

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

**TUESDAY, 25 MARCH 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Meredith Ferleger, Esq., Zarwin Baum
Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop
Jason Morris
Lee Kaplan
Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design, LLC
Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design, LLC
Stephen Beers
Jessica Beers
Paul George
Norman Bach
Paul Boni
Jim Cassidy, C2 Architects
Joseph DiCicco, C2 Architects
Carey Jackson Yonce, Canno Design
T. Rolah
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 300, 302, 304, 306, 308-10 N 02ND ST

Project: Demolish non-contributing building, construct four-story single-family dwellings

Review Requested: Review and Comment/Final Approval

Owner: Lighthouse on Vine, LLC

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design, LLC

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct six four-story, single-family townhouses on N. 2nd Street in the Old City Historic District. The site is at the northeast corner of the district, with the highway to the north, a gas station to the south, and an empty lot associated with the highway to the east. The properties at 300, 302, 304, and 306 N. 2nd Street are vacant lots and were at the time of the designation of the historic district. These properties are considered “undeveloped” and the Commission’s jurisdiction is review-and-comment only. A non-contributing, one-story garage stands at 308-310 N. 2nd Street. It would be demolished. Because the garage stood on this site at the time of the designation of the historic district, this property is not “undeveloped” and the Commission has plenary jurisdiction.

The proposed townhouses would face 2nd Street and have garages at the rear accessed from Vine Street. The townhouses would have cast stone bases, dark red brick above, metal panels on two-story bays, and metal windows. This application proposes rooftop decks with stair houses and trellises for the townhouses. The decks would be set back five feet from the front façade.

STAFF COMMENT: These townhouses would be compatible with the Old City Historic District, pursuant to Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects, Agata Reister and Vincent Mancini, attorney Meredith Ferleger, and developers Jason Morris and Lee Kaplin represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the design for the building at 308-310 N. 2nd differs from the others is related to the fact the Commission has full jurisdiction over that site, but not the other sites. Ms. Reiter affirmed that they did enhance the design for the site over which the Commission has full jurisdiction. Mr. Morris stated that they proposed brick for all the townhouses to keep the design consistent throughout the row.

Ms. Hawkins commented that she found the design to be a disjointed composition. She stated that she was naturally looking for an AB rhythm and found the AABB rhythm odd. Mr. Morris stated that they put the punched openings on one end, but provided bays on the other to provide a more contemporary appearance and meet the market demands. Mr. Mancini stated that rhythm results there being six units, an even number, as opposed to an odd number. He stated that he did not see this as detrimental to this development. He opined that the limestone used across all of the buildings creates a level of uniformity.

Ms. Gutterman asked if gates like those proposed could be found elsewhere in Old City. Ms. Reister stated that there are many examples of similar gates along Vine Street and pointed out some examples in photographs. Ms. Stein opined that the gate looks commercial. Ms. Gutterman concurred and stated that it looks out place with the townhouses. She suggested that it be more decorative or ornamental and not so utilitarian.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: These townhouses would be compatible with the Old City Historic District, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 115-19 CUTHBERT ST, UNIT E

Project: Construct one-story rooftop addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Steve and Jessica Beers

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop

History: 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a small, one-story rooftop addition with roof deck on a residential multi-family building located within the Old City Historic District. The former light-industrial building was a box factory built about 1920; it was altered and added to in the 1980s. The design of the proposed addition is Modern in style, not to exceed 65 feet in height, and would be set back about four feet from the Mascher Street facade. The addition would meet the parapet of the historic building along Cuthbert Street for a length of about 19 feet, with the remaining span along Cuthbert Street set back about three feet. Cuthbert and Mascher Streets are very narrow and views of the addition from the public right-of-way would be limited.

This project came before the Architectural Committee in January of 2014, at which time the Committee recommended a simplification of colors and materials, additional glazing, and a reduction of visibility of the addition from the public right-of-way. This revised proposal reflects simplified materials and colors and the addition of glazing, but the overall massing remains relatively unchanged from the prior submission.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and owners Stephen and Jessica Beers represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano explained that the interior floor plan of the addition was updated since the last time it was reviewed by the Committee. He also noted that the current proposal reflects updated materials, a simplification of the materials on the south façade, and the addition of glazing on the west wall. Several material color options for the façades were included. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Beers if he had a preference of material color, to which he responded that he preferred the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MARCH 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

darkest gray option. Ms. Pentz commented that she also preferred the dark color, and appreciated the solid appearance of the color as compared to the last submission.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Montalbano about a railing for the parapet. Mr. Montalbano replied that the parapet was likely not high enough to be used as a railing, so a railing would need to be added on the inside face of the parapet. He suggested a glass panel with no metal bar at the top. Ms. Hawkins suggested a thin cable railing, which would be a better choice due to ease of cleaning and also reflectivity. Ms. Pentz agreed that the railing should be metal instead of glass. Mr. Montalbano and Mr. Beers clarified that their intention is for a roof deck on top of the addition, not located in the few feet of space between the addition and the parapet. Ms. Hawkins asked about a pilot house shown on the drawings in plan but not in elevation. Mr. Montalbano responded that he mistakenly did not show the pilot house in elevation. Ms. Hawkins suggested that an exterior stair on the north side of the addition should be considered instead of a pilot house, as the pilot house would add about nine additional feet in height to the addition.

Ms. Beers explained that the purpose behind the addition is to allow for their family to stay in Philadelphia, specifically Old City, and for their daughter to grow up in the neighborhood.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the in-concept application, provided an exterior stair is substituted for the pilot house, the railing is metal, and the addition is dark gray in color; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 4203 MAIN ST

Project: Remove one-story addition, construct three-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul Pascucci

Applicant: Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design, LLC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition to an existing three-story mixed use building located in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. An existing one-story section in the rear would be demolished, and the existing rear masonry wall would be retained and enclosed within the new addition. The materials proposed for the new rear façade would be stucco, with a texture and color to match existing. The proposed new addition would be built over the rear slope of the existing gable roof, resulting in a flat roof at the rear of the building. The addition would not be visible from Main Street and would be minimally visible from the east on Pensdale Street. The proposed addition would, however, be visible from Station Street at the rear. The south side of Station Street immediately adjacent to the proposed project location is a rear yard and a surface parking lot. The remainder of the south side of the street is composed primarily of garages and rear yards, while the north side of the street is an undeveloped strip of land which slopes up to meet the railroad bed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Vincent Mancini and Agata Reister represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins clarified that the staff recommended denial because the proposed new roof would encroach on the historic gable roof. The applicant presented revised drawings, which, Ms. Reister noted, would extend the rear slope of the roof, creating a new gable roof. Mr. Mancini added that the existing conditions are problematic for a rear third floor addition because the head height at the rear of the building is extremely low. He noted that the original intention was to extend the existing roof but to also create a minor overframe. He continued that the second option was to extend the roof from the ridge. Mr. Mancini noted that if they could have kept the original eave line and built the addition below it, they would have. Ms. Gutterman asked for the ceiling height of the third floor, and Mr. Mancini responded that it is approximately seven feet six inches. Mr. Mancini noted that the window sill heights at the front of the building are also problematic, measuring only about one and one half feet from the floor, and that they are attempting to create a code-compliant addition.

He noted that, because the sloped roofs on either side of the property are higher than that of this property, he believed that the alteration of this roof would be acceptable, as it would be less noticeable. Ms. Hawkins opined that reframing and overbuilding the roof is grossly inappropriate as it destroys any semblance of the historic roof. Mr. Mancini understood, noting that it is a practical problem that they are attempting to solve.

Ms. Stein asked whether the applicant was opposed to changing this to a two-story addition, and Mr. Mancini responded that, if the Commission denies the proposed three-story addition, they would have to propose a two-story addition instead. Ms. Hawkins noted that not all three-story buildings are appropriate for three-story additions, and suggested the possibility of a roof deck on the top of a two-story addition. Ms. Hawkins observed that, short of creating a third-story addition below the eave line with steps down, which she noted presented other complicating issues, she did not see a way to construct an appropriate third-story addition at this property. Mr. Mancini responded that they had explored that possibility, and Ms. Reister noted that, since the addition is so small, if they had to put in steps, it would become unusable.

Mr. Mancini asked whether it would be acceptable if they continued the existing roofline at the rear, and Ms. Hawkins stated that she would recommend offsetting the roofline in some way, either by extending from below the existing eave line, or by creating a dormer. Mr. Mancini noted that a dormer was an excellent solution, but that they assumed that was just as bad, as it broke the eave line. Ms. Hawkins noted that it is a possibility, but they would not be able to go full width of the building on the dormer. Ms. Gutterman interjected that a dormer may give a path into an addition, but would not necessarily make the space useable. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that this is a great opportunity for a roof deck, which would increase the potential use and desirability of the apartment.

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

ADDRESS: 2122 CHANCELLOR ST

Project: Construct third-floor addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Julia Feng and Stephen Woerheide

Applicant: Jim Cassidy, C2 Architecture

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a third-floor addition on the roof of this carriage house. The addition would be set back eight feet from the front façade. A deck with a metal railing would be constructed in front of the addition. The addition would be highly visible and would even exceed the sizes of the additions on neighboring structures, which predate designation. At the end of a row and facing Walnut Street across an open parking lot, this building is highly visible from the public right-of-way and any rooftop addition would be highly conspicuous. The row is one of the most ornate set of carriage houses in the city.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jim Cassidy and Joseph DiCicco represented the application.

Mr. Cassidy explained that the couple that lives here would like to enlarge their family. The current house has a garage on the first floor and the kitchen, dining room, bedroom, and bath on the second floor. They would like to construct two more bedrooms and a deck on the third floor.

Ms. Hawkins asked if they propose to remove the large chimney. Mr. Cassidy explained that he would like to remove it. Ms. Hawkins said that she would recommend against the removal or raising of the chimney. She objected to the proposal owing primarily to the addition's high level of visibility from the public right-of-way and the railing rising up behind the decorative parapet. Mr. Cassidy said that there is a precedent with other additions in the row. He stated that he would consider matching the line of the other additions. Ms. Hawkins explained that the two additions in the row predated the creation of the historic district and were therefore built without the Historical Commission's review. Ms. Gutterman explained that certain buildings are simply inappropriate for third-floor additions. Ms. Stein echoed this sentiment and explained that, owing to the carriage house's location, any rooftop addition would be highly conspicuous from the public right-of-way. She stated that the staff could review a mock up to verify the extent of visibility of the proposed addition from the public right-of-way. Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicants had photographs showing the side of the building; they replied that they did not. All Committee members indicated that would not recommend approval of removing or altering the chimney. Ms. Hawkins noted that building code would require that any addition be located at least ten feet from the outlet of the chimney. Mr. Cassidy said that the proposed addition is about 600 square feet and, if reduced in size, at a certain point the addition would become too small to be worth building. Ms. Stein suggested gaining space by converting part of the first floor to living space or excavating for a finished basement to gain space. Ms. Pentz suggested that Mr. Cassidy could construct mock-ups to determine if any rooftop addition would be

inconspicuous. Ms. Gutterman suggested recommending denial. Ms. Stein concurred with her suggestion.

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

ADDRESS: 240 S 07TH ST

Project: Construct three-story addition and decks, alter rear dormer

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Franco Deblasio

Applicant: Carey Jackson Yonce, Canno Design

History: 1796, John Hutchinson, carpenter

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing an addition and two decks at the rear of this late eighteenth-century building. The building already has an unusual cantilevered rear addition, which predates its designation. The new addition would be constructed on and beside the rear ell, infilling the side yard. It would be clad with siding like the siding already on the existing rear addition. The side wall of the ell at the side yard would be retained and encased within the addition. An upper roof deck would be added to the addition and accessed from a rear dormer converted to a door. A second deck would be constructed on the existing addition. The addition and upper deck would be visible but inconspicuous from both 7th and Manning Streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the upper deck railing is not attached to the pitched roof except at the dormer, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Carey Jackson Yonce represented the application.

Mr. Yonce explained that, although it was not shown this way on the plans, he would pull the deck railing back from the roof of the main block and narrow it to the width of the dormer to keep it off the roof.

Ms. Stein asked if the proposed addition was as-of-right in terms of zoning. She asked whether the zoning code allows for windows to be installed along the north wall and she asked about the material proposed for the cladding of the addition. She said she found it odd to encase a brick building in wood siding. Mr. Yonce said that he thinks the addition will be as-of-right, but noted that the wall may be required to be clad in a different material. He said that the wood siding is to distinguish the additions from the original building and observed that the previous addition is covered in wood siding. The wall will be fire rated. He explained that Mr. Baron had pointed out to him that the front dormer had been previously altered without a permit; he noted that the property owner is willing to restore the front dormer.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment. Paul George and Norman Bach, the owners of the adjacent house at 238 S. 7th Street, introduced themselves. Paul Boni, an attorney, accompanied them. Mr. George presented documents illustrating the history of the relationship

between these houses. He said that they were all built by a Mr. Hutchinson in the 1790s. The house at 236 was built first on the north end as a corner to the full width of the lot. The houses at 238 and 240 S. 7th were built together with the traditional rear ells forming a courtyard to provide light to the east front room as well as the rooms along the ell. He said that, although there have been additions to these ells for kitchens, the rear ell courtyard has always been maintained to provide light to both houses. He said that he opposes the proposed addition because it will destroy the historic space between the houses and remove the light from all the rooms of the houses. This destruction of an historical space is in violation of Standard 9 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Commission typically allows for modifications to areas that are not visible to the public. Mr. Boni contended that the addition would be visible to the public. He also said that, according to his reading of the ordinance, the Commission does have jurisdiction over the exterior areas not visible to the public. The difference is that the staff may review and approve applications for those areas without referral to the Commission.

Mr. Baron said that the Committee and Commission have, on some occasions, reviewed and denied proposals for alterations to exterior portions of a building not visible to the public when the features proposed for alteration have a high level of significance. He mentioned the case of a rounded ballroom projecting from the back of a building on the 1500 block of Spruce Street. Ms. Pentz asked if these buildings were classified as Significant in the Society Hill Historic District. Mr. Boni said that they are classified as Significant and individually listed as well.

Ted Robb of 236 S. 7th Street spoke in support of his neighbors' objection to the addition.

Lorna Katz of Society Hill Civic Association said that she was surprised that the application was submitted for final review considering that the drawings lack notes providing dimensions and materials. She opined that the plans need refinement.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Baron if he had reviewed a mock-up for visibility from the public right-of-way. Mr. Baron said that he had not, but noted that the visibility seems well illustrated by the drawings; they show the addition would be visible both from 7th and Manning Streets. Ms. Stein asked if the chimney would need to be raised. Mr. Yonce said that it might need to be raised, but it was not depicted as such on the drawings. Mr. D'Alessandro expressed a concern with the proposed changes to the windows on the north façade. Ms. Stein said that she was concerned with the extent of the addition. She said that the construction in the side yard would increase the visibility of the addition from Manning Street. Ms. Hawkins said that the ell would no longer be readable, but would be subsumed by the addition. Mr. Yonce countered that this addition will be part of the historical tradition of additions to these rear ells. Ms. Gutterman said that it looks as though a large object had landed on top of the historic ell. She expressed concerns with potential inaccuracies and unknowns on the drawings. She suggested a recommendation of denial, to which Mr. D'Alessandro concurred.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.