

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

**TUESDAY, 15 NOVEMBER 2011
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Robert Palladino, Landmark Architectural Design
Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design
Brian Wentz, Keast & Hood Company
Robert Graves, BLT Architects
Michael Prifti, Young Smith Field Condominium Association
Mark Leuzzi
Edward Bell, Lawson Bell Architects
J. Albert Calluso
Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 2525 S GARNET ST

Project: Restucco exterior, replace roof, convert window to door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark Leuzzi

Applicant: Vincent Mancino, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1910; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

Preservation Easement: No

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restucco the exterior, replace the roof, and cut down a side window into a door.

The proposed stucco would be applied to the building using a wire lath and a smooth finish. The original stucco is known as "pebble-dash" stucco; a stucco system created in which pebbles or small rocks are thrown against the wall surface so that they stick to the wet stucco finish. The staff suggests the old layer of stucco be removed prior to installation of new stucco. The new stucco should be applied directly to the building with a pebble-dash finish.

Currently, there is a small jalousie window on the bottom of the side wall projection. The applicant proposes to cut down the window to install a door. The door would maintain the current width of the window. The grade would be lowered one foot to accommodate the new door.

The building and its twin retain the original flat terracotta tile roof. The applicant proposes to remove the terracotta tiles on the front and rear slopes of the roof and install a square synthetic slate shingle. No information has been provided regarding the condition of the original tiles. The staff suggests individual tile repair rather than replacement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of side door installation and stucco, provided the old stucco is removed and new stucco is installed with a pebble-dash finish, pursuant to Standard 9, and denial of the roof, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Mark Leuzzi and architects Robert Paladino and Agata Reister of Landmark Architectural Design represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant to explain the proposal for smooth stucco installation rather than a pebble-dash stucco finish. Mr. Leuzzi explained that the property retains the original textured stucco and that it never had a pebble-dash finish. He distributed photographs of the stucco surface. He stated that he removed a piece of the stucco and could see the original base coat beneath the top layer. Mr. Evans asked the applicant why the building needs to be restuccoed. Mr. Leuzzi claimed that the stucco is in poor condition and is falling off in some areas.

Mr. Leuzzi stated that he proposes to replace the terracotta tile roof with a synthetic slate shingle roof because it is leaking. Ms. Gutterman asked if the tiles are broken allowing water to infiltrate the roof. Mr. Leuzzi surmised that some tiles must be broken because the roof is leaking. Ms. Gutterman contended that it may be the substrate under the tiles that is causing the leaks. Mr. Leuzzi stated that some tiles are missing and others are loose. Ms. Hawkins asked if the problem is caused by the flashing or the tiles themselves. Mr. Leuzzi claimed that the tiles

have failed. Ms. Hawkins stated that she does not see broken tiles in the photographs. She noted one tile that has slipped from position and one spot where a tile is missing. She concluded that the problem appears to be isolated to specific areas. Mr. Leuzzi acknowledged that the roof could be repaired, but explained that he does not want to perform yearly maintenance on the roof when a synthetic slate installation could last 40 years. Ms. Gutterman explained that the tiles could be removed, the substrate and flashings repaired, and the tiles reinstalled. Mr. Leuzzi responded that his proposal is based on finances. He stated that it would be financially infeasible to remove the tile, repair the roof beneath it, and reinstall the tile. He observed that most of the cost of such a repair would be the labor and, in the end, after spending more than it would cost to install a new roof, he would be left with a roof that would last a few years at best.

Mr. Evans asked the staff to comment of the prevalence of pebble-dash stucco in the Girard Estate Historic District. Ms. Sell explained that there are many different types of stucco coatings in the district. She noted that some houses are fully coated in pebble-dash stucco while others that have pebble-dash stucco sections. She stated that some have a rough or textured finish, while others have a smooth finish. She agreed that the 2001 designation photograph lacks the detail of the applicant's close-up photographs. His photographs demonstrate that this building has a textured finish as opposed to a pebble-dash finish. Ms. Pentz noted that the applicant photographs are highlighting non-matching patches and asked Mr. Leuzzi if he wishes to replace the stucco for aesthetic reasons. He responded that he will be making structural changes at the rear of the house that will require the exterior to be restuccoed.

Mr. Leuzzi stated that he was made aware of the historic designation after he purchased the property. He reported that his lawyer sent letters to the previous owner and realtor which stated that they should have made him aware of the designation. He stated that the realtor told him that he could opt out of the designation. Ms. Hawkins explained that any misinformation provided by the previous owner and realtor are not relevant to this proposal. Mr. Leuzzi observed that the Commission did not provide a pamphlet explaining its jurisdiction and design guidelines for the district. Ms. Hawkins explained that every homeowner and prospective homeowner has the opportunity to consult with the Commission staff at any time. She added that every building in the city must comply with building and zoning codes and Commission's review is part of the process for historically-designated properties.

Ms. Hawkins summarized the Committee's comments and stated that the stucco appears to be a textured finish rather than a pebble-dash finish and the roof is terracotta and appears to be in the same condition as shown in the designation photograph. She noted the last piece of the proposal is the alteration of a window to a door by dropping the threshold and raising the head. Mr. Paladino explained that they propose to use a door that matches the existing front exterior door. He added that the door is seven feet tall and will need to be modified to fit the new proposed opening of six feet and eight inches. Mr. Leuzzi explained that the door will be cut down at both top and bottom rails. Ms. Reister added that they will fill in the sides of the door with additional trim to fill the opening. Mr. Cluver asked why the head cannot be raised higher to accommodate the door. Ms. Reister stated that there is a stair landing above the opening. Ms. Hawkins asked if they considered moving the door to the left or right and install sidelights. Ms. Reister stated that they could do that, but would need to do a study to see how narrow the space would be. Mr. Cluver suggested narrowing the opening to make a proper door opening. Ms. Reister stated they could do that, but were making an effort to retain the width of the existing brick window opening. Mr. Cluver suggested that, if they modify the door, they should take height off of the top rail to match the width of the side stiles and take the remainder from the bottom rail.

Ms. Reister noted that it is the owner's intent to wire over the existing stucco and install new stucco. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the relationship of the existing wall plane to the window and door openings must remain the same. The plane of the wall should not project out beyond its current plane. Mr. Leuzzi stated that they will not go above the window surrounds because they plan to cut out the windows with a grinding saw and feather the new stucco into the window surround. Ms. Hawkins asserted that the stucco cannot be feathered but must be within the same plane as the existing wall. Mr. Baron stated that the existing stucco should be removed before the new stucco is applied. Mr. Leuzzi stated that it is impossible to remove the stucco. Ms. Hawkins stated that he has the option to repair the existing stucco. Mr. Leuzzi claimed that it would cost \$20,000 to remove the existing stucco and install new stucco. Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee must apply the Standards when reviewing applications.

Ms. Reister asked the Committee if the only option is to replace the roof with terracotta tiles. Ms. Gutterman stated that the applicant would have to demonstrate that the tiles could not be feasibly repaired. If the tile has reached the end of its life, the Commission can approve its replacement with an alternate material that replicates the appearance. Mr. Cluver noted that it is less expensive to patch and repair existing terracotta tile roofs than to replace them. Ms. Sell added that the staff has the authority to approve replacement with an alternative material at the rear of the property as it is not visible from the public right-of-way. She suggested an option could be to salvage tiles from the rear and use them for repairs on the façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the installation of the side door with a change in opening dimension to match the width of the new door, and application of new stucco, provided the old stucco is removed and the new stucco is installed with a textured finish, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, and denial of the replacement of the roof as proposed, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 1216 ARCH ST

Project: Repair terra cotta cornice, remove end sections and replace with stucco

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Young Smith Field Condominium Association

Applicant: Robert Graves, Architect

History: 1902, Field and Medary, architects

Individual Designation: 6/13/1990

District Designation: none

Preservation Easement: No

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to repair the brick and terra cotta cornice of this former industrial building. Most of the terra cotta will be pinned and patched. The two ends of the terra cotta cornice would be removed and replaced with brick and stucco. The repair does not meet Standard 6 and, if the original terra cotta cannot be repaired, the applicant should consider fiberglass reinforced concrete or another appropriate material that would be a better and more durable match for the terra cotta.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the removal of the ends of the cornice and their replacements with stucco, but approval of all other repairs, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineer Brian Wentz, architect Robert Graves, and property owner's representative Michael Prifti represented the application.

Mr. Wentz explained that the building has been netted for more than eight years to prevent failing masonry from falling. Under the City's new façade inspection law, the building owner has one year to make the necessary repairs to the façade. They hope to retain all parts of the existing cornice and to pin them back. However, they suspect that they will need to permanently remove the two ends of the cornice because of the extent of the deterioration. They hope eventually to restore these pieces in terra cotta but do not have the funds to do so now.

Mr. Prifti explained that the condominium association is unable to obtain a loan to undertake more extensive repairs.

Mr. Graves explained that they need to scaffold the building to examine the conditions and remove any damaged sections. It would take considerable time to have new terracotta sections of the cornice fabricated. They cannot afford to leave the scaffolding in place during such a fabrication. Therefore, to install new terracotta sections, they would need to rescaffold the building, which would cause them to incur an undue expense. The Committee members asked why they could not make the replacement sections out of another material that could be manufactured more quickly or that could be installed without full scaffolding. They also asked why that the castings for the molds could be made ahead of time and the replacement pieces installed while the original scaffolding was up. Mr. Graves said that they were operating under a tight schedule, owing to the new law. The Committee members pointed out that, owing to the impending winter, it was unlikely that any work could start until spring. They contended that the replacement sections could be fabricated in time for the start of work in the spring. They noted that the staff could approve the replacement of these pieces in a material that matched the appearance and properties of the terra cotta.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the removal of the ends of the cornice and their replacements with stucco, but approval of all other repairs, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 223 MONROE ST

Project: Rehabilitate exterior, construct rear addition, replace roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lisa Pappo

Applicant: Edward Bell, Architect

History: 1745

Individual Designation: 2/26/1957, 6/24/1958

District Designation: none

Preservation Easement: No

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate of the historic building and construction of a rear addition. The building, which was constructed about 1745, is extremely old and in very good condition. On the rear, the application proposes to add a second floor to an existing single-story, twentieth-century addition. The construction of the addition would necessitate cutting a hole in the historic rear façade that would be approximately four feet wide. The addition would cover parts of the rear cornice and roof. The application also proposes the exterior rehabilitation of the historic building. The windows, doors, woodwork, masonry, and roof would be repaired

and/or replaced, but the details are not provided. Owing to the age and significance of this building, interventions should be limited to restoration of the historic portion of the building and alterations to the rear addition.

The application materials are very vague. A cover letter accompanying the application lists work that would be undertaken, such as repair and replacement of windows, doors, woodwork, and the roofing, but no details are provided. The architectural drawings are likewise incomplete. Plans but no elevations are included. The rendering of the addition is not detailed. The photographs of the exterior of the building are incomplete.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Edward Bell represented the application.

The Committee members questioned the need to remove the large amount of historic fabric at the rear wall to make the connection between the historic portion of the building and the proposed master bedroom at the rear. The Committee members stated that elevation and section drawings would help them understand the head heights, distances between floors, and other aspects of the design. Also, they suggested that photographs of the existing link structure connecting the main block to the rear ell would aid their review. Ms. Hawkins opined that the enlarged link would be acceptable if it did not extend above the rear cornice, but instead connected to the historic building below the cornice. Mr. Evans noted that there is a long history of additions at the rears of rowhouses. Ms. Pentz and Gutterman asserted that the addition could be constructed without removing such a large section of the second-floor rear wall. Mr. Baron explained the limited extent of public visibility of the rear of this building from a driveway leading to a courtyard parking area, but said that the visibility would increase as the leaves fall off the trees. Some Committee members encouraged Mr. Bell to withdraw his application and submit a new application with more complete documentation.

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

ADDRESS: 1617 LOMBARD ST

Project: Restucco façade, add balconies, cornice, quoins, transom, and planter

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: J. Albert Calluso

Applicant: Albert Calluso

History: 1850; front façade rebuilt, 1984

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: No

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the front façade of this residential property in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The property was constructed c. 1840. The original nineteenth-century brick front façade was very significantly altered when the building was modernized in the 1960s. The Modern 1960s façade was subsequently replaced in 1984 and a more traditional front façade constructed. This new façade, however, did not replicate the original design or material of the original facade.

Today, the front façade has oddly proportioned window openings and a failing stucco surface. The proposed alterations would remove the failing stucco and apply new scored stucco with the addition of corner quoins. The proposed corner quoins, however, would protrude from the plane of the wall in what is an otherwise consistent street façade. A new cornice would be installed; the building lacks a cornice currently. Metal railings attached to create the appearance of balconies would be installed at the second and third-story windows. Lastly, a planter would be constructed at the ground floor. The planter, which likely would project into the public-right-of-way, may require an ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the corner quoins; approval of the stucco, railings, cornice and planter, provided the stucco is a traditional three-layer application and not a Dryvit system, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Albert Calluso and architect Anthony Bruttaniti represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the proposed planter may require a variance. Mr. Calluso stated that other properties had recently built similar planters. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee could discuss it, but that the planter may require other reviews beyond the Historical Commission's approval.

Mr. Calluso stated that his intent is not only to replace the failing stucco, but to enhance the property and the streetscape. He noted that the building is taller and wider than surrounding properties. He opined that the existing façade is unattractive and has no historic significance. Ms. Hawkins agreed that the existing façade is not significant.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the front door would be retained. Mr. Calluso answered that the front door would remain, and that its enlargement would require substantial interior alterations. Ms. Hawkins stated that it did not match the proposed alterations stylistically.

Mr. Calluso explained that the existing stucco is proud of the surrounding buildings and that he plans to remove the existing layers and apply a new layer, which would not protrude any further than the existing. He also noted that he intends to align the quoins align with the adjacent surface and not to protrude beyond it. Ms. Hawkins stated that the three layers of stucco would probably be about an inch in thickness and that it would not be possible to have quoins that would not protrude beyond the stucco. Mr. Evans stated that regardless of the thickness, the notion of applying quoins is not appropriate to this particular house. Mr. Cluver concurred with Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans explained that quoins are elements that express change in planes or corners, neither of which are present in this mid-block façade. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the house at 421 Spruce Street, which the applicant is using as a model, does not have quoins either. Mr. Calluso explained that he thought the quoins evoked the Gilded Age, which is the period that inspired him.

Mr. Cluver stated that he was not convinced that scored stucco meant to represent ashlar masonry would be appropriate in a streetscape composed of mostly red brick. Mr. Calluso stated that the Bell Telephone building at the corner was tan brick with limestone trims and that a neighboring house was also stucco. He added that the building at 421 Spruce Street is scored and that he had taken cues from its façade. Mr. Danta stated that the staff had considered the setting and especially the surrounding area during its review of the application. He stated that the surrounding blocks have houses with similar alterations, specifically Lombard and Addison Streets, and that stuccoed facades and new brick front facades are common. Ms. Gutterman stated that scored stucco was acceptable as long as it was a shallow scoring and not done to

resemble heavy rustication. Ms. Pentz concurred and added that the scoring should be proportionally correct and located thoughtfully. She advised the architect to align the scoring pattern with the masonry openings in the façade in order to create a realistic “ashlar” façade. Mr. Cluver stated that the belt courses separating the floors should be eliminated. Ms. Gutterman noted that scoring is usually done in a graduated pattern, where the scoring gets dimensionally smaller as it extends into the higher floors. Mr. Cluver pointed out that the grace of the proposed alterations rest on the detailing and the refinement; it could be done well or poorly.

Ms. Hawkins stated that, historically, balconies were found at the second floor, but not on all floors. She advised that the balconies should not be added to the third floor of the house. Mr. Calluso stated that he already purchased a salvaged large balcony from Cincinnati and that he intends to cut it to fit all four openings on the façade.

Mr. Evans asked whether the windows would be enlarged. Mr. Bruttaniti explained that they are not enlarging the masonry openings, but adding trim to compensate for the oddly proportioned window openings. He clarified that the trim would be added to the outside of the windows. Mr. Baron noted that the existing windows were newly installed and would not be replaced. Mr. Cluver asked about the location of the trim. Mr. Bruttaniti explained that the trim around the windows would be applied on top of the stucco and around the windows. Mr. Cluver noted that such an installation would make the façade look odd and could lead to water infiltration issues. Ms. Hawkins stated that the trim may have to remain the same size it is now, or be applied within the masonry opening to avoid long-term maintenance problems. Ms. Hawkins asked if the trim would be done in stucco. Mr. Bruttaniti answered that it would be a composite mold. He distributed a catalogue to the Committee members that showed proposed trim profiles. Mr. Danta asked if the color of the trim would match the color of the stucco. Mr. Bruttaniti answered that the color of the stucco would be integral to the mixture and that the trim would be painted to match the color of the stucco. Mr. Calluso clarified that he would prefer not to have to paint the trim. Ms. Hawkins stated that the staff could work with the applicant to determine an appropriate shape for the trim and location where it would be applied. She added that the intent would be to apply the trim within the masonry opening, but that the applicant could also apply a lintel that would protrude beyond the plane of the wall. She stated that there is historic precedent for lintels that protrude beyond the plane of the wall.

Mr. Evans stated that he did not find the planter at grade appropriate to the house. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if they would be willing to add a flower box rather than a planter. Mr. Calluso answered that he would prefer a planter. Mr. Evans stated that the Commission should not approve the planter unless it was better designed. He objected to cladding the planter with Belgian block, which is a paving material and not appropriate for a vertical plane. Mr. Cluver concurred and advised the applicant to reconsider the cladding material.

In order to assist the applicant with the revision of the application, Ms. Hawkins requested that her colleagues on the Committee list those elements of the design that should be reconsidered or revised. Mr. Cluver provided the following list:

- use of a traditional three-layer stucco, not a Dryvit system,
- shallow scoring to be done in a realistic manner to mimic ashlar,
- elimination of the corner quoins,
- elimination of the belt courses,
- elimination of the balcony railings on the third floor,
- a historically accurate cornice profile,

- redesign of the ground-floor planter, and
- window trim within the masonry opening only.

Mr. Cluver advised the applicant to meet with the staff and revise the proposed design prior to the Commission meeting. He noted that the staff could assist the applicant with the final details.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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