

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

**TUESDAY, 27 JUNE 2017
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Shannon Barg, Preservation Alliance
Philip Scott, KSK
Anne Niedrach, KSK
Gail Harrity, PMA
Nicole White, PMA
Jane Lawson Bell, PMA
Michael J. Lewis, Williams College
E. Milroy, Drexel
Gabriel Furtado
Andrew Murphy
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing
Alex Gauzza, ISA
Joe Forkin, Delaware River Waterfront Corporation
Brian Phillips, ISA
Thom Kurek
Susan Miller Davis
Kerry L. Bryan
Jennifer MacNaughton
Michael Mattioni, Esq., Mattioni, Ltd.
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
David S. Traub, AIA, Save Our Sites
Barbara M. Wold
Julie Motl, Julie Motl, Architect
Scott Woodruff, Designblendz Architecture
Robert Palladino, Landmark AIA
R. Parsky

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2017
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Karen Earley, Sedgeley Club
Lois Krombolz, Sedgeley Club
Matt Gibson, CertainTeed
Matthew Mowrer, O'Donnell & Naccarato
Ashley May, Fidelis
Eric Heidel, (re)Work Architecture & Design

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 2600 BENJAMIN FRANKLIN PKY, PHILADELPHIA MUSEUM OF ART

Proposal: Construct Turrell Skyspace pavillion
Review Requested: In Concept
Owner: City of Philadelphia
Applicant: Philip E. Scott, KSK
History: 1928; Philadelphia Museum of Art; Horace Trumbauer, architect
Individual Designation: 6/29/1971
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a site-specific artwork named Skyspace by internationally prominent artist James Turrell near the Philadelphia Museum of Art. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved an in-concept application for the Skyspace in July 2016. Since that time, the design and has been refined and detailed.

Artist James Turrell works with light and space to create artworks that engage viewers with the limits and wonder of human perception. His artworks have been shown at hundreds of major museums and galleries throughout the world. Turrell has said: "My work is more about your seeing than it is about my seeing, although it is a product of my seeing. I'm also interested in the sense of presence of space; that is space where you feel a presence, almost an entity — that physical feeling and power that space can give."

The proposed site is within Fairmount Park, to the west of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, on the rock promontory known as the North Plateau, which overlooks the Fairmount Waterworks and the Schuylkill River. The Museum and the Waterworks are both designated as historic, but boundaries for the early designations are not defined. Fairmount Park as a whole is not designated as historic.

Skyspace will be an open elliptical structure with a perimeter stone bench with a high back that provides a sense of enclosure. Conceived as a pavilion, the structure will feature steel tube columns supporting an elliptical canopy with an aperture framing views of the sky. At dawn and dusk, an array of changing colored lights will project up onto the underside of the canopy. The work is intended to be a contemporary, twenty-first-century response to the two similarly scaled and sited pavilions already on the ridge above the Waterworks. The Skyspace canopy will align with the eave of the 1870s Mercury Pavilion to the south.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of July 2016.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Gutterman recused, owing to her work for the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Gail Harrity of the Philadelphia Museum of Art and architect Philip Scott represented the application.

Ms. Harrity stated that the Museum is proud to acquire a work by James Turrell, a renowned artist. She stated that a donor has generously provided the funding for the work. She noted that the current design responds to questions raised by the Architectural Committee, Historical Commission, Art Commission, and several other City agencies and interest groups. She explained that the artist selected the site for its relationship to the museum and other gazebos and for its view of the sky. She stated that the Skyspace has been very successfully integrated into the landscape.

Mr. Scott stated that they are creating a third pavilion on the precipice overlooking the Water Works. He directed the Committee members to the historic photographs in the application materials. He explained that this location has changed significantly over time. He noted that the historic water tower stood at about the proposed location of the Skyspace. He stated that they have revised the path to the Skyspace and will now run the path along the ridge from the adjacent pavilion, "hugging" the existing retaining wall. The Skyspace will be "pushed" into the hill about four feet, making the path relatively flat, reducing its prominence, and aligning with the eave of the adjacent pavilion. He noted that they will use stone quarried from the site to extend the retaining wall. The Skyspace seating and floor will be a local black granite. The base will not project above grade more than about six inches. The underside of the canopy will be a bright white, but the top of the canopy will be a gray color, like the lead-coated copper of the adjacent pavilion, as requested by the Historical Commission. Also in response to the Commission, the horizontal light tray has been eliminated and the lights added to the trough that runs around the Skyspace. The underside of the canopy will be lighted twice a day for less than one hour, at dawn and dusk. It will likely not be lighted during the colder months. He observed that most other Skyspaces are in private areas, but this one will be very public, making security more difficult. Cameras will be hidden in the Skyspace and monitored by the Museum's security personnel.

Ms. Stein asked if the Skyspace will be permanent. Ms. Harrity stated that it will be permanent. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the artist selected the black granite. Ms. Harrity stated that he did select the material. She noted that the lighting at the base of the seating is for safety purposes. Ms. Pentz asked about the existing retaining wall. She noted that the wall has a concrete cap now. Mr. Scott stated that it would be replaced with a stone cap. Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the wall has been "very nicely integrated" into the project. He thanked the applicants for making the revisions requested by the Historical Commission. He asked if the artist has selected one of the three seating options. Ms. Harrity replied that they will likely select the granite-clad version, not the solid granite version. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the wood on the handrail. Mr. Scott stated that the wood was the artist's preference. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he is opposed to the project, not for any architectural reasons, but because he deems the site to be more important than any work of art.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if anyone in the audience wished to offer public comment. Elizabeth Milroy introduced herself as a professor of art and art history at Drexel and the author of a book on the history of Philadelphia's green spaces. She stated that she is opposed to the project because the site is historic. She contended that there has not been any public conversation about this project. She stated that she would like to review the plans. She claimed that the Skyspace would not "dialogue" with the Water Works. She objected to the proposed location and to the lack of opportunity for public input into the project. Mr. McCoubrey asked for additional public input into the project. Michael J. Lewis introduced himself as the Faison-Pierson-Stoddard Professor of Art History at Williams College and a "long-term scholar of Philadelphia architecture." He observed that he is "steeped" in the architectural and landscape history of Philadelphia. He noted that Fairmount is called out on William Penn's plan for the city. He asserted that it is the one sacred place in Philadelphia and architects have treated it as such including Frank Furness. He acknowledged that this site has changed extensively over time, but asserted that that "does not mean that anything goes." He stated that "this is the wrong site for this object." He contended that there have only been three significant interventions at this site, the construction of the Water Works, the establishment of Fairmount Park, and the construction of the Art Museum. All were undertaken for the city. The Water Works provided fresh water. Fairmount Park provided green space. And the Art Museum brought visual culture. He asserted that the Skyspace is not a "big thing." It is a "good thing." James Turrell is a "first-rate artist." But, the Skyspace will not match the scope and scale of the three main interventions, Mr. Lewis argued. He stated that the artist should be compelled to find another spot for his Skyspace. This spot is the gate to the city. It is the first location people see when they visit the city. It should remain pristine. Mr. Lewis complained that we spend more on hardscape than landscape these days. He asserted that this project sounds like it will have too much hardscape. He claimed that this pavilion will destroy "that most supremely sensitive quality of any great work of architecture or landscape, the sense of interval. How far things are apart. As important as a musical rest." He asked the Committee to reject this application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of July 2016.

ADDRESS: 21 N CHRIS COLUMBUS BLVD

Proposal: Replace roll-up doors; remove portions of roof and wall cladding

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia/DRWC

Applicant: Alexandra Gauzza, Interface Studio Architects

History: 1919; Municipal Pier 9 North

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate Pier 9 North, also known as the Cherry Street Pier, for temporary use while a permanent use is sought. The pier building is very large, more than 500 feet long and 100 feet wide, has been unused for many years, and is in poor condition. A full restoration is not financially feasible at this time. The proposed rehabilitation will provide a temporary, public use.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The application proposes to dismantle the easternmost 155-foot section of the pier building, removing the wall and roof panels and clerestory windows, but leaving the masonry and steel structure in place, creating an open garden area on the water. The open area would be landscaped. The remaining masonry and steel structure exposed by the dismantling would be weatherproofed. A curtain wall would be installed at the new break in the building, enclosing the remainder of the building. Salvaged materials from the dismantling would be used to replace missing and deteriorated sections of the remaining building. At the north façade, non-historic metal roll-up doors would be replaced with glass doors to allow for views of the river from the interior. Salvaged metal roll-up doors would be used to replace missing and deteriorated doors on the south façade. A couple of the original sliding doors survive among the many non-historic roll-up doors, but are in very poor condition. The remaining roof and walls would be repaired. The interior would be renovated with shipping containers for artisans' spaces and a restaurant or food trucks.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided one of the original sliding doors is retained on site for future replication, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Joe Forkin of the Delaware River Waterfront Corporation, attorney Tony Forte, and architects Brian Phillips and Alexandra Gauzza represented the application.

Mr. Forkin explained that the Race Street Node has seen a renaissance lately. The Delaware River Waterfront Corporation (DRWC) has invested in the Race Street Pier and the good development like the Fringe Arts building has filled in. He noted that DRWC has been seeking a reuse for the 500,000 sf warehouse for many years. Private developers have proposed to demolish the warehouse and construct on the pier many times, but DRWC wants to retain it for public recreational use. This project is intended to allow the public to use and enjoy this space. This project will provide utilities to the building, stop the deterioration of the building, and allow the public to use it. A portion of the roof will be removed for a public park. The remaining building will house artists and "makers." Stabilizing and occupying the building will be Phase 1 of its redevelopment. Futures phases will include restoration when funds are obtained. He stated that they would happily retain one of the sliding doors for replication at a later date. He noted that they are welded in place currently. Mr. Forte added that the removal of the wall and roof panels is all completely reversible. The remaining roof will be repaired.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the project is reversible. The main components of the building will be retained. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to describe how the exposed structure will be protected. Mr. Phillips explained that the steel structure will be inspected and repaired as needed. The masonry will be exposed but left in place. Mr. Forte added that the steel structure will be painted to protect it. The masonry structure will be repaired. Ms. Stein asked the applicants to explain how they will make the building more transparent. Mr. Phillips reported that the front of the building would be left unchanged. At the north façade, which faces the bridge, the roll-up metal doors will be replaced with glass garage doors for the views. At the south side, the solid metal doors will be retained or replaced with salvaged doors. Egress will occur along the south side. Mr. Forkin added that the interior will be treated like an extension of the exterior. The doors will be open regardless of the weather and the public will be encouraged to walk through. The artists' space and restaurant will be heated and cooled, but the rest of the space will be unconditioned. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the materials of the railing. He stated that glass would not be appropriate. Ms. Gauzza replied that it would be a perforated metal railing.

Mr. D'Alessandro observed that the railing should stay true to the industrial aesthetic. Mr. Forkin stated that they will salvage elements such as clerestory windows with the disassembly at the east and reuse them to replace lost and damaged elements on the remainder of the building. Mr. Forte reiterated that anything that can be salvaged and reused will be salvaged and reused. Mr. D'Alessandro questioned why they are removing windows at the masonry section at the east. Ms. Gauzza responded that they are removing them at the east to create the open park at the end of the pier. Mr. Forte explained the idea of an outdoor, open space at the end of the pier to Mr. D'Alessandro. Ms. Stein stated that the proposed open space is "fantastic" and "clever." She stated that this could be a model for how to reuse a pier building. The park will pull people into and through the warehouse. Mr. Forte stated that opening the building at the end will give people a new view and appreciation of the steel structure. Mr. McCoubrey said that "it is great that one of these piers will become publicly accessible."

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Architect Richard Thom stated that the pier is an important part of Old City's history. He stated that any stabilization of the pier, even a Phase 1, is positive. The roof is in poor condition and will benefit from this project by being repaired. He commended the Delaware River Waterfront Corporation for finding a public use for the pier.

Patrick Grossi applauded the Delaware River Waterfront Corporation for retaining and adapting the pier building with a creative approach.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided one of the original sliding doors is retained on site for future replication, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 1237 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Legalize mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: MacKenzie Roebuck-Walsh

Applicant: MacKenzie Roebuck-Walsh

History: 1830; Thomas Linnard, developer

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959, 3/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a mosaic mural that was installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. The building stands at the corner of Lombard and Iseminger Streets. The mural was installed on an original exposed brick façade on Iseminger, directly on the public right-of-way. The mural violates Sections 6.15.a.2 and a.3 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, which stipulate that "murals shall not be placed directly on historic fabric," and "murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric." The Historical Commission occasionally approves murals on non-historic fabric like exposed, stuccoed, former party walls, but not on original brick facades.

A staff member visited the site during the installation of the mural and explained to the installers that the building is designated historic and, as such, approvals and permits are required for all exterior alterations. Despite the information, the installation proceeded and the mural was

completed. At the Historical Commission's request, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for the installation of the mural without an approval.

The owner claims in a cover letter that she did not understand the implications of the historic designation. However, a staff member explained the implications of designation to the owner soon after she purchased the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9 and Section 6.15 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Tom Kurek, a friend of the property owner, represented the application.

Mr. Kurek explained that the mural had been installed over the period of a month and no one spoke to the installer regarding the historic designation or the need for a building permit until the last day of the installation. He contended that no one told MacKenzie Roebuck-Walsh, the owner, about the historic designation or the need for a building permit. He said that she knew that she did not live in an historic district, but was unaware of the individual designation. He stated that the realtor who sold her the property failed to mention that the building was designated as historic. Mr. Kurek reported that the stucco on which the mosaic was placed was applied directly to the brick side façade of the building. Regarding the potential removal of the mural, he stated that artist Isaiah Zagar has no experience removing one of his mosaics without demolishing it. Removing it will destroy it. Mr. Kurek explained that the bricks were in poor condition and the owner wished to cover them for this reason. He said that she thought she would brighten up the neighborhood. He noted that she did not alter the front façade, only a side facade. Mr. Kurek claimed that someone associated with the Historical Commission had told Emily Smith, the executive director of Philadelphia's Magic Garden, the arts organization affiliated with artist Isaiah Zagar, not to attend to the Architectural Committee meeting because the Commission and the Magic Garden Organization were "in alignment."

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Baron if he had inspected the wall to see if the mosaic could be successfully removed. He replied that the stucco area is framed by a metal track, which typically indicates that the stucco was applied to a mesh, making it easier to remove.

Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Kurek if the property owner had discussed installing a mosaic with the neighbors. Mr. Kurek responded that the owner did not discuss installing a mosaic with the neighbors. However, the owner is now collecting signatures from neighbors on a petition in support of the mosaic.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she was under the impression that the seller was obligated to inform the buyer of any historic designation when purchasing a house. Mr. Baron replied that the seller should provide a seller's property disclosure statement, which includes information about historic designation. Mr. Baron explained that he personally informed this owner that her building was designated as historic shortly after she purchased the property. He noted that he gave her his business card and explained the implications of the historic designation to her. Mr. Kurek responded that the owner disputes Mr. Baron's claim that he advised her of the designation. Mr. Baron reported that he visited the property several times while the mosaic was being installed. He left a business card for the owner, who was not at home. Mr. Baron also claimed that he spoke to the installer while the work was occurring and informed him of the

need for a building permit. Mr. Baron reported that he returned to the site the next day and saw that the work was continuing. Ms. Gutterman asked if this discussion with the owner came about because the owner applied for a permit for something else. Mr. Baron explained that he used to live on the block, although he has not resided there for the past three years. He met the owner at a block party and gave her the information at that time. Mr. Kurek said that “that seems quite personal in nature.” Mr. Kurek said that the artist, Isaiah Zagar, has installed murals all over this neighborhood and the city and they relied on him with regard to permits. He told them that no permits were necessary. Mr. McCoubrey said that the Commission regularly reviews permits for murals. He noted that there is a process for mural reviews. He and Ms. Stein emphasized that they must review this as an application based upon the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, as if it had not been installed. The Commission may consider other factors beyond the Standards. Ms. Pentz expressed concern about whether the removal of the mural could harm the brick; removing it might be worse than leaving it in place. She stated that doing some “destructive investigation” would indicate whether it could easily be removed.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Jennifer McNaughton, who resides at 13th and Waverly Streets, stated other owners in this enclave of little streets, Iseminger, Camac and Waverly Streets, have respected the process. She said that the preservation process only works if everyone respects the rules. She remarked that, in doing repairs to her house, she has spent additional funds to purchase historically correct windows and doors in order to preserve the historic character of the house and street. She asserted that others should have to respect the process as well. Ms. McNaughton read a letter into the record from Joan Preuhs of 1230 Waverly Street. It stated that the mural is “hideous and detracts from the historic character of the neighborhood.” The letter said that approving the mural would “set a precedent for others to follow and, by doing so, destroys more of the history and charm of the neighborhood.”

Susan Davis, who resides on Iseminger Street, explained that she is both an architect and the former Director of Public Art for the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority. She said that there are two parts to this issue. The first is the neighbors have dealt with and complied with the Historical Commission and respected the process because of the protections that it affords. She contended that this is an incredibly intact ensemble of buildings and that people live with these restrictions because they wish to preserve this special neighborhood. The second issue is the “imposing presence of the alteration,” which she claimed undermines the historic character of the building and the block. She said that she has additional messages of objection from others on the block, which she could provide to the Commission.

Mr. Kurek reiterated that the owner did not know the process and would have followed the process had she known. If the neighbors really care about the neighborhood, they should have provided information about historic designation whenever someone moves in. If that had been the case, then the owner would have followed the process.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9 and Section 6.15 of the Historical Commission’s Rules & Regulations.

ADDRESS: 141-43 N 4TH ST

Proposal: Construct additions, restore north facade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: JG Traver Inc.

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: 1780

Individual Designation: 4/26/1966

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert a vacant building for residential use. The building is located behind a structure facing onto 4th Street and it extends east to Orianna Street. It was constructed about 1780 by the adjacent the German Reformed Church as a two-story schoolhouse. It was modified and enlarged for use as a warehouse in the nineteenth century. At that time, the attic was enlarged with the raising of the gable roof to create a single-pitch, nearly flat roof and a one-story warehouse was constructed around the south and east sides of the building. The exposed portions of the south and east facades of school building were stuccoed with a very hard cement, which cannot be removed without destroying the underlying brick. The north façade of the school building was not stuccoed. It retains its exposed Flemish bond brick with watertable. All window and door openings in the north façade have been infilled, but are easily discernible.

This application proposes to restore the north facade of the building, repairing the brick and reopening the door and windows. The later roof on the school building would be removed and an additional story with gable roof would be added. Portions of the one-story addition would be demolished to reveal the south façade of the historic building. Remaining portions of the warehouse addition would be reused. A deck with pergola would be constructed on the remaining one-story portion at the south. The remaining portion of the warehouse at the east would be enlarged to six stories; it would face onto Orianna Street and include residential lobby and garage entrances.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stuart Rosenberg, attorney Michael Mattioni, and property owner Kirk Pratt represented the application.

Mr. Rosenberg summarized the application. He explained that removing the roof on the single-story addition to the south of the school building will re-expose walls and windows that have not been seen for years as well as create open space on a lot that is built to maximum lot coverage. Removing the roof on the section of the single-story garage on Orianna Street and reusing the remaining walls as a base for an addition circumvents zoning restrictions. Ms. Pentz said how pleased she was to see a proposal that finally celebrates the historic school.

Ms. Stein focused on Orianna Street. She asked if the existing garage ever had garage doors on Orianna Street. The current garage door faces onto the vacant lot to the south. Mr. Rosenberg pointed out that there are other garages on Orianna Street. Ms. Stein asked again if this particular building ever had a garage door on Orianna. Mr. Rosenberg said that he thought

it might have had garages on Orianna, but he would need to do some research to answer that question with certainty. He noted that it currently has a garage entrance facing south. Ms. Stein said that she was opposed to any garages on Orianna Street because garages would have a negative impact on the pedestrian nature of the block. She said that she also found the proposed addition facing Orianna to be too large and imposing. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Rosenberg acknowledged that the building heights in the area are not consistent, but asserted that this proposal is within the spectrum of heights. He said that there is another 65-foot tall building on the block. With the proposed roof configuration, the proposed building will be slightly lower than the taller building to the northeast across Orianna. Ms. Stein asked if the pedestrian doorway on Orianna Street will be the primary entrance to the new residential units. Mr. Rosenberg said that it would be a primary entrance. The complex will also use an existing entrance on 4th Street. He said that the number of units in this building will be small. Ms. Stein thought that the doorway could be made more gracious. Mr. Rosenberg agreed. Ms. Gutterman said that she objected to the random nature of the balconies and she did not like the limestone cladding for the upper floor of either building. In response to a question, Mr. Rosenberg replied that the roof would be standing-seam metal. Ms. Stein asked whether there was any work proposed to the buildings on 4th Street. Mr. Rosenberg responded that there was not. Ms. Gutterman thought that the windows on the Orianna Street façade should be larger. She asked him to explain the slot for mechanical equipment in the middle of the new roof on the school. He explained that the slot would hide mechanical equipment and an area for a deck. Ms. Gutterman objected to the potential of a stairhouse to access the slot. Mr. Rosenberg said that he is not proposing a stairhouse; he explained that he is proposing a hatch, which will not be seen from the street. Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the access to the roof decks on the building on Orianna. He said that it would be no taller than five feet and not visible from Orianna Street. Mr. Rosenberg explained the restoration of the north façade of the school building. Mr. Baron pointed out evidence that the central windows on the south facade should also have balconies similar to the north façade. Mr. Baron said that there are staircase landings in the interior that indicate balconies in the centers of the facades. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the windows should be enlarged on the proposed addition on the Orianna Street façade. Ms. Stein and Mr. McCoubrey both suggested that the roof should be reduced in size on the top-floor addition on the school to cover only the interior space and not a balcony. They said that, as proposed, it resembles a Frank Lloyd Wright design with the extended eaves.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the roof overhang on the school addition is eliminated; and, at the Orianna Street façade, the garages, balconies, and limestone at the top floor are eliminated, the doorway is rendered more gracious; and the window proportions are improved; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 224 CATHARINE ST

Proposal: Construct addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ed J. Malesiewski

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate a building under a conservatorship action. The applicants would restucco the east party wall, repair masonry, and install historic windows and a door. The applicant seeks to construct porches along the rear wall as well as a cantilevered third-story addition and deck to the rear ell. The addition would span above the rear cornice and would result in a roof overbuild at the connection with the main house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the cantilevered addition and deck, but approval of all other aspects of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Adam Montalbano and attorney Michael McIlhenny represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano explained that the building is being renovated under the auspices of a conservatorship action. The initial violations have been corrected and cleared under applications approved by the Historical Commission's staff. The judge had additionally approved the market-rate redevelopment of the building, partly at the request of the owner. He explained that they are proposing a third-floor rear addition to provide a fourth bedroom. They are also proposing rear overhanging balconies and a fourth-floor roof deck. Mr. Montalbano explained that the existing rear addition was constructed after 1900. The proposed addition is pushed back to create an area of separation from the main roof. He said that the 4' 6" overhang of the addition could be reduced in size or sit on support posts. Ms. Stein observed that the rear addition is taller than and creates overbuild onto the main roof. Mr. Montalbano offered to reduce the amount of overbuild. Ms. Gutterman stated that she could not support an overbuild onto the main roof or the cantilever of the addition. Ms. Stein suggested removing the spiral stair to the deck as well as the overbuild. Mr. Montalbano explained that they are trying to create a market rate house comparable to other houses in the neighborhood. Ms. Gutterman suggested that decks are not by right. She would recommend approval of a deck at the second floor instead of the addition. Mr. Montalbano suggested a deck with a cable railing to reduce visibility. The Committee members opined that such a railing would still be too visible. Ms. Gutterman recommended modifying a second-floor rear window to get to a second-floor deck. Ms. Pentz asked why the second-story balcony has support columns on one drawing but not another. Mr. Montalbano said that it should be shown consistently with columns. Ms. Pentz suggested that perhaps two-story columns could be added to support the cantilever. Mr. McCoubrey suggested gaining the extra space with a bay rather than a cantilever. He also asked if perhaps three bedrooms were not enough. He suggested keeping the addition below the cornice line of the original house. Mr. Baron noted the significant public visibility of the rear of the building, which is adjacent to a public park. Mr. Montalbano responded that a tree screens part of the addition.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would offer a motion to recommend denial of the cantilever and fourth-story deck, but approval of all other aspects of the proposal. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he was prepared to second such a motion, if one were made. Ms. Stein suggested an amendment; if a third-floor rear addition were allowed on the ell, it should be limited in height to remain below the cornice line of the main block. Ms. Gutterman said that she would accept such an amendment. Mr. Baron said that he was confused because Ms. Gutterman had stated that she would move to recommend denial of the addition, but then Ms. Stein was offering suggestions for the approval of an addition. Ms. Gutterman opined that a revised proposal for an addition with no cantilever and that sat below the cornice line would be acceptable. Mr. McIlhenny said that they are under a time deadline with a court hearing in one month. Ms. Gutterman suggested presenting a revised design at the Commission meeting, where Mr. McCoubrey would represent the Committee. Mr. Montalbano asked if the Committee would recommend approval of a deck at the second-floor rear. Ms. Gutterman said that that would be covered in her motion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the cantilevered addition and fourth-story deck, but approval of all other aspects of the application as well as a third-floor addition with no cantilever that remains below the cornice line of the main block, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 1601 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Stabilize building; install vinyl-sided rear wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Noris & Miguel A. Santiago

Applicant: James Harre, Designblendz

History: 1859; Robert Purvis House

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to stabilize a building that has been vacant and neglected for many years. The Historical Commission approved rehabilitation of the building in 2003. However, the building has not been rehabilitated. Instead, it has further deteriorated and the rear ell has been demolished. In 2012, a court order allowed the demolition of the rear ell with the proviso that it must be reconstructed within a year. It was not reconstructed.

The property is subject to many violations and this application responds to some of those violations. The walls will be reinforced with new load bearing studs and star bolts. The brickwork will be repaired with a mixture of pointing, patching, and brick replacement. Windows will be installed in several openings. The opening in the rear wall, which was temporarily infilled, will be infilled and covered with vinyl siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of all aspects of the application, except denial of the vinyl siding, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Scott Woodruff and project designer James Harre represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. Woodruff stated that they hope to stabilize the structure on a temporary basis. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Baron what cladding material would be acceptable in place of the proposed vinyl siding. Mr. Baron said that the staff found the vinyl siding inappropriate for the historic district, but suggested stucco with a brick red color finish. Ms. Gutterman asked if this would be acceptable to the client. Mr. Woodruff said that stucco is not so much more expensive than siding. Brick would be much more expensive. Ms. Pentz expressed concerns about details and effectiveness of the structural intervention. In particular, she noted that the new studs are discontinuous at every level creating a hinge. Mr. Woodruff said that the new studs and star bolts will take away much of the weight from the exterior wall. Mr. D'Alessandro advised that, if the masonry is weak, then it needs to be repaired and repointed. Ms. Pentz noted that, when using stairbolts, one needs bridging between joists to create additional support. Ms. Gutterman asked if the new structure had been designed by an engineer. Mr. Harre replied that it had been designed by an engineer. Mr. Baron asked if they plan to remove or sister the joists. Mr. Woodruff replied that they will be sistered.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the vinyl siding is replaced with an appropriate cladding material and the engineering details are verified, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 2240 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Demolish wood addition; construct deck and pergola

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gage Johnston and Jack Jallo

Applicant: Julie Motl, Julie Motl, Architect

History: 1859

Individual Designation: 12/5/1974

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a later rear addition and construct a roof deck in its place on this corner property. The proposed roof deck is designed to reflect the client's desire for privacy. The design proposes a wood structure with Hardie board panels, a pergola, and a metal railing with metal infill panels. The Hardie board panels will be painted to match the red brick of the building. The staff does not oppose a roof deck in this location; however, the staff suggests that the proposed design is not in keeping with the open nature of decks typically approved by the Commission, owing to the Hardie board panels and railing infill panels.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Julie Motl represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she did not understand the claimed desire for privacy, given the openness of the sides. Ms. Motl responded that there would be some privacy on the front and

sides and it would have a feeling of enclosure, rather than the openness of a railing only around the perimeter. She referenced a similar-style deck in the historic district, but Ms. Chantry clarified that that building is newer construction and is non-contributing to the district. Ms. Gutterman commented that the pergola is acceptable, but not the Hardie board. Ms. Motl responded that her client is not interested in a traditional picket railing. Mr. McCoubrey commented that, privacy issue aside, there is a stylistic issue. He commented that it does not look appropriate on a nineteenth-century townhouse, and it is a large element at the rear that is commanding a lot of attention. Ms. Motl commented that it is currently a solid addition. Ms. Gutterman agreed, and noted that that is the issue. Mr. McCoubrey elaborated that the current addition is a background piece that one would expect on the rear of a building. He suggested planters as a means of achieving privacy. Ms. Stein commented that she is not opposed to the removal of the existing addition, but that the proposed deck makes one question if it is an addition or part of an original wall. She commented that the addition of a wood deck on a brick building in Spring Garden is acceptable, and even with a pergola. But the brick-colored Hardie board panels create a frame that is confusing. Ms. Motl stated that another option is to use siding like the existing addition. Ms. Stein responded she that is also opposed to that option because it is creating a wall on top of a brick building. She suggested that it should look more like a deck, and that the applicant should present a revised design that looks subservient to the brick house. Ms. Pentz agreed with Ms. Stein, and noted that the early acceptance of the concept of an open deck by the Commission years ago was based on early photographs that showed wooden frames built on the roofs for the purpose of drying clothes. Ms. Motl asked if a lighter structure in either metal or wood is acceptable. Ms. Gutterman commented that a deck with a pergola and wood railing is acceptable, with plantings behind the railings, but it needs to look more temporary. She suggested that the pergola can be supported with structure, and could be steel, but should be a garden element rather than a building element. Ms. Chantry commented that the staff was also in support of the pergola.

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

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

ADDRESS: 412 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Construct addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul and Pamela Young

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition and roof deck with pilot house, and renovate the facades of this corner property located in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The building likely dates to the 1850s, but underwent substantial renovations in 1937 and 1963. In 1937, the 18th Street wall was rebuilt, and in 1963, a storefront used for a grocery store was removed and the second-story rear addition was reconstructed in masonry. The current window style and configuration dates from that time. This application proposes to

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

remove all of the projecting windows and replace them with in-swing doors on the Addison Street façade at the second and third floors, and one-over-one double-hung windows on the 18th Street façade. The existing second-story rear addition above the carport would be removed, and a slightly set-back three-story addition with garage door would be constructed at the rear. An existing roof deck would be removed, and a roof deck with pilot house would be constructed over a portion of the main block and new rear addition. A window well is proposed where there is currently a Bilco door.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Robert Palladino represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff discussed how the two proposed elevations do not appear to belong together. Ms. Chantry responded that it is difficult to unify the facades owing to the cut-down window openings on the Addison Street façade, which they are not proposing to infill. The staff suggested removal of the proposed shutters on the 18th Street façade because they are not proportionally correct. Mr. Palladino agreed that there was no historic photograph to work from, and noted that each façade is different and it will be difficult to make the facades more similar. Ms. Gutterman suggested deletion of the shutters and a different design for the windows on the 18th Street façade. She stated that she dislikes Juliet balconies. Mr. Palladino clarified that the Juliet balconies are not proposed to extend out. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that she dislikes Juliet balconies; it is a personal preference. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the paint will be removed. Mr. Palladino responded that the paint will not be removed. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the deck is visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Palladino responded that the proposed deck is set back and will not be as visible as the current deck. Ms. Gutterman suggested limiting the deck to the addition; she added that a small section on the main block to allow for access to the pilot house would be acceptable. Ms. Gutterman asked if any window types other than double-hung windows were explored. Mr. Palladino responded that he assumed double-hung windows were the most appropriate, but that maybe a hopper window could work. Mr. Gutterman responded that she is trying to get the two facades to blend better. Mr. Palladino asked if maybe the doors on Addison Street were more the issue, rather than the windows. Ms. Gutterman responded that currently the windows go together on the two facades. She understands the owner's intent to make the building look more historic, but the problem is the openings on Addison Street have been changed so that they do not have the historic proportions; double-hung windows do not look right. She suggested the applicant work with the staff on other types of windows that might create a modern interpretation of the historic house. She suggested that the removal of the shutters may make the facades appear more uniformed. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that it is difficult to determine a window that works with the Addison Street façade, when the 18th Street façade is much more characteristic of the nineteenth century. He suggested removal of the shutters but retention of the proposed double-hung windows.

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

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he was not opposed to keeping the style of the floor-to-ceiling windows on the Addison Street façade, but they would require guardrails. Ms. Gutterman suggested that perhaps the design could remain the same, but the new sash would be operable and located within the masonry opening rather than projecting. Ms. Pentz stated that she does

not object to the shutters. Mr. Palladino clarified that the shutters would be real operable shutters, and would fold where necessary to create an accurately-sized shutter.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 3-2 to recommend approval, provided the proposed shutters and Juliet balconies are eliminated, the deck is reduced in size and located primarily on the addition with access from the pilot house, and a window design that is more compatible for both elevations is investigated, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz dissented because they did not object to the proposed shutters.

ADDRESS: 2500 SPRING GARDEN ST, SEDGELEY CLUB BOATHOUSE

Proposal: Replace cedar shingles with polymer shingles

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sedgeley Club

Applicant: Karen Earley, Sedgeley Club

History: 1902; Sedgeley Club; Arthur H. Brockie, architect

Individual Designation: 1/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the existing cedar shingle siding with CertainTeed Cedar Impressions Sawmill shingles. The shingles are deteriorated and are very difficult to maintain, owing to the wet environment adjacent to the river. The Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept application to replace the shingles, wood trim, and windows and insulate the walls in February 2017. The Committee was split on the shingle replacement, but agreed that any replacement should adequately address the corner shingles. The application was withdrawn prior to the Historical Commission's review. The current application proposes the shingle replacement only. The wood trim and windows have been restored, rather than replaced in alternate materials. The insulation project will not be undertaken. Since the last review, CertainTeed has developed a corner shingle, which will be used on this project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Karen Earley and Lois Krumboltz from the Sedgeley Club, and Tim McGuirk, Matt Gibson, and Brian Kirn from CertainTeed represented the application.

Mr. McGuirk presented a corner detail mockup, indicating the varied widths of the shingles on either side of the corner. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the corners are mitered, and Mr. McGuirk confirmed this.

Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the overlap of the shingles is sufficient to prevent wind-driven rain from coming under and down to interior of the building. Mr. McGuirk explained that a house wrap substrate would be installed beneath the shingles. He noted that the mockup shows the 90 degree corner angle from the side. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there is additional flashing not shown in the mockup. Mr. McGuirk responded affirmatively, noting that they used the mockup in a heat/cold testing to make sure that it would perform and stay looking the same

in extreme temperatures. Mr. Kirn noted that the material was tested up to 140 degrees Fahrenheit and below freezing.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the corners are actually mitred and not a butt joint. Mr. McGuirk responded affirmatively, noting that the tools used to cut the material are traditional wood-working tools. Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether it would be possible to customize or alter a piece on site, or whether that would have to be done at the factory. Mr. Kirn responded that the pieces could be altered in the field through a normal carpentry process. He explained that the sample pieces being looked at by the Committee members were an early prototype with a glossier finish than the one they would be seeking to use for this project. Mr. McGuirk explained that the reinforcing ribs on the back of the shingles are where they could be cut to create the three different widths. Mr. Kirn noted that that also provides nine corner size options.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the preferred color for the siding. Mr. Kirn responded that the process for the material is replicating the aging process of real cedar shingles. He explained that there are two types of cedar—Western red cedar and Western white cedar—and that the color the Sedgely Club is looking to use is “Rustic Blend,” an aged red cedar look. When red cedar is fresh, it has a red color, but as it ages, it turns to a brownish color. He noted that CertainTeed has replicated that aged appearance in three different shades for the Rustic Blend, and those would be mixed in on the building. The applicants presented a mockup of the Rustic Blend color. Mr. Kirn explained that the material also has variegated striping to replicate the appearance of natural cedar shakes. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the material is paintable. Mr. Kirn responded that it is not. Ms. Stein asked if red cedar was the original cladding material for the Sedgely Club. Ms. Earley responded affirmatively. Mr. Kirn noted that there is a significant difference between the cedar available today and the cedar used in 1902. The cedar product used commercially today is harvested from rapid-growth cedar trees under 10 years old, versus trees harvested in 1902, which were typically over 100 years in age and considerably more dense. The cedar shingles available today often do not last more than five to ten years, he explained.

Mr. McCoubrey asked how long the CertainTeed product has been in use. Mr. Kirn responded that the panelized version of the product has been around since 1991, but the individual pieces were introduced in early 2015. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the pieces would be individually applied. Mr. Kirn confirmed that they would. Ms. Stein asked if the entire boathouse would receive the shingles, or whether there are any areas where the shingles would not be replaced. Ms. Earley responded that anywhere there is a shingle now, a replacement CertainTeed shingle would be used. She noted that the moisture and reflection from the river makes it difficult to maintain the natural cedar shingles. Mr. Kirn explained that they engineered the product so that it is naturally drainable, which is important given how much moisture is on the river. He noted that real cedar shingles are solid, trapping moisture against the house. He opined that the substrate under the existing shingles is probably significantly rotted, and may need to be repaired or replaced as part of the project. He argued that the drainability of the CertainTeed product would increase the longevity of the entire building, and reduce the risk of mold or mildew. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any concern over the exposure of the shingles along the river in terms of moisture or heat and cold. Mr. Kirn responded that no, this type of product has been commercialized since 1991, and offers a lifetime warranty. He noted that it is a well-respected brand in the marketplace. Mr. McGuirk explained that the product is most commonly used at the Jersey Shore. Mr. McCoubrey asked how the product drains. Mr. Kirn responded that there are ribs on

the back of the shingles, unlike wood shingles that are flush against the underlying material. Mr. McCoubrey replied that real cedar is breathable.

Ms. Gutterman asked what sort of flame spread the CertainTeed shingles have. Mr. Kirn responded that they are a Class C, which is the same as cedar shakes.

Ms. Stein asked if the roof would be replaced at the same time. Ms. Earley responded that the roof replacement was reviewed and approved recently by the staff of the Historical Commission. Ms. Earley noted that, after the first meeting with the Architectural Committee, they had the windows and all of the trim beautifully restored. She explained that they worked with a historical painting company that understood the building and stripped all of the old layers of paint off and restored the beautiful historic profiles of the trim. She noted that they took the comments of the Committee from the first review to heart, and were very pleased with the outcome. Ms. Stein asked what material was used for the roof replacement. Ms. Earley responded that the roofing is a Landmark asphalt shingle in a weathered wood color. She noted that the exterior shingles are the only element left in the restoration of the building. She explained that CertainTeed has offered to donate the shingles—a boon for the organization, which is always scraping the bottom of the barrel in terms of funding. She reiterated that the building is exposed to extreme wear and tear owing to its position on the river. She noted that real cedar shingles would be an additional \$20,000, would be more difficult to maintain, and would not last as long. She noted that, since the shingles are baked by the sun on one side, and are shaded on the other, typically what Sedgeley Club does is to stain the cedar shingles, which costs an additional \$10,000. She argued that the CertainTeed shingles are a great financial gain for the Sedgeley Club, but that they will also look great and be easier to maintain. Mr. D'Alessandro congratulated CertainTeed for entering into the manufacturing of this type of shingle, but asked how they could assure the owner that they were getting a good product. Mr. Kirn responded that CertainTeed offers a lifetime warranty on the product. Mr. D'Alessandro asked what would void the warranty. Mr. Kirn responded that incorrect installation could void the warranty. Mr. D'Alessandro clarified that it would need a certified installer. Mr. McGuirk responded that this is a high profile project for which CertainTeed representatives would be on site during installation. Ms. Earley noted that Sedgeley Club would not want to install a product that was going to fly off. Mr. McGuirk noted that CertainTeed has worked with a number of contractors during the product development. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if a subcontractor would be performing the work. Mr. Kirn responded negatively, noting that they would definitely back the product, given that they would be on site. Mr. McGuirk noted that part of the delay in returning to the Architectural Committee was that they wanted to run the corner detail through the testing trailer. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the shingles have been wind-tested. Mr. Kirn responded affirmatively, noting that the shingles have a higher wind load rating than any other product on the market owing to the fact that there are four fasteners in each shingle. He explained that the shingles were tested in winds up to 330 mph. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the shingles would be attached using a pneumatic stapler. Mr. Kirn responded affirmatively, but noted that they could also be applied by hand. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if there were any issues with splitting. Mr. Kirn responded that they changed the polymer so that it was a little more rubberized and would not crack, and that the material is also reinforced by the ribs on the back. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the company had really thought out the design. Mr. Kirn responded that the product took four or five years to develop, plus two years of testing. Mr. McGuirk noted that this winter a contractor used a roofing gun, against CertainTeed's recommendation, in very cold temperatures, but the shingles still did not split. Mr. Kirn noted that they tested the material down to 30 degrees, but recommend it not be installed in conditions below 40 degrees.

Ms. Gutterman asked if someone has developed details of the Tyvek window flashings and aluminum drips specifically for Sedgeley and its wood trim. She asked whether the flashing will be visible and come out in front. Ms. Earley responded that the details have not been developed in writing. Ms. Gutterman asked if the details have been drawn or if a mock-up has been completed. Mr. Kirn responded that the house wrap will be exposed during construction, but that the flashing will ultimately be hidden. Ms. Gutterman responded that the flashing would be partially visible in order for it to come over an edge. She opined that projects such as this usually present typical details for how the flashing will work. Mr. Kirn noted that they have a few typical sample drawings. Ms. Gutterman responded that none were submitted to the Architectural Committee. Ms. Stein noted that this is not a typical Shore house; the boathouse has some atypical details that would not be found on new construction. Mr. McGuirk responded that they have typical details, but that he is not sure how the window flashing would work in a historic building. Mr. McCoubrey replied that the color of the flashing would be important. Ms. Gutterman agreed, adding that the visibility and how the flashing works with the trim that the Club just went to all the trouble to restore, and the roofing. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the flashing details should be submitted to the staff for review.

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

Mr. McCoubrey opined that, although the Architectural Committee does not typically take financial concerns into consideration, for him, the fact that this product is being donated to an organization with a financial need is positive. Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting that the reduced maintenance of the material is also important.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mockup is constructed on site showing the typical flashing details in relationship to the other building elements, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 318 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Demolish building; construct 3.5 story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: NE Property Investment, LLC

Applicant: Ashley May, Fidelis Engineering

History: 1970; Nancy Brewster Grace House; Stonorov & Haws, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a three-and-a-half story colonial-style building where there is currently a 1968 contributing building at the corner of South 4th and Cypress Streets. The applicant has verbally communicated that the existing building will not be demolished, but, based on the minimal application materials provided, the staff considers this to be an application for demolition and new construction. The applicant is proposing a colonial appearance for the new building to be in keeping with other buildings in the vicinity; however, there are numerous nearby buildings from the 1960s which are contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, of which this is one.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 9, 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Ashley May represented the application.

Ms. May explained that her clients are looking for feedback, and that the building is going to be an owner-occupied home. She noted that she understands it was designed by Oscar Stonorov and is listed as contributing. She explained that the bay on the front façade is completely rotten. She opined that the windows were never sealed or caulked properly, and are basically just glass that is framed. As a result, she noted, water has penetrated the windows and rotted the floor joists and the decking of the second-floor roof and first floor. She explained that the owner wants to either construct an addition on top of the existing house and make it structurally sound as it appears now, or if the Historical Commission would approve it, they want to make it Colonial looking. She noted that the owners are willing to keep the appearance as it is now, but that elements need to be replaced. Ms. Gutterman noted that the front elevation rendering in the submission shows what the front would look like if they made a Colonial appearance, and asked what the side of the house was supposed to look like with that front. Mr. McCoubrey responded that that is not an option. Ms. May presented a side elevation rendering. Ms. Gutterman asked if the intent was to do a lot of overbuilding. Ms. May responded that no, the intent was to maintain the same footprint as it is now. Ms. Gutterman replied that that would not be possible, because right now the house is two stories. Ms. May responded that the house would maintain the same footprint on the lot. Ms. Gutterman responded that it appears that the front of the building would be extended. Ms. May replied that, by zoning terms, the building would maintain the same footprint, because the bay window at the second floor is marked on the zoning plan.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the existing building was designed during a significant redevelopment period by a significant Philadelphia architect, so anything that would propose its significant alteration or demolition would be very difficult to approve. He suggested that the applicant could pursue the existing building's restoration. Ms. May agreed that the existing building has a lot of character for a modern building, including interesting interior features. Ms. May asked if they restored the exterior, if they could also construct an addition on top of the existing building. Ms. Gutterman responded negatively. Mr. McCoubrey replied that the building's existing form is very significant, with the double shed forms and chimneys, and that all of those elements would be considered character-defining features. Ms. May asked whether it would be possible to extend the basement instead, noting that the foundation currently only extends about half way from the front of the property to the back of the property. She asked whether the Committee would be comfortable with the owner excavating the basement to the full length of the building. Ms. Gutterman responded that that would be fine as long as the work is not visible, for example, as long as they are not proposing to install windows for the new portion of the basement. Ms. Gutterman noted that the staff could work with the applicant on repairing or restoring the building to its original appearance and would not have to present a new application to the Architectural Committee or Historical Commission. Ms. May reiterated that the wooden bay is completely rotten. Ms. Gutterman responded that that is why there are epoxies. Ms. May asked whether they would have to use the existing paint colors. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Historical Commission chooses not to regulate the painting of wood trim. Mr. McCoubrey noted that it would be possible to figure out the original colors, if the owners would like to restore those. Ms. May replied that she actually did research on Stonorov

and found a few photographs of the house that he built for himself out in Charlestown Township, and could incorporate some of the colors he typically used.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Paul Boni, chairman of the zoning and historic preservation committee for the Society Hill Civic Association (SHCA), stated that this house is important to the community, its history, its part in the redevelopment of the neighborhood, and is by an important architect. He stated the SHCA's support of the staff recommendation of denial.

David Traub of Save Our Sites commented that his organization opposes demolition of the house, and is concerned that the demolition would set the precedent for further subjective and selective pruning of buildings in historic district. He opined that the demolition would open wider the flood gates of an ongoing attempt to dismantle historic districts with the intention of building bigger, more valuable, and more profitable structures for owners and developers. He reiterated Save Our Sites' opposition, stating that they do not seek to be unduly alarmist, but only cautious in what they see as a trend and which they warned against in a hearing last summer before the Historical Commission. He noted that there are exceptions to the rule, but this is not one of them. He mused that this house has no great architectural distinction, but that is not the point. Its effect on the streetscape is not harmful, it blends in quite well, and one walking by it would find no objection, he continued. After all, he opined, if one looks hard enough, one can find a reason for tearing down any building in this or any other historic district. For example, someone can easily object to the modern house two doors down at the corner of Cypress Street as being incompatible with the Georgian flavor of the district and propose tearing it down. In conclusion, he stated that the consideration of an already designated building is a serious matter, and reiterated Save Our Sites' opposition to the demolition.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance concurred with the staff's recommendation that this application, if it were to go forward, would constitute a demolition. He encouraged the applicant to pursue a restoration that retains the character-defining features of Stonorov's original design. He opined that the building is appropriately listed for both its position in the redevelopment period and for Stonorov's significance.

Ms. Stein noted that, based on the minimal drawings provided, the Committee assumes that the project proposes demolition of the existing building.

Ms. May stated that, if it would be acceptable to excavate the basement, then that is what they would do instead. Ms. DiPasquale asked Ms. May to clarify whether she was withdrawing the application. Ms. May confirmed her withdrawal of the application.

Ms. May asked whether the front ground-floor window could be enlarged. Ms. Gutterman responded that Ms. May would need to produce a drawing of the proposed alteration and review it with the staff.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 9, 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

ADDRESS: 201 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Install thru-wall flashing; replace sealant; install expansion joints

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Claridge, LP

Applicant: Brian Palmer, Palmer Waterproofing

History: 1955; Rittenhouse Claridge; Samuel O'Shiver, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to repair the masonry of the north and east elevations of the Rittenhouse Claridge, a contributing building in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. The repair work would include removing and salvaging several courses of the face brick, cleaning and painting corroded steel lintels and relief angles, installing a stainless steel drip edge with a waterproofing membrane, and reinstalling salvaged and new face brick. This work would be completed at the fourth through twenty-fourth floors of the two elevations, and the stainless steel drip edge would be visible above the windows at every floor. Additional work includes replacing cracked brick, replacing sealant at window perimeters, repointing at limestone window sills, and saw cutting brick to provide new vertical control joints.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the replacement of cracked brick and sealant, provided the "Natural Stone" color is used, and approval of the installation of expansion joints, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. The staff recommends exploring whether alternative options exist for stabilizing the corroded steel lintels and relief angles that would have less visual impact on the building than the proposed stainless steel drip edge.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineer Matthew Mowrer represented the application.

Mr. Mowrer asserted that, in his opinion, the flashing was a simple waterproofing detail, serving as a drip edge to remove any water that entered the façade. He explained that the control joints have essentially made themselves by opening in a straight, vertical line, and that his intent is to install a soft joint to allow the building to move. He noted that he has identified a great brick to match existing and has had the colors reviewed by the staff. The real issue, he added, is the flashing, which will create a horizontal visual line adjacent to the windows where there is currently stacked brick.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the drawings included in the application show where the new control joints are planned. Mr. Mowrer responded that they are shown on sheets 1-S2 and 2-S2. The crosshatch, he added, indicates areas of brick removal to allow access to the steel. Ms. Gutterman again asked where on the elevation the control joints will be placed, questioning whether the joints will span the entire height of the building. Mr. Mowrer responded that the control joints will span the entire height and noted that the work will not include the area identified on the drawings as "Not in Scope," which outlines a 20-foot area adjacent to the outer edge of the building. The "Area of Work," he continued, shows where work will be concentrated. Ms. Gutterman again asked where the control joint will be located. Mr. Mowrer and Ms. Gutterman discussed the drawings to determine the location of the joint. Mr. Mowrer clarified that the control joint will not be saw cut, because it will be placed at the floor line between

windows where the crosshatch is shown. He referred the Committee to the repair legend on the drawing.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether the lintels will be replaced above only eight of the ten windows, so the two at the east end will not be addressed. Mr. Mowrer affirmed and noted that the owner does not want to install sidewalk protection, so the work must remain 20-feet from any sidewalk to comply with the building code. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether water will enter the untreated area. Mr. Mowrer answered that end dams will be installed to restrict water in the area. Ms. Gutterman asked, if end dams can be used at the east end, why the same could not be installed at the west end of the elevation to avoid the protruding flashing and striping effect it creates. Mr. Mowrer replied that end dams could be installed but that he prefers to fully eliminate water with proper flashing. Ms. Gutterman responded that the flashing detail changes the appearance of the building.

Ms. Stein inquired whether there is another flashing detail that would be acceptable to the owner that would not expose the stainless steel drip edge, because the detail as proposed significantly alters the aesthetics. Mr. Mowrer answered that he understands the concern over the horizontal banding created by the flashing and that the owner could accept an alternative. The problem, he continued, is moisture management in the wall, adding that he would want the flashing to stand out from the wall with a drip edge. Ms. Gutterman replied that the projection and its visibility are problematic. The fact that the detail is not included above two windows at the opposite end, she argued, leaves the possibility of water pooling there. Mr. Mowrer responded that the intent is to continue moving around the building but remaining 20-feet away from the edge to avoid installing overhead sidewalk protection. He commented that, if the direction from the Committee is to extend the flashing at the east and install sidewalk protection, then he would relay that information to the owner. Ms. Gutterman responded that that is not the Committee's request, adding that there is conflicting information about what needs to be done at the east end compared to extending the flashing three and a half brick courses in order for the wall to daylight at the other end. She argued that at the west end where the flashing must be extended, the building will end up with stripes on what is now a very uniform brick wall. On the other end, she continued, there is a possible issue of a deteriorated lintel, and there will be no work to expose the brick and replace flashing, and thereby the condition will not be addressed. Mr. Mowrer answered that the difference in approach from one end to the other is per the owner's restrictions and that he has funds to repair the areas where work is proposed.

Ms. Gutterman questioned why the flashing could not terminate half a brick beyond the window frame and not two-and-a-half bricks beyond it. She argued that it would eliminate the striped appearance. She further asked whether another material with less visibility, rather than stainless steel, could be considered. Mr. Mowrer explained that extending the drip edge off the face of the brick will result in visibility no matter the material. He noted that copper and aluminum flashings are available and added that aluminum should not be installed in a masonry wall. The Committee agreed that the large overrun beyond the window frames is problematic. Ms. Gutterman asserted that extending the flashing detail a half a brick course would allow the wall to daylight without creating the striping pattern.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the relieving angle extends the entire length of the façade. Mr. Mowrer answered that it does not stop above the windows and instead extends to the edge of the building. Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether a soft joint would be installed. Mr. Mowrer confirmed that there would be a soft joint at the underside where the brick meets the lintel. Ms. Gutterman

asked if the condition of the relieving angle is uniform across the façade. Mr. Mowrer answered that it is. Ms. Gutterman asked if the relieving angle is corroded, and Mr. Mowrer replied that it is.

Ms. Stein asked how the brick matching will be done and whether existing bricks would be reused. Mr. Mowrer responded that he likes to reuse existing brick. Because some will be lost, he continued, he has already gone through the review process for identifying matching brick. Ms. Stein asked if the proposed partial mortar replacement is limited to areas that are hatched on the drawings. Mr. Mowrer answered that the mortar will extend across the heads of all windows, which is represented by the diagonal hatch on the drawings. Ms. Stein asserted that she is worried about introducing a piecemeal approach to repairing the wall and that it will result in piecemeal bricks, piecemeal mortar, and piecemeal stainless steel flashings that extend from the brick and which have nothing to do with the architectural elements. Those elements, she argued, are very strong on this building and of its period. She contended that the work does not seem to come together. Mr. Mowrer responded that the owner's intent is to continue the work around the building. He explained that they provided an estimate for all the work and the owner has set aside funds. Eventually, he continued, the work will extend throughout the building and what is presented in the current application is this year's phase. Ms. Stein replied that she thinks stopping shy of the end of the building is a mistake. In the future, she added, there could be a different contractor, different construction period, bricks could not match, mortar could not match, and so on. It is not a good plan, she emphasized. She encouraged the applicant to take a floor-by-floor approach rather than completing vertical piecemeal sections as proposed. She stated that the approach is part of the reason why there is such concern from the Committee, in particular because the flashing will look awkward when finished. She asserted that the flashing does not relate to the windows.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if all of the relieving angles are ultimately going to have to be replaced. Mr. Mowrer answered that they are not replacing the angles and are only cleaning them. The relieving angles, he explained, are starting to damage the brick, which is why he is proposing the repair work. He noted that the building has ripped itself apart where a control joint should be located. Ms. Gutterman asked whether a control joint would be in a particular expanse of brick, and Mr. Mowrer affirmed, stating that the area is essentially a brick stack. Ms. Gutterman asked if the control joint wraps the corner, and Mr. Mowrer affirmed.

Ms. Stein inquired whether the relieving angles turn the corners at every floor. Mr. Mowrer explained that they do. Ms. Stein expressed concern that if the Committee were to approve the repair now, it sets a precedent for the future. She stated her opposition to exposed stainless steel ribs that create shadow lines on the building.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there are soft joints in the wall. Mr. Mowrer replied that the joints were originally mortared, but they have cracked and someone had sealed them with sealant. They are now soft joints, he noted.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested finding an alternative flashing method. Mr. Mowrer stated that the proposed flashing detail is the standard recommended detail. He added that he understands that the horizontal pattern is an eyesore. Ms. Stein asked if there are other details that the Brick Institute supports for historic construction. Mr. Mowrer replied that there is not, because the flashing needs to extend out to the face. Water, he continued, has surface tension, so it will always reenter a material, which is why a drip edge must turn down. He added that even if that

drip edge stops at the face, which was recommended earlier, there will still be a little suction. Mr. Mowrer contended that sealant can be applied, but it fails in seven to 10 years. Ms. Gutterman countered that every place where sealant is proposed will have the same maintenance issue. Mr. Mowrer responded that he is only proposing sealant at control joints. Mr. McCoubrey noted that sealant would be applied in locations with flashing. Ms. Gutterman inquired whether Mr. Mowrer will flash above the sealant. Mr. Mowrer answered that flashing would be applied above sealant with the intent that if moisture gets inside the wall, the next floor's flashing would catch it and redirect it out from the wall. Ms. Gutterman stated that water can only be caught and redirected where there is solid brick, otherwise it would enter the head of the window. Mr. Mowrer asked whether Ms. Gutterman is referring to the perimeter seal. Ms. Gutterman replied that the proposal is to flash at the relieving angle and the drip edge will protrude. She then asked whether any material between the top of the metal and underside of the first brick is proposed and whether it would be sealant. Mr. Mowrer replied that it would be sealant and directed Ms. Gutterman to a detail in the application. Ms. Gutterman noted that the sealant joint would need to be maintained every seven to 10 years. Mr. Mowrer agreed, adding that the joint is essentially covered by the flashing, so it would only be vulnerable to wind-driven rain. Ms. Gutterman responded that it is not covered by the flashing and that it would be under the flashing, between the flashing and brick. Mr. Mowrer again agreed, noting that the flashing is turned down, which would place the sealant underneath. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the top of the flashing and brick would be sealed. Mr. Mowrer replied that it would not, because water would need to escape from that area.

Ms. Stein contended that the Brick Institute has changed its details over time and that five or 10 years ago they offered alternate flashing details. She stated that she was unsure what details they provide today and added that many architects still design buildings that have a flashing stopping gap at the brick face sealed underneath the flashing stop, so the detail does not turn down at the hem like the proposed detail. She questioned whether that type of detail would be more appropriate where there is monolithic brick, such as the corners of the Rittenhouse Claridge building. At the window heads, she continued, it is not problematic for the flashing to turn down, but she reiterated that the detail would break up the view of the monolithic façade, which defines the architectural character of the mid-century design. She added that she would like to push the applicant on that detail, as the staff urged.

Mr. Mowrer replied that the details have changed from using lipped brick and down-turned flashing. Ms. Gutterman asked if Mr. Mowrer had considered lipped brick. Mr. Mowrer answered that he had but that it is not necessary at this building since the existing brick is not lipped. He added that the exposure of the metal is the concern but that water must always escape. Mr. Mowrer explained that he encounters flashing installed flush to the face of a wall when performing leak investigations.

Ms. Stein asked whether a 20-year sealant will be used. Mr. Mowrer replied that there are no 20-year sealants, because a manufacturer will not warranty it. He asserted that the alternative, as the Committee noted, would be to terminate the projection at the edge of the windows and then install the flashing flush with the face of the brick for the remainder of the wall, though he argued that it would become a maintenance item for the owner. The Committee responded that sealants are a maintenance item. Ms. Gutterman clarified that the concern is not wanting to lose the beautiful corner by having bands every eight feet. She encouraged Mr. Mowrer to reach out to the Brick Institute of America to explore alternatives they offer for buildings of the 1950s. She added that this is likely not the first issue of its kind and asked that Mr. Mowrer find whether the

Brick Institute has any ideas of how to accomplish a better flashing detail without having the lip of the stainless steel flashing protrude the face. She then asked whether the issue is limited to the relieving angles at the floor levels. Mr. Mowrer replied that it is, and additionally the control joint. Ms. Gutterman asked whether some areas are worse based on exposure. Mr. Mowrer answered that the lower levels are more corroded than higher levels due to lack of drying. Water, he added, sits more on the lower levels, but the difference is minor. Ms. Gutterman asked if any steel needs to be replaced or if the work is only surface repair. Mr. Mowrer answered that there is an allowance for possible lintel replacement that he hopes to avoid that intervention. It seems, he continued, that the lintels can be scraped, primed, and painted. Ms. Gutterman clarified that, while there is corrosion and deterioration, it does not seem that any significant corrosion has eroded the steel.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the replacement of cracked brick and sealant provided the “Natural Stone” color is used, the installation of expansion joints, and the installation of flashing with an alternate detail without the projecting stainless steel flashing, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 419 S 20TH ST

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

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Shabs LLC

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

History: 1845; 1875, mansard; 1885, storefront

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a revision version of a design presented in an application reviewed and denied by the Historical Commission at its 9 June 2017 meeting. That application proposed to demolish the existing rear roof slope and dormer and construct a mansard addition in line with the rear wall of the main block. The Commission voted to deny the rear addition. During its review, the Commission suggested that the applicant redesign the proposed addition so that it did not mimic the adjacent mansard and was set back from the rear façade of the historic building. The current application implements the Commission’s advice precisely. The staff has since learned that the existing rear roof slope and dormer are original to the 1845 building.

The current application proposes to demolish the rear roof slope and dormer and to create a smaller addition than previously proposed. The addition would maintain a 5’-8” setback from the plane of the neighboring mansard roof and would be minimally visible from Waverly Street. The addition would contain two one-over-one, aluminum-clad windows and the rear wall would be clad in fiber cement clapboard siding. Other work includes the replacement of one window and one door at the third story and the repointing and repainting of the rear masonry wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Historical Commission’s direction at its 9 June 2017 meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

Mr. Heidel explained that he has proposed to set back the addition so it is roughly in line with the current projection of the existing dormer. On drawing A-0.1, he continued, there is an aerial perspective and street view that provide information on the addition's general appearance and visibility from Waverly Street.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the material on the existing dormer, and whether it is wood or shingles. Ms. Keller responded that a photograph of the existing dormer is included in the application. Mr. Heidel stated that the entire dormer is currently clad with rubber roofing, and that the rubber roofing was applied to the whole rear of the roof structure. He added that he did not know what may have existed previously. He noted that he is open to other options for roofing material, if the Committee finds another material to be more appropriate.

Ms. Stein asked if the addition is approximately the same depth as the dormer. Mr. Heidel responded that it is.

Ms. Pentz asked whether the neighboring building retains its original dormer. Ms. Keller answered that several buildings on the row retain their dormers. Mr. Heidel added that two dormers at the south end of the block had been removed in the past, but that there are two more dormers currently intact.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the vent stacks will get relocated or raised. Mr. Heidel answered that he would try to reroute the vents through the new roof of the addition, so they would not be visible from a public way. Ms. Gutterman asked whether Mr. Heidel considered using Hardie board siding rather than fiber cement panels. She advocated for a material with dimension and profile rather than a monolithic material. Mr. Heidel responded that the material proposed is not vinyl siding and is actual clapboards, though composed of a fiber cement material. Ms. Gutterman asked whether it would need to be repainted. Mr. Heidel replied that it would.

Ms. Stein inquired whether there is a change proposed to the fascia at the rear of the building or whether the fascia drawn is existing. Mr. Heidel replied that he does not know what lies under the existing capping. Should there be an ornamental wood cornice, he continued, it would be retained. Ms. Stein asked that the fascia be minimized, because it appears much larger than the neighbor's fascia and appears to be in poor repair. Mr. Heidel responded that the fascia will be replaced. Ms. Stein noted that the adjacent building's fascia has a slimmer profile. Mr. Heidel replied that he thought they were all roughly the same size. Ms. Stein asked that it be improved and that, if it is to be replaced, that its shape be minimized.

Mr. McCoubrey observed that the addition is minimally visible. He asked for further comments from the Committee, noting that there is no member of the public present.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to the Historical Commission's direction at its 9 June 2017 meeting, with the following comments:

- that the applicant consider using HardiePlank in lieu of fiber cement panel;
- that the profile of the fascia proposed along the rear brick wall be smaller in profile;

- and that the vent stacks currently at the rear of the property be minimized so they are not visible from a public way.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:44 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

6.15.a.2-3: Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.

6.15.a.3: Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.

14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or

unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.