

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

**TUESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 2017
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Emily Schrider
Adam Montalbano, Moto Design Shop
Geoff Schunck
Erin Senke
Mark Galbraith
Catalina Gonzalez
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Susan Reel-Parish
G. Baker
Kevin Yoder
Henry Clinton, Henry Clinton, Attorney
Jeff Watson, Harman Deutsch Architecture
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architecture

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz, and Messrs. Cluver and D'Alessandro joined him.

ADDRESS: 329 S 25TH ST

Proposal: Demolish roof and front and rear walls; construct addition and deck; reconstruct front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Geoffrey Schwartz

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop Inc.

History: 1855; façade replaced 1958

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 to demolish the rear slope of the gable roof, front and rear walls, and rear dormer of this contributing row house in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District and to construct a third-floor addition behind the ridge pole of the roof. This level of removal constitutes a demolition in the legal sense and would require a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest before any approval. Although much of the addition probably cannot be seen from the street, the roof deck and pilot house comprise a floor above the ridge line and would be visible from the park across the street. The current c. 1958 façade would be demolished and reconstructed, however, some details are not correct on the current elevations. The staff would support an addition that sits below the eave line of the existing building at the rear, preserving the rear slope and dormer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the reconstruction of the front façade with corrected details and staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the demolition and addition, as proposed pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and owner Geoffrey Schwartz represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano explained that he presented a proposal for a mansard roofed addition at the last Architectural Committee meeting. He has submitted a revised application based on the comments offered at the last meeting. He stated that he now proposes to restore the front wall and retain the front gable and dormer. He pointed out photograph No. 8 in the application, showing a view from the park. The house is shown behind a tree. He also said that Drawing A102 shows the viewing angle from across 25th street to the rear addition. He claimed that the addition would not be highly visible from the park. Mr. Schwartz reported that the park slopes down toward the river. Mr. Montalbano pointed out that the roof deck has been set back approximately five feet and features a vertical picket railing. Mr. Baron displayed photographs he took showing the extent of visibility through a notch at the front where it is possible to see both the front and rear gable. From Panama Street, the pilot house will also likely be visible, Mr. Baron claimed.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the demolition is proposed to obtain more space or if it is intended to address a structural problem. Mr. Montalbano replied that more space is desired. Mr. McCoubrey asked if they are gutting the interior. Mr. Montalbano answered that they are, except for floors, which they will modify for a new stair. He said that his clients desire more space for the growing family. The top floor has little headroom. He explained that he has positioned the bathroom in the front gable with the front edge at the shower. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if there

are any section drawings to show the various heights. Mr. Montalbano replied that they have not provided section drawings. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that he opposes this level of demolition. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the Historical Commission has been consistent in asking for the retention of rear roof slopes and rear walls. He asked if the chimneys will be demolished; he noted that they are not included on the plans. Mr. Montalbano said that they will be demolished below the roof to gain space, but will be retained above the roof with support built into the attic level. Mr. Cluver asked about the basis of reconstruction of the front facade. Mr. Baron pointed out that the historic photograph showed that this building and its neighbor were built as twins. Mr. Baron photographed details from the neighboring house, which can guide this restoration. Mr. Cluver pointed out that several details should be changed and he urged the architect to work with the staff to get them right. Mr. Montalbano pointed out that the visibility of this addition from the public right-of-way will not be as great as with some properties. They have proposed the façade restoration in hopes of gaining flexibility on the less visible parts of the building. Mr. Schwartz said that they would be willing to lower the height of the pilot house. He does not understand the concern with the rear roof slope since it is less visible from the street. He asked if they could balance their concern with the front restoration. Mr. D'Alessandro said that they could not trade one area for the other, but that perhaps the Commission would consider such a quid pro quo. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that it is important to retain the rear wall, rear roof slope, and dormer. He explained that there is a preservation issue independent of visibility from the public right-of-way. He said that they might recommend approval of an addition in the back yard below the eave. They might even approve a modification to the dormer to access a deck. Mr. Schwartz said that this was cost prohibitive for the amount of space they would gain. Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment of which there was none. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the façade reconstruction would require better documentation and drawings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the reconstruction of the front façade with corrected details, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the demolition and addition as proposed, pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

ADDRESS: 240 W TULPEHOCKEN ST

Proposal: Construct enclosed exterior stair and elevator; install fence; construct dormer

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Tulpehocken Palazzo/Darin Bielby

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop Inc.

History: 1893; Harry K. Cummings Residence; Frank Miles Day, architect

Individual Designation: 3/9/2012

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove an existing non-historic rear fire escape and construct an enclosed stair and elevator as a primary means of egress from the second and third floors of this former single-family residence, which is being converted into apartments. After meeting with the Architectural Committee in October, the applicant withdrew the previous options and has returned with a revised design. The new enclosure would be more solid than last time and would sit further from the building to preserve more of the roof fabric. One south facing dormer is proposed to be replaced with a similar but slightly larger dormer. The staff asks

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 OCTOBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

whether the amount of space and light that is being gained from the larger dormer justifies the removal of the original. The applicant also requests approval of a 48-inch high black metal fence with vertical pickets along Tulpehocken Street.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano reported that the current application is a revised version of the application reviewed at the Architectural Committee's last meeting. The revisions are based on the Committee's comments. He adjusted the position of the stair away from the building to allow for a first-floor walkway between the building and the stair tower, which permits the historic windows to remain unobstructed. He reduced the amount of glass area and substituted pebble dash stucco in place of some of the glass. He retained a portion of glass is a commercial glazing system. He displayed photographs of headroom clearance for his connection to the house. He proposed to reuse existing doorways at the second and third floors. He proposed to shift a wall of the connector to maintain the visibility of a corner of the dormer. He will proposed to widen a cut in roof about six inches to obtain the proper door and hallway widths. Ms. Gutterman pointed out a drawing inconsistency between Drawings A304 and A201. She also asked about roof materials for the connector. Mr. McCoubrey suggested it be a different material than the main roof. The Committee members objected to the roof slope on the stair tower and connection to the existing building. Mr. Cluver also asked about the design of the interior stair as well as door widths and the finish of the stair. He stated that he objected to EFIS, but would favor real stucco. Mr. McCoubrey complimented Mr. Montalbano for surgically adding this stair to the existing building. He asked whether there would be a spot for a bird's nest at the connection. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about constructability. Mr. McCoubrey asked about making the stair tower even more solid with punched openings. Mr. Cluver asked about the dormers. The Committee approved of the one new dormer, but not the demolition and reconstruction of the smaller dormer. Mr. Cluver also recommended making the walls of the dormer as small as possible, maximizing the window area.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the metal fence. Mr. Montalbano discussed the other fences on the block. The new fence will be a simple metal picket and the existing stairs will be moved back several feet, salvaging the existing materials. The Committee members suggested decorative caps on the metal posts.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided ornamental caps are added to the fence, the steps are salvaged and rebuilt in the new location; the stair connector including its roofing and cladding material is restudied; and a dormer can be constructed on the west side, but the dormer on the south is unmodified, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 321 S CAMAC ST

Proposal: Demolish rear wall and ell; construct addition; cut parking entrance in garden wall

Review Requested: Final Review

Owner: Catalina Gonzalez and Mark Galbraith

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop Inc.

History: 1829

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This row house faces onto Camac Street; at the rear is a garden with brick fence on Fawn Street. A series of early houses face onto Fawn Street, as well as some rears. This application proposes to remove the highly visible original rear wall of the house set back from but facing Fawn Street and replace it with a two-story addition and green roof. The proposed glass and wood faced addition would use an architectural vocabulary incompatible with the existing building. The brick fence wall at the rear of the property would be largely demolished and replaced with garage doors.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and owners Catalina Gonzalez and Mark Galbraith represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano explained that they are proposing to demolish the rear wall and ell and create a two-story addition. He said that they will be preserving the rear roof slope and dormers and the scale of the addition is consistent with other additions in the area. He said that the neighbor at 319 South Camac Street has an addition with roof deck that required an alteration to the rear roof line. He is also proposing to create a rear parking space by cutting an opening for a gate into the rear wall. His clients are proposing a green roof at the rear, something that not every applicant is willing to pay for, he explained. Ms. Gutterman asked about the approval of 319 South Camac Street. Mr. Baron said that, in his memory of that addition, the rear roof had already been modified and there had been substantial change to the rear. Mr. McCoubrey objected to the demolition of the rear wall of the house. He suggested that the plan would allow for the retention of that wall as well as saving the rear corbelled cornice and pole gutter. Mr. Cluver asked about the drainage. Mr. Montalbano said that he thought they could retain the gutter and cornice. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the chimneys. Mr. Montalbano said that they would retain and support the exterior chimneys. Mr. Cluver asked if the proposed removals should be considered a demolition in the legal sense. Mr. Baron said that it could be looked at that way, but the definition in the ordinance indicates that a demolition is the removal of the building in whole or significant part. Mr. Baron advised that the Committee can opine on that question. Mr. Baron said that he had encouraged constructing the addition as a new carriage house on Fawn Street, staying away from the original building. Mr. Cluver said he is sympathetic to an addition, but asserted that this addition is out of character with the building and neighborhood. Mr. Cluver asked about the front façade. It was noted that the windows are changing from the 6-over-9 sash to 6-over-6 sash and the detail of the BILCO doors appears incorrect. Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the windows are being replaced at all rather than repaired. He explained ways to do that and explained that repair is more "green" than throwing them in the landfill. He opposes the replacement of the windows. Mr. McCoubrey said that the

rear wall and cornice should not be removed. There is more latitude at the first-floor rear. Ms. Gutterman opposed the removal of the brick garden wall at the rear along Fawn, which she called a character-defining feature. She said that the addition should be redesigned. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he would recommend approval of the new gate at the rear garden wall.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the rear addition and gate, but approval of the front rehabilitation if it is historically accurate, with the staff to review the details.

ADDRESS: 2311 MADISON SQUARE

Proposal: Legalize windows, storm door, and door frame

Review Requested: Final Review

Owner: Rittenhouse Development Corporation

Applicant: William Baker, architect

History: 1872, Charles Leslie, developer

Individual Designation: 9/28/1971

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This property falls within a development of unusual row houses on one of two garden blocks. All of the properties on these blocks are individually designated. The application proposes to legalize inappropriate windows and a door frame on the front façade of this historic building. The applicant applied to the Historical Commission and received a permit to renovate the interior and install one window on the rear façade of this house. The permit approval specified that there would be no work to the front façade. The developer then removed the front windows and installed aluminum-clad square-head windows into the arch-head openings. Square aluminum panning was installed in place of the original ogee molding at the window frames. Alerted by concerned neighbors, the Commission had a violation issued. The staff met with the developer to discuss the correct windows and the appeal process. Several weeks later, again without a permit, the developer had the original ogee front door frame removed and replaced with square stock. He also installed a new storm door. The marble was painted blue grey and the bricks were repaired with grey cement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect George Baker represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed some additional photographs of correct windows on the block and the correct rope molding for the doorway. He said that the flat stock that the owner had installed around the door has now had moldings applied to it; however, it still does not match the original. Mr. Baron stated that perhaps the storm door could be approved because it is full-glass door; he noted that the frame is not appropriate. Ms. Gutterman asked which pieces of marble had been painted. She was told that the marble on the watertable has been painted blue and the marble lintels and sill appear to have been painted white. Mr. Baker said that the owner has contacted a window company and has been given a price of \$2,000 per window for the correct replacement.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 OCTOBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. Baron explained that the building had its correct frames but replacement sash before the recent work was completed. Unfortunately, the owner replaced the frames as well. Mr. Baker explained that there are many unfortunate alterations on these two blocks. Mr. Baker stated that the door is original. Mr. Baron disagreed, stating that the door is not correct. He noted, however, that the door is not part of this application. The frame was replaced recently with incorrect moldings.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

ADDRESS: 1631 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Legalize demolition of rear additions and construction of rear addition; construct front window well

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael Lopsoski

Applicant: Shae Nicole Morong, Plato Studio

History: 1887; Furness, Evans & Co., Architects

Individual Designation: 3/7/1974

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Contributing, 1/29/1986

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the removal of rear additions and construction of a rear addition, which was completed without a building permit, and to cut a window well at the front of the building to allow for a means of egress from a proposed basement bedroom. The rear of the building is visible from Westmont Street, which is considered a service alley on this block. The new addition is three stories in height, and includes windows at each floor in the existing conditions photograph, but not in the architectural drawing. The proposed window well at the front involves the cutting-down of the only basement window, despite the drawings stating that there are no exterior modifications on the front elevation. Additionally, the staff notes that the front elevation drawing does not accurately depict the existing conditions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Ms. Chantry explained, in the absence of an applicant, that the staff first received the application as a walk-in to the office, requesting approval for a new rear addition. Ms. Chantry asked the applicant to provide photographs of the rear of the property, so that the staff could understand what would be lost in terms of historic fabric. The applicant returned the following day with photographs showing that the rear had already been demolished, and a new rear addition was nearly complete. Ms. Chantry noted that violations for work without a permit, and a stop-work order, had been issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. This application was in response to those violations, and the architect was presumably brought in after the construction work was done so that an approval and permit could be obtained. The staff additionally noted that the drawings showed a proposed window well at the front façade, despite the drawings

stating that there are to be no exterior modifications to the front facade. Ms. Gutterman opined that the Committee should not recommend approval of something that is in violation, and she does not know if it would be approved if it had been applied for before work was done, as the addition is very large and visible. She opined that the Committee may have considered the basement window well. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the drawings are inaccurate. Ms. Chantry commented that the staff was more concerned about the window well as compared to the rear addition, since Westmont Street at the rear is a service alley, and it does not appear that any window wells have been inserted on the front elevations of this row. Mr. McCoubrey noted that there are other window wells at the rear and side of the property.

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

ADDRESS: 2016 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Demolish rear roof and dormer; construct addition and rear deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2016 Locust Street LLC

Applicant: Richard Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1845; refaced c. 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear slope and dormer of the main block of this building, and to construct an addition with a flat roof. The addition would extend from just below the ridgeline of the gable roof and across a portion of the building that spans between the original house and a later three-story addition. The addition would be clad in fiber cement panels and wood decking material and would open out onto a new deck. New windows would be installed in the existing rear window openings, but the application does not specify the material of these windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Villa represented the application.

Mr. Villa commented that they are proposing to remove the rear roof slope and dormer of the building, which is currently a three-unit building with a commercial first-floor unit. He noted that the building is looking to be converted into all residential. The rear of the building, he explained, currently has some vinyl siding and brick, and they are proposing to replace the vinyl siding with fiber cement clapboards, and to replace the windows with whatever is acceptable to the Historical Commission. He opined that the proposed addition and deck would not be visible from Latimer Street. He noted that there would be no work to the front elevation. The majority of the rear of the building, he explained, has been altered, except for the rear slope of the roof. Mr. McCoubrey asked if there is any portion of the original rear wall remaining. Mr. Villa responded that there is a small portion at the third floor where there is an existing well, but the bricks are not sitting on anything.

Ms. Gutterman asked why the staff recommended denial of the application, even if the proposed alteration is not visible. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff believes that the gabled roof is a character-defining feature of the building, and has not determined on site that the rear is not visible. Mr. Villa offered to use the roof beams as decorative pieces inside the building. He noted that the dormer is not in great shape, and if they were going to replace it, they would replace it in kind. Mr. Villa explained that part of the reason for their request is that there is no insulation in the roof and it is not a very usable space. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that sometimes that is a good thing, because over-insulated buildings can have issues with moisture buildup.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the reason for the alteration is to get an extra bedroom on the third floor and a deck. Mr. Villa responded affirmatively, noting that the deck is allowed by the zoning, and they wanted to put it up there to make a nicer unit. He noted that they would be amenable to moving back the deck railing and even moving back the addition's overhang, which is there for to shade the sun.

Ms. Gutterman asked where the mechanical equipment would be located. Mr. Villa responded that it would be located on the new addition's roof. Ms. Gutterman replied that that location makes it potentially more visible, and that the applicants should be careful with sightlines. She opined that the submission does not include any photographs of the neighboring properties. Mr. Villa responded that the center photograph shows the neighboring properties. He noted that the building to the right is lower than this building, and the buildings to the left are taller. He explained that Latimer Street is a 12-foot-wide street. He offered to place the mechanical units in an inconspicuous location.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the demolition section drawing accurately depicts the existing conditions, which appear to be a full three-story structure that exists. Mr. Villa responded that there is a light well that is a few feet wide on the west side, and there is currently a mechanical unit in that light well.

Mr. Cluver noted that there is an interior proposal for a furred out front wall with insulation added. He cautioned the applicant against adding insulation because of the potential impact of trapping moisture and altering the freeze/thaw cycle patterns. It changes the dew point in the wall and can potentially damage the masonry. Mr. Villa responded that he does historic preservation work in brick-front houses in Baltimore, and the National Park Service has allowed them to do tax credit rehabilitations using flat-frame walls with R5 one-inch rigid insulation. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that Mr. Villa should provide details and noted that there needs to be air space in the walls. Mr. Cluver replied that the drawings show inappropriate insulation. Mr. Villa responded that he did not know that the insulation would be a point of contention at this meeting. Mr. Cluver noted that the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the interior, but it is work on the interior that could have an impact on the exterior.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the larger issue is not of the visibility of the proposed addition, but the demolition of a character-defining feature of the rear roof slope and dormer of the house. He noted that the gain of one bedroom in a building that is quite large does not seem worth the loss. Mr. McCoubrey also opined that the deck should be pulled back to be minimally visible from Latimer Street. Mr. Villa responded that if they were not allowed to build the addition, they would not build the deck because there would be no way to access it. Mr. McCoubrey replied that there could be an alternative way to access a deck. Mr. Villa reiterated that they probably would not build the deck if they could not build the addition, and would not make the dormer into

a door. Mr. Villa commented that he is aware that they are proposing to remove a character-defining feature, but that it is not visible, and is not the only character-defining feature left on the building.

Mr. Cluver noted that, in looking at the zoning site plan and an aerial image, it seems that the addition may be highly visible from Latimer Street. Ms. DiPasquale commented that Latimer is a fairly narrow street. Mr. Villa noted that the public portion of Latimer Street ends just past the property.

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

Mr. Cluver reiterated his position on the interior insulation. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, opining that applicants should provide details on the types of insulation to be used in the permitting process. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over interior work. Mr. D'Alessandro replied that insulation can impact the exterior of the building. Mr. Villa noted that they would not be able to meet their REScheck with the types of insulation proposed by the Committee members and would not be able to get their building permit. Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Villa to explain. Mr. Villa explained that REScheck is the State's minimum R-value for exterior walls. If they do a flat-frame with R-5 or R-10, they do not meet the standards and get an approval from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that then they would need additional air space. Mr. Villa replied that then they would need a full-frame wall and their window sills would become very deep. Mr. Cluver asked if there is an avenue through the existing building code to avoid the REScheck issue. Mr. Villa responded that REScheck is required for any portion of the square footage that is being worked on. Ms. DiPasquale noted that there is also a record for this building that the front elevation was reclad in the 1960s.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 2401 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Demolish rear dormer; construct shed dormer; relocate mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Debra Jensen and Stephen R. Kurens

Applicant: Kevin Yoder, K Yoder Design

History: 1830

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish an existing rear dormer and to construct a new triple-width dormer on this highly-visible corner property. The application offers to alternatives. Scheme A includes creating a triple-wide dormer with a shed roof. Scheme B includes retaining a more prominent gabled dormer in the center, flanked by slightly recessed projections. An insurance survey from 1831, just after the building was constructed, notes that the house features "Two arch head dormer windows, 12 lights each, glass 8 x 10 inches." Although the original dormer window at the rear has been extended and cut down to create a door, it generally retains its original width and height, aligning with the front dormer. Sometime

between 2014 and 2016, the front dormer was capped, without Historical Commission approval, to give it a gabled appearance, rather than the original arch. The purpose of the alteration is to conceal a condensing unit and provide additional roof space for interior HVAC equipment that is being relocated to the third floor of the building.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kevin Yoder represented the application.

Mr. Yoder explained that he had not been aware when he first met with Ms. DiPasquale that both dormers were originally arched. Ms. DiPasquale apologized, noting that the insurance survey had been incorrectly filed in the Historical Commission's archive. Mr. Yoder explained that the reason for the proposal is to relocate an interior HVAC unit from the second to third floor. He noted that the HVAC unit and the washer and dryer in locations that are in the way of an interior redesign to open up the second floor and make the house more usable. He offered to distribute interior floor plans to the Committee members. He explained that his initial plan was to make the dormer look nicer and more symmetric as in Scheme A. He noted that Scheme B in the renderings proposes to retain the dormer as a gabled dormer, and have the other elements read as separate features. He offered to make the center dormer roof arched. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the change that is occurring on the outside is the addition of a storage room and a wall to hide the condensing unit. Mr. Yoder responded affirmatively, but noted that the larger issue is the space that it creates inside for the HVAC unit. He directed the Committee's attention to a 3D rendering that shows the interior volume for the HVAC unit and how that impacts the roof. He noted that he met with the HVAC engineer to see if there was a different way to configure the equipment, but opined that there is not. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the application also proposing to move the condensing unit to the other side of the dormer. Mr. Yoder responded affirmatively, explaining that the condenser is less of an issue than the interior HVAC unit. He noted that they could potentially move the condenser down to the ground level. Mr. Yoder presented a conceptual model showing the minimum bump out required on the roof for the unit to be in the desired interior location. Ms. Gutterman responded that it could move further into the room. Mr. Yoder replied that moving it further into the room would place it in front of a window. Ms. Gutterman opined that the visibility of the change and the change to the roof slope is radical and not acceptable. She noted that, no matter the degree to which they try to show that there is one center dormer and two less prominent dormers, the proposal still looks like a wall, and alters the understanding of the prominent roofline. She opined that there has to be somewhere else on the interior that the mechanical equipment can be located. Ms. Gutterman also asked if there needs to be some sort of louver for the equipment, and questioned how the unit will exhaust or get fresh air. Mr. Yoder responded that it currently takes air from around itself. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the condensing unit would need plenty of fresh air. Mr. Yoder responded that wherever the condenser would be placed, it would be open on three sides. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that it is a huge change to just move a condenser. Mr. McCoubrey suggested moving the HVAC unit to the other side of the dormer on the interior, acknowledging that there is a well by the stairs. Ms. Gutterman asked why there is a need to move the unit from the second floor. Mr. Yoder responded that they would like to open up the second floor, and the unit is currently in the center of the second floor, directly below the proposed location. Ms. Gutterman noted that, without a second-floor plan, it is hard to know if there are other options. Mr. Yoder offered to distribute a second-floor plan. Ms. Gutterman noted that it was not part of the submission.

Mr. McCoubrey reiterated that it is a highly visible alteration, and that it would be difficult to recommend approve of such a change to a unique gable end, which would alter the relationship of the roof and dormer. He suggested that the applicants find a way to make the equipment fit on the inside without impacting the exterior. Mr. Yoder asked what alterations they could make to the dormer to improve upon it. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant work with the staff on the details for restoring and improving the dormer. Mr. Yoder noted that Ms. DiPasquale had told him that she felt this was a large intrusion, but asked whether it would be acceptable to build a small, shingled bump-out. Ms. Gutterman responded negatively, noting that the bump out would be too visible on the street side of the dormer. She opined that a similar proposal on the other side of the dormer might be less conspicuous from the public right-of-way, but noted that the Committee would need to see that proposal before determining whether it was actually acceptable. She noted that there is a skylight that is not shown on the renderings. Mr. Yoder responded that the existing skylight would not interfere with the change if they were to move the unit to the other side of the dormer. Ms. Gutterman opined that anything between the dormer and the edge of the building would be too visible and would not be acceptable. Mr. McCoubrey commented that if they moved the unit to the other side of the dormer, there would be more latitude on the interior and could avoid impacting the roof at all. Ms. Gutterman reiterated her question about needing air intake ductwork.

Mr. McCoubrey thanked Mr. Yoder for his diligence in looking at multiple dormer options, but reiterated that this is too drastic a change. Mr. Yoder responded that he was looking for a way to improve the dormer. Mr. Yoder asked what his options are moving forward. Ms. DiPasquale explained that he could move forward with the application as-is to the full Historical Commission, could revise between the Committee and Commission meetings, or could withdraw the application, or submit a revised application in the future. Mr. Cluver opined that any alteration between the dormer and the street would not be acceptable. Ms. Gutterman agreed and noted that the Committee needs to act on the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ADDRESS: 4044, 4046, 4048, AND 4050 MAIN ST

Proposal: Demolish buildings; retain façades; construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 4044 and 4046 Main St, Allegheny Distribution & Delivery

4048 Main St, 4048 Main LP

4050 Main St, Gary and Susan Gevurtz

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch

History: 4044, 4046, and 4048 Main St, 1860

4050 Main St, 1850, Roxborough Mills/Fidelity Machine Works/Wilson ChildsWagon Works

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish most of the three rowhouses at 4044, 4046, and 4048 Main Street, leaving only a portion of the side façade of 4044 Main Street and the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 OCTOBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

front facades of the three rowhouses intact. The historic Wagon Works buildings would be retained, though most of the adjacent structure behind would be demolished. It proposes to convert the remaining sections of the structures into a mixed-used residential and commercial building with indoor parking. The proposed multi-story addition would be set back approximately 42-feet from Main Street, with another significant setback from the Shurs Lane façade. The new building would total four stories in height, and would be clad in red brick. The material of the addition's windows is not identified, and the application proposes to retain the existing vinyl windows at the rowhouses or to replace them in kind and to install aluminum coping around the frames. Two second-story window openings on the mill building would be converted to doors and Juliet balconies would be installed. A garage door would be inserted at the first floor of 4048 Main Street to allow access to interior parking. The rear elevation, which faces the Schuylkill River, would feature balconies within the proposed addition, and several new openings would be punched through the existing second-story façade of the mill building.

The staff contends that this application proposes a demolition, the destruction of a building in whole or in significant part, and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments, but such an argument might be formulated, owing to numerous violations as well as problems associated with redeveloping properties in the flood plain. If an argument is made and the project is considered, the front facades should be faithfully restored and the additions should be clad and fenestrated in ways that are compatible with the historic mill building. For example, stucco and stone would be more appropriate than brick for cladding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, unless the applicant can demonstrate that no feasible reuse is possible or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Henry Clinton and architects Rustin Ohler and Jeff Watson represented the application.

Ms. Keller explained that the Committee had reviewed a similar application for the property the previous month, but that the applicant withdrew the application prior to the Historical Commission meeting.

Mr. Clinton stated that he had appeared before the Committee at its 26 September 2017 meeting, but that the presentation did not go as well as he had hoped. He explained that, following the review, he met with the staff and retained an engineer to inspect the condition of the three rowhouses. He displayed a board with a large aerial photograph of the site to show the Committee members. In the previous iteration of the application, he continued, he showed plans to completely demolish 4048 Main Street in order to install a drive aisle. Now, he added, he is proposing to retain the top two stories of the façade and to install a garage door at the first story. He described other changes, including pushing the apartment addition further to the rear of the building, which reduced the number of apartments from 42 to 37. Mr. Clinton provided the Committee members and staff with an engineer's report on the three rowhouses.

Mr. Ohler reiterated Mr. Henry's comment that the previous application proposed a complete demolition of 4048 Main Street and noted that the application has changed to retain the façade,

though the first story would be altered to allow for a garage door opening. He explained that one revision includes moving the addition off the original portion of the 1850 mill building and bringing it over approximately 30 feet to make it less visible when viewing the building from the Shurs Lane side. He described a similar revision to the rowhouses, noting that the addition will be pushed back from the Main Street façade and will be set behind the original roof structures, though the roofs will be replaced. He asserted that the entire building is in the floodplain, though the mill building sits much higher than the three adjacent rowhouses. The mill building, he continued, has flooded twice since 1983. He contended that the rowhouses are in such poor condition, because they have experienced flooding approximately twice a year for 20 years, with even more frequency recently. Mr. Ohler claimed that 4044 and 4048 Main Street are imminently dangerous and have notices posted from the City of Philadelphia. He asserted that Mr. Clinton has permission from the Department of Licenses & Inspections to stay the demolition in order to complete the Historical Commission process, to allow the developer the opportunity to maintain the facades. He argued that 4046 Main Street, which does not currently have violations for structural issues, would receive similar status as the adjacent rowhouses, should the two be demolished. He clarified that complete demolition is not his or the owner's intention. He noted that the staff recommendation stated that the rear portion of the existing mill building is to be demolished, but argued that he intends to keep the first and second stories intact, as well as the rear existing windows. He stated that the proposal requires the removal of the roof where the addition will be constructed, but that the mass of the building would remain intact in terms of floors and fenestration.

Ms. Keller clarified that the staff considered it be demolition in the legal sense, owing to the amount of demolition required to construct the addition, despite the retention of the facades. Mr. Ohler argued that the building is currently open inside and that all exterior and structural bearing walls would remain, as well as interior masonry and fenestration. He contended that only the roof would be removed and that, in his opinion, there would be no demolition to the mill buildings themselves and only demolition behind the three rowhouses.

Ms. Gutterman requested clarification regarding the amount of demolition to the three rowhouses, and whether the intention is to demolish all but the exterior wall. Mr. Ohler affirmed, adding that the front facades and the side wall facing 4042 Main Street would remain. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the entire structure with the exception of the exterior, meaning one front wall and one side wall, would be demolished. Mr. Ohler affirmed. Mr. Cluver asked whether the roof shape will be retained. Mr. Ohler answered that the roof shape would be rebuilt in kind to retain the eave and slope and that the addition is proposed to be set back from behind the original A-frame roof portion.

Mr. Cluver observed that the second-story plans show occupied space. He asked for clarification on the floor level relationship to the rowhouse windows. Mr. Ohler responded that the second story of the mill building would continue across to the third story of the rowhouses, so the front third-story windows would be apartments, while the first and second-story windows would be located at the parking garage. The garage, he continued, would be a double-height parking garage with a mechanical parking system that elevates cars above ground to accommodate the parking needs of the neighborhood and community group and to address the zoning requirements. The garage's steel structure, he added, would help support the facades that would be retained. Mr. Cluver asked whether the windows at the first and second stories of the rowhouses would be blocked out or left open. He opined that he would not want to see cars

parked at the interior and questioned whether they should have a blind behind the windows. Ms. Gutterman stated that staff can review the detail.

Mr. Cluver inquired about how much of the façade at the 4042 Main Street side would be retained, observing that it appears only to continue as far back as the accessible spaces within the garage. He then questioned whether the accessible spaces will also have the stacking system. Mr. Ohler replied that those spaces would not stack and that there would be a steel structure installed. Mr. Cluver then confirmed that the stacking system begins after the historic façade terminates.

In reviewing the first-floor plan, Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the intent is to maintain the windows and doors of the rowhouses. Mr. Ohler referred the Committee to the façade renderings, explaining that they would maintain the fenestration, although the doors would be sealed and would become inoperable, they would exist from the exterior. Ms. Gutterman inquired whether something would be placed in the window opening besides glass and whether ventilation would be required, since it will function as a garage. Mr. Ohler stated that the garage would be open at the rear and at the side between the two buildings. He also indicated that some internal mechanical ventilation would be installed and that real windows could be included at the historic facades.

Mr. Cluver questioned the floor levels relative to the window heights, adding that in looking at the window sills of the mill building compared to those of the rowhouses, he sees a sizeable discrepancy. He asked whether there would be window sills 4.5 feet off the floor at the interior. Mr. Watson replied that the floor elevations change at the interior and that stairs would be incorporated to account for the floor level changes.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the addition's 3-foot 6-inch parapet that is proposed in addition to the spandrel panel above the upper-story windows. He questioned whether those elements could be reduced in height and why spandrel panels were proposed above the windows. He also questioned why the design lacks a more typical relationship between the window tops and the top of the building.

Returning to a topic that had already been addressed, Mr. Baron interjected that there is a public interest argument for the proposed demolition, adding that the larger question is the addition's design. He stated that he recommended that the applicant consider a stone and stucco veneer, and the concern was how to apply stone to stick construction. Mr. Baron then referred the Committee members to a photograph in the application that shows a new building on Belmont Avenue that includes a gray stone veneer and stucco. He explained that he intended to show that the combination is possible and added that using gray stone to mill additions is more traditional in Manayunk. He noted that the rear portion of this particular mill building is a 1958 addition. He advocated for injecting more character of a traditional mill addition into the building and referred to the current design as looking like a motel. He asserted that, by incorporating stone, it would make the addition more appropriate to the building. He then recommended that the design include a low gable roof without the parapet. He noted that the rest of the building is stucco and stone. Mr. Baron then returned his focus to the public interest argument for demolition, stating that there were four additional rowhouses within the row, all of which were demolished without the Historical Commission's approval, because of the Department of Licenses & Inspections' concern over public safety. He explained that water enters the buildings and washes the clay from the foundations. In this particular case, he

continued, installing a concrete structure behind these walls may in fact be the only intervention that will save the three rowhouses and maintain the character of Main Street. Under normal circumstances, he added, the Commission would not advocate for so much demolition; however, in terms of maintaining the streetscape, he reiterated that this proposal may be the way to prevent complete loss.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission would be the bodies that determine whether the application warrants demolition in the public interest. Mr. Baron replied that the Commission would ultimately rule on the matter, and again argued that the history with this row shows that one after the other has been lost. Zoning in this area, he added, restricts residential use, so some plan, such as the current application, that retains the residential buildings is useful, since retention is made difficult by the City's regulations.

Mr. Baron then commented that the vinyl windows on the rowhouses should not be replaced with vinyl windows. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.

Ms. Gutterman requested clarification on note 22 of the drawings. Mr. Ohler answered that the note reflects the existing gap between the two buildings. Ms. Gutterman asked about the gray area behind the façade and the doors. Mr. Ohler replied that the doors allow entry to the garage. Ms. Gutterman asked how the gate operates and whether there would be a transom. Mr. Ohler responded that a swing gate is proposed and that the door system would include a transom, adding that each door is 8 feet tall.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Baron if there is a precedent for Juliet balconies on mill buildings. Mr. Baron replied that the balcony is shown wider than the opening, which is problematic. He then stated that the openings once contained hayloft doors where deliveries could be made. He suggested a simple vertical picket safety railing rather than the wider railing shown. Mr. Ohler responded that the railings on the historic mill building do not protrude and are simple black painted metal railings offered for safety so the doors could function. He clarified that the balconies of the addition project three feet. Ms. Gutterman observed that there is a shadow line on one of the mill balconies that makes the balcony appear to project. Mr. Ohler explained that the head of the existing garage door extends behind the awning and appears as a shadow line above that line.

Mr. Cluver stated that note 34 calls for new aluminum-clad windows and asked where those windows are located. Mr. Ohler responded that the aluminum-clad windows are proposed for the rear elevation, explaining that there is an existing asphalt-shingle shed dormer that was built over the one-story section as a later addition. He added that there are existing masonry openings in that wall and that he is proposing to infill those rear openings with the slider windows shown in elevation. He noted that he could not find a historic photograph and was not sure what the configuration would have been. Mr. Cluver countered that they were likely not muntinless sliders. Mr. Ohler replied that he is open to suggestions on the window type. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he believed the lower windows are of a more industrial scale and consist of large, punched openings. Mr. Ohler asked whether Mr. McCoubrey is referring to the way in which the brick coursing and panels are configured in the addition. Mr. McCoubrey confirmed that those features are issues, adding that Mr. Ohler could remove the paneling and bring the eave down. He contended that there appears to be almost a fourth story between the head of the window and top of the parapet. Mr. Ohler responded that there is approximately 3.5-feet for roof trusses and pitch concealed, which is partly behind the spandrel panels. He added that he

could consider reducing the height.

Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. Baron's previous comment about reconsidering the roof shape, so it appears more as a mill building. She then asked the applicant to consider stucco and stone. Mr. McCoubrey disagreed with Mr. Baron and asserted that brick mill buildings exist in Manayunk, including one across the street from this property. Ms. Gutterman agreed, but noted that she finds the incorporation of the metal panels to be problematic. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he personally does not object to the use of brick and the way the material is differentiated from the stone. He then expressed concern over the use of stone that appears as a glued on veneer. Mr. Watson commented that the first iteration of the design exclusively featured panels.

Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Baron's argument that this application makes a public interest argument to justify the demolition.

Mr. Cluver commented that he likes the articulation in the addition and asked how the window above the gate correlates to the plan. Mr. Watson and Mr. Ohler answered that the window is in the stair tower. Mr. Cluver inquired whether the stair tower is part brick and part metal panel, and whether the other inset area is for the elevator. Mr. Ohler affirmed.

Mr. Baron remarked that, on the river side, it seems that the brick is cantilevered over the lower story. Mr. Ohler responded that it projects the entire width of the one-story section, clarifying that the upper portion is not cantilevered and is supported by steel posts. Mr. Baron asked if the area functions as roof decks. Mr. Ohler replied that it is identified as a roof deck on the drawing, but that it is only a roof and not a roof deck.

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

Mr. Baron stated that the bracing of the facades is very important in order to prevent the owner from having to rebuild them to appear old. He argued that the existing facades should be retained. Ms. Gutterman agreed, stating that this is a "facademy," which implies a bracing of the existing facades and not a demolition and reconstruction of them. She added that, in addition to maintaining, bracing, and supporting the facades, any required repairs will need to be made following construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Historical Commission find that the selective demolition is necessary in the public interest and approve the application, with the staff to review details, provided:

- the facades of the rowhouses are braced, retained, and reused, not demolished and reconstructed;
- the rooflines, windows, and doors of the rowhouses are restored to their original appearances;
- the balconies on the mill building have a simple metal rail and no projection;
- the metal panels above the addition's windows are removed and the window openings are punched openings;
- the addition has a sloped roof and its height is reduced;
- the windows in the historic buildings are wood, those in the addition are aluminum, the second-story windows in the existing rear building have a historic industrial appearance, and no vinyl windows are used in the project; and,
- real stucco, not EIFS, is used.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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.

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

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.