

**THE MINUTES OF THE 658TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 9 JUNE 2017
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Betty Turner, M.A., Acting Chair
Michael Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Antonio Fiol-Silva, AICP, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C
Steven Hartner, Department of Public Property
Melissa Long, Division of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
H. Ahada Stanford, Commerce Department

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

ALSO PRESENT

Tom Fein, NV5
Karen Thompson, DRWC
Peter Laucks, KLA
William Martin, Esq., Fox Rothschild
Ray Rola, Rola Architecture
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners
Nicholas Connolly, Cecil Baker & Partners
Sarah Labov
Vince Krakayskas, Department of Public Property
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Nicholas Melisiotis
Reuben Asia, Esq., DBR
Natalia Revelo, S2 Design
Sue Patterson, Penn Knox
Pat Ryan
Robert Palladino, Landmark
Ian Toner, Ian Toner Architecture
Robert Volpe, Lily Development
Eric Heidel, (re)work Architecture & Design LLC
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer
William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Turner called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Fink, Fiol-Silva, Hartner, Long, Mattioni, McCoubrey, Royer, Schaaf, and Stanford joined her.

MINUTES OF THE 657TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to adopt the minutes of the 657th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 May 2017. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REQUESTS TO CONTINUE NOMINATION REVIEWS

Ms. Turner asked Mr. Farnham to introduce the first continuance request. Mr. Farnham reminded the Historical Commission that it had continued the review of the nomination for 23 W. Penn Street for 45 days to allow for the property owner and community representatives to meet and seek a compromise solution to the redevelopment of the property. He explained that the property owner is now requesting an additional 45 days to arrange for a meeting with the community.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to extend the period to hold a special meeting for the review of the nomination for 23 W. Penn Street from 45 days to 90 days from the Historical Commission meeting on 12 May 2017. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Farnham presented the request to continue the review of the nomination for 2041-55 Coral Street and remand it to the September 2017 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of the nomination for 2041-55 Coral Street and remand it to the September 2017 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 MAY 2017

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda, which included applications for 1227-37, 1301 Beach Street and 1201-11 N Delaware Avenue; 101 W. Highland Avenue; 4146-48 Parkside Avenue; and 1629 Wallace Street. Ms. Turner asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. Ms. Turner asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 1227-37, 1301 Beach Street and 1201-11 N Delaware Avenue; 101 W. Highland Avenue; 4146-48 Parkside Avenue; and 1629 Wallace Street. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1227-37, 1301 BEACH ST AND 1201-11 N DELAWARE AVE

Proposal: Renovate path

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia Department of Public Property

Applicant: Michael Connor, NV5

History: 1827; Penn Treaty Park

Individual Designation: 3/9/2012

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 8.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make numerous site improvements to Penn Treaty Park. The majority of the ground disturbance would be limited to portions of the park that built on disturbed land or fill from the 1987 expansion of the park. The application proposes to construct a promenade that will feature lighting, seating, and an asphalt path. Fill will be added to create a bermed lawn. The majority of ground disturbance appears to be limited to approximately three feet in depth for footings required to anchor fixtures such as lighting and benches. New trees and meadow plantings will also be added along the perimeter of the site.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 2301 MADISON SQ

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Nicholas Melisiotis

Applicant: Christopher Stromberg, S2 Design

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 9/28/1971

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration portion of the application, including the reconstruction of the chimney, with the staff to review details; and denial of the addition portion of the application; pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition on this corner property on Madison Square. The original application proposed to demolish the rear walls of the building and to construct a two-story addition that would occupy nearly the entire parcel. Revised plans retaining the majority of the exterior masonry walls were presented at the Architectural Committee, and those were the plans for which the Committee recommended denial. The application reviewed by the Committee proposed to demolish and reconstruct an historic wood-frame portion of the building and construct an addition filling in below and to the rear of the frame section. The new addition would have been clad at the first floor in limestone panels, and at the second floor in metal panels. The addition would be readily visible from S. 23rd Street.

The unusually-shaped existing frame portion of the building appears to be original to the building, as this form is evident on nearly all similar Madison Square properties. The Historical Commission has previously approved the infill of the first-floor notch below the frame portion, provided the cladding of that infill is distinguished from the cladding above.

The revised application submitted in the Historical Commission packets scaled back the proposed addition, limiting the first-floor addition to the filling in of the notch below the existing frame portion of the building, and setting the proposed second-floor addition in from the street.

The application also proposes to restore many elements of the building to their historic appearances, including the restoration of the masonry and the replacement of windows and doors. The staff notes that the details of the doors and windows may not all be correct as shown, and will need to work with the applicant to revise some details.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Christopher Stromberg and owner Nicholas Melisiotis represented the application.

Mr. Melisiotis explained that he first fell in love with Madison Square because it is a garden block, and that he rented another building on the street for about five years. When this house came up for sale, he decided to buy it in order to continue to live on the block. He noted that the neighbors all try to pitch in together, and that the block is closed off to traffic. He opined that this property was one of the most neglected on the block, but that that did not scare him because is a developer and builder in the city. He noted that he has worked on several historic properties in the neighborhood and nearby neighborhoods, and wants to restore the exterior to what it looked like 130 years ago. He explained the inappropriate alterations that have been made to the building over the years, including the painting of the brick, the addition of green shutters, and a front door that looks like it is from a hardware store. He noted that he plans to remove and restore those elements with historically appropriate elements. He opined that, having lived on the block, he knows that the little street in the back is solely used for trash and garbage pickup. He opined that no one uses their rear yards, and that the street is a mess. He noted that, when he first moved there, there was a lot of trash in the rear street and it was not maintained. He explained that he and his neighbors pitched in to hire someone to clean up the street. He noted that he quickly learned some of the deficiencies with the properties, including the small lots and houses where all the rooms are compartmentalized. Every room had a purpose and the houses were divided with a steep stair in the center, he explained. He noted that he wants to maintain the stair but create additional flow within the space by expanding the building at the rear. He explained that he engaged an architect to determine the options, and looked at other houses along the block. He opined that most houses have been modified in the back, and people have infilled the underside of what used to be the bathroom projection on the second floor. He remarked that Ms. DiPasquale had mentioned that the Historical Commission had approved such an infill under a projection for a nearby property. Some people have extended the second floor, and some people have expanded their buildings almost to the lot line. He explained that he and his architect looked at what could be done to make the space more livable, as he has intentions of living in this space. In order to do so, he would like to add another bathroom and closet. He explained that the revised proposal requests to extend the second floor and to fill in at the first floor under the existing projecting frame portion of the building. He noted that the architect met with the staff, who made recommendations for materials, size, massing, etc. He opined that one of the biggest concerns the staff had was the retention of the back brick wall, and that they made revisions based on the feedback and presented revised plans to the Architectural Committee. Ms. DiPasquale interjected that the staff had not recommended approval of the massing or materials of the proposed addition, even with the retention of the

brick walls. Mr. Melisiotis reiterated that he would like to live in this house and to fix the deficiencies with the house. He opined that other property owners along the block have made modifications, and that he is not asking to do anything that other people on the block have not already done, regardless of whether they did it through the proper channels. He noted that he would not undertake work that is not approved. He opined that what makes this building historic and charming is not its rear along a six-foot-wide alley, but the fact that it is on a garden block. The front of the property is what matters to him, he said. He explained that, in the plans submitted to the Commission there is a perspective view that depicts the revised second-floor addition as hardly noticeable coming down 23rd Street. He reiterated that he wants to invest his time and money into the front of the building, not the back, and that it is a two-story home on a garden block. He noted that he is asking for approval based on the current plans, which is not what he originally wanted, but which were revised and he thinks are a compromise.

Ms. Turner noted that the south and east elevations appear to be able to be approved, but asked Mr. McCoubrey to explain the issues with the work to the north elevation. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Architectural Committee was unanimous in its opinion that the open court at the rear of these buildings is a unique and character-defining feature of these properties. He lamented that the aerial view that the staff had included in the Architectural Committee packets did not appear to be included in the Commission packets. He explained that the block is formed by C-shaped masonry buildings with what are essentially wood frame bays at the rear. He noted that the Committee felt that that form and mass was a character-defining feature and that by starting to fill in those courts, that feature would be compromised. In the past, the Commission has permitted the infill below the bay, he noted, but the Committee was concerned about the precedent of starting to infill these courts. He argued that this building happens to be at the corner, so it will be much more visible than other properties. He noted that the space added on the interior is essentially a storage room, and that the new bathroom could be placed in the second-floor room that is shown as a storage room. He noted that he appreciates the applicant's attempts to set the addition back and mitigate its impact, but he still believes that the design does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He suggested cladding the infill below the bay, which has been permitted in the past, in a material that is differentiated from the existing scalloped shingles, such as a clapboard or something different but compatible.

Mr. Fiol-Silva opined that the primary characteristic of these properties is that they open to a garden block. He noted that he is sensitive to the need for the homes to be modified so they are attractive, and that he personally he is not bothered by the revised additions. He agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that the additions should be clad in a different but compatible material. He opined that the revised additions were not that bad, especially given the restoration aspects of the application. He noted that, if the Commission were to deny part of the addition, he would suggest that the bathroom over the grill does not need to be there and that the bedrooms could share a bathroom. He reiterated that he is not opposed to the revised addition, but would like to see the cladding differentiated.

Ms. DiPasquale noted that the revised application did remove the previously-proposed first-floor addition that would have blocked the masonry wall, so the addition at the first floor is limited to below the existing bay. Mr. Mattioni expressed confusion over Ms. DiPasquale's comment. Ms. DiPasquale displayed the floor plans of the original application and the revised application to the Historical Commission, noting that the original proposal and the proposal that was presented at the Architectural Committee meeting would have extended the first floor nearly to the edge of the lot line. In the revised application, she explained, the applicants have eliminated that portion of the addition, and pulled the second-floor addition in a few feet from the property line. Mr.

Mattioni clarified that the revised application is much more limited, and agreed with Mr. Fioli-Silva's previous comments.

Mr. Stromberg noted that Ms. DiPasquale had mentioned Standard 10, which involves maintaining the integrity of the original building. He opined that that is one thing that they did between the original application and the one submitted to the Architectural Committee, which is to maintain the integrity of the original building. He noted that the revised application does not modify the foundation walls, and only proposes cutting down a first-floor window to make a door opening. The original L-shaped masonry walls are being retained, except for a three-foot section to connect the living room to the kitchen. Mr. Stromberg noted that they would be willing to use whatever cladding materials the Commission would like for the addition.

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

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 9 June 2017, with the staff to review details, especially the exterior cladding of the additions to ensure that it is compatible. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. McCoubrey dissented.

ADDRESS: 1116 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct decks at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Redworth Dev. LLC

Applicant: Ken Spector, Mr. Contractor

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 6/16/1970

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the two rear decks, provided the second-floor window opening is restored to its original size and a historically appropriate window installed, and the siding is removed and the walls returned to stucco, the removed chimney is reconstructed in masonry or stuccoed with an alternative interior framing structure, that the deck at the second-floor not extend beyond the neighboring deck, and that the decks include a cap board at the end of the joists, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize work that has commenced and to allow for the completion of the construction of two decks at the rear of this property along Waverly Street. Several changes to the rear of the building have occurred over the last several years without review by the Commission. A deck at the second-floor rear was removed circa 2015, and it appears that the second-floor rear window opening was partially infilled at that time. It appears that the current doors at the second and third floors were installed circa 2013, at which time this property's half of the chimney at the third floor was also removed. The current siding at the rear appears to have been installed in 2016.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Hanna Haynes and contractor Rob Woods represented the application.

Ms. Haynes commented that she purchased the property in 2016, and therefore was not the property owner when much of the illegal work was done. She asked for approval of two decks

but not with the condition of correcting prior work, as it would be cost-prohibitive to remove the siding. She opined that it looks cleaner and better than the property next door. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the application was revised since the review by the Architectural Committee. Ms. Haynes responded that the application has not been revised to incorporate any recommendations of the Committee. She asked again for approval of the decks without a condition of removal of the siding.

Ms. Turner asked for public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he would move to deny the application, per the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Fiol-Silva asked for clarification of the staff recommendation. Ms. Broadbent confirmed that the staff recommendation was approval of the decks, provided the work done without permits was corrected. She noted that the Committee made a similar recommendation. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked about the objection to the existing siding. Ms. Broadbent responded that the rear was originally stucco, and vinyl or aluminum siding is not a historic material. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that he is uncomfortable approving an application with conditions. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Committee decided that the decks would have been approved anyway, but that the siding, the demolition of the chimney, and the change in the window would not have been approved. Mr. Baron commented that the Commission is allowed to place conditions on permit approvals. Mr. Mattioni asked if the Commission is saying that the siding has to be removed as a quid pro quo for the decks, and if the Commission denies the decks, will the property owner still be subject to violations if she does not remove the siding and restore the window. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked for a rendering of the deck. Ms. Haynes responded that it will have a vinyl railing and Trex decking, and will look much nicer than the neighbor's deck.

Ms. Turner asked if there is consideration of Mr. McCoubrey's proposed motion. Mr. Fiol-Silva mentioned the chain link fence. He asked if there is something that can be done to improve the overall appearance little by little, rather than something as onerous as having to replace all of the siding. He suggested that when the siding needs to be replaced in the future, at the end of its useful life, the walls could be returned to stucco. Ms. Haynes agreed that the chain link fence is more hideous than the siding, and stated that she is willing to change it or remove it. Mr. McCoubrey reminded the Commissioners that all work done to this property, despite not being done by this property owner, is in violation of the City's preservation ordinance. Ms. Haynes asked if the Commission has the power to issue violations to the person who actually committed the violation. Mr. Mattioni responded that it does not; any violation would be issued to the current owner, even if a former owner undertook the work. He stated that any dispute between the current owner and the former owner is a private dispute. Mr. Farnham agreed, stating that there is no way for the City to hold anyone but the current property owner responsible for the condition of a property. When this property was purchased, it was purchased with the conditions in violation. He explained that he is not an attorney and cannot provide legal advice, but opined that Ms. Haynes may have recourse with the former owner, but that she would need to pursue on her own as a private matter. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked if there is anything compelling the property owner right now to make these changes. Mr. Fink responded that the Commission could request that the Department of Licenses and Inspections issue violation notices for inappropriate changes that have occurred in the past. He explained that some are seeking to have the violations corrected as part of this application, as opposed to separating the deck from the other work that has been uncovered.

Ms. Turner again asked if there is an alternative to Mr. McCoubrey's proposed motion. Mr. McCoubrey commented that, from the Architectural Committee's perspective, this work does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. There were a series of recommendations by the Committee, but the applicant has opted to not accept any of those recommendations. Ms. Haynes responded that she has agreed to the cap board, but the cost to make the other changes to the rear is prohibitive.

Ms. Turner asked for other suggestions, such as staging the process. Mr. Farnham commented that generally he is not in favor of tying new applications to potential violations; however, the work here is tied closely to the deck. The rear doors are needed to access the deck, and the siding and window are at the deck wall. He suggested that one solution may be to separate out the unpermitted work from the current proposal, and judge the current proposal on its merits. He opined that the decks do meet the Standards, and then, once the deck question is decided, the Commission could choose to direct the staff to take some sort of enforcement action regarding the unpermitted work.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested approving the application for the two rear decks, with the staff to review details, and stating that the other illegal work is not part of this application. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked what the enforcement would entail. Mr. Fink responded that there would be a violation notice and time to correct the work, and there would be the opportunity to appeal. If nothing is done, and the appeals fail, then there would be prosecution in court, and potential fines. Mr. Fiol-Silva opined that the application for the decks called attention to the potential violations. Mr. Mattioni commented that what triggered the larger discussion was the application to construct the decks. Ms. Haynes asked if the Commission is notified when a historically designated property is sold. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Commission does not receive notice of sales. Mr. Baron commented that the sale of a property does not remove a violation. Mr. Farnham corrected previous assumptions and explained that this application resulted from a violation that was issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections for construction of a deck without a permit. The deck was under construction without a permit. The illegal work and subsequent violation brought the application before the Commission. Mr. Schaaf questioned if an approval and subsequent construction of the decks would cause problems with removal of the siding. Mr. Farnham responded that constructing the deck could complicate slightly the removal of the siding, because there may have to be a connection of the railing to the building, but it should not be a significant obstruction. Mr. Mattioni stated that he would second a motion like that suggested by Mr. McCoubrey, with the understanding for the applicant that the action does not approve or legalize the vinyl siding, built-down rear window, or any other alterations to the property. Ms. Haynes asked if the concern of the Commission is the appearance of the building. Mr. Mattioni responded that it is not, and that her historical property carries with it all of the requirements under the City ordinance. Mr. Schaaf commented that the appearance is not the issue, and Ms. Haynes's observation is correct in that the rear wall does look tidy and clean; however, that is not the historically appropriate appearance for the rear wall.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application for the two rear decks, with the staff to review details, with the understanding that the action does not approve or legalize the vinyl siding, built-down rear window, or any other alterations to the property. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 101 W HIGHLAND AVE

Proposal: Construct addition; renovate historic building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia Department of Public Property

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker and Partners

History: 1894; Chestnut Hill Fire Station; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 7/10/2015

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, with the following comments:

- An analysis of the thermodynamic properties of the wall should be undertaken to ensure that adding insulation at the interior does not contribute to any long-term masonry damage;
- The slope at the entry should be reviewed to ensure that any grade change does not affect the building's historic character; and,
- The design of the watch room should be further reviewed, with the suggestion that the current all-glass structure potentially incorporate metal banding at the base or another detail.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate the historic Engine 37 fire station and construct an addition on adjacent land to house modern apparatus. The proposed addition is a one-story, two-bay structure that is linked to the existing building with a connector. An existing window opening will be enlarged vertically to allow passage from the connector to the existing building. The volume of the new addition will be clad primarily in a smooth stone similar to the banding on the existing building. The connector is primarily glass, allowing for visibility of the street from the watch room. The historic building currently contains non-historic doors in its two narrow bays. This application proposes to install reproductions of the original bay doors, with one leaf remaining operable to allow for the public to enter the fire station.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

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: 1870; storefront added c. 1880

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 1 to recommend denial of the rear addition and slate replacement at the front roof as proposed but approval of the restoration work at the front façade and replacement of the slate roof in kind, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the rear shed roof and a single dormer at the fourth story of 419 S. 20th Street and to construct a rear mansard roof with two dormers to loosely replicate the appearance of the front roofline. The rear addition would be visible from

Waverly Street. The addition would feature asphalt shingles and two aluminum clad two-over-two double-hung sash windows. A new window and doors would be installed at the third story. The application also proposes to install wood two-over-two double-hung sash windows at the second through fourth stories of the front façade. The historic beveled slate shingles currently installed at the front mansard roof would be replaced with slate shingles in a rectangular shape.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Eric Heidel represented the application.

Mr. Heidel stated that the fronts of the buildings in this row contain four stories and change to three stories at the rear with shed roofs. An exception, he noted, is the property to the north, which maintains four stories from front to back. He explained that he is proposing to remove the shed roof and dormer that occupies roughly one-third of the building's rear upper level and to construct a new addition that would extend the fourth floor to the rear wall of the lower stories. The addition, he added, would align with the neighboring structure. Mr. Heidel asserted that the mansard roof form was the most sympathetic massing to complement the northern structure, which has a mansard roof that wraps three sides of the structure. The proposed materials of the addition, he continued, are different to set apart the new roof and to prevent the creation of a false sense of history.

Ms. Turner asked to review the Architectural Committee's report on the application. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Architectural Committee had a split vote of 4 to 1, but that the main concern was that the addition would be highly visible from a public right-of-way and that it would significantly alter the rear configuration of the property, which was originally a shed roof and dormer. He added that the Committee also had concerns over creating a false sense of history by introducing a mansard roof that essentially extends what is the corner property. The typical development pattern, Mr. McCoubrey continued, would have been to have a larger corner property with smaller mid-block houses being differently configured. He reiterated that the primary concern related to the addition's visibility.

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

Mr. McCoubrey discussed denying the extension of the fourth story per the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Mattioni clarified that the Architectural Committee's recommendation contained two components. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the first part of the recommendation referenced the replacement of shingles at the front façade and that they have been revised. Ms. Keller confirmed that the shingles were revised, adding that Mr. Mattioni may have been referring to the Committee's approval of the restoration work proposed for the front façade, with the exception of the slate as previously proposed. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the proposed work to the front façade be approved.

Mr. Fiol-Silva asked for clarification on the proposed work at the rear. Mr. McCoubrey explained that there is currently a sloped rear roof with a dormer that would be removed and raised to allow the fourth floor to be extended to meet the adjacent corner property. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked if the proposed work alters the dormer's configuration. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the application proposes to raise the entire rear of the roof. Currently, he continued, there is a mansard at the front and a sloped roof in the back with a single dormer. Mr. McCoubrey added that the dormer and the rear sloped roof would be removed, the floor would be extended, and the rear addition would then be covered with a mansard.

Mr. Fiol-Silva inquired whether the plans outline where the existing roof is, adding that it can sometimes be difficult to differentiate the proposed work versus the existing structure.

Mr. Heidel showed on a screen projection where the existing roof is and what is proposed. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked Mr. Heidel to identify on a section drawing where the existing roof terminates. Mr. Heidel identified it and explained that the existing dormer extends roughly halfway into the proposed addition. He showed the area that currently consists of a shed roof and dormer, adding that the proposed work would remove that feature and extend the roof. Mr. Mattioni observed that, according to the proposal, the addition consumes approximately one-third of the rear. Mr. Heidel affirmed. Mr. Mattioni asked whether the size and high visibility of the addition was the reason for the Architectural Committee's recommendation of denial. Mr. McCoubrey affirmed.

Ms. Royer stated that the Commission needs more information on the addition, including existing drawings and clear renderings from the street.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the proposed mansard, which replicates the condition of the corner property, creates a false sense of history and remains an issue.

Mr. Fiol-Silva agreed with Ms. Royer's comment that the Commission needs more information. He stated that, in looking at the massing, it is clear that the mansard roof of the corner building provides an integral part of the building's character. He asked Mr. Heidel to outline over the existing drawing where the addition would be located. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the addition doubles the visibility at the rear wall. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked that Mr. Heidel show the area, and Mr. Heidel outlined the area on the projected image. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked whether the second and third stories would also be infilled by an addition. Mr. Heidel explained that they would not change. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked whether the fourth-story addition would cantilever over the existing rear wall. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the lower stories extend beyond the current fourth-story wall, and that the fourth story would be extended to align with the wall of the lower stories.

Ms. Turner again asked for public comment and again none was offered.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the rear addition, but approve the restoration work at the front façade and replacement of the slate roof in kind, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Heidel asked whether the Commission would favorably consider a smaller addition that extended to the dormer rather than the plane of the lower stories. He asserted that the smaller addition could be set back approximately 5'-6" from the rear wall. Mr. McCoubrey replied that, depending on its visibility, it would be looked on more favorably. Mr. Schaaf added that it should not attempt to replicate the elements of the neighboring mansard roof.

ADDRESS: 313-15 S CHADWICK ST

Proposal: Revise design of previously-approved doors and windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robert and Josephine Volpe

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design, LLC

History: 1860; Women's SPCA of Pennsylvania

Individual Designation: 10/5/1978

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the garage door as presented, but approval of the metal railing at the second-story doors, with the design of the doors reflecting the design approved by the Historical Commission on 13 January 2017, and approval of a solid entry door with a cross-lined panel base, solid panel above, and a three-light transom over the door slab, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install new garage and entry doors and second-story doors with guardrails at a former carriage house. An application for a third-story addition with roof deck and the restoration of the front façade, including new doors, was approved by the Historical Commission on 13 January 2017. At that time, the application included garage and second-story doors designed to match the written descriptions of two insurance surveys of the building dated 1873 and 1875. The previously approved design included cross-lined panel doors at the garage and second-story openings, which also included segmental heads and board and batten shutters. The second-story openings did not include guardrails. The insurance survey indicates that the entry door should consist of a cross-lined panel bottom with glass above and a three-light transom. The current application proposes to change the configuration of all doors to include a simplified raised-panel design and to install guardrails at the second-story doors. Two options for the entry door are included.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Robert Palladino, owner Robert Volpe, and attorney Michael Phillips represented the application.

Mr. Phillips argued that the issue following the Architectural Committee meeting remains the change to the cross-buck panels, since the Committee seemed to accept the proposed addition of railings at the second-story doors. He noted that the cross-buck design was reflected in an 1873 insurance survey and asserted that the door design does bear any significance to the 1978 nomination. Photographs from 1978, he added, show that the cross-buck doors no longer existed. Mr. Phillips claimed that the building's historical significance dates to 1909 and is not related to the architecture of the building. Its significance, he asserted, relates to the building's function as the first veterinary dispensary in the United States. He stated that there is information in the Commission application identifying the building as America's first animal clinic. He then claimed that the cross-buck design is not germane. Mr. Phillips noted that Mr. Volpe has agreed to comply with all the recommendations that have been made to date. However, he continued, the owner would respectfully request that he not be required to install the cross-buck doors and that he instead be permitted to use the design submitted in the current application. Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Palladino to speak about the door changes that were requested.

Mr. Palladino explained that in the original application, the entry door was proposed as a single door with two sidelights. In rereading the insurance survey, he added, it was found that a double-door would be preferred, which is one reason a double-door is currently proposed. He

stated that he is trying to be a little more in line with what was described in the insurance survey and asserted that the owner is not requesting a lesser alternative. He noted that, while the cross-buck design is described in the insurance survey and not presented in the application, he feels the design of the doors is consistent with the style of the façade and similar facades in the neighborhood.

Mr. Phillips added that the Architectural Committee recommended a three-light transom over the door slab and that he is amenable to that element.

Mr. Volpe argued that he has agreed to install twenty-three mahogany windows, a mahogany entry door, and mahogany garage doors, adding that his request for the change is not to use lesser materials. He stated that he is only asked for some relief from the cross-buck design.

Ms. Turner asked for comment from the Commission members. Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether the insurance survey was the source of information on the cross-buck doors. Ms. Keller answered that the design is described in two insurance surveys dated 1873 and 1875. She also pointed out that, according to a letter mailed to the property owner from the chairman of the Historical Commission immediately following designation in 1978, the property was designated for its history and its historical association with the Women's SPCA. She clarified that its designation was not solely based on its role as a Women's SPCA. Ms. Keller added that after designation in 1978, the owner applied for a plaque. At that time, she noted, the Historical Commission reviewed plaque applications. She stated that the Commission denied the plaque request in part because the doors were incorrect.

Mr. Phillips responded that the denial of the plaque application was based on the condition of the doors and that there was no reference in that letter to the cross-buck panels. Ms. Keller disagreed and clarified that the letter does not specify that the denial was based on condition. Mr. Phillips countered that the letter only states "doors," so the specifics are unknown and it is unclear whether the Commission reviewed the insurance survey. It remains unknown, he continued, when the building opened in 1909 as the first animal clinic, whether it retained the cross-buck doors. He concluded that there is no way to know that definitively.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Phillips why the cross-buck door design is such an issue. He stated that he does not understand the owner's objecting to replicating the original design, since there is a clear description in the historical record of the building that indicates the cross-buck doors existed. Mr. Volpe responded that he dislikes the design.

Mr. Mattioni opined that the applicant is asking why the Commission is so strongly insisting on the cross-buck design, as opposed to the alternative they have presented for approval. He added that he finds there to be a mixed issue of what is historically important and what is not.

Mr. Baron noted that the building is part of a row and falls within a historic district. Carriage houses, he continued, almost always display that cross-buck design, and this building stands in a row of other carriage houses. Mr. Baron argued that while the building was converted to an SPCA, the cross-buck design is one of the most distinguishing characteristics of carriage houses and is ubiquitous among that building type throughout the district.

Mr. Volpe claimed that neither of the two other carriage homes on the block have cross-bucks. Ms. Keller disagreed, clarifying that the carriage house next door to Mr. Volpe's property contains cross-buck elements. Mr. Volpe responded that the building does not have a cross-

buck design on the front door, but acknowledged that the building contains cross-buck panels below the first-story windows.

Mr. Farnham disagreed with Mr. Baron's comments about the building's significance as a carriage house within the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. He clarified that typically individual designations supersede district designation. The significance of the building, Mr. Farnham continued, is that it served as an early or the first ASPCA, and that the point of restoration should be 1909, not necessarily the forty years prior. In 1909, he added, it remains unknown whether the building retained the cross-buck doors it had in 1875, but if the Commission were to be very specific about a point of restoration, it should be 1909. Mr. Farnham suggested that the staff could conduct additional research to try to determine what doors existed in 1909, though he added that it seemed as if Mr. Phillips and his client have done some research and have not found any further documentation. Mr. Farnham stated that he wanted to leave open the possibility for doors designs other than the cross-buck, since that door was associated with the building forty years before its conversion to an SPCA.

Mr. Fiol-Silva asked whether the original doors had the cross-buck design. Mr. Farnham answered that the insurance survey describes the cross-buck doors, but that it is unknown whether those doors existed when the building became an SPCA in 1909. Mr. Fiol-Silva replied that, aside from the building's function as a veterinary clinic, it has significance within the historic district. Mr. Farnham confirmed that it falls within the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. Mr. Fiol-Silva opined that carriage houses and townhouses comprise the district and that the cross-buck design exudes history, clearly indicating what the former use was. He added that he thinks it makes the building immensely more interesting. In looking at the proposed garage design, he stated that it reminds him of a garage down his street, any garage, but that the cross-buck design lends much more character and relates to the initial purpose of the building. He commented that the divided-light door is non-congruent and that the solid doors make sense. Mr. Fiol-Silva argued that he finds the original relationship of the stables to the townhouses more significant than the fact that there may have been a veterinary clinic in the building at some point.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that both aspects of the building's history are important. Mr. Phillips interjected that he respectfully disagrees with the Commissioners, adding that he has the letter nominating the property. In the letter, he continued, the owner requested that "the veterinary medical facility, the Caroline Earle White Dispensary, be recognized as an historical site or building by the Philadelphia Historical Commission. It is of great historical importance among Philadelphia 'firsts' in that it was established on December 11, 1909 as the first such dispensary in America." He then asserted that the accompanying photographs do not show the cross-buck design on the doors. For the significance, he added, one must look to the reason why this property was individually designated and what the condition was when it was designated as being historically significant. Mr. Phillips contended that there is nothing in the Historical Commission's records that states that the cross-buck design was germane to the Commission's decision to individually designate the property. He reiterated that the design in 1909 remains unknown and argued that the door design is the sole issue for which his client is seeking relief. Mr. Phillips stated that Mr. Volpe has agreed with the design of the building and all of the revisions in every other aspect. He asserted that the cross-buck design was not essential to the property's nomination.

Mr. Fiol-Silva repeated Mr. Phillips' statement that it remains unknown whether the cross-buck doors existed at the time of designation and asked the staff to confirm that the property is listed both individually and within a district. Mr. Phillips confirmed its designation status, adding that

Mr. Farnham indicated that the individual designation takes precedence over the district designation. Mr. Fiol-Silva reiterated Mr. Phillips' statement regarding the lack of information on the doors at the time of the building's conversion to an SPCA. Mr. Phillips agreed, adding that photographs showing the property's condition at the time of individual designation in 1978 show that the cross-buck doors had been replaced.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether complete designation information is available. Mr. Phillips responded that he has a letter he could share but that it only congratulates the property owner on the designation of the property. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he was interested in other information.

Ms. Turner questioned whether there could be additional research conducted, as Mr. Farnham mentioned previously. Mr. Phillips responded that the property was nominated on October 3, 1978, and that on October 6, 1978, the property was designated. He noted that not much information was provided for nominations at the time. The owner, he continued, sent a letter stating that the organization was hosting a gala or event and asking the Historical Commission designate to designate the property. He noted that the Commission responded affirmatively three days later.

Mr. Farnham stated that he did not find any additional information in the property file that bears on this topic.

Mr. Schaaf asked how the garage door will operate and whether it will be hinged to move at the jambs or if it will open overhead. Mr. Palladino answered that the garage will operate as an overhead door. Mr. Fiol-Silva inquired whether the way the door operates is driving the need to change the design and asked whether the cross-buck garage door can only open on hinges from the jambs rather than overhead. Mr. Palladino replied that it is possible for a cross-buck garage door to open overhead.

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

Mr. McCoubrey commented that, regardless of whether the entry door contains a cross-buck design or not, it should have four panels rather than the two large panels proposed. Mr. Phillips responded that they are amenable to that request.

Mr. Fiol-Silva opined that his preference is for the cross-buck design, though if some question about whether or not they existed he would give the owner the benefit of the doubt. He asserted that the cross-buck design looks better, but whether or not they were there in 1909 is a gray area.

Ms. Turner asked for a motion. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he would make a motion to accept the recommendation of the staff and Architectural Committee for denial, based on the fact that the cross-buck doors were excluded from the design. Mr. Mattioni clarified that the Architectural Committee's recommendation was for denial of the doors but approval of other significant issues and asked whether Mr. McCoubrey's proposed motion was for complete denial of the application. Mr. McCoubrey explained that his motion would refer to the four openings that were presented in the application. Mr. Mattioni read the Architectural Committee's recommendation, and Mr. McCoubrey stated that he would accept an amendment to the motion he would make. Mr. Mattioni responded that he would not second the motion but wanted to make sure that McCoubrey's intention was clear. He asked whether the Architectural Committee's recommendation, which he just read, is the motion that Mr. McCoubrey is intending to make. Mr.

McCoubrey confirmed that that would be his motion. Mr. Mattioni commented that the only denial is the denial of the garage door. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the motion includes a denial of the second-story doors and the entry doors, which do not incorporate the cross-buck design as reflected in the applicant's previous submission to the Commission. Mr. Mattioni countered that he has a different understanding of the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Schaaf noted that the recommendation is provided on page 22 of the Architectural Committee minutes.

Ms. Turner asked Mr. McCoubrey to read the Architectural Committee's recommendation in full. Mr. McCoubrey agreed to read the recommendation, stating that he will present it as his motion.

Mr. Fiol-Silva asked whether he is correct in understanding that the cross-buck design had previously been approved by the Commission. Mr. McCoubrey answered that this application was submitted and approved by the Commission previously, and the applicant has returned to eliminate the cross-buck doors. Mr. Phillips interjected that he believes if the applicant had presented the application without the cross-buck design in January, it never would have been an issue. Since it was in the original application, he claimed, the owner is now stuck with the door design. He argued that there was nothing to tie the building to the cross-buck doors. Mr. McCoubrey countered that the insurance survey clearly documents the door style. Mr. Phillips contended that the survey was completed years prior to the period of historical significance.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the garage door; approve the railings at the second-story doors, provided the design of the doors reflects that approved by the Historical Commission on 13 January 2017; and approve a double-leaf entry door with panels over cross-buck bases and a three-light transom, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 2. Messrs. Mattioni and Fink dissented.

ADDRESS: 1629 WALLACE ST

Proposal: Modify previously approved rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1422 Front LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the suggestion that the windows at the addition's side and rear be made uniform in head height, sill height, and width, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application is a resubmission of a proposal to construct a rear addition to the property at 1629 Wallace Street. The previous application proposed to convert an existing vacant shell into a five-family dwelling and included the restoration of the front façade and the construction of a rear three-story addition. The Historical Commission voted to approve that application on 9 September 2016. Owing to access issues along the western property line, the location of the addition has been modified and the current application proposes to construct a similar three-story addition located along the eastern property line. Like the original design, the visible north and west elevations of the addition would be clad in brick. However, because the

west wall will no longer function as a party wall, one-over-one aluminum clad windows, similar to those previously approved at the north façade, are proposed along the west elevation.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 4146-48 PARKSIDE AVE

Proposal: Construct apartment building on vacant lot

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 4148 Parkside LP

Applicant: Steven Bachich, Raymond F. Rola, Architect

History:

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/11/2009

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the design satisfies the Standards in massing, color, and materials, but suggested that the columns should be longer, the railing heavier, the porch wider, and the windows made of a material other than vinyl.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a six-story apartment building on a vacant lot in a row of buildings on Parkside Avenue. The Historical Commission's authority over this site is review-and-comment jurisdiction only because the lot was undeveloped at the time of designation. The Historical Commission has previously commented on a proposal for the site that was much less compatible with the historic district than the current proposal. The current proposal is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing of the historic buildings in the district.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 204 N 35TH ST

Proposal: Legalize windows; install additional windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Teresa Labov

Applicant: Teresa Labov

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 3/25/1969

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize one-over-one vinyl windows that were installed in this house without a permit or the Historical Commission's approval and to approve one-over-one vinyl windows that are not yet installed. After neighbors complained about the window replacement, the work was stopped. The building originally would have had four-over-four windows with thicker vertical muntins, beaded to create the appearance of casement windows, as is typical of Italianate structures and found on the similar adjacent houses. This house was modified with the removal of its front porch and the addition of a Colonial Revival doorway. The

windows for that period would have typically been six-over-one or six-over-six. All four sides of this house are visible from public rights-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Sarah Labov, the daughter of the property owner, represented the application.

Ms. Labov stated that she would like to try to find a compromise solution so that she is able to devise and submit a new application to the Commission that could be approved. She explained that her parents purchased the property in 1971. In the 1980s, her mother became the sole owner. Ms. Labov stated that, in 1995, she and her daughter moved back into the house with her mother. She noted that, as a child, she was always told that it was an important house and that nothing could be done to alter the appearance of the front façade. Around 2015, her mother began suffering from dementia and she took over tasks of running the house. First, she replaced the heating system and then, this past November, the windows. She explained that she replaced the windows to try to achieve a more constant temperature in the house. She said that she worked with a contractor who is experienced in Powelton Village, but is based in Bucks County. He was not familiar with the City's laws. He gave them a good price for vinyl windows because he works with a particular window company. As he was installing windows, a member of the community involved in preservation stopped by and asked the contractor if he had a permit. The community member notified the Historical Commission. Ms. Labov stated that the installation was halted with all but seven rear windows installed. She stated that she would like an approval to install the remaining windows. She stated that Mr. Baron has provided her with information about the building as well as appropriate replacement windows.

Ms. Labov acknowledged that there are three main issues with regard to the replacement windows. The first is the vinyl material. The second is the muntin pattern. The third is the covering of the wooden frames with panning. She displayed photographs of the conditions, showing the overall house with the new windows and altered trim. A photograph showed the difference between the first and second round of vinyl installations. Another photograph showed the original windows on the rear and the capped frames. She explained that she is appearing before the Historical Commission to explore whether there is a way to compromise that removes the damage without replacing all of the windows again. Ms. Turner asked if there is a way to replace the windows over a period of time. Mr. Farnham replied that the Commission may approve a staged replacement, but suggested that the Commission might first consider which facades are primary and which are secondary; the Commission may have some flexibility with secondary facades. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Committee discussed a compromise to allow vinyl windows on the rear but replace the windows on the front and side facades, which are more visible. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked when the windows were installed. He stated that, since there was no harm to the historic structure and no willful intent on the part of the owner, perhaps the windows could be replaced later. Mr. McCoubrey countered that this was the moment when the old windows wore out and should have been replaced with appropriate windows. He observed that this is not the first time that the Commission has faced this question. He remarked that owners of similar houses have been required to replace the vinyl windows with appropriate windows.

Ms. Labov made a case for the one-over-one muntin pattern, explaining that the windows were probably changed when her porch was removed and new frontispiece installed. She asked for permission to retain the vinyl one-over-ones and remove the panning. She said that she could then use that money to restore the trim and work on the cornice and frontispiece. She said that her family has been upstanding in the community. Ms. Labov asked Mr. McCoubrey to restate the Committee's concerns. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Committee was concerned about

both the frames and the sash. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked if the original windows were two-over-two. Mr. McCoubrey said that the windows were originally two-over-two. They were later modified to one-over-ones. Mr. Farnham suggested that the one-over-one windows could have historical significance if they are associated with an extensive renovation. Mr. McCoubrey said that the original two-over-two windows had their muntins removed and became one-over-ones. Mr. Fiol-Silva said that the vinyl windows look the same as the one-over-ones with the muntins removed. Mr. Baron explained that the profile of the wood windows was different than that of the vinyl; the wood windows had more depth, meaning that the glass was set back farther from the faces of the rails and stiles. The frames also have more detail that has been covered up. Mr. McCoubrey said that the covering of the trim is the most disturbing, but that the Commission has consistently required the replacement of vinyl windows. The Commission has reviewed hundreds of these applications and has been consistent, he asserted. Mr. Baron suggested a compromise to allow the vinyl windows to remain on the side with just the 10 windows on the front façade to be replaced. He expressed the importance of consistency. Otherwise it encourages people to undertake inappropriate work and then seek forgiveness. Mr. Schaaf said that Mr. Baron's compromise appeared very reasonable. Mr. Schaaf discussed the example of the VFW Hall in Chestnut Hill; in that case, the Commission required a total window replacement over several years. He said that the compromise suggested by Mr. Baron is less onerous. Ms Labov asked which period the windows should be restored to, two-over-two or one-over-one. Mr. Baron responded that there is a reasonable argument for installing one-over-one windows. He recommended requiring the replacement of the front windows at once rather than a sequential replacement of all of the windows. He explained that it is very difficult to enforce replacements over long periods of time because judges typically do not keep cases open long enough for gradual enforcement. Ms. Royer asked if the window from the front façade could be installed in another façade. Mr. Baron said that all the windows have already been delivered. Mr. McCoubrey stated that one-over-one wood windows would be the appropriate windows for the front façade.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to legalize the windows at the side and rear facades, provided the panning on the side windows is removed, but to deny the legalization of the 10 windows and panning on the front façade. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 4301 MAIN ST

Proposal: Legalize alterations

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: MNYK Realty, LLC

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: The staff of the Historical Commission approved work to this corner commercial property in November 2016. The contractor has exceeded the approved work and the owner is now seeking to legalize that work. The illegal work includes the installation of mechanical equipment on the rear two-story ell. Previously, condensers had been located on a one-story addition at the rear closest to Station Street. The architectural plans approved by the Historical

Commission's staff did not include any mechanical equipment. The staff visited the site and determined that the mechanical equipment is highly visible from the public right-of-way.

In addition to the mechanical equipment, the illegal work includes the addition of decorative brackets to the main cornice of the building. The approved plans call for the removal of non-historic siding from the cornice and a consultation with the staff to determine the design of any additional cornice elements. The building is a simple Greek Revival structure and modillions as shown on the plan might have been appropriate. Instead, the contractor failed to consult with the staff and installed Fypon Italianate brackets, which are inappropriate for the style of the building and not in compliance with the approved drawing.

The storefront cornice was rebuilt and a hood added over the side doors, neither of which was included on the approved plans. Windows were installed without the requisite review and approval of shop drawings. The window facing Main Street does not fit its opening. The applicant proposes to add a layer of brick and a bullnose sill. Several courses of brick may be needed to fill the gap below the smaller window.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney William O'Brien, design consultant Cynthia Meadows, architect Peter Laucks, and property owners Paul and Patrick Ryan represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained the Architectural Committee recommended denial and reported that the architect has submitted plans addressing many of the Committee's concerns. He explained that he visited the building since the Architectural Committee meeting. The owners indicated that they are not in favor of some of the proposals shown on the architect's plans such as the removal of the canopy and the rear door and he understands that they may be submitting a revised set of plans today. He reported that he saw additional work seen at the site recently that has never been documented on any of the plans. In particular, there are two pipes projecting from the side wall on Roxborough Avenue that appear to be venting mechanical equipment. Mr. Baron recommended remanding the application to the Architectural Committee to address the new information and develop a consistent recommendation.

Mr. Mattioni asked if some aspects of the application can be approved by the staff. Mr. Baron responded that the cornice brackets and treatment of the rear wall can be reviewed and approved separately. He said that some of the issues that require Commission review include a canopy at the side doors, venting for the pizza oven, a tall roof vent, and vents on the side wall.

Mr. O'Brien introduced his clients and architect Peter Laucks. He explained that the building which has been a restaurant for generations had suffered from deferred maintenance. He reported his clients have invested \$500,000 in repairs. He noted that they had been held up for a year by a mistake made by a plans examiner at the Department of Licenses & Inspections. He remarked that his clients have agreed to all of the recommendations of the Committee in the latest set of plans. He promised that the canopy will be removed. They will remedy the windows, which are too small for their openings, with a course of brick and a wooden skirt. The owner has agreed to clean and point rather than paint or stucco the rear facing wall. They propose to screen the mechanical equipment with a screen moved closer to the edge of the building. He said that the height of the vent and the placement of the vent for the pizza oven are determined by code and are not discretionary. He said that the air conditioning units, which were previously on the rear one-story roof, were once hidden by a 40" parapet wall that was removed. They have been moved to the second-story roof where they will be less visible. He said that the two pipes projecting from the wall are to vent a new boiler. Mr. Laucks said that there is a new gas

fired boiler to provide hot water and he said that this is the most unobtrusive spot to vent the unit while maintaining its efficiency. He distributed photographs of other vents and mechanical equipment throughout Manayunk. He claimed that the only two areas of concern are the vent pipes and the screen. He noted that his clients would like to open the restaurant as soon as possible. He reported that the vent pipes will be covered. Mr. Mattioni said that he owns a property with vents but that his vents look better. Mr. Fiol-Silva suggested remanding the vent question to the staff or Architectural Committee for further review. Mr. McCoubrey said that the screen seemed to him the most important open issue requiring the staff's attention. Mr. Baron recommended a horizontal skirt board of about eight inches, a straight rather than sloped railing, a painted material, and at least one inch by one inch square pickets. He also asked that the rear door have four panels as seen in the revised drawings and not a glass panel as has been already installed.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application documented by the drawings dated 31 May 2017, with the screen on the roof moved toward the street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 11:41 a.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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 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 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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.