

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

**TUESDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2015  
ROOM 578, CITY HALL  
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair  
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP  
Nan Gutterman, FAIA  
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C  
Suzanne Pentz  
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director  
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I  
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

**ALSO PRESENT**

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Eve Parrot, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects  
Massimiliano Scarchilli, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects  
Laurie Sherman  
Stephen Foley  
Jaci Dagsanin  
Leo Franklin, TBB  
Will Beice, TBB  
Carl White, Think Brownstone  
Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture  
Derek Ziegler  
Gili Ronen  
John Rooney  
Joseph Volpe

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**ADDRESS: 2023-25 RITTENHOUSE SQ**

Project: Remove garage; renovate building; construct addition and roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tisoped Corp.

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

History: 1885; George Hewitt, architect

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to convert a carriage house, now a garage, into a multi-unit residential building. The front façade will be rehabilitated with the garage opening restored to its original arched opening. The entrance door opening will be cut down to grade and the door extended with a kick plate. The structure behind will be completely reconfigured with the addition of several floors. At the rear, on Manning Street, the non-historic single-story cinderblock façade will be modified with new doors and windows that will be more in keeping with the character of the block. A fourth story will be added, which will be visible but setback from both Rittenhouse Square and Manning Streets. Two light wells will be cut into the structure to provide light to the residences. The details of the new windows and doors as well as the samples of the masonry repairs can be reviewed by the staff.

The fourth floor addition could be set back farther from the front façade, behind the light wells, by removing the bedroom and bath from the front unit as well as the false façade and leaving only a stair house for deck access. As proposed, the addition may be conspicuous from Rittenhouse Square Street. A mock-up would be useful to determine the extent of visibility.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the application, provided the addition is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Massimiliano Scarchilli represented the application.

Mr. Scarchilli displayed renderings showing the visibility of the proposed rooftop addition from various points on Rittenhouse Square Street. He explained that the structure has a simple stucco face to minimize its obtrusiveness. The addition would be located on the west side of the building; however, it would have a wing wall on the east side to create symmetry.

Ms. Hawkins opined that the addition should not be visible from the street. Mr. Scarchilli offered a version with a mansard in which the height of the addition is reduced at the front to reduce visibility. Mr. Cluver observed that the addition will still be visible from side angles and opined that he did not find the mansard to be in keeping with the character of the building. Ms. Guterman asked if the structure could be set back additionally by reducing the sizes of the light wells. Mr. Scarchilli said that they were at their code defined minimum size.

Ms. Stein expressed concern about the floor plates that would be visible to the public running across the insides of the windows and about the glazing of the bottom of the central hayloft doors. She commented that the project tries to squeeze in too much program behind the small façade. Mr. Baron countered that the project includes several positive aspects, such as the lack

of a garage, which allows the carriage opening to be restored to its original size and replicas of the historic doors to be installed. Some Committee members disagreed, stating that the restoration of the front facade came at too high a price in terms of other alterations.

Mses. Gutterman and Stein suggested that the Committee recommend denial because of the high visibility of the addition, the glazing of the lower panel of the hayloft doors, and the installation of floors visible through the windows. All Committee members but Ms. Pentz agreed. Ms. Pentz expressed no opinion because she had missed the beginning of the review.

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

**ADDRESS: 123-29 S 17TH ST**

Project: Add and replace doors; install mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Liberti Center-City

Applicant: David Schmauk, Wulff Architects, Inc.

History: 1899; First Baptist Church; Edgar Seeler, architect

Individual Designation: 1/27/1962

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to infill basement window wells and cut two window openings down to create doorways on the Sansom Street façade of this church building. The application offers two door designs for the new doorways. Either design is appropriate, but that the leaded glass windows removed from the openings to be enlarged should be salvaged and stored on site. The application proposes replacing the existing side door with a new door to match. The application also proposes adding mechanical equipment on the roof of the building. If feasible, a mock-up should be installed to allow the staff to determine the extent of visibility of the mechanical equipment.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the mechanical equipment is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect David Schmauk represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that he had recently visited the site to ascertain the visibility of the proposed mechanical equipment from the public right-of-way and found it to be completely invisible. The Committee members asked Mr. Schmauk if he had a preference on the door design, given that he has provided two alternates. He said that his client prefers Option B. The Committee members agreed that this design was the more appropriate option.

Ms. Stein expressed a concern about the loss of the piece of stone under the windows resulting from the cuts for the new doors. She asked if the sidewalk could not be sloped upward to avoid removing that sill. Mr. Schmauk said that the sidewalk is too narrow and the slope would be too great. Ms. Gutterman asked if a landing could be installed instead. If a landing were set into the

opening six inches, it would only project two feet six inches into the sidewalk. Mr. Schmauk said that the Sansom Street sidewalk is so narrow that he did not think that the Streets Department would approval it. In addition, he commented that a landing would create a tripping hazard and be dangerous.

Mr. Cluver asked his fellow Committee members if they would accept the uneven door sizes to allow for handicap accessibility. All members agreed that the uneven sizes were acceptable. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee recommend approval of the application with the Option B door design, provided a landing at the sidewalk is investigated, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schmauk reiterated that a landing would create a tripping hazard.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the Option B door design, provided a landing at the sidewalk is investigated, with the staff to review details.

**ADDRESS: 1800 PINE ST, UNIT 103**

Project: Replace windows and doors; repair masonry; construct decks, install vent

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Steven Carter & Laurie Sherman

Applicant: Matthew Fanfera, Samson Home Restoration

History: 1840

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to make numerous modifications to a third and fourth-floor condominium unit of this four-story corner rowhouse. The application proposes to repoint masonry; to replace and restore portions of the existing cornice and historic entrance on the 18th Street façade; to restore a bathroom window on the third floor of a rear addition; to install simple steel brackets to provide additional support to a third floor balcony on the 18th Street façade; and to install an eight-inch copper kitchen duct on the 18th Street facade.

The application also proposes to install a large roof deck and trellis on the main block of the building, which would be accessed via a new exterior stairway from a proposed lower deck on top of the rear addition. The proposed roof deck would be set back six feet ten inches from the Pine Street façade, and two feet three inches from the 18th Street façade. The railing would span between the existing chimneys, which would be raised. The roof deck would feature a gas fireplace near the front of the building, and a black painted wood trellis and privacy screen along the west side of the deck.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the masonry repair, window and door replacement, and installation of steel brackets; approval of the installation of a kitchen duct, provided the duct is flush with the façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9; and denial of the roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Rooftop Guidelines.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stephen Foley and owner Laurie Sherman represented the application.

Ms. Sherman noted that she is unfamiliar with the standards with which the application was being judged. Ms. Hawkins responded that they are available from the staff.

Ms. Gutterman asked what the proposed kitchen duct would look like and where it would be located, and Ms. DiPasquale directed her to drawing A-4, below the third-floor window.

Ms. Pentz questioned the necessity for the balcony brackets, and Mr. Foley responded that they are seeking additional support, despite the fact that there is no current flexibility or rust.

Ms. Hawkins directed the attention of the Committee to the proposed roof deck. Ms. Hawkins noted that the Rooftop Guidelines seek to limit visibility of roof decks from the public right-of-way, and this deck would be visible from the public right-of-way. Typically, she noted, decks are limited to locations on rear ells, not on the principal masses of the building. Proposing privacy screens in addition to railings makes it even more visible, and therefore less compliant with the Standards.

Mr. Foley commented that the owner does have access to the rear portion of the roof, but it is not easily accessible from the interior. Moreover, views of the skyline would be blocked by the front section of the house if a deck is located on the rear ell.

Mr. Foley noted that the neighboring property has a deck whose floor is elevated two feet above the roof, making it approximately five feet to the top of the railing. The proposed trellis/partition wall is intended to provide privacy from this neighboring deck. Ms. Sherman noted that a good portion of the neighboring deck and stair access is visible from the south on 18<sup>th</sup> Street. Ms. Hawkins commented one cannot draw conclusions about the neighboring deck without knowing the circumstances of its permitting.

Ms. Hawkins opined that this is a key property in the historic district, and she is personally opposed to seeing any portion of any roof deck of any kind on the main mass of the building. Ms. Stein agreed with Ms. Hawkins, and asked whether a deck could be added on the lower roof and be invisible from the street. Ms. Hawkins opined that a deck on the lower roof could be minimally visible. Ms. Hawkins stated that roof decks are amenities, but not rights.

Ms. Sherman noted that they had looked at other properties in the neighborhood, including 18<sup>th</sup> and Delancey, and 20<sup>th</sup> and Delancey, which have roof decks on the main block, and asked whether that was a consideration to the Committee. Ms. Hawkins responded that she was not aware when those roof decks were installed, and that it may have been prior to designation or an illegal installation. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the roof deck at 1800 Delancey was approved in February 2014, but that the penthouse was to be no taller than depicted on the mock-up, and that the railing was not to be visible at all. She continued that the constructed deck is very visible, and that the staff is involved in an enforcement action that will result in the alteration of the deck so that it is invisible from the street. Ms. Sherman responded that they are aware of the situation at 18<sup>th</sup> and Delancey, and are willing to adhere to same condition, that the deck with railing is invisible from the street. She noted that, if they were to build a deck on the lower portion of the roof, their only view would be of the fire escape on the property across 18<sup>th</sup> Street.

Ms. Sherman asked if the deck would be approvable if it was less visible. Ms. Hawkins responded, asking if it could be invisible, the standard applied at 1800 Delancey. Mr. Foley opined that, if they were to pull the railings back from the facades and shrink the decking, it may be able to be invisible. Mr. Cluver commented that, if the railing were pulled back from 18<sup>th</sup> Street, where it is primarily visible, and there was no trellis, the most visible elements of the deck would be eliminated and the application would be very different. Ms. Stein commented that any kind of stair to get up to the deck would be visible. Mr. Cluver responded that one could make the argument that the stair was part of the lower deck.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the chimneys are currently active, and Mr. Foley responded that they are not, but that they would like to install a gas fireplace. Mr. Cluver noted that there are regulations regarding clearance around exit points for chimneys that may be necessary to address.

Ms. Hawkins asked if there was an alternative means of accessing the upper roof, aside from a stairway from the lower roof. Mr. Foley responded that it may be possible, but would likely involve the construction of a pilot house, which he believed would be a tradeoff for the trellis, unless there was a way to slope the pilot house to restrict its view in that way. Mr. Cluver asked about the width of the proposed exterior access stair, and Mr. Foley responded that it would be just over three feet wide. Mr. Cluver noted that, if the stair was narrowed and pushed as far as possible from 18<sup>th</sup> Street, it would be less visible from the street. Mr. Foley responded that he would be happy to make the stair as narrow as possible. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the proposed stair would occupy most of what would be a reasonably sized deck on the rear ell.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee adopt the staff recommendation, and Ms. Hawkins agreed. Ms. Pentz suggested adding recommending denial of the installation of the brackets, which, if not needed for structural reasons, create a false sense of history. Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Hawkins agreed.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the masonry repair, window and door replacement, and approval of the installation of a kitchen duct, provided the duct is flush with the façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9; and denial of the balcony brackets and the roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Rooftop Guidelines.

**ADDRESS: 1529 NORTH ST**

Project: Construct single-family dwelling

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Linda C. Littlejohn & Apostolos Vardakis

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a three-story, single-family dwelling on a currently vacant lot. The property was identified in the Spring Garden Historic District inventory as a “garden with parking pad,” but given no classification. The Commission’s jurisdiction is limited to Review and Comment only.

The front façade of the proposed townhouse would be clad in brick, with a cast-stone base and cast-stone lintel over a front-loading, carriage-style garage door. Above the garage door would be a PVC-clad bay window with double-hung windows, and decorative brackets. The entry to the home would be located through a slightly recessed vestibule extending the full height of the building. A small balcony would be located at the third floor of this entrance bay.

The rear of the property, which is not visible to the public right-of-way, would be clad in stucco and feature a second-floor deck and a third-floor Juliette balcony. The proposed home would also feature a rooftop deck, accessed via a pilot house set back approximately eighteen feet from the front façade.

**STAFF COMMENT:** The staff comments that, excepting the front-loaded garage, which is inappropriate for the historic district, the proposed new construction is compatible with the Spring Garden Historic District in materials, massing, size, scale and proportion.

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

Ms. Hawkins commented that, based on the previous Historical Commission meeting, it was her understanding that front-loading garages are not permitted in this area. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she had done some research into the code, and found that there is room for interpretation. However, she explained that it is her understanding that an overlay disallows front-loading garages is between Chestnut Street and Washington Avenue, but not in this area. Ms. Hawkins and Ms. DiPasquale agreed to do additional research into the code.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the front-loading garage is inappropriate, and that the street wall should be maintained, and that the recessed entry and balcony are inappropriate.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the property turned the corner, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that the western wall of the proposed building abuts the rear yard of a 16<sup>th</sup> Street-facing building. Mr. Cluver clarified that it is not a corner property, but that it would include an exposed party wall. Mr. Cluver recommended that the cornice turn the corner and extend at least partially onto the west face of the building. He also recommended that the masonry turn the corner for a minimum one bay, if not the whole length of the wall.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 FEBRUARY 2015**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee commented that the front-loading garage is inappropriate, the street wall should be maintained with no recessed entry or front balcony, and that the cornice and masonry should turn the corner from the front façade onto the west wall.

**ADDRESS: 111 S 15TH ST**

Project: Replace awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chest-Pac Assoc LP

Applicant: Dottie Tuccio

History: 1922; Packard Building; Ritter & Shay, architects

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace two awnings with smaller awnings in the southernmost two windows along the 15th Street façade. There are currently ten matching awnings along this façade, which were approved by the Commission in 2008, and replaced earlier awnings approved in 2005. The application proposes to reduce the height of the awnings by two panes of glass in height in order to increase visibility from the interior of the building in a new client space.

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

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Carl White of Think Brownstone, the tenant, represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the location of the floor level in the building, and Mr. White responded that their office is on the mezzanine level, which occupies the upper half to two thirds of the windows. He indicated in the photograph the ceiling height of the lower floor, commenting that a radiator covers the lower portion of their windows. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the proposed awning would cover the height of the radiators, and Mr. White responded that they would. Mr. White noted that the existing awnings extend to roughly head height on the interior, covering the view and presence of natural light in the tenant space. Mr. Stein asked whether the owner would consider replacing all of the awnings with the smaller awnings for consistency. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that the smaller awnings are more appropriate for the building. Mr. White responded that they had offered to also replace the third awning to the south of the entrance portal on S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street, but had been denied by the landlord because the third awning was not in their lease. Mr. Cluver asked whether the awnings to the north of the entrance were all part of Del Frisco's restaurant, and Mr. White confirmed that they were. Mr. Cluver commented that he had no objection to the design of the proposed awning per se, but that the lack of consistency on the windows on 15<sup>th</sup> Street was problematic. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the applicant would consider having no awning, and Mr. White responded that they would be fine with no awning, as there currently are no awnings. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the applicant would be willing to lose the exterior signage provided by the awning, and Mr. White responded that their main objective is to get rid of the tall awning, and their secondary objective is to have signage. Ms. Hawkins asked about the condition of the back of the radiators, and Mr. White responded that he believed they were solid black. Ms. Hawkins opined that she would be more comfortable with

no awnings on two bays of windows than mismatched awnings along the façade. The other Committee members concurred.

Ms. Hawkins asked the Committee members how they would feel about signage on the interior of the windows extending the height of one pane behind the radiators. Mr. Cluver responded that signage on the interior of the space would be acceptable, and Ms. Hawkins noted that the Committee and Commission would not need to review such signage. Mr. Cluver noted that an exterior mounted sign would not be appropriate.

Ms. Hawkins offered two thoughts. First, the awnings as proposed would be acceptable if all awnings on the 15<sup>th</sup> Street façade were replaced to match; second, the radiators behind the windows should be cleaned.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the awnings as presented, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

**ADDRESS: 19 N 03RD ST**

Project: Install windows, doors, storefront, and balconies; construct roof deck with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 19 North 3rd Street, LLC

Applicant: Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install new windows, doors, a storefront, and balconies on the front and rear façades of this mixed-use building located within the Old City Historic District. A roof deck and pilot house is proposed for the rear slope of the building. Since the time of the initial submission, the architect and property owner met with the staff of the Historical Commission and have subsequently revised their drawings to reflect comments from the staff. These revisions include the storefront and windows, to reflect an insurance survey from 1840 for this building; the removal of the balcony initially proposed for the front façade which was not appropriate for this building; and a pitched roof on the pilot house in an effort to minimize visibility from the street.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the storefront, front and rear façade windows, and rear balcony, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the roof deck as presented, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Anthony Bruttaniti and property owner Joseph Volpe represented the application.

Mr. Bruttaniti explained that the revised drawings are a result of advice received during a meeting with the staff. Since the time of that meeting, they have removed the exterior cladding on the storefront, revealing the marble columns of the original storefront. He noted that the capitols of the column tops were removed long ago, but the stone thresholds are intact. Ms. Hawkins stated that the revised drawings are a dramatic improvement from the initial

submission. Mr. Cluver asked about the unique muntin pattern of the storefront doors. Ms. Broadbent responded that the pane configuration is based on an 1840 insurance survey. Mr. Cluver asked about the space below the sill on the center bay. Mr. Volpe stated that there is a metal plate there now, but the goal is to bring back the second doorway into the basement.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Commission typically does not approve roof decks on the main volumes of historic buildings. Mr. Bruttaniti noted that he revised the massing of the pilot house to slope the pitch of the roof in an effort to minimize visibility from the street.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the low adjacent building. Ms. Broadbent responded that it was the same height as the subject property historically, but has since been reduced to a two-story building, which results in greater visibility of the proposed roof deck for the subject property.

Mr. Volpe asked if they can put balconies at the rear of the fourth and fifth floors in lieu of a roof deck. The balconies would be five feet deep and the width of the building, which is seventeen feet. Mr. Cluver suggested reducing the width by one foot on each side, so that the balconies are fifteen feet wide. Ms. Hawkins suggested a black metal railing with thin simple pickets. Mr. Cluver commented that the rear of the property is a secondary element in this instance, so although it is visible, it is not a prominent component and therefore he is in support of balconies at the rear.

Mr. Volpe commented that they may propose shutters for the front façade. Ms. Broadbent confirmed that the 1840 insurance survey states that this building had shutters on all floors above the storefront. Mr. Baron noted that the shutter hardware remains. Mr. Cluver stated that the shutters would overlap. Mr. Baron responded that shutters overlapped historically. Mr. Cluver stated that the shutters will need to be the height of the window opening and each leaf will need to be half of the width of the window opening, installed using appropriate shutter hardware. Mr. Bruttaniti asked if they could forgo shutters, which the Committee responded favorably. Mr. Baron told Mr. Bruttaniti that they can make that decision later.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed location of mechanical equipment. Mr. Bruttaniti responded that the rooftop units were to be located under the roof deck. Mr. Baron suggested that the units be located on the far north side of the roof, where the pilot house is currently shown in the drawings.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the storefront, front and rear façade windows, and suggested rear balconies at the fourth and fifth floors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the roof deck and pilot house, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

**ADDRESS: 225 PINE ST**

Project: Cut window well at sidewalk; install window and well cover

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Rooney & Amira Bass

Applicant: Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture

History: 1746; John Worrell Jr. House; new façade, 1966

Individual Designation: 7/28/1965

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to cut a window well at the sidewalk and install a window and well cover for sunlight and egress purposes at the front façade of this two-family house. The proposed well cover is made of PVC and is four feet wide by three feet deep. The façade of this building has been altered several times, most recently in the mid-1960s to be brought back to a residential appearance.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial as presented, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Anthony Bruttaniti represented the application. Property owner John Rooney arrived while the review was underway.

Mr. Bruttaniti explained that the building has two units, and this owner's unit consists of the basement, first floor and rear of the second floor. The owner recently had a baby and is looking to occupy the basement to gain more space. Building code requires that the occupied basement have a second means of egress. Mr. Bruttaniti stated that there is currently a basement window where there once was a larger opening, which may have had a bulkhead. He did not have a photograph to document the larger opening. He stated that he would accept a flat or raised window well cover, but it will have to allow light into the basement. Ms. Hawkins responded that PVC is not an appropriate material for the historic district, and Ms. Pentz commented that the window well cover should be made of materials that were used historically in the district, which does not include PVC.

Ms. Hawkins noted that she is generally uncomfortable with the precedent set by approving such applications, because she does not want to see them everywhere in the district. She explained that she understands that this façade has changed greatly over time, but she is still not comfortable with this proposal. Ms. Gutterman commented that, without more information about the basement wall opening, she is hesitant to recommend approval of this application. Mr. Cluver noted that bulkheads are found throughout the city, but not with clear covers. As a means of egress, he would consider it, but not with a clear cover. Mr. Bruttaniti reiterated that they need both egress and light. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he would like to see evidence of a bulkhead before approving a new bulkhead, and the light component will be difficult to achieve. Ms. Hawkins clarified that there may be evidence of a larger opening, but it does not mean that the doors were clear. Ms. Pentz asked if they can use a metal grate instead of a raised cover. Ms. Hawkins responded that the metal grate is an Old City vocabulary, not a Society Hill vocabulary. Ms. Stein summarized that the owner is trying to occupy a part of a historic building that was not intended to be occupied, and the repercussions of that novel occupation are visible from the street, which changes the character of the historic district.

Mr. Rooney arrived late to the review. Mr. Bruttaniti asked that the Committee summarize the discussion for Mr. Rooney. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Committee acknowledges that the building's façade has changed over time; however, the proposal is inconsistent with the architectural vocabulary of this property and the surrounding district. Mr. Bruttaniti told Mr. Rooney that the Committee would like to see evidence of a former bulkhead, and the Committee does not consider PVC or wrought iron to be appropriate for the cover, and would instead prefer opaque doors. Mr. Rooney asked why a wrought iron grate would not be appropriate. Ms. Hawkins responded that the wrought iron is part of the vocabulary of Old City, but not part of the vocabulary of Society Hill. Mr. Rooney asked if there is an official guidebook for such standards. Ms. Hawkins responded that there is not. Mr. Rooney asked if there is an official rule or code being applied. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Committee reviews each application on a case-by-case basis, providing a professional opinion predicated upon their understanding as design professionals of the specific building and its attributes and the surrounding district. Mr. McCoubrey added that the review is also based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, which provides guidelines for appropriate alterations to historic buildings. Mr. Rooney asked for a copy of the Standards. Ms. Hawkins responded that they are available online.

Mr. Cluver asked if the new egress opening could be located on the side of the property. Mr. Bruttaniti responded that the space alongside the building at the rear is too narrow to satisfy the egress requirements.

Mr. Baron commented that the staff could visit the site to inspect the foundation for evidence of stairs in the basement to determine if this building once had a bulkhead, should the owner wish to rebuild a traditional bulkhead with marble sides and wood doors.

Mr. Rooney asked if a bulkhead with wood doors would be consistent with the character of the block. Ms. Hawkins responded that it may be, but the staff would have to inspect the building for evidence of a former bulkhead. It is a design feature found in the surrounding area and would therefore be appropriate to the district. Whether it is appropriate to the building, would depend on the results of the staff's inspection of the building. She continued that the Committee is not able to design an appropriate exit and light source at this meeting. The Committee reacts to applications; it does not formulate them. She commented that this application is trying to solve two problems, those being egress and light, so she asked if the light requirement can be satisfied in a different way, or if the space can be occupied in a different way that does not require the light. Mr. Rooney stated that the Committee will deny the application because it shows a glass cover over the window well. He stated that there is currently a small window in the basement with a small grate over it, and asked if there are specific guidelines as to how much the sidewalk opening can be expanded. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Committee is charged with reviewing the application; the owner should work with his architect to develop an appropriate application.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

**ADDRESS: 940 E WASHINGTON LA**

Project: Remove and replace chimney

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gili Ronen & Derek Ziegler

Applicant: Gili Ronen

History: 1914; Jean Smith House; Carl A. Ziegler, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Awbury Arboretum Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to remove a Wissahickon Schist chimney from this three-story Colonial Revival house to free up space for interior renovations and then replicate its exterior appearance above the roofline with a wood-framed structure clad with a Wissahickon Schist veneer. The house is located in the Awbury Arboretum Historic District. The chimney emerges through a rear slope of the roof. The chimney is minimally visible from the public right-of-way and public portions of the arboretum.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Although the Roofs Guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines recommends "Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building" including "chimneys," the staff recommends approval, with the staff to review details, because the chimney is inconspicuous from public vantage points and, if detailed correctly, its replacement will not be discernable to the public.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Gili Ronen and Derek Ziegler represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins reported that her historic preservation firm provided some services related to the nomination of the Awbury Arboretum Historic District, but she contended that that work did not create any conflicts with this review. Ms. Ronen and Mr. Ziegler agreed.

Mr. Ziegler referenced photographs, contending that the chimney is only minimally visible from publicly accessible location. He distributed a photograph of a sample of the Wissahickon schist veneer against the house, showing that the material is compatible with the schist facades of the house.

Ms. Pentz stated that she was unaware that a veneer in Wissahickon schist is available. Ms. Ronen stated that there are a few companies now providing it. She stated that it comes in individually pieces and they are laid up one at a time in mortar on a backing board.

Ms. Pentz questioned the engineer's report. She asked if it was possible to support the chimney by installing steel in the attic floor rather than steel supports down through the house. Ms. Ronen stated that she wished that were the case. She stated that she understood that this is not possible because the chimney is not attached to any wall but is freestanding. Ms. Pentz suggested that the chimney could be supported by steel members that span the attic. Ms. Ronen stated that the engineer concluded that it was not possible. She stated that they would prefer to do it that way and it would also be more cost effective.

Mr. Cluver stated that he was concerned about the longevity of the new chimney; the veneer will be placed on wood framing and will be exposed to the weather on all four sides. He stated that these things work best with a masonry backing, but acknowledged that that defeats the purpose of this project.

Ms. Hawkins stated that it appears that the Architectural Committee has concerns about the long term stability of this proposal, owing to the fact that the wood will move and shrink with the weather at a different speed than the masonry on the outside of it. She stated that she also has questions about the connection of the replacement chimney to the roof. She suggested that the weight of the new chimney, which will bear on the roof, will possibly lead to leaking.

Mr. Cluver stated that, putting the technical aspects aside, the replacement of a chimney with one that matches it would be appropriate if it is detailed correctly. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the size of the stones should be varied as they are on the house. Ms. Hawkins also advised that corner pieces should be used to avoid the appearance of tiles. Ms. Gutterman recommended that they look at completed projects that have used this material to get a full understanding of what the chimney will look like.

Ms. Stein stated that she prefers the solution offered in Ms. Pentz's first comment. She stated that supporting the chimney from the attic would be the best outcome. She stated that the roof has just been redone, the flashing is intact, and it might be less expensive to do that. She stated that that path seems less intrusive and more durable in the long run. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the owners might want to have a discussion with another design professional before committing to this solution.

Ms. Ronen asked if the Committee would be amenable to the complete removal of the chimney without replacement. Ms. Hawkins stated that Committee would like to see the chimney remain.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, because the chimney is inconspicuous from public vantage points and, if detailed correctly, its replacement will not be discernable to the public.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

#### **STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES**

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

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

Standard 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.

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.