mr. Evans stated that the restaurant will not need a large sign if the food is as good as the cover letter suggests. Ms. Hawkins stated that this is largely a pedestrian street with some slow-moving vehicles. She contended that a large sign is

not necessary for business. She also stated that the La Terrasse sign does not project nearly as far off the building as the proposed sign. Mr. Fisher stated that his sign is 4'-3" wide at the widest point. Ms. Hawkins noted that that does not include the mounting brackets. She concluded that the sign is too large for the narrow street of historic row houses.

Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Evans again noted that they found the logo sign offensive. Ms. Hawkins, the chair of the Committee, replied that they could comment on it, but the content was not within the Commission's purview.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cluver moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial of Sansom Street façade alterations including the signage, awnings, shutters, and light fixtures, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9; approval of the front fence and rear signage, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Gutterman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

512 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Natalya Lerner

Applicant: Joe Serratore

History: c. 1820

Designation: individually designated, 4/30/1957

Project: Construct rear fourth-floor addition.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear fourth-floor addition. The roof of this house has been modified. The addition would enclose an existing open deck area on the rear slope of the roof. The addition would be clad in stucco. The addition would be minimally visible from the public right away.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Joe Serratore represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Serratore whether a structural engineer had reviewed the plans to determine if the party walls could support the new addition and also if the new window could be legally installed in the party wall. Mr. Serratore stated that he is working with an engineer, who will verify the structural design. The window will have a two-hour fire rating and will be installed if approved by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Cluver asked if the stucco would match the brick. Mr. Serratore replied that it would not, but it would harmonize with the brick. It would be a beige or off-white. Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed windows. Mr. Serratore responded that they would be wood, 6-over-6, double-hung windows. Mr. Cluver suggested that they should be trimmed in wood. Mr. Evans asked if the exterior plane of the addition should be set back from the plane of the historic wall to differentiate between the new and old. Mr. Danta explained that the addition would be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. The set back would not be discernable to the public. Mr. Cluver disagreed with Mr. Evans, contending that the addition should not be set back. Mr. McCoubrey suggested a cornice or some other indicator of the transition between the new and old.

Myra Eskin of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that her organization had not yet reviewed the proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Pentz moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, provided a transition element is added between the old brick and new stucco and the new windows are trimmed in a traditional manner, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2204 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Owner: Andrew Kleeman

Applicant: Matt Tomeo

History: c. 1875

Designation: individually designated, 12/5/1974

Project: Install solar panels.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install solar panels on the former carriage house of the Bergdol Mansion. The panels would be installed on the eastern slope of the imitation standing-seam hip roof. The Commission approved the faux standing-seam metal roof several years ago. The applicant proposes to install the panels directly onto the surface of the roof between the standing seams without disrupting their pattern.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the panels, provided they are installed between the standing seams, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Matt Tomeo represented the application.

Mr. Tomeo explained that the roof is not a metal, but is instead a rubber-like roof that imitates the appearance of a standing-seam metal roof. It is grey in color. The Commission approved the roof several years ago.

Ms. Hawkins asked about penetrations to the roof. Mr. Tomeo explained that there will be no penetrations. The solar panels, which are paper thin, are rolled out onto the roof and affixed to it with an adhesive. He showed a sample to the Committee.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the electrical connections. Mr. Tomeo explained that the panels will be wired together and to a junction box. A conduit will run down from the roof, usually at the side of the building. Mr. Cluver stated that the details should be carefully considered. Ms. Gutterman stated that the staff can review the details to ensure that they are appropriate. The wiring should be inconspicuous and should not penetrate the roof. Ms. Hawkins stated that the panels should be held away from the eaves, ridges, and hips, probably 12 inches. Mr. Evans asked the panels cannot be placed on the west-facing roof. Mr. Tomeo replied that the panels would not receive as much sun in that location.

Siraik Zakarin, a neighbor, asked if the solar panels would produce glare or reflection. Mr. Tomeo stated that they would not; there is no glass in the panel.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Committee should adopt a set of standards or guidelines for evaluating solar panel applications. He asked about the color, visibility, and the capacity of the installer to locate the panels between the standing seams. Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee should review every case on its merits. An approval of a particular product in one case does not mean that it is appropriate in every other case. He stated that, in this case, the visibility is minimal and the pitch of the roof is relatively low. Mr. Evans added that the roof is already a substitute material. Mr. Evans also noted that the staff had supplied the Committee with the National Park Service's Interpreting the Standards Bulletin 52, *Incorporating Solar Panels in a Rehabilitation Project*, for this meeting.

Mr. Baron asked the applicant to provide a color photograph of the existing roof for the Commission meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, provided the panels are not located within 12 inches of the eaves, ridges, and hips; the panels are all aligned on the roof; with the staff to review details including wiring and connections. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

413-15 GASKILL STREET

Owner/Applicant: Jessica Litt

History: 1903, Jewish bath house

Designation: individually designated, 1/22/1963
significant in Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize replacement of windows

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize vinyl windows. The owner inherited several properties on this block including this building. She claims that she was unaware of their designations as historic. She replaced the character-defining windows on the front of this building with vinyl windows. She claims that the old windows were in poor condition. She states that replacement wood windows will cost \$3,000 including labor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The owner Jessica Litt represented the application.

Ms. Litt explained that she inherited the properties from her mother. She claimed to be unaware of the historic designation and its implications. She replaced the windows because of their deteriorating conditions as well as vandalism. She stated that her contractor advised against wood windows. She stated that she would be willing to alter the window frames to be more appropriate, but she does not have the resources to replace them.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the proportion of window pane to muntin has changed dramatically. She stated that the muntins look thin. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Cluver added that the vinyl material is also inappropriate. Ms. Litt stated that the window contractor claimed that approvals and permits were not needed. Mr. Cluver responded that the contractor was wrong. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee is advisory only and makes recommendations to the

Commission based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The Commission has more discretion and can take other factors into account.

Ms. Litt stated the windows were replaced more than two and one half years ago, but she only received the violation in April 2010. Mr. Baron stated that the current owner's parents were notified of the designation in writing. Ms. Litt stated that she is in financial trouble. She stated that she cannot afford to replace the illegal windows. She reported that she has two other properties for sale and is barely able to pay the property taxes. Ms. Hawkins advised her of her right to submit a financial hardship application, but noted that the Architectural Committee is not the body to review such an application. She advised Ms. Litt to speak to the staff about her options. Ms. Litt stated that she is unable to sell or rent her properties or pay the property taxes.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1701-7 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Electrical Mechanics Association

Applicant: Robert Sharrow, contractor

History: 1939, major alterations and addition including pitched slate roof in 1961

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

Project: Legalize/Approve Solar Panel Installation on roof

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install solar panels on most slopes of the complex roof of this Colonial Revival union hall at 17th and Spring Garden Streets in the Spring Garden Historic District. The installation of the solar panels has already begun. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued an electrical permit for the installation and the contractor started the project. The Department does not refer electrical permits to the Commission. During an inspection, a building inspector determined that the project requires a building permit as well as the electrical permit. Upon application for that permit, the applicant was referred to the Commission.

The roof on this building is a cross gable with multicolored slate and is visible from both Spring Garden and 17th Street. Fasteners have been attached to the roof; pieces of slate were notched to allow for the attachment. No solar panels have been installed yet. The solar panels are grey.

The Roofs Guideline of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines allows for rooftop additions including solar panels, provided "they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features." The National Park Service's Interpreting the Standards Bulletin 52, *Incorporating Solar Panels in a Rehabilitation Project*, likewise notes that "the installation of solar panels should conform to guidance regarding rooftop additions, i.e. that they be minimally visible, to avoid altering the historic character of the building." This application proposes the installation of solar panels on several slopes of this complex roof, which dates to 1961. To satisfy the Standards, solar panels should be "inconspicuous from the public right-of-way."

The inventory for the Spring Garden Historic District dates this building to c. 1922 and classifies it as contributing. That construction date is incorrect. In 1939, the southern arm of the current

building was constructed. It was a Colonial Revival style building with a flat roof, denticulated cornice, and parapet. In 1961, the northern arm of the building was constructed in the same Colonial Revival style. At that time, the parapet was removed and the slate roof with centered gables was added. The architectural drawings for this major renovation show that the new pitched roof was added over the flat roof, which was retained in place. The period of significance for the Spring Garden Historic District is 1850 to 1930. Therefore, this building, which was constructed in 1939 and significantly altered and added to in 1961, after the period of significance, was mistakenly classified as contributing owing to an error in professional judgment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the design is modified to ensure that the solar panels are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Union representative Robert Poston and contractor Robert Sharrow represented the application.

Mr. Sharrow explained that the panels will mount on racks, which are C-channels approximately two and one half inches tall. He displayed a sample panel. He stated that the entire system would stand no more than three inches above the roof and would be located 22 inches below the ridgeline and off the edges. He showed a photograph of an installed system on another building.

Mr. Evans claimed that the installation would make the slate roof difficult to maintain. He noted the copper bibs visible in some of the photographs submitted by the applicants and claimed that the bibs indicated earlier repairs. Mr. Sharrow responded that those bibs were not indicative of repair, but were installed with the solar panel supports as flashing. Mr. Poston stated that the union has replaced six pieces of slate in the 12 years that the union has owned it. Mr. Poston explained that the pitched roof with slate was added in 1961, when the rear half of the building was constructed. He claimed that the building had a flat roof from 1939 to 1961. He noted that the slate roof is only 49 years old. He stated that the flat asphalt and gravel roof from 1939 still exists under the pitched roof. It is visible in the attic. Mr. Farnham stated that his review of the zoning folder confirms the applicants' assertion that the pitched roof, gables, and northern half of the building date to 1961.

Mr. Poston stated that the union is showing its support for the sustainable technology by installing the panels. Mr. Cluver asked the applicants not to wave the "green flag." He claimed that solar panels do not provide a good return on investment. Mr. Sharrow responded that the panels will cut the union's electrical bill by 30% and will pay for themselves in a few years. Mr. Cluver disagreed and claimed that it takes about 60 years to break even on solar panels. Mr. Sharrow respectfully disagreed and reminded the Committee that his firm is one of the largest solar installers on the East Coast. He estimated a return on the investment within five and six years. Other Committee members advised that the economics of the panels are irrelevant to the Committee's review.

Ms. Pentz asked about the visibility from the streets. Mr. Poston replied that the solar panels will be visible from the street. Mr. Evans contended that one cannot simply "slap" solar panels on historic buildings with turrets or gables. Mr. Poston responded that they are not "slapping." They are installing carefully. Mr. Baron asked if it would be possible to locate the panels on the more

inconspicuous sections of the roof. Mr. Poston noted that all of the clips and most of the racks are already installed. Mr. Sharrow insisted that the union and its contractor had attempted to comply with permit requirements. They applied to the Department of the Licenses & Inspections for permits and were issued an electrical permit. Thinking they were in full compliance, they began work and were not informed that they needed a building permit until the work was well underway. They stated that they had made a significant investment in the project. Ms. Gutterman stated that the panels would be highly visible. She also objected to the damage to the slate.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance suggested that the Commission should work with the Department of the Licenses & Inspections to ensure that applications for solar panels on historic buildings are referred to the Commission. He also contended that the Commission should educate itself on the standards for reviewing solar panels on historic buildings. Mr. Gallery contended that, if the union is claiming that it needs to install the panels to save money, then it should file a financial hardship application to justify the alteration that does not meet the Standards. He asserted that the Commission can only consider financial justifications within the realm of a hardship application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that there are several differences between this solar panel system and the system reviewed earlier. This system stands off the roof, is more reflective, and covers more historic fabric. Mr. McCoubrey asserted this mounting system is not compatible with the roof. The slate should not have been cut.

Ms. Pentz reminded the Committee that this building is not what the Commission thought it was when it classified it as Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District. It was not constructed in 1922. A section with a flat roof was constructed in 1939. The building we see today was created in 1961, when the rear half was constructed and the pitched, slate roof was added.

Mr. Sharrow stated that he and his client have operated in good faith, invested significant money in this project, and applied and received what they were told was the requisite permit. He asked how the City could issue a permit for the project and then require a subsequent review once the project was underway. He stated that the City would be responsible for any losses incurred by his company and the union because it issued and then retracted its approval of the project.

Messrs. Baron and Farnham advised the applicant that the Architectural Committee conducts a technical review to determine whether the application complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the Commission's standards. Its recommendation is non-binding. The Commission itself can take extenuating circumstances into account. They suggested that the applicants save their economic and legal arguments for the Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Evans moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

410 S. PERTH STREET

Owner: Eric E. Dean

Applicant: Nick Meli Jr.

History: c. 1970

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

Project: Remove siding and install granite tile

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the corrugated metal siding on the first floor and replace it with black granite tiles. All four houses in this row retain the corrugated metal siding at both the first and second floors. The corrugated metal siding is original and a character defining feature for this row.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Eric Dean and contractor Nick Meli represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked the owner why he was seeking to replace the corrugated metal. Mr. Dean replied that the metal looks “awful.” He contended that the stone would improve the appearance of the entranceway. He asserted that the metal is a cheap building material that is common among houses of the era. He noted that none of the metal has been replaced on his block, but it has been replaced on some houses just outside the historic district.

Ms. Pentz observed that the designation of the Society Hill Historic District explicitly classified the Redevelopment Era buildings as historically significant. She stated that the proposed change would alter a character-defining feature of a Contributing building. She stated that she sympathizes with the applicant, but contended that the feature should be protected. Mr. McCoubrey agreed. He asked if the material is in poor condition. Mr. Dean stated that it is not. Mr. Dean added that the proposed replacement material would be the same color as the original material and would be difficult to distinguish from the original material from a distance. Ms. Hawkins noted that the metal could be painted to “freshen” it. Mr. Evans observed that the black stone would soon look as dated as the metal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Pentz seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

569 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Gary Bromley

Applicant: Andy Barreras

History: c. 1886

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

Project: Construct rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor rear addition on top of a two-story rear portion of the building. The addition would be clad in stucco. The proposed roofline would be higher than the existing building roofline. The drawings provided do not include a rear elevation or plans.

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

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

Ms. Gutterman agreed with the staff recommendation that the application is incomplete and the proposal does not meet the Standards. Mr. Evans also stated that the proposed addition is incompatible with the historic building. He added that, even if the applicant had submitted complete documentation including a plan and rear elevation, the Committee would recommend denial.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1718-20 NORTH STREET

Owner: Don Doyle

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: c. 1926

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

Project: Demolish garage, construct three-story building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a garage that is classified as Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, and construct a three-story building in its place. The applicant has neither claimed nor provided the documentation to support a claim that the building cannot be adaptively reused or that its demolition is necessary in the public interest. Rear sections of the building have collapsed and the Department of Licenses & Inspections has cited the building for Unsafe conditions, but the applicant has not claimed that the Department is requiring the demolition of the building to abate the Unsafe conditions. The applicant submitted a very similar application in December 2009. The Architectural Committee recommended denial of that application because it provided no justification for the demolition of the Contributing building. The applicant withdrew that application before it was presented to the Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the historic preservation ordinance.

§14-2007(7) (j) No permit shall be issued for the demolition of an historic building, structure, site or object, or of a building, structure, site or object within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building, structure, site or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that [the] building, structure, site or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Michael Loonstyn represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman questioned whether this same developer had presented this same application to the Committee in the past. Ms. Cote confirmed that Mr. Loonstyn had submitted a very similar application in December 2009. The Architectural Committee recommended denial because it provided no justification for the demolition of the Contributing building. The applicant withdrew that application before it was presented to the Commission. Ms. Gutterman asked what, if any revisions, had been made to the application since the earlier submission. Mr. Loonstyn replied that the application remained unchanged. Ms. Pentz responded that the Committee had no choice but to recommend denial. The Commission cannot approve the demolition of a Contributing building without a finding of hardship or necessity in the public interest. Ms. Gutterman agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the historic preservation ordinance. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

232 CHRISTIAN STREET

Owner: Cornelia and Jesse Soifer

Applicant: Cornelia Soifer

History: c. 1764

Designation: individually designated, 6/28/1966

Project: Install front door

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two options for front door replacement. The applicant prefers to install a six-panel Dutch door with the top two panels glazed. The second option would be a storm door with two louvered panels. The appropriate door for this house would be a solid six-panel door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of both options, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Cornelia Soifer and contractor Peter Marle represented the application.

Mr. Evans observed that the extant door is not the original door. He noted that several houses in Society Hill and Old City have Dutch doors. He stated that he would support a Dutch door. He commented that glass was not appropriate for a Dutch door. Historically, they would not have had glass. He also noted that a six-panel wood door would be acceptable. Ms. Soifer said that she would be willing to delete the glass. Mr. Cluver stated that the proportions of the rails and styles are very important to the appearance of any door. Mr. Evans agreed that the proportions of the proposed door were inappropriate. Ms. Soifer stated that she was willing to adjust the dimensions to satisfy the Committee. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the staff should review the final design to ensure that the proportions were correct.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval of a solid wood Dutch door without glass, with the staff to review details. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2001 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Applicant: Rob Vahey & Corey Weiser-Vahey

Owner: Corey Weiser

History: c. 1859

Designation: individually designated, 11/6/1975

contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Demolish bay, construct addition, alter openings, restucco garden wall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the first-story exterior. It proposes to demolish a side bay and construct a one-story addition in its place. The existing bay appears to have been built in the 1920s and lacks the fine detail of the historic second-story bay of this building. The proposed addition would be flush with the main block, clad in painted wood recessed panels, and include six-light casements and a wood cornice. Infill of a side window on the rear ell is also proposed. In the rear, the applicant proposes a partial infill of a masonry opening and installation of French doors and a window.

In April 2010, a violation was issued for installation of a multi-colored mural on the stucco side wall along 20th Street without Historical Commission approval or a permit by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. This application proposes to correct the violation by rebuilding and recoating the wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of side bay demolition and construction of a one-story addition, provided the window proportions are adjusted and the cornice does not extend beyond the plane of the main facade; approval of rear door and window alterations; denial of side window infill, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the staff to comment on the historical significance of the bay that would be removed. Ms. Sell responded that the staff had considered the significance of the bay, which is a later addition and concluded that it had not acquired historic significance in its own right and therefore did not need to be retained and preserved. She stated that the staff had decided that the bay was not a character-defining feature. She stated that it did not have the fine detailing of the earlier bay on the side façade.

Mr. Evans asked about the staff recommendations for approving the design of the bay. Ms. Sell stated that the staff deemed the panes in the casements in the bay to be too small relative to the historic window panes on the façade. Mr. Rasmussen stated that he had not studied the issue, but would reconsider the panes sizes to make them more of the scale of the other window panes in the house.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the roof of the addition and its intersection with the historic building. Mr. Rasmussen stated that the roof intersects the wall about eight inches below the window sills. It would be flashed into the wall.

Mr. Cluver stated that he agreed with the staff's assertion that the cornice should not project beyond the plane of the façade of the main building. Mr. Cluver suggested that the addition itself should be set back slightly, six or eight inches, from the plane of the historic wall. Mr.

Rasmussen agreed. Mr. Cluver also stated that the frieze board above the windows at the addition is too wide. Mr. Cluver stated that he approved of the addition as a whole, but would like a couple slight adjustments to the proportions.

Mr. Cluver stated that the window should not be infilled. Mr. Rasmussen reported that there is already an interior stair in front of the window. He stated that it is a very difficult space to work with. Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey suggested that he retain the window and accommodate it in the interior. Mr. Rasmussen agreed to find a way to retain the window.

Mr. Evans asked if the roof deck is legal. Ms. Sell stated that the deck was in place at the time the district designation photographs were taken in 2001.

Mr. Cluver remarked that the illegal patchwork paint on the wall should be removed. Ms. Sell noted that the application would correct that illegal work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cluver moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval of side bay demolition and construction of a one-story addition, provided the window proportions are adjusted and the cornice does not extend beyond the plane of the main facade; approval of rear door and window alterations; denial of side window infill, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Gutterman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

420 S. VAN PELT STREET

Owner: Peter McCleary

Applicant: Sonja Bijelic & Vojislav Ristic

History: c. 1865

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

2100-block Addison Street included in Historic Street Paving District, 12/9/1998

Project: Legalize partial installation of fence and parking gate

OVERVIEW: The rowhouse at 420 S. Van Pelt Street is located at the northwest corner of Van Pelt and Addison Streets. This application proposes to install a wood fence with horizontal slats and a roll-down metal parking gate to the south of this building, parallel to the south wall of the rowhouse along the curb line at Addison Street. The fence and gate would be located four feet south of the southern boundary of this property and would enclose the sidewalk that runs along the north side of the 2100-block of Addison Street for the entire depth of this property. The rowhouse is contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District and the 2100-block of Addison Street is designated as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District.

The work was started without the Historical Commission's approval, a building permit, or the Streets Department's approval. Portions of the brick sidewalk have been removed and footings installed. The frame for the roll-down gate has been installed. The Department of Licenses & Inspections halted the work in May 2010 after a neighbor filed a complaint.

Note that the submitted site plan is inaccurate. It shows the southern property line at the curb line of Addison Street. The deed clearly states that the property is 16 feet wide; the rowhouse itself is 16 feet wide. The sidewalk is not part of the 420 S. Van Pelt Street property. The staff confirmed this fact with the Survey District.

During a site visit on 15 June 2010, the staff observed a new wood deck with trellis on the rear ell. The horizontal wood railing on the new deck matches the proposed fence. Although this ell had a deck at one time, aerial photographs show that it there was no deck on the ell in 2009. This deck was added without the approval of the Historical Commission or a building permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The staff will request a violation for the illegal deck.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9, Site Guideline, and the failure to demonstrate authorization of the property owner(s).

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Sonja Bijelic and Vojislav Ristic represented the application.

Ms. Bijelic stated that the property owner had informed the architects that the property line ran along the Addison Street curb line as shown on her site plan. Ms. Gutterman asked how the property line is defined in the deed. Mr. Farnham responded that the deed stipulates that the property is 16 feet wide. He stated that the building itself is 16 feet wide. The property does not include any open space to the south of the building, where the fence would be located. Mr. Farnham also explained that the City's online property information system, ParcelExplorer, shows that there is an easement running along the south side of this property, where the fence and gate are proposed. Any construction in this area would require the approval of all property owners within an interest in the easement. He concluded, stating that the proposal to fence off the sidewalk is inappropriate regardless of the identity of the property owner; it would set a very bad precedent. Ms. Bijelic stated that her client "was led to believe" that his property line runs along the curb. Mr. Ristic added that the assumption about the property line was based on the side stoop, which was installed several years ago. Mr. Farnham explained that he confirmed with the Streets Department that Addison Street is not an open street. Ms. Bijelic stated that she did not have access to the deed, but she did see a map that showed that this property begins at the northwest corner of Addison and Van Pelt Streets. Mr. Farnham responded that the northwest corner of Addison and Van Pelt Streets is not identified by the actual corner where the curbs meet, but is an abstract point that depends on the legal widths of the streets. Ms. Bijelic reported that the street narrows to the west and the buildings are built out to the line of the proposed fence. Mr. Farnham agreed that that is true, but asserted that it has no bearing on the location of the property line at this property.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the Committee put the property ownership question aside for a moment and consider the architectural and preservation merits of the project. Mr. Evans noted that the gate in the elevation drawing does not look at all like the gate in the photographs. Ms. Bijelic commented that the frame for the gate could be clad in wood. She also noted that the fence would be very transparent. She showed a sample of the fence to the Committee. Mr. Evans observed that the sample does not look like the gate in the elevation drawing. Mr. Evans stated that the gate in the drawing looks very random. Ms. Bijelic stated that the actual gate would not be random.

Mses. Gutterman and Pentz stated that the fence was not appropriate in this location. Ms. Gutterman also asserted that the gate was not appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey stated that a fence in line with the side wall of the main block, fencing in the side yard at the ell, would be acceptable. He stated that the current location was not appropriate.

Mr. Ristic claimed that the alley was like a “cesspool.” People “urinate” and “defecate” in it. They throw garbage in it. Graffiti is common. He claimed that the fence would stop such behavior.

Ms. Pentz asked if this application proposed legalization of the roof deck. Ms. Sell stated that the deck is not part of this application. Mr. Ristic stated that the deck has been in place since the 1970s. Mr. Sell countered that the deck is new. She noted that there had been a deck on this building, but that it was removed in 2009. She stated that the Pictometry photographs from 2009 show that there was no deck on the building at that time. She informed the applicants that the new deck requires both the approval of the Historical Commission as well as a building permit. She also noted that the deck is very different from the deck that had been on the ell. Ms. Pentz stated that the Commission should be careful not to inadvertently approve the deck while reviewing the fence.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9, Site Guideline, and the failure to demonstrate authorization of the property owner(s). Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

203 S. SARTAIN STREET

Owner: Erin Randolph-Williams

Applicant: Jane Golden

History: c. 1830

Designation: individually designated, 2/28/1961

Project: Install Mural

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to paint a mural on the north-facing stucco façade of the building at 203 S. Sartain Street. This façade faces a community garden. The staff suggests that the barge board of the gable be painted a solid, contrasting color, so as to differentiate it from the mural and retain the definition of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the barge board of the gable is differentiated from the mural, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Amy Johnston and Jane Golden of the Mural Arts Program and artist David Guinn represented the application.

Ms. Johnston described the proposed mural for a property that abuts a community garden. She presented documentation that included letters of support from the property owner and a petition with 99 signatures supporting the mural. Ms. Johnston introduced the original artist watercolor that will be replicated on the wall. She showed photographs depicting the relation of the mural site to the garden and the surrounding buildings. Mr. Guinn described the proposed mural as an enhancement to the existing garden. The embracing trees represent the spirit of the community garden. The garden flows up onto the wall. The colors are drawn from the garden. The mural also includes three small vignettes.

Mr. Cluver asked how the wall will be prepared for the painting. Ms. Johnston replied that the vines would be removed. The stucco will be repaired if necessary.

Ms. Pentz asked about the identity of the owner of the community garden. Ms. Johnston replied that the Redevelopment Authority owns the garden and the Washington Square West Civic Association runs it. She stated that the Mural Arts Program will enter into agreements with both parties.

Mr. Cluver asked if the paint would trap moisture behind it. Ms. Johnston stated that the Mural Arts Program is very careful about its choices of materials and has many years of experience painting on stucco walls. Mr. Evans asked if the soundness of the stucco would be verified before the painting began. Ms. Johnston stated that the Mural Arts Program has trained staff who would verify the soundness of the stucco. Ms. Golden advocated for the project as well.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the artist would be willing to paint the barge board in such a way to allow the shape of the roof to be discerned. Mr. Guinn stated that he would. He suggested that a deep rust color might be appropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cluver moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, provided that the barge board of the gable is differentiated from the mural, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Pentz seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

300 S. FAWN STREET

Applicant: Jill Morrone

Owner: Megan Smith and Jeannie McMullen

History: c. 1860

Designation: individually designated, 2/28/1961

Project: Install third-story rear and roof decks

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install decks at the third-story and roof levels of this corner property. The third-story deck would be supported in part by wood piers extending to the ground. A rear window would be cut down for access. A spiral stair from the lower deck is proposed to access the roof deck. The roof deck is proposed to come to the edge of the roof and would occupy more than three-quarters of the roof. The decks will be highly visible from Fawn and Cypress Streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Megan Smith and expediter Jill Morrone represented the application.

Ms. Smith presented photographs of her property and neighboring properties. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to explain how high the deck would stand above the parapet wall. She observed that the deck itself would be about two feet above the parapet. By code, the railing would be 42 inches. The top of the railing would be more than five feet above the parapet, about 5'-6", making the deck very visible. Ms. Smith conceded that the deck would be visible, but she claimed that it would improve the overall view, which includes rears of properties, some of which are in disrepair. She stated that she has very little outdoor space. She said that the rears of the houses across Cypress include parking areas. Mr. Cluver pointed out that this property is not in a historic district, but is instead individually designated. The Commission's mandate is to

preserve it, not the general streetscape. He noted that the other houses referred to by the applicant may or may not be designated as historic.

Ms. Morrone stated that the property at 311 S. Camac Street, directly behind this property, was significantly altered recently. An addition with deck was constructed.

Ms. Pentz asked about the roofline of the house. Ms. Smith stated that it is slightly sloped, but virtually flat. Ms. Pentz noted that it does not have a rear ell. Ms. Morrone stated that, although she is not a builder, she believes that the design could be revised to be less tall above the roof. Ms. Hawkins noted that the neighboring roof decks are on rear additions and ells, not on main blocks. Ms. Gutterman added that the decks are within the footprints of the buildings and do not extend off the buildings like the proposed rear deck.

Ms. Smith stated that she would like more open space. She also hopes to create a rooftop garden in the future. She claimed that the deck would shade the interior, cooling it. Ms. Hawkins suggested painting the roof with a silver coat to reflect the sun's heat. Ms. Smith stated that they would build the rear deck first and the roof deck later, perhaps in three years.

Mr. Cluver noted that, typically, decks should be placed on rear ells. However, there is no ell here. Also this is a corner property. Also, the applicants are seeking approval for not one, but two decks. He stated that the proposal would greatly intrude on this little building. Ms. Morrone asked if the Committee would support a green roof. Mr. Cluver stated that he did not believe that this building would support a real green roof. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the structure for a green roof on this building would be as intrusive as a deck. Ms. Smith reported that a building at Cypress and Camac has a deck with pergola. Ms. Hawkins stated that the staff would need to research the neighborhood examples offered by Ms. Smith to determine whether they were designated, legal, illegal, or grandfathered. She stated that the Committee could not base its recommendation on a photograph of a neighboring building.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would vote to recommend denial owing to the visibility of the decks and the size of the roof deck. Ms. Morrone asked if there was any way that the application could be approved. Ms. Pentz added that the Commission does not typically approve decks on the main blocks of buildings.

Ms. Morrone asked if a rear addition with a deck would be preferable. She also asked if the Committee objected most to the deck on the main roof. Mr. Cluver stated that he would support a one-story rear addition with a deck on it, but not the rear deck with the tall supports or the main roof deck. Ms. Smith stated that the second-floor deck would not be easily accessed because a bathroom is located at the rear of the house. She also noted that obtaining a zoning permit for an addition and deck may not be possible. Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed design was not appropriate; a lighter, less obtrusive, better designed rear deck, perhaps at the second floor, might be appropriate. Mr. Baron suggested that a second-floor deck could be accessed from the yard.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. McCoubrey moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines. Ms. Gutterman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

17 N. 3RD STREET

Owner: ELD Leasing Corp, Shalom Vaturi

Applicant: Carmelita Martell, store tenant

History: c. 1835

Designation: individually designated, 12/31/1984

contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12 2003

Project: Legalize dome awning at corner

OVERVIEW: The applicant has installed a dome awning on this corner storefront and now seeks to legalize it. Two shed-type awnings that would fit between the piers and preserve the visibility of the vertical piers would be more appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Business owner Carmelita Martell represented the application.

Ms. Martell explained that she is a clothing designer. She was selling wholesale, but recently decided to open a retail location. She explained that she installed the awning to improve the appearance of her shop. She stated that she obtained the Commission's approval to paint her building. She was working with an awning company, which was going to obtain the necessary permits and approvals, but that company backed out. She went ahead and installed the awning. She rejected the proposal from the staff for historically appropriate awnings. She asked why the staff suggested revealing the stone columns when they are purely structural and have no ornament. Mr. Baron stated that the storefront is typical of the Greek Revival warehouse or loft buildings in Old City. He observed that the Commission has long-standing policies about this building type and a deviation from those policies would have significant consequences because of the prevalence of this type in Old City. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has always required that awnings are placed in individual bays to reveal the piers, rather than spanning across multiple bays. Ms. Martell stated that two awnings, one per bay, would not satisfy her retailing needs. Ms. Pentz stated that the corner is the most interesting historic feature of the building and should not be covered. Ms. Martell responded that she is not covering the corner, she is decorating it. She claimed that the awning adds a French, historic, boutique feel to the building. She showed photographs of the storefront before and after the awning. Mr. Evans suggested the two-awning solution. Ms. Martell stated that she would not install two awnings. She claimed that marks on the storefront show that there was an awning on it at some previous point. Ms. Hawkins responded that there may have been other awnings, appropriate or inappropriate, before the Commission acquired jurisdiction over the property. Ms. Martell stated that an architect with an office nearby approved of the awning. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee is bound to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to the proposal; the Commission may take other factors into account. Mr. McCoubrey again informed the applicant that there are other solutions that would satisfy her goals as well as historic preservation goals.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

200 MARKET STREET

Owners: Sandra Schwalb and Andrew Ullman, Trustees

Applicant: Ray Brogden, Robert Rosen Associates

History: remnant of older building reconstructed c. 1955

Designation: non-contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Construct second-floor addition, reface facade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter and add to the building at the southeast corner of 2nd and Market Streets for use as a restaurant. An application for this project, submitted by a different architect, was approved in concept in November 2008. Since that time, the project has been revised and improved. The basic elements have not changed, including a second-floor addition and deck. The first floor has been improved with exposure of some old elements such as a cast-iron corner column. The windows are now larger and more vertical than originally proposed, which is more in keeping with rhythms and proportions in the district. The architect is proposing brick veneer tiles to cover the first-floor walls including both cinderblock and original brick areas.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a 4-inch brick veneer set in the plane of the existing walls is used, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the November 2008 approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ray Brogden and business owner Luca Sena represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked why the second-floor addition appears very tall. She asked about the space above the windows. Mr. Brogden explained that the second-floor addition would have a very tall parapet at the roof to hide mechanical equipment behind it. Ms. Hawkins asked if the equipment could be relocated to avoid constructing such a tall parapet wall. Mr. Brogden responded that the locations of the mechanical equipment are determined by the building code, which requires that air intakes and outlets be situated away from one another and from property lines. Mr. Baron stated that the building is low and Market Street is wide, making the roof highly visible.

Mr. Evans asked why some of the “archaeological” finds are being preserved on the façade and others are being “demolished.” He stated that the staff’s proposed solution would require the demolition of “historic” brick. Mr. Farnham interjected that, by definition, there is no historic fabric at this site. When the Commission classified this property as Non-contributing in the historic district, it stipulated that the building was not historic. He advised the Committee to review the application to ensure that the surrounding historic district is protected, but contended that the Committee should not seek to protect historic fabric at the site; by definition, there is no historic fabric at the site.

Mr. Sena noted that he does not own the building. He is considering leasing it for a restaurant. He explained that the building had been coated with a stucco material colored and scored to look like brick. He removed areas of the stucco to determine whether the underlying brick was salvageable. Although he found small areas of preserved brick, he also discovered an assortment of non-historic materials like cinderblock and added structural supports. He decided that the underlying façade beneath the stucco could not be salvaged. He therefore decided to propose a brick veneer to give the building a uniform appearance that would be compatible with

the historic district. He noted that the brick veneer would be more compatible than the stucco brick face, which the Commission approved several years ago. Mr. Baron suggested removing the non-historic infill material and replacing it with brick. Mr. Baron pointed out an area that had a cornice; he noted that that brick had never intended to be exposed. Ms. Gutterman asked what Mr. Baron was proposing for that area, given that the brick was not intended to be exposed. Mr. Baron suggested covering that area. Mr. Brogden contended that his client did not want to remove the non-historic infill. He stated that he was concerned about destabilizing the wall. His client, who is only a tenant, does not want to entirely reconstruct the building.

Mr. Sena stated that he is proposing to use a very expensive, fine brick veneer. He reported that he visited two sites on Bainbridge Street where the veneer had been applied. He stated that it was indistinguishable from real brick. Mr. Cluver noted that it was not possible to create real returns at door and window openings with veneer brick, where the sides of real brick would be revealed. The thinness of the veneer would be exposed. Mr. Brogden explained that the walls are bowed. To create true surfaces for the veneer, the walls must be parged.

Mr. Evans suggested that the building should be demolished. Mr. Brogden noted that his client is not the owner and cannot simply demolish and rebuild the building. Mr. Sena reiterated that he cannot demolish the building.

Mr. Sena asked if he could reinstall the stucco brickface that the Commission had approved six or eight years ago and that he had removed with the hope of restoring the brick beneath. The Committee members opined that stucco brickface would not be appropriate. Ms. Hawkins suggested a scored stucco.

The discussion turned back to the second-floor addition. Mr. Cluver stated that the addition with the parapet was too top heavy. He suggested a stucco finish with scoring or panels at the parapet to provide a break and reduce the mass of the addition. Mr. Baron suggested a cornice between the second-floor windows and parapet. Mr. Brogden stated that the second-floor addition would be faced with cedar siding. Mr. Evans suggested a screen, not a parapet, for blocking views of the mechanical equipment.

Mr. Cluver reminded his fellow Committee members that they are charged with determining whether this proposal would have an adverse effect on the district. He observed that the district has a very eclectic mix of buildings in this area. Mr. Farnham agreed, stating that this section of the district does not have a cohesive streetscape like that of the 100-block of N. 3rd Street. Mr. Baron added that the building to the south of this site was cut down after a fire. The building to the south of it is Cuba Libre, a neo-Cuban style. There is a diner across the street. This area does not retain its historic streetscape. Mr. Sena agreed.

Mr. Sena stated that he would build whatever the Committee wanted. He remarked that he just wants to get his project moving. He observed that he simply wants to improve the appearance of a Non-contributing building. He asked the Committee to find a way to allow him to move forward.

Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Evans stated that they preferred the earlier design, which was approved in concept. Mr. Sena responded that the earlier design did not take into account the mechanical equipment needed for a restaurant. If it had, it would have looked very different. Mr. Evans stated of the earlier design that "there was an idea behind it. It had a self-awareness and a

comfort level of its own.” Ms. Gutterman stated that the earlier design had a “geometry behind it.” Mr. Brogden replied that the earlier design would not work. It may have looked nicer, but it did not meet the needs of the restaurant. Speaking of the earlier design, Ms. Gutterman countered that “there was a geometry. There was a pattern. There was some life to it.” Mr. Baron advised the Committee that they should articulate their concerns about the design in terms of its compatibility with the historic district. He reminded them that the property is classified as Non-contributing. Ms. Gutterman responded that she is not sure whether “design is trying too hard, or it is not trying hard enough.” She said that she “just has trouble with it.” Mr. Cluver said that he “is not understanding the story behind” the design. Ms. Pentz stated that this is a very prominent location and should have a “signature” building. Mr. Evans stated that he would accept a “quirky” building, but this proposal has no quirkiness.

Mr. Sena pleaded with the Committee members for assistance. He stated that he was not sure what they were asking him to do. He asked them if he could resubmit the design that was approved in concept. Ms. Gutterman explained that she thought that the railing at the second-floor deck intersected the second-floor addition at an awkward point. Mr. Cluver suggested a cornice or similar divider on the addition with a false attic story above to hide the mechanical equipment. He stated that there should be some articulation between the second floor and parapet. Ms. Hawkins stated that she found the cedar inappropriate as a siding in the district. Masonry or metal would be better.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1606 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner/Applicant: Howard Winig

History: 1890, Albert Dilks, architect

Designation: individually designated, 10/12/1990

Project: Install vestibule gate

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a metal gate to restrict access to the alcove that leads to the front entrance to the building. The gate would be installed to prevent inappropriate activities from taking place in the alcove. At one time, the building had such a gate, but it was a later addition that has since been removed. The building has other metal work, for example at the base of the storefront window. A gate in this location would meet the Standards, but the shape and simplicity of the proposed gate are not appropriate. The gate should mirror the shape of the opening and, perhaps, include ornamental elements like those at the base of the storefront.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the gate is revised to better fit the opening, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Howard Winig and property manager Jason Winig represented the application.

Mr. Baron commended the owner for the restoration of the building. He suggested that the shape of the gate should better follow the shape of the alcove.

Jason Winig told the members that the gate is intended to discourage trespassers from using the alcove inappropriately. A maintenance worker currently washes the area daily. He explained that it would have easy egress for emergency escape, would not be locked, and would have a dual action sliding pin for closure. They are hoping to deter unwanted access.

Ms. Hawkins asked if there was enough room for the gate to swing open. Jason Winig said that there was and that the gate would remain open during the day. Mr. Cluver asked if the gate met egress requirements. Jason Winig stated that it would be a dual-action gate, opening in and out. It would be left open during the day and could open out in the case of an emergency. He added that the gate will not be locked typically. The gate is intended as a deterrent.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the attachment. Jason Winig stated that they will reuse existing mounting holes. He pointed them out in photographs.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the staff could review a revised design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, provided the gate is revised to better fit the opening and existing mounting holes are reused, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Pentz seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. McCoubrey excused himself from the meeting.

105 MANTON STREET

Owner: Mike McCann

Applicant: Joe Serratore, architect

History: wood house, c. 1828; demolished with Commission approval, 6/24/85

Designation: individually designated, 3/30/1965

Project: construct new three-story house on site

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a new house on this vacant lot at the corner of Manton and Front Streets in Pennsport. A wood-framed, half-gambrel house built about 1828 stood on the lot at the time of designation on 30 March 1965. The Commission approved the complete demolition of the house on 24 June 1985. The City of Philadelphia was the owner of the building at the time of demolition and the demolition permit application is stamped "City ordered demolition and/or stucco." A zoning permit for the demolition was issued in 1976.

The property is individually designated and is not located in a historic district. The new building would share a party wall with the designated building at 1110 S. Front Street. The Law Department advises the Commission that it must base its decision regarding this application on the direct impact of this project on historic fabric at this property, 105 Manton Street, and not on its indirect impact on surrounding properties, designated or not. Owing to the demolition of the historic building, the new building will have no impact on historic resources at the site itself.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Joe Serratore and developer Mike McCann represented the application.

Mr. Baron distributed an email from a neighbor regarding the proposed development. In it, the neighbor asks the Architectural Committee to table the application until the neighborhood has met to discuss it. Mr. Baron explained that neither the staff nor the Committee has the authority to table the application.

Ms. Pentz asked if there are any historic resources extant at the property. Mr. Baron stated that there are not. The designated house that stood on the site was demolished in 1985. It was owned by the City and demolished with the Commission's approval because it posed a danger.

Mr. McCann explained that he purchased the property with plans and approvals to construct a house on it. However, he has decided that he does not wish to construct the approved plan. He stated that he instead wishes to construct a smaller, scaled down house. The staff stated that it was unaware of any previous approval or permit for a new house. The Commission files do not reflect any reviews or approvals for a house. Mr. Evans stated that he was shocked that the proposed house was scaled down from the earlier, permitted proposal. He said that he found the scale objectionable. Mr. McCann responded that the house currently proposed is fairly small, about 1900 sf. Mr. Evans asked if the adjacent house is designated. Mr. Farnham replied that the properties to the north at 1100 to 1110 S. Front Street are designated. Mr. Evans claimed that the new building "would place a load" on the party wall and would therefore impact the historic house to the north. Mr. Serratore explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections will review their engineer's plan to confirm that this building would not place any unintended loads on the neighboring house. He also stated that the contractor would be bonded, thereby protecting the neighboring house during construction.

Mr. Farnham explained that he contacted the Law Department about this application, which advised him that the Commission and Architectural Committee should take into account only the direct impact this project would have on historic resources at the property, given that this property is only designated individually and is not in an historic district. He noted the clause in the preservation ordinance at §14-2007(7)(k)(.4), which authorizes the Commission "when making its determination as to the appropriateness of the proposed alterations, demolition or construction" to consider "the compatibility of the proposed work with the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape." He acknowledged that the clause is somewhat vague and informed the Committee that the Law Department has advised, albeit informally, that the Commission may consider the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape only when the subject property and surrounding properties are in an historic district. The Law Department has advised that, when reviewing applications for individually designated properties outside historic districts, the Commission should limit its review to assessing the direct, not merely visual, impact on historic fabric. He stated that there is general agreement that there is no historic fabric at this site. He conceded that there may be some direct impact on the property to the north, with which this building would share a party wall, but that direct impact would be insignificant, assuming that this house is designed appropriately from a structural standpoint. Mr. Evans asserted that, if Mr. Farnham's advice is sound, then the Committee had no option but to recommend approval. Mr. Farnham responded that he was not seeking to tie the Committee's hands, but to provide the legal advice provided to the Commission. He acknowledged that the Committee was free to formulate any

recommendation to the Commission to approve, deny, or table, with or without conditions. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the Committee could recommend denial owing to the loss of light and air to the neighboring buildings. Mr. Farnham responded that the preservation ordinance does not authorize the Commission to protect light and air. Mr. Farnham concluded, saying that this is what is called a “phantom designation.” The building was demolished legally, but after the 1985 ordinance went into effect. The ordinance provides a mechanism for seeking rescission of the designation, but the owner has availed himself of that process.

Mr. McCann stated that, despite the Commission’s apparent limited power, he was willing to work with the Architectural Committee and Commission to improve the design. He stated that his business as a real estate broker is dependent on a good reputation in the neighborhood and he would revise the design to be more compatible with its general surroundings.

Mr. Evans stated that his suggestions were relatively minor. He noted that there is a precedent for taller buildings at corners. He stated that he objected to the stucco bays. He suggested brick facades with a brick cornice and punched openings. Mr. McCann stated that he is not a developer. He stated that he purchased the lot to improve the neighborhood. Mr. Serratore stated that he could modify the design. Mr. Cluver suggested removing the front bay on Front Street and adding punched windows. He suggested modifying the bay so that it looked like a real bay, with a lower roof. He suggested a more vertical muntin pattern in the windows. He also noted that the lintels should extend beyond the window openings.

Robert Duggan, the owner of 1110 S. Front Street, stated that he appreciated Mr. McCann’s willingness to adjust the design. Mr. Serratore assured him that the new house would not bear on his house in any way.

Mr. Baron stated that the gambrel roof was an important element of the lost historic building. Ms. Gutterman agreed and suggested incorporating the roof form into the new building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Evans moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval and suggest that the front bay be removed and replaced with two double-hung windows in punched openings at each floor, the side bay be shortened, the window proportions be improved, and the lintels be extended beyond the openings, with the staff to review details. Ms. Gutterman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

415 S. CROSKEY STREET

Owner/Applicant: Joel Frisch

History: c. 1870

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

Project: legalize windows, security gate, transom

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows, metal security gate, and transom. The staff approved an application for interior work and window replacement at the rear of the building, but the owner exceeded the scope of the permitted work. Although the approved drawings originally noted the replacement of the basement windows and a security door, the applicant deleted them from the drawings, withdrawing all work to the front facade from the review. The staff later discovered that the storm door, transom, and basement

windows had been replaced. The first and second-story windows at the front façade were also replaced with vinyl units since designation without a permit.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Joel Frisch represented the application.

Mr. Frisch stated that the first and second-floor windows were installed by the previous owner, who is now deceased. He agreed that the Commission had approved a permit application for interior work that stipulated no exterior and that exterior work was undertaken afterward. He stated, however, that the exterior work was undertaken because significant exterior deterioration was discovered during the interior construction and because exterior elements were damaged during construction. He stated that the security door was replaced after the old security door was damaged during construction; the new door matched the old door as well as other doors on the street. The transom was replaced because the wood was rotted. The basement windows were replaced by the contractor after they were damaged during the construction. Mr. Frisch claimed that he asked the staff for recommendations for the basement windows, and then went ahead with the replacement after the staff failed to provide the recommendations. Mr. Baron disagreed, stating that he did provide precise information about the replacement windows. Mr. Frisch claimed that none of his neighbor's basement windows are appropriate. Mr. Baron responded that the inappropriate windows were either in place at the time of designation or were replaced illegally.

Ms. Gutterman noted the new security door is not the same as the security door that was damaged and removed. The applicant claimed that it was replaced in kind. Mr. Frisch replied that the new door is similar to the old door. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission typically requires that storm/security doors are fully glazed to reveal the historic door. He also noted that the four windows and two basement windows are all vinyl, the transom is not appropriately framed, and none of the windows meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. Frisch asked who is responsible for illegal work undertaken by a previous owner. Mr. Baron responded that the current owner is always responsible for ensuring that a property complies with the building and zoning codes. Ms. Hawkins added that buyers have a responsibility for due diligence.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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 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.

Site Guideline: Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site; or which damages or destroys important landscape features.

Storefronts Guideline: Recommended: Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

§14-2007(7) (j) No permit shall be issued for the demolition of an historic building, structure, site or object, or of a building, structure, site or object within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building, structure, site or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that [the] building, structure, site or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.