

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

**22 JANUARY 2008
CITY HALL, ROOM 578
9:30 A.M.**

PRESENT

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Herb Levy, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Edward Fink, Architectonic Design
Gary Vernick
William Stange, PREIT
Phil Yocum, JMA
Brad Ehnert
David Peppard
Lynn Blausch
Daniel Promislo
George Claflen, Claflen Associates
Stephanie Saile, Claflen Associates
Gary Knappick, City of Philadelphia, CPO
David Villela, City of Philadelphia, CPO
Joseph Pooler
Anthony Miskitz
Laurits Schloss, Gardner-Fox Associates
Peter Lazor, Lazor Design
Mike Kershaw
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Cory Ritter, Russell Roofing
Lorrin Thomas
Daniel Mann
Alexander Rice, Gardner-Fox Associates
Eric Matzkin

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rivera called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Mr. Levy joined him. Ms. Pentz later joined the meeting.

215 VINE STREET

Owner: Gary and Kim Vernick

Applicant: Elaine DelDuca

History: vacant lot subdivided from 217 Vine Street

215-217 Vine Street classified as contributing to the Old City Historic District

Project: Construct single family dwelling

OVERVIEW: The property owner submitted an application in November 2007 proposing the construction of a four-story, single-family dwelling at the corner of N. American and Vine Streets. This application proposed a contemporary building with wide bay windows at the second, third, and fourth stories on the Vine and American Street facades, a recessed balcony at the fourth story on the east façade, and a garage with curb cut on the east side. In December 2007, the Commission approved in concept a four-story building with a bay window on the American Street façade that does not extend above the fourth-floor ceiling height, but no bay on the Vine Street façade.

The applicant now returns with a revised proposal for final approval. The redesign is contemporary, but includes some design elements suggested by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. On the Vine Street façade, the bay has been eliminated. The casements, stone lintels and sills, coursing, and typon cornice have been proposed to correspond with the adjoining historic structure. A dormer is proposed at the fourth story. On the American Street façade, the bay window terminates beneath the fourth-floor ceiling height. The windows in the bay are also casements with muntins. The coursing on the south façade continues at the east façade. Stone steps are proposed for each entrance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell explained that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. She asked if the applicants or any member of the public objected to proceeding without quorum. No one objected. Liz Blazeovich of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia requested that the minute clearly reflect that a quorum was not present.

Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. Property owner Gary Vernick and architect Edward Fink represented the application.

Mr. Rivera reminded the applicants that the Commission had stipulated that the bay on the east façade should not extend above the height of the fourth-floor ceiling. He noted that the current plans show that the bay roofline follows the main roofline, which is above the limit set by the Commission. Mr. Fink agreed that that is true. Mr. Rivera asserted that the bay should have its own roof, separate from the main roof. He added that it will be almost impossible to frame the bay roof as it is currently designed. Mr. Fink stated that his client wanted the ceiling of the bay to be as high as that of the rest of the room. He explained that the house was designed from the inside out; he reported that "the tail is wagging the dog."

Mr. Rivera stated that the parapet separating the house from the neighbor to the west was much too tall. Mr. Fink stated that the building code requires that it is 30 inches above the roof. Mr. Rivera stated that it can be much shorter in certain situations. Mr. Fink agreed and noted that it was dependent on the type of fireproofing in the interior. Mr. Rivera asserted that it is unnecessarily tall. He suggested that the applicants revise the roof of the bay and the fire-separation parapet.

NO-QUORUM RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval.

801-823 MARKET STREET

Owner: PREIT Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust

Applicant: Philip Yocum

History: 1929; designated 6/9/2006

Project: Replace glass, restore windows, add louvers, remove non-historic addition, clean masonry

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace existing opaque wire glass in the second through sixth-story windows with clear glass to match the existing glass in the seventh through thirteenth-story windows.

On the sixth-story balcony at the southeast corner, the applicant proposes to demolish a non-historic one-room addition, open and restore two in-filled window openings, and install two metal windows to match the historic window design. The addition is concealed behind a parapet and not visible from the public right-of-way.

The applicant proposes to restore windows marked "A," "B," "C," "F," and "G" on the north, south, and east facades to match the existing historic window. The applicant also proposes to remove window sashes and install louvers within existing window frames at locations marked "D" and extend existing half-louvers to full window louvers at all locations marked "E" on the north, south, and east facades. (See plans A911 and A912).

Masonry cleaning is also proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the glass replacement, demolition of the non-historic one-room addition on the sixth-story balcony, window restoration, and masonry cleaning, pursuant to Standard 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9. Denial of the louver installation, pursuant to Standard 2, 5, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell explained that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. She asked if the applicants or any member of the public objected to proceeding without quorum. No one objected. Liz Blazeovich of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia requested that the minute clearly reflect that a quorum was not present.

Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Philip Yocum and owner's representative Bill Stanger represented the application.

Mr. Yocum explained that the new ownership proposes to retain the first three floors as retail space and convert floors four, five, and six to office space. He stated that they are installing new HVAC equipment as part of the conversion. He explained that the existing louvers are not original; they were added as needed over the years. They need more air intake for the new systems and therefore would like to add more louvers; they also propose to remove some louvers. They propose to add 18 louvers and remove 13, for an increase of five louvers. They need to add the louvers because they cannot run duct work to the roof. The upper floors are under separate ownership. Mr. Yocum stated that he would reuse the historic sash removed to make way for the louvers to restore other windows throughout the building. He would not remove the window frames to install the louvers, but would maintain the frames in place. He

noted that he is proposing to regularize the louver pattern on the building. He concluded that the louver installation would be completely reversible.

Mr. Rivera and Mr. Levy both expressed concerns about the installation of louvers in the Market and 8th Street façades. Mr. Levy stated that he was especially opposed to the louvers at the second-floor level. Mr. Yocum stated that the proposed design was the best option given the lack of accessibility to the upper floors and the code restrictions related to the use of the open stair tower. The applicants also noted that the HVAC system is a floor-by-floor system that does not allow for bringing air in at one floor and exhausting it at another. Mr. Baron asked the applicants if they could leave the window frames and sash in place, remove the glass from the sash, and place the louvers behind the sash. Mr. Rivera agreed that this would be a good solution. Mr. Yocum stated that he could explore this solution.

Ms. Blazeovich stated that the Preservation Alliance was concerned about the removal of the historic Strawbridge & Clothier signage without the Historical Commission's review. Mr. Stanger answered that the signage had been removed by the previous owner and that the current owners had tried to locate the removed signs without success. He stated that he would consult with the Preservation Alliance about the missing signage and then submit an application to the Commission regarding the missing signage as well as new signage.

NO-QUORUM RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the louvers proposed for the Market and 8th Street façades are painted black and set behind unglazed sash.

1515 NORTH STREET

Owner: David Peppard

Applicant: David Peppard

History: c. 1875; contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize demolition of rear one-story addition; replace doors and windows; stucco rear façade; clean front façade.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes restoration to the front façade with installation of two-over-two windows on the first, second, and third stories and a four-panel door as well as masonry cleaning. The plans are not adequately annotated and no shop drawings or specs have been submitted for review.

The applicant proposes to legalize the removal of a rear one-story shed, exposing an interior wall. The building was constructed in 1875 and Bromley's 1910 Atlas indicates the existence of a rear one-story shed. Photographs submitted by the applicant show the shed covered in clapboard siding prior to demolition.

In the rear, the applicant proposes to stucco the entire façade, install doors and a six-light window at the first story and six-over-six windows in all other window openings. No shop drawings have been submitted for review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell explained that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. She asked if the applicants or any member of the public objected to proceeding without quorum. No one

objected. Liz Blazeovich of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia requested that the minute clearly reflect that a quorum was not present.

Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. David Peppard and Bradley Ehnert represented the application.

Mr. Ehnert presented supplemental information to the Committee members. The applicants stated that they would install two-over-two true-divided-light windows at the front and six-over-six simulated-divided-light windows at the rear. The basement windows will be three-light true-divided-light windows. The windows will be sash kits, the frames will be retained. The cornice will be refinished. The brick will be cleaned, with the staff to review cleaning specifications and samples. The new railing would install in a mortar joint and into the sidewalk. Mr. Ehnert explained that the new door would be a single-leaf door that would look like a double-leaf door. Mr. Levy asked about the sliding window in the plans. Mr. Baron and the applicants corrected him, stating that the drawing depicted a section through the two-over-two window, not a sliding window. Mr. Baron suggested to the Committee members that the staff should review the details of the windows and door because he had just received the details and had not had time to review them closely. He stated that the original door may have been a single- or double-leaf door. The Committee members agreed.

Mr. Levy stated that he considered the demolition and stuccoing at the rear to be appropriate.

NO-QUORUM RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review the details.

713 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Barbara Caine

Applicant: Daniel Promislo

History: 1799-1801 by Benjamin Latrobe; individually designated 4/30/1957; significant to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of an aluminum awning sign on the front façade. The awning covers the original historic fanlight and door moldings.

This application also proposes to legalize, a temporary hanging sign on the first-story façade, a wooden box addition with five metal figurines on an existing brick planter, and a circular lighting fixture mounted adjacent to the doorway.

This application proposes the installation of a flat aluminum sign to be mounted between the first-story windows and new metal numbers mounted to the masonry indicating the address.

The staff suggests the installation of a hanging blade sign mounted to mortar joints instead of a flat the sign.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the planter and street numbers using existing holes in mortar joints, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of awning, flat aluminum sign, and lighting fixture pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell explained that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. She asked if the applicants or any member of the public objected to proceeding without quorum. No one objected. Liz Blazeovich of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia requested that the minute clearly reflect that a quorum was not present.

Ms. Sell presented the application. Daniel Promislo, who rents space in the building for his retail establishment, represented the application.

Mr. Promislo stated that the circular sign between the two windows is temporary, but would be replaced with a permanent sign. The new permanent sign would be larger. It would stand off the wall to avoid allowing water to collect behind it. He stated that he had appeared before the Art Commission, which approved of the sign. He stated that he planned to change the street numbers on the building to make them "more contemporary and appealing." He stated that the alterations proposed have already been implemented; he added the awning, light fixture, flower boxes, and signage and removed an illuminated signage and older flower boxes.

Mr. Rivera stated that a projecting sign would be more appropriate than the circular sign flat against the building.

Mr. Baron stated that this building is part of a very old and historically significant row. It had retained most of its historic features. He stated that the original leaded fan light, which is clearly visible in designation photographs, has been removed. Mr. Promislo replied that he had not removed the fan light. Excepting the awning, the doorway has not been changed since he rented the space. Mr. Baron asked Mr. Promislo if he owns the building or the shop. He stated that he rents the space, but does not own the building.

Mr. Rivera commented that a double-sided blade sign would be a more appropriate design for this significant façade than the proposed flat sign. Mr. Baron stated that the awning now covers the doorway, which is an important design element of the building. He asserted that the awning should be removed. Mr. Promislo stated that he needed the awning to advertise his business. Mr. Levy noted that the building currently has five signs for the business; he contended that five signs on the small building are excessive. Mr. Rivera again suggested that an appropriately-sized blade sign would advertise the business and be more sympathetic to the building. Ms. Sell stated that the exterior stair and planter were illegally installed in the 1960s.

NO-QUORUM RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of planter, street numbers in mortar joints, and light fixture, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the flat sign and awning, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

1801 VINE STREET (FAMILY COURT BUILDING)

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: David Villela

History: 1938-1941 by architects John Windrim and W.R. Morton Keast; designated 6/29/1971

Project: Install handrails

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install handrails in the middle three bays and at the sides of steps leading to the Family Court Building. The handrails would be attached to the granite steps of the court house. The public enters the building through a sequence of spaces, first an arcade, then a vestibule and finally a reception lobby. These spaces are reached by a series of stairs. The applicant proposes to install simple rails made of painted steel posts and

bronze handrails. The proposed design would be compatible with the Neo-classical grandeur of this building without being historicist.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. David Villela and Gary Knappick of the City's Capital Programs Office and architects George Claflen and Stephanie Saile represented the application.

Mr. Villela introduced the project, stating that the building code requires handrails from the entrance of the building to the sidewalk if the stairway has more than three steps. The handrails would be installed for added safety. Mr. Knappick added that the bike racks, currently near the entrance of the building, will be moved to the sidewalk. He explained that an escutcheon, or a painted steel flange as shown on the drawings, would cover the new holes to prevent water infiltration. Mr. Levy asked the applicants if they were concerned that the steel would rust. Mr. Villela said that the steel is of the highest quality and would be painted to prevent corrosion. Mr. Knappick stated that wrought iron railings of this size are not available. He stated that, after consulting with experts, he concluded that steel would not corrode if a high-performance paint is applied. The members of the Committee deemed the proposal appropriate.

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

2503 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: Joseph & Terri Pooler

Applicant: Anthony Miskitz

History: c. 1910

Project: Install clad windows with simulated-divided light windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace all the windows in this c. 1910 Colonial Revival house in Girard Estate. The staff conducted a site visit and concluded that the original windows for this property were wood one-over-one double hung units. The applicant proposes to install aluminum clad units with a six-over-six simulated-divided-light configuration. The applicant did not submit shop drawings for the replacement units.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Owner Joseph Pooler and applicant Anthony Miskitz represented the application.

Mr. Miskitz introduced the project. He explained that proposal raises two issues for the Commission: the appropriate pane configuration and true- versus simulated-divided-lights. He suggested that six-over-six windows are appropriate for the Colonial Revival style house. Mr. Danta stated that he and Ms. Sell visited the property and determined that the existing one-over-one windows are original. Mr. Miskitz stated that many of the houses in the neighborhood have vinyl replacement windows and only six have maintained their original one-over-one windows. Mr. Miskitz stated that his client prefers the multi-pane windows. He does not like the undivided, one-over-one windows. Mr. Miskitz explained that his client is also to reduce maintenance and is therefore proposing a clad unit that would have the same shadow depth and profile as a true-divided light window, such as Kolbe & Kolbe windows. Mr. Miskitz reported

that a house on the adjacent corner has multi-pane or divided-light windows at the rear of the property. Mr. Danta replied stating that he scrutinized those windows and determined that they are not original, but are replacements. They provide no information about the appropriate window pane configuration for the house in question. Ms. Pentz stated she understood the owner's desire for multi-pane windows, but asserted that the Committee must encourage restoration. She concluded that this house was constructed with one-over-one windows and therefore the replacements should be wood one-over-one windows. Mr. Levy suggested that simulated-divided-lights could be considered for the secondary facades.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6 and 9.

1913 DELANCEY STREET

Owner: Robert Kirkpatrick & John Wind

Applicant: David Pizzico

History: c. 1920

Project: Construct garden wall with parking gate

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enclose an open front yard, used for parking, with a new garden wall with a parking gate. The property was originally constructed as the rear of a Spruce facing house and it was subdivided creating a separate property facing Delancey Place. The applicant would like to formalize the space to better respond as a front façade and to enhance the streetscape. The proposed design includes an arched brick garden wall with a central accordion garage gate. The gate is flanked by two piers topped by urns and people doors flank each end of the composition. The parking space and entrance pathway would be paved. The designation photograph shows a second floor metal balcony that has since been removed. The applicant would like to install a new balcony of similar design in the same location.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architect Laurits Schloss and property owner Robert Kirkpatrick represented the application.

Mr. Schloss introduced the project and described the proposed work. He explained that the house in question had been a library that was added to the rear of a house on Spruce Street about 1920. It was subsequently subdivided from the main building on Spruce and is now a single-family house facing Delancey. He displayed numerous photographs of the house and the surrounding neighborhood. An open parking area separates the house from Delancey Street. He would like to add a gate to enclose that parking area and provide additional security; there are frequent intrusions onto the property. He would also like to reconstruct a balcony that can be seen in photographs, but is now missing. Mr. Rivera inquired if the gate is a bi-fold door. Mr. Schloss stated it is a slide-by door. The Committee deemed the proposal appropriate to the building and the district. Mr. Rivera suggested that Mr. Schloss edit his extremely lengthy and detailed presentation for his appearance before the Commission.

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

111 S. 15TH STREET (PACKARD BUILDING)

Owner: David Grasso; 111 S. 15th Street Associates

Applicant: Peter Lazor, AIA

History: 1922, Ritter & Shay, Architects

Project: Penthouse addition

OVERVIEW: An earlier version of this application was presented at the December 2007 Architectural Committee meeting and withdrawn prior to the Commission meeting. The applicant now proposes a revised design that incorporates the comments of the Committee members about the cladding material. The application proposes to reconstruct the penthouse on the roof of the Packard Building. Currently the building has a one-story penthouse; which would be altered into a two-story residential space. The proposed design for the penthouse is contemporary in style and would be clad in brick and cast stone. The proposed brick color would differentiate the new portion of the penthouse from the old. Owing to the height of the building and the obstructions of the sight lines by neighboring high-rise buildings, the proposed alterations would be minimally visible. The west elevation facing Chestnut Street would be the most visible. The architect has made this elevation the focal point of his design. The addition would be compatible in rhythm and scale to the upper stories of the Packard building without copying its Renaissance design elements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Randal Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Peter Lazor represented the application.

Mr. Lazor explained that the new brick would resemble the historic brick, but would not match it exactly. It would be within the same color family, but not a perfect match. Mr. Levy stated that the applicant had implemented the Committee's suggestions.

Liz Blazeovich of the Preservation Alliance opined that the proposed addition was well designed and appropriate for the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details.

6918-6926 RIDGE AVENUE

Owner/Applicant: Michael S. Kershaw

History: Christopher Ozias House, c. 1805

Project: Legalize complete demolition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the demolition of the early nineteenth-century, rubblestone Christopher Ozias House, which stood at 6918-6926 Ridge Avenue. After the house partially collapsed, an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building Imminently Dangerous on 20 November 2007 and ordered the property owner to demolish or repair it (Case #135543). The property owner retained Geppert Bros. Inc. (Contractor License #21794) to demolish the house and clear the lot of debris. The work was undertaken without the approval of the Commission or a demolition permit. The owner now seeks the Commission's approval of the demolition as a prerequisite for a demolition permit. The owner has simultaneously applied to the Commission for the rescission of the designation;

that application will be forwarded to the Committee on Historic Designation and the Commission.

The Commission designated the property on 30 October 1962. The current owner purchased the property on 1 December 2000. In his cover letter with the application, the owner states that the "property was in deplorable shape" when he purchased it. He explains that "During this time the whole back end of the property has been continually falling down." From the purchase in December 2000 to the collapse in November 2007, the property owner did not submit any applications for repair or other work to the Commission.

The property has been the subject of many complaint calls to the Department of Licenses & Inspections including several since the Department began using its Hansen computer system in 2004, which are listed here. On 31 August 2004, Councilman Michael Nutter's office informed the Department that the yard was overgrown with weeds. Violations were issued under the Department's old LIMS computer system. On 31 March 2006, the Police Department reported to the Department that the house was vacant, the side had partially collapsed, and squatters were occupying the building. The Department declared the building Unsafe on 3 April 2006 (Case #58155). On 12 and 17 April 2006, two citizens filed separate complaints alleging that the front porch was rotting and falling toward Ridge Avenue. On 26 July 2006, the Ridge Park Civic Association complained that the house was vacant, open, and strewn with trash and debris. On 22 October 2007, the Historical Commission requested an inspection and violations after a porch was demolished without the Commission's approval. On 20 November and 11 December 2007, the Fire Department informed the Department that the building was collapsing.

It appears that the owner is in the process of selling the now-vacant lot for redevelopment as a branch bank. On 27 September 2007, an application was submitted to the Department of Licenses & Inspections for a zoning permit that included the demolition of all existing structures and the construction of a one-story building with parking (App. #101266). On 25 October 2007, a building permit application was submitted to the Department for the construction of a bank building (App. #111629). In October 2007, a Commission staff member met with Thomas Chapman, an attorney representing Wachovia Bank, and explained to him that the site was designated as historic and the staff did not have the authority to approve a demolition application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The record clearly indicates that the current owner failed to keep this building in good repair as required by Section 14-2007(8)(c) of the Philadelphia Code:

The exterior of every historic building, structure and object and of every building, structure and object located within an historic district shall be kept in good repair as shall the interior portions of such buildings, structures and objects, neglect of which may cause or tend to cause the exterior to deteriorate, decay, become damaged or otherwise fall into a state of disrepair.

The staff therefore recommends that the Commission require the owner to reconstruct the historic building, pursuant to Section 14-2007(9)(d):

Any person who alters or demolishes a building, structure, site or object in violation of the provisions of Section 14-2007 or in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a permit shall be required to restore the building, structure, site or object involved to its appearance prior to the violation. Such restoration shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any penalty or remedy available under the Code or any other applicable law.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Michael Kershaw represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained that, despite the staff's recommendation, he did not consider the reconstruction of the historic building to be a practical or appropriate resolution to the matter, in which a designated historic building was apparently lost to negligence. He noted however that the ordinance requires historic buildings to be maintained and authorizes the Commission to require their reconstruction if altered or demolished in violation of the historic preservation ordinance.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant about his ownership of the property and his plans for it. Mr. Kershaw explained that he operates a title and mortgage company at an adjacent property and purchased this property for its land. He reported that the building was in very poor condition when he purchased it. He stated that he intended to demolish the historic building and use part of the land for a parking lot for his business; he planned to build two houses on the remaining land. Mr. Kershaw explained that he did not know that the property was designated as historic when he purchased it in 2000. He added that he would not have purchased it if he had known. He stated that he owns several properties on Main Street in Manayunk that are designated as historic. He has restored some of them under the review of the Historical Commission. Ms. Pentz requested clarifications on the claims made by the applicant regarding the deteriorated conditions of the property. Mr. Kershaw responded that the house was infested with termites. He reported that the chimney collapsed on the roof, after which the house deteriorated quickly. He stated that he neither intended to nor did rehabilitate the building. Mr. Baron stated that the previous owner was aware of the historic designation; he noted that he had met with him several times. Mr. Kershaw stated that the previous owner was not physically able to participate in the sale in 2000. He explained that he had purchased the property from the owner's sisters, who may or may not have been aware of its designation. Mr. Levy asked Mr. Kershaw why he did nothing to prevent or repair the severe deterioration of the building, especially in light of the many complaints documented by the staff. Mr. Kershaw responded that he secured the building, but that vagrants broke in it and caused more damage. He noted that he wanted to demolish the building, but did not have the funds. He stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections ordered him to demolish the building or the Department would demolish it and place a lien on the property. Mr. Kershaw stated that he demolished it to comply with the Department.

Mr. Rivera asked how many other investment properties the applicant owned in the city. Mr. Kershaw answered that he owned approximately ten properties in Manayunk. Mr. Rivera stated that the applicant owns a mortgage and title company and should be more informed than the average property owner. He asserted that Mr. Kershaw should have discovered the designation during his due diligence. Mr. Kershaw answered that he did not know of the historic designation until recently. Mr. Levy highlighted the many complaints and violations, but conceded that reconstruction was not practical.

Ms. Pentz asked whether the Commission had detailed photographs or measured drawings of the building. Mr. Farnham stated that he knew of no good documentation on the lost building. Mr. Baron stated that the neighborhood association is considering proposing an historic district in the area and may have detailed photographs of the building.

Mr. Kershaw asked the staff why the building had been designated. Mr. Farnham answered that the building uniquely represented the history of this area at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Mr. Baron further explained that this building was one of the oldest surviving examples of the early settlement along Ridge Avenue. Mr. Rivera opined

that this building was a landmark that should have been saved for future generations Mr. Kershaw stressed that he demolished the building on direct orders from the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections and that he had a verbal agreement with them to proceed without a demolition permit. Mr. Farnham stated that he had spoken with the Department's inspector and confirmed this claim. Mr. Rivera suggested that the Commission discuss the matter with the Department and find ways to prevent similar situations in the future. The Committee members agreed that the Department should inform the Commission prior to demolition in such situations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to adopt the staff recommendation and recommend that the record clearly indicates that the current owner failed to keep this building in good repair as required by Section 14-2007(8)(c) of the Philadelphia Code:

The exterior of every historic building, structure and object and of every building, structure and object located within an historic district shall be kept in good repair as shall the interior portions of such buildings, structures and objects, neglect of which may cause or tend to cause the exterior to deteriorate, decay, become damaged or otherwise fall into a state of disrepair.

The Committee therefore recommends that the Commission require the owner to reconstruct the historic building, pursuant to Section 14-2007(9)(d):

Any person who alters or demolishes a building, structure, site or object in violation of the provisions of Section 14-2007 or in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a permit shall be required to restore the building, structure, site or object involved to its appearance prior to the violation. Such restoration shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any penalty or remedy available under the Code or any other applicable law.

5339 KNOX STREET

Owner: Daniel Hartzog & Lorrin Thomas

Applicant: Cory Ritter

History: c. 1876; designated 3/29/1966

Project: Reroof mansard with asphalt shingles

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reroof the mansard and porch roofs of this Second Empire house with Hatteras simulated slate squared asphalt shingles and to cap the mansard ridges with shingles. Originally, the mansard would have hexagonal shaped slate shingles with copper ridge rolls. Currently the mansard is clad in asphalt shingles with shingles on the ridges. The staff would approve Carriage House simulated slate octagonal asphalt shingles, as the hexagonal shape is not available in asphalt shingles, and copper or aluminum ridge rolls.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Lorrin Thomas and roofing contractor Cory Ritter represented the application.

Mr. Ritter stated that the shingle he is proposing is appropriate even if it does not replicate the shape of the original slate shingle. He noted that he is proposing the Stormy Night color. He stated that his client does not want to use the Carriage House, Grand Manor, or Centennial shingles because they have the second layer or under-layer that is intended to replicate the

shadow line. He claimed that no roofing companies manufacture an asphalt shingle in the original scallop shape. Mr. Baron noted that a synthetic slate shingle is available in the appropriate shape. Mr. Ritter countered that although the synthetic slate is less expensive than real slate, the labor costs to install it are the same as real slate. It would be very expensive to install synthetic or real slate. He added that the synthetic slate has not been on the market very long and therefore has not been proven to be reliable. Ms. Thomas explained that the roof she is proposing will cost \$50,000 to \$60,000. The synthetic slate would cost \$90,000, which she cannot afford. She also noted that she is not proposing to remove slate; the roof is already asphalt. Mr. Ritter reported that the shingle he is proposing is lighter than the one suggested by the staff, but has a longer warranty.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicants to explain why they did not propose recreating the ridge roll. Mr. Ritter explained that the added cost was the reason why he had not proposed to recreate the ridge roll. He noted that the aluminum ridge roll would provide some savings; it would cost about \$10 per linear foot less than the copper.

Ms. Thomas objected to the staff and Committee's rejection of her proposed shingle. She explained that the Commission had approved a rear addition for her a few years ago. At that time, the staff had explained to her that the Commission approves applications that propose contemporary-styled, unobtrusive work. She claimed that the shingle she is proposing would be unobtrusive. Mr. Baron explained to her that there is a significant difference between her addition application and her roofing application. When reviewing additions to historic buildings, the Commission does prefer contemporary-styled, unobtrusive additions. However, when reviewing alterations to historic buildings, the Commission always advocates for the restoration of missing historic fabric. In this instance, the Commission could but probably would not insist on a reroofing with real slate. As a replacement for the real slate, the Commission may accept an asphalt shingle with the same shape and color as the original slate. The Commission is unlikely to accept an asphalt shingle that has no relationship to the original slate. He added that the under-layer on the asphalt Carriage House shingle, which has the correct shape, reproduces the shadow line that you would have with a real slate shingle. Ms. Thomas noted that nearby houses are roofed with the rectangular shingle. Mr. Baron responded that those houses may not be historically designated or the rectangular shingle may be appropriate for those houses. Mr. Ritter provided photographs of nearby houses. Ms. Pentz stated that the original pattern of the slate is very important to the historic appearance of this house. She stated that the Committee must recommend denial of the inappropriate shingle in order to maintain consistency. She stated that she would vote to recommend approval of a shingle with the correct shape, but denial of the proposed shingle.

Mr. Rivera asked the applicants to explain the cost differential between the proposed Hatteras shingle and the more appropriate Carriage House shingle. Mr. Ritter stated that it would cost about \$4,500 more to roof with the Carriage House shingle.

Mr. Levy asked about the appropriate color for the shingle. Mr. Baron displayed a sample of the Carriage House colors and pointed out the correct color. Mr. Ritter again objected to the dark under-layer on the Carriage House shingle. Ms. Thomas again objected to the shingle and claimed that the Commission should not intervene in the detail decisions about her house. She stated that she found it unbelievable that the Committee would comment or hold a review on such a minor detail. She noted that the Commission approved a rectangular shingle for her neighbor at 126 W. Penn Street. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission routinely reviews shingle choices and determines appropriate shingles for historically designated buildings; it is not at all uncommon. He stated that the decision at 126 W. Penn Street was very complicated.

He explained that that property owner installed real slate on the sections of his mansard roof that are visible to the public. The Commission had compromised and allowed him to install non-historic shingles at sections of the roof not visible to the public in exchange for installing the real slate. Mr. Baron suggested a compromise in this instance; the owner could install the appropriate shapes where visible from the street and other shingles at the rear. Ms. Thomas rejected that proposal. She stated that she wanted a consistent shingle throughout the house. Mr. Rivera explained to her that the Committee must apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to the application. The proposed shingle is inappropriate. He suggested that she plead her case to the Commission.

Mr. Ritter showed some other shingle options to the Committee. Ms. Pentz informed him that the Committee could only recommend approval of a shingle with the shape and color of the original slate shingle. Ms. Thomas claimed that there is a range of appropriate choices; she stated that she, not the Commission, had the right to make the final choice from that range. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance reminded everyone that the goal of the Commission is to preserve and/or restore the historic character of buildings. Installing the appropriate shingle would restore the historic character of the roof of this building.

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

110 N. WOODSTOCK STREET

Owner: Daniel Mann

Applicant: Daniel Mann

History: c. 1850; individually designated 03/25/1969; 04/28/1970

Project: Legalize windows in front facade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of nine vinyl windows with a nine-over-nine configuration in the front façade of this row house. The historic windows were wood six-over-six double-hung sash windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal. Daniel Mann represented the application.

Mr. Mann stated that he did not know that his property was designated as historic and his neighbors were unaware of their designations as well. He stated that he attempted to determine whether he needed a building permit or any City review before installing the windows. He contacted the Department of Licenses & Inspections and was told that he did not need a permit for the windows if he did not alter the openings. He reported that he chose windows that were aesthetically pleasing. He submitted emails documenting his attempts to determine whether he needed permits. Mr. Baron suggested that he should have contacted the Historical Commission, which is responsible for ensuring compliance with the historic preservation ordinance. He also informed Mr. Mann that, regardless of his knowledge of the designation, the Committee must be consistent in its recommendations. Mr. Mann stated that he did what he could and that he spent a great deal of money on the windows. Mr. Levy stated that the Committee had no choice but to recommend denial of the legalization. Ms. Pentz concurred. Mr. Mann stated that the Philadelphia Historical Commission has duty to inform people of its designations.

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

906 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: William Manfredi

Applicant: Alexander Rice

History: 1820, William Strickland, architect; part of Portico Row; individually designated

Project: Construct two-story rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a two-story rear addition on a one-story section of the rear ell of this important building at Portico Row. The building has been divided into condominiums. It suffered a fire in the 1980s and was reconstructed with modern windows at the rear ell. The owner would like to enlarge his unit, which is located in the rear ell, with the addition of two rooms. The applicant appeared before the Committee last month proposing an addition that would overhang the first floor of the rear ell by 30 inches on two sides; the overhang would be supported by brackets. The revised application proposes a bay on the south and west elevations of the addition, instead of the overhangs. The rear of this building is visible from 9th Street as well as Cypress Street, the service alley at the rear.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Alexander Rice, the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Rice stated that the current proposal differs from the previous proposal. Instead of the addition cantilevering over the first floor, two two-story bays are proposed for the south and west facades of the addition. The revisions to the design are based on the Committee comments.

Eric Matzkin, the owner of a condominium at 908 Spruce Street, voiced his concerns about the impact of the addition on his home. He stated that the addition would block his light and air. Mr. Rivera rejected Mr. Matzkin's objections, asserting that they relate to matters outside the Commission's jurisdiction. He stated that they are zoning, not preservation, issues. Ms. Pentz stated that she considers this design to be more respectful of the historic architecture than the first. Mr. Rice noted that his proposal satisfies the zoning requirements and has been approved by zoning.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance opined that the proposal is not consistent with the historic character of Portico Row. He observed that there are no rear bays on Portico Row buildings. He also noted that one typically does not see bay windows on the sides of rear ells. He stated that bays are typically modest, but this proposal is not modest. He continued that the backs of the Portico Row buildings are highly visible. He concluded that this design should be consistent with the rest of the row.

Mr. Rice stated that the space that the bays provide is crucial. Mr. Rivera remarked that that the interior space is open and that there is no need for a bay on the side. Mr. Levy stated that there were enough windows on the rear and asked if the windows on the side were necessary. Mr. Rice replied that the side bay window provides ambient light as well as the desired interior space. Mr. Rivera asked the applicant to explore the transition between the building and the bay. He stated that the bays are heavy and not massed like the rest of the building. Mr. Rice stated that he was open to chamfering the bays. Mr. Levy suggested that the side bay be

eliminated. Mr. Rivera concurred. Mr. Rice offered to show examples of side bays and added that one would not be able to see the side bay from 9th Street. Mr. Gallery stated that there are some side bays on Clinton Street, but there are no side bays on Portico Row. Ms. Pentz stated that her colleagues have offered good suggestions, however she did not object to the current proposal, provided the roofs of the bays are lowered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the bays are beveled at the corners and the heights of the bays are reduced, making the roofs of the bays independent of and below the rear ell roof.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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.

New Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Placing functions and services required for the new use in non-character defining interior spaces rather than constructing a new addition;
Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed;
Recommended: Placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building;
Recommended: Designing a rooftop

addition when required for the new use that is set back from the wall plane and as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.