

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

**TUESDAY, 25 MAY 2021
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair	X		
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP	X		
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, all Commissioners, staff, applicants, and public attendees participated in the meeting remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Christina Santos
Marty Gregorski
Eric Marshall
Carolyn Campbell
Yoav Shiffman
Erin Witzel
Marianne Porter
John Scanlon
Olivia Baackes
Pat Patrick
Chris Mejia-Smith
Susan Davis
Genie Galetta
Dart Sageser
Bohdan Kulchycky

Joe Burda
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Eric Peterson
Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
Lorna Katz
Richard DeMarco, Esq.
Megan Strenski
David Ade
Ed Barnhart
Paul Labow
Andrew Miller, Esq.
Chris Spay
Janice Woodcock
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Christian Origlio
Gabriel Deck
Joe Lombardi
Ben She
Lucky Re'em
Brenna March
Susan Wetherill
Liz Kulchyckyj
Audrey Hampton
David Whipple
Paul Toner
Leonid Chachkes
Jay Farrell

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 400-36 S 3RD ST, AKA 301-17 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct parish hall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. Peter's Church

Applicant: David Ade, SMP Architects

History: 1758; St. Peter's Church and Yard

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

The property in question, 400-36 S. 3rd Street, is a large parcel that occupies much of the block bounded by Pine, S. 3rd, Lombard, and S. 4th Streets. St. Peter's Church stands at the northeast corner of the site. St. Peter's Cemetery occupies much of the northern half of the site. The southwest corner of the site, a surface parking lot, is being subdivided from 400-36 S. 3rd Street as 301-17 Lombard Street. St. Peter's Church proposes to build a parish hall on the site. The overall property, 400-36 S. 3rd Street, was individually designated in 1957 and was included in the Society Hill Historic District as a Significant resource in 1999. Although part of the larger tax parcel at 400-36 S. 3rd Street at the time of designation, the surface parking lot at

301-17 Lombard Street is separately classified as Contributing for its archaeological potential, but not for any aboveground resources.

The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a design for the parish hall in 2019, with the requirement that the property owner conduct an archaeological investigation. Since that time, the archaeological investigation has been completed and a new architect has taken over and revised the design of the parish hall. The underground parking has been eliminated from the project. The exterior materials and design details of the parish hall design have changed slightly, but the overall siting and massing of the building are very similar to the project approved in 2019.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a parish hall

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Rehabilitation Standards of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.*
 - The archaeological investigation has been completed and the final report submitted with the application.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The revised design is similar to that approved in 2019. The proposed building would be differentiated from the old and would be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:45

RECUSAL:

- Ms. Gutterman recused from the review of the application, owing to her architectural firm's work at the property.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect David Ade represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey questioned the setback of the proposed building from 3rd Street.
 - Mr. Ade responded that the setback aligns with the church building.
- Ms. Stein opined that the size and scale of the proposed building are compatible with the district and for its context, but expressed concerns that the Lombard Street elevation feels like a back door. She suggested that architectural improvements could be made to make the elevation feel more street and urban friendly. She noted

that there are multiple types of brick proposed, a flat red and a striated red brick, and opined that the striated brick is out of context and will not be complementary to the Society Hill Historic District.

- Mr. Ade responded that, despite the restraints of the interior program of the building, they did try to acknowledge that it is a pedestrian sidewalk and public thoroughfare. He explained that the presentation space in the great hall on the right, and the desire to focus attention on the east garden, that is where there is a two-story solid wall. He noted that they reduced the solid wall of the great hall from three to two stories and introduced a flat vertical window. He explained that on the left side the Lombard Street elevation is the kitchen and food cupboard area, which he opined do not lend themselves to interior views. He noted that the entrance is a secondary staff entrance, and that the adjacent windows are intended to give additional pedestrian-scale interest. He explained that the different brick types are intended to create a one-story element at the pedestrian scale.
- Ms. Stein questioned the location of a large walled-in area with cedar fencing and a brick wall that encloses dumpsters and generator immediately adjacent to Lombard Street, and why it is not more internal to the property. She noted that the generator will likely be noisy.
 - Mr. Ade responded that they located the generator and waste enclosure there because they needed seven parking spots and were limited in how those could be arranged. He explained that service to the transformer comes off Lombard Street, so they tried to be efficient in the length of the run. He noted that the masonry enclosure would be of the same brick as the building. He noted that the design has changed slightly, with a metal gate in keeping with the metal picket fence that surrounds the rest of the property. He explained that they have an acoustician on the team, so they would address any sound ordinances in place.
 - Ms. Stein questioned whether the public will be able to see into the enclosure.
 - Mr. Ade responded that a cedar fence is proposed for the east side of the enclosure, blocking the view of the trash area from the street.
 - Ms. Stein questioned the use of cedar fencing as opposed to brick for this wall.
 - Mr. Ade responded that they can look into whether they can make the east side brick as well.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether there is a slope to the grade, and expressed concern over the use of a single row-lock course as the base of the building.
 - Mr. Ade responded that there is a relatively consistent grade around the perimeter of the building. He noted that the grade does drop on the east side of the courtyard, so there is a small retaining wall.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro opined that it is inconsistent with the size of the building to have such a small base.
 - Mr. Ade responded that they intended to acknowledge the through-wall flashing that will have to be 8 to 12 inches above grade. They will acknowledge it with some brick detailing.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the size of brick proposed.
 - Mr. Ade responded that they are proposing 11 5/8-inch Norman brick.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the relieving angle does not have to extend beyond the face of the brick, and opined that he is uncomfortable with the base of the building.
 - Mr. Ade responded that there are examples of more contemporary buildings in Society Hill where the brick continues down to the base of the building.

- Mr. Cluver questioned the use of elongated brick.
 - Mr. Ade responded that the church likes the idea of a contemporary building, so they hoped to differentiate the building with the use of a larger masonry.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein's concerns, noting that the Committee struggled with the feeling that the original design in 2019 turned its back on the Lombard Street elevation. He opined that the current design also does so, and suggested that the design be more pedestrian-friendly. He agreed that the scale of the building is fine but some sort of articulation and additional fenestration would be helpful.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the two proposed bricks are too similar, and that, combined with the longer dimension, he does not see the relationship between the proposed materials and the Society Hill Historic District.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the great hall is the most successful portion of the project; the rest of the design, he commented, has no relationship to Society Hill and could be anywhere. He noted that the proposed building is next to one of the most significant churches in the district, and in the city. He opined that there should be a connection to the neighborhood both in materiality and in articulation. He opined that the elevation facing the church now has a lot of glass that dissolves the corners, and that he does not feel that elevation is successful. He suggested that the three-story massing could be articulated in a way that is more in keeping with the district, noting that he does not mean it should be faux Colonial.
 - Ms. Stein agreed, noting that the sheer amount of glass and dissolving of the corners makes the building feel commercial. She suggested more finessing of the design, perhaps through the use of a glassy vestibule with additional masonry on the second and third floors where the function of the classrooms and meeting spaces that are typically dark at night could be more closed and more successful in the context of the neighborhood and the function. She noted that the two-story assembly hall space facing the garden has a different function and that she can picture it being lovely and lit up at night.
 - Mr. Cluver agreed with his fellow Committee members, noting that there are a few examples of curtain walls in Society Hill, but that the predominant feel of buildings in the district, even those of the Redevelopment Era, is more of a punched-masonry aesthetic as opposed to a curtain wall aesthetic. He expressed dismay over the lack of precedent or context photos in the application, noting that there may be precedent for the design choices the applicants have made, but that none of that is presented in this application.
 - Mr. Ade responded that they were very aware of the previous design, which had a glazing system on both the east and north elevations, so the amount of glazing has actually been reduced considerably from the previous approval. Programmatically, he noted, the parish is interested in having visibility in and out of the building so people can understand what takes place in the building and see activity and life in the building. Architecturally, the idea was to reveal this activity by peeling back the corners of the building. He noted that they can look at the amount of glass proposed if that is an issue.
 - Mr. Ade noted that on the Lombard Street elevation, they could add some texture to the darker color of the masonry through the introduction of brick patterning, of which there are examples in the district that they can point out. He also noted that there are three trees that will screen the building and add an additional layer of pedestrian scale.
 - Ms. Stein supported the use of patterned brick, as opposed to the striated brick, if there is precedent in the district. She suggested that there also still needs to be

- additional glazing on the first floor, particular to the left of the door, possibly through the use of frosted glass.
 - Mr. Ade responded that they could work with the program of the food cupboard to look at that possibility.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the materials are not called out on the elevation drawings, but rely on keynotes that are then not available in the legend. For example, ALT is not called out; SCR is called out, but no description of it is provided. He questioned the material of the downspouts and asked the applicant to address these comments.
 - Mr. Ade responded that they can provide more specific and detailed information on the elevation materials. The downspouts would be metal in the same color family as the storefront system.
- Ms. Stein questioned the color of the metal paneling and cladding system, noting that the renderings look like anodized aluminum, but the materials called out show a tan and grey.
 - Mr. Ade noted that the reference to storefront frames in a warm, tan color, which would be a painted material. The canopies and infill panels would be a grey, pulled from the church roof and trim. The proposed doors on Lombard Street and seen from the northeast would be wood.
 - Ms. Stein clarified that the grey would be a mid-range lead grey.
 - Mr. Ade confirmed that that would be the case, noting that the roof of the church is a turncoated steel, so that is the color they would be picking up on.
 - Ms. Stein opined that a turncoated steel color would be appropriate, but an anodized steel material would not be.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The size and scale of the proposed building is compatible with the site and the overall context of the Society Hill Historic District.
- The use of red brick is appropriate for the district, but the striated brick is not. Patterned brick would be more appropriate.
- The Lombard Street reads as a secondary elevation, is not pedestrian friendly, and needs additional articulation.
- The applicants should explore the use of brick in place of cedar fencing on the east side of the trash/generator enclosure.
- The design of the rowlock base is out of keeping with the character of buildings in the district.
- The scale of the glazing on the north elevation is too great and the dissolved corners do not appear to have precedence in the district and are not successful relative to the historic context.
- The application does not feature context or precedent photos, making it difficult to assess the compatibility of the proposed design with the site and the district.
- The application materials are lacking in terms of notations and keynotes.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building would be compatible in massing, size, and general materials with the property and its environment, but not in terms of fenestration or architectural features, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

- The archaeological investigation has been completed, satisfying Standard 8.

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

ITEM: 400-36 S 3RD ST, AKA 301-17 LOMBARD ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman				X	
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6			1	

ADDRESS: 1915 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Modify façade; construct rooftop addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chris Spay

Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates

History: 1970

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

The property at 1915 Delancey Place is listed as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. This application proposes to modify the façade of the non-contributing building and construct a fourth-floor addition with a roof deck and pilot house. At the first floor, the application proposes to narrow the existing garage opening and to install a person door. At the second and third floors, the application proposes to enclose existing recessed balconies, and to clad this portion of the building in dark grey brick, with new casement windows. The existing stucco would be painted a light grey. A fourth-floor addition set back nine feet from the front façade would be added, and on top of that, a roof deck and pilot house.

The context of the block is varied, with predominantly two and three-story residential buildings. The building to the east at 1913 Delancey is set back approximately 25 feet from the street edge, increasing the visibility of the side elevation of 1915 Delancey. The building to the west, a carriage house for 1920 Spruce Street, is two stories in height.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Modify façade
- Construct fourth-floor addition with roof deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MAY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - Since the building is non-contributing, the Historical Commission is charged with evaluating the impact of the proposal not on the building itself but on the district as a whole. The use of brick and stucco are compatible materials with the district, but the cool colors of light and dark grey are not consistent with the warmer red brick, limestone, and brownstone palette of the district. It is difficult to determine the visibility and impact of the massing of the proposed addition from the application materials. The staff recommends additional renderings from the east and west be provided. The application appears to comply with this Standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided renderings or a mockup determine that the proposed massing will not overwhelm the neighboring properties, and that the materials are of a palette consistent with the district, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:33:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Logan Dry represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Dry ran through context photographs of the block, noting that there are primarily two and three-story buildings, but also some very tall three-story buildings and one four-story building.
- Mr. Dry explained that they tried to minimize the massing by setting back the fourth floor. He opined that the narrowness of the street plus the presence of street trees reduces the impact of the proposed addition. He noted that the adjacent building is set back from the street, which makes it challenging to make it completely invisible.
- Ms. Stein questioned the visibility of the proposed addition and whether the proposed brick cladding wraps the corners of the façade, noting a desire not to have the brick give a “wallpaper” effect.
 - Mr. Dry responded that they do not have a rendering of the view from the west because it is difficult to get a good vantage point, and they are limited with what they can install on the west elevation since it is a party wall. He suggested that they would be amenable to using a terra cotta color stucco on the party wall if that would be more acceptable.
 - Ms. Stein agreed that that would be a more appropriate solution than having the brick appear to be a thin veneer.
- Mr. McCoubrey commended the reduction of the garage opening, noting that there will need to be the introduction of a new column of brick. He opposed the half stucco, half brick approach to the upper floors, opining that the whole façade should be brick. He recognized that the proposed design is attempting to acknowledge what was

- there, but opined that it is being changed so drastically that the design now has a split personality.
- Mr. Dry responded that they originally conceived of a design with brick at the first floor with stucco above, but that it began to have a wedding cake appearance. He replied that they could look into a full brick veneer if that is more appropriate.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that he would be concerned with the transition between a thin brick and stucco, but if it is all one material and is in one plane, that will be less of a concern.
 - Mr. Dry agreed, noting that for the transition between brick and stucco, since the stucco sits back, they would likely be using a transition piece such as a soldier course between the lower and upper floors.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the depth of the flower boxes and whether the whole façade is pushed back for the flower boxes.
 - Mr. Dry responded that the flower boxes are not integral to the design. He clarified that the façade would not be set back for the flower boxes; they were just added to the rendering to give the building extra appeal.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro opined that renderings represent what the applicants are applying for and that it is confusing to include the flower boxes.
 - Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the massing of the addition, from both the east and west. She noted that the rendering shows the view from the east but not the west. She also expressed concern over the balcony railing at the third floor, noting that the Architectural Committee usually asks that railings be set back owing to visibility. She also agreed with Ms. Stein and Mr. McCoubrey's concerns about the materials not appearing as pasted onto the façade.
 - Mr. Cluver expressed concern over the deck at the front of the building, noting that essentially the whole roof is getting decked over. He opined that the Roofs Guideline typically would not allow for a deck on the front of a house.
 - Mr. Dry responded that they designed the top roof deck with the usable part set back and are willing to compromise on the third-floor deck.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned the use of thin brick versus full brick veneer.
 - Mr. Dry responded that the current plan is to install thin brick over the existing brick on the garage portion, with full-size brick above, since the existing brick and stucco are not in the same plane. He noted that using the thin brick below with full brick above would allow them to create a consistent plane and appearance. He opined that it would be difficult to get brick to match the existing garage, and they will need to install a new pier within the existing garage opening, as well as for the upper floors.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that the elevation drawing does not show the thin brick, and that there are other inconsistencies between the floor plans and the elevation drawings as well.
 - Mr. Dry apologized, noting that he felt the rendering was the most important to update after getting staff feedback.
 - Ms. Stein opined that the applicants should attempt to match the existing brick and not install thin brick over the existing brick. She noted that this would be a better long-term solution.
 - Mr. Cluver agreed, noting that the concept of an adhered brick feels inappropriate, and there are durability concerns as well.
 - Mr. Dry responded that if were to proceed as-is, the existing upper-floor addition is stud-wall construction clad in stucco, and the brick of the garage is 8-10 inches thick. He explained that they would be able to adjust the thin brick so it would be

in the same plane as the new brick above, but noted that he is hearing that that is not preferable.

- Mr. Detwiler, suggested leaving the existing brick and existing soldier course as a logical break if they cannot find a perfect match, but that he does not think it will be too difficult to match once cleaned and looked at by a good mason.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with earlier comments about reducing the appearance that the façade is pasted on. He suggested that the windows be articulated with an appropriate reveal and that the windows include sills. He noted that the existing windows are set back and have sills, but the windows are shown as just punched out of a brick wall with no sills in the rendering and drawings for the proposed design.
- Ms. Lukachik expressed concern over how imposing the addition and pilot house will be, noting that she does not feel there is enough information to make that determination. She opined that the pilot house appears overly tall, and questioned how tall it actually would be, since one note says to maintain 6-foot 8-inch clearance inside, but the drawings also show a 10-foot height.
 - Mr. Dry responded that the 10-foot height is a note they put for zoning since that is the allowable height, but in reality it would probably be more in the range of 8 feet to the top of the pilot house.
 - Ms. Stein agreed with Ms. Lukachik and opined that the drawings should reflect the minimum, not maximum, height.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the general amount of roof deck space. She opined that roof deck on top of the fourth floor should be pulled back to the front of the pilot house.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned the location of the mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Dry responded that they plan to cluster the mechanicals toward the rear or the pilot house to eliminate visibility.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how tall the elevator overrun would be.
 - Mr. Dry responded that it would not exceed 42 inches in height, the height of the parapet wall. He noted that there is no elevator access to the roof deck.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether there is any demolition involved.
 - Mr. Dry responded that the demolition would be predominantly limited to interior demolition, since the joists are clear-spanning, as well as the removal of the existing roof in preparation for the fourth-floor framing.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if they really want a glass door for the front of the building.
 - Mr. Dry responded that they are not wed to a particular door design, but that neighborhood groups tend to like glazed doors since they add more visual interest and light to the street.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The front elevation should be clad entirely in brick rather than a split between brick and stucco.
- The brick should wrap onto the east elevation so as not to appear pasted on.
- The stucco of the west elevation should be terra cotta colored.
- Thin brick should not be used over the existing brick, but the brick above should match the existing garage brick.
- The windows should be appropriately articulated with masonry reveal and sills.

- The fourth-floor roof deck should be set back to align with the pilot house.
- The third-floor deck should be eliminated.
- The pilot house should be shown at the minimum, not maximum, height possible.
- It is difficult to assess the impact of the proposed design given the limited number of renderings. Additional renderings from the west as well as east should be provided.
- There are inconsistencies between the elevations, plans, and renderings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The general massing of the proposed addition is likely acceptable, but there is insufficient information and conflicting details in the application, making it difficult to assess the full impact and final details of the design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented owing to inconsistencies in the application.

ITEM: 1915 DELANCEY PL MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 404 FOUNTAIN ST

Proposal: Construct apartment building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 404 Fountain LLC

Applicant: Richard DeMarco, Zarwin Baum

History: 1854

Individual Designation: Pending

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

The property at 404 Fountain Street contains a c.1854 building on a large lot. A nomination to designate the property as historic was submitted to the Historical Commission, and notice of the proposed designation was sent to the property owner on 8 April 2021. At the time of notice to the property owner, draft building permit and zoning permit applications were in eCLIPSE, L&I's online permitting system, for complete demolition of the building. Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, the so-called "transition rule," allows the Commission, its committees, and staff to consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation, including but not limited to executed

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MAY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications. The staff intends to recommend designation of only the historic building with a buffer, rather than designation of the entire parcel. Should this boundary recommendation be adopted by the Commission when it reviews the nomination to designate, the Commission would not have jurisdiction over this proposed new construction.

This application has been submitted as one possible option for the property owner, which is to retain the existing building and assume that the Historical Commission will have jurisdiction over the property. This application proposes to construct a four-story apartment building on the remainder of the lot, allowing for views of the historic building from Fountain Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story apartment building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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 work will 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.*
 - The proposed new construction, while potentially overwhelming in scale, allows for the retention of the historic building without any attachment or alterations to the historic fabric.
- *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.*
 - The apartment building could be removed in the future without impact to the historic building.
- *Historical Commission Rules & Regulations Section 6.9.a.10: The Commission, its committees, and staff may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Rules & Regulations, in light of the plans for the development of the property already in place at the time the Historical Commission notified the property owner of its intent to consider a designation.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:05:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Richard DeMarco, architect Janice Woodcock, and developer Eric Marshall represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. DeMarco explained that there are significant legal issues regarding vested rights involved in the timing of this proposed designation. He stated that Mr. Marshall is exploring the option of a compromise that preserves the building but allows for new

construction on the remainder of the site, despite having applied for demolition of the building.

- Ms. Stein asked about the context of the area.
 - Mr. Marshall explained that the site is opposite the Roxborough High School and has multi-unit apartment buildings on either side. The prior use of the site was multi-unit residential in the historic building, and commercial in a rear building. He is attempting to find a compromise that will satisfy the community and the Historical Commission but will still allow for development on the site.
- Ms. Chantry explained that Option 2, designed by Ms. Woodcock, was provided late. She asked the applicants if Option 2 is the design that the Committee should focus its review on.
 - Ms. Woodcock responded that the Committee should focus its review on Option 2, which was designed to be more in keeping with the scale of the historic house, offers more room between the house and the new construction, and which takes cues from the architecture of the Roxborough High School across the street.
- Mr. Cluver agreed that Option 2 is a better design than the original design submitted. He stated that there would ideally be additional space around the historic house, given that this is likely to be a designation of an individual property, and is not located within a historic district, so the context is the property itself. He stated that the stepping down of the massing at the front of the new construction and the change in material are two steps in the right direction. Mr. Detwiler agreed that the change in material is successful.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he appreciates the situation regarding the pending historic designation, and would take this type of proposed design over the complete loss of the historic house. Ms. Stein agreed.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the removal of the rear of the historic house.
 - Ms. Woodcock responded that the main block of the historic house is proposed for retention, and all rear additions are proposed for removal.
- Ms. Stein asked for a site plan for Option 2, noting that the site plan in the application materials pertains to the original design.
 - Ms. Woodcock explained that the location of the new construction in both options was not changed in relation to the street, but it was lowered in height in Option 2. The stair tower was moved back into the building so that the front is less wide than is shown in the site plan provided for the original design, giving additional room between the historic building and the new construction.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the proposed use of the new construction.
 - Ms. Woodcock responded that it will be multi-family residential.
- Ms. Lukachik asked if the new construction could be pushed farther back from the rear of the historic building. She noted that it is proposed to be approximately five feet in depth which appears to be crowding the historic house. Ms. Gutterman asked about the intention of the new rear wall of the historic house. Ms. Stein suggested a buffer of 20 to 25 feet at the rear and 15 to 20 feet at the side between the historic house and the new construction. Mr. Detwiler agreed that it is important to get light through to the rear of the historic house.
 - Ms. Woodcock responded that they can install windows in the rear wall if it is over five feet in distance from the new construction. She stated that she has additional renderings to show this view but those were not provided to the staff in advance of the meeting.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about zoning.
 - Ms. Woodcock responded that it is by-right zoning.

- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Committee typically has the input regarding boundaries from the Committee on Historic Designation before reviewing projects.
 - Ms. Woodcock asked about submitting for that process.
 - Ms. Chantry explained that the Committee on Historic Designation is scheduled to review the nomination at its 2 June 2021 meeting.
 - Ms. Woodcock asked about submitting these plans for review by the Committee on Historic Designation.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that the Committee on Historic Designation focuses its reviews on the merits of the nomination.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Committee on Historic Designation would likely want to see this proposal.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the stone retaining wall.
 - Ms. Woodcock responded that the historic steps and schist wall will be retained, and where the historic wall ends, a similar masonry will be used to continue the wall as shown in the rendering.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the rounded corner of the new construction might work as stepping of the brick. He suggested a similar treatment for the curved edge of the new section of retaining wall. He thanked the developer for putting forward this plan to preserve the historic house.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Oscar Beisert, the author of the nomination of the property, about the demolition of the rear of the building, because no photographs were included in the application to show the rear.
 - Mr. Beisert responded that many rear ells, including this one, are important, but that the staff's recommendation regarding Section 6.9.a.10 of the Rules & Regulations, the so-called "transition rule," should be considered. He opined that allowing for the removal of the rear ell means that the developer will not oppose the designation and the main block of the house will be preserved as a result.
- Ms. Stein made a motion to recommend denial as presented, but explained that the applicants heard positive feedback on Option 2, and the recommendation of denial is because the Committee was not provided with a set of consistent documents to approve, owing to Option 2 being more recently designed. Mr. Cluver asked if there was a way to convey a conceptual-level approval, so that a vote of denial is not used as a tool against designation of the property. Ms. Stein agreed that she would recommend approval of this application if it were in-concept, but it was submitted as a final approval, and not enough information was provided to recommend approval. Mr. Cluver asked about changing the application from final approval to in-concept. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicants address the comments from the Architectural Committee and continue with the final approval process.
 - Mr. DeMarco explained that they chose final approval because of the issue of the late nomination after the developer had invested significantly in the property in what they thought was going to be an over-the-counter approval. He stated that they are committed to Option 2 and providing plans to the staff in advance of the Commission meeting.
 - Mr. Marshall agreed that they wish to stay with a final approval owing to time constraints, and an in-concept process requires two rounds of reviews in order to obtain a building permit. He stated that he can commit to making revisions based on the Committee's comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Toner, representing the Ridge Park Civic Association, noted that his client is the nominator and as such, his client believes the building is an important historic asset in the Ridge Park community, and the nomination was submitted in full accordance with the law.
- Ben She supported the application.
- Carolyn Campbell, a landscape architect, supported the application, and questioned who had been hired as the landscape architect and how the community could use the property.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commended the Ridge Park Civic Association and the Keeping Society for taking last-minute action to nominate the property as historic, and the developer for their willingness to work with and around the historic building. He supported the application.
- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, commented that he appreciates the developer's willingness to preserve the historic building, but that absent his actions as the author of the nomination, the building would be demolished. He stated that there has been a lot of praise for the developer, but it should not require a nomination to force a developer to work with a historic building. He commented that Option 2 is an improved design.
- Erin Witzel, a neighbor, commented that it is good that the developer is willing to work with the historic building, and that the community is concerned about increased density of new construction and the loss of historic resources.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 404 Fountain Street is under consideration for historic designation.
- This application proposes to retain the main block of the historic building but demolish the rear addition, which has limited visibility from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Section 6.9.a.10 of the Rules & Regulations is applicable, in light of the plans for the development of the property already in place at the time the Historical Commission notified the property owner of its intent to consider a designation.
- Option 2 provided in the application is the preferred design, but additional plans need to be provided for review by the Historical Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, owing to incompleteness.

ITEM: 404 FOUNTAIN ST MOTION: Denial owing to incompleteness MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 321 S CHADWICK ST

Proposal: Modify and legalize roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Olivia Baackes

Applicant: Olivia Baackes

History: 1890

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

In March 2021, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the construction of a roof deck without permits for this Contributing property in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. The deck, which sits on raised posts, replaced an earlier deck that was only a minimal black metal railing system connected into the roof, with no raised decking. The manner of construction of the new deck makes it more visible from the public right-of-way than others on this block, of which there are several with railings that are visible. This application proposes to modify and legalize the existing roof deck by adding copper standing seam metal roofing to the area between the decking and roof in order to hide the raised posts.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install standing seam metal roofing between decking and roof.
- Legalize deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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 work will 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.*
 - The constructed deck is not compatible with the historic features of the property.

- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The as-built deck is highly visible from the public right-of-way. If modified as proposed in the submitted drawings, the deck would remain conspicuous from the public right-of-way, and therefore the application fails to satisfy this guideline.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:54:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owners Olivia Baackes and John Scanlon, and architect Joe Lombardi represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Scanlon explained that he and Ms. Baackes believe their application takes into account the historic nature of their property and the surrounding context, and that they are open to feedback regarding the proposed solution to retain the as-built deck and install a covering over the structure.
- Ms. Stein explained that the staff recommended denial because the deck, railing, and pressure-treated wood are all highly visible from the public right-of-way. She explained that the Roofs Guideline calls for roof decks to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. She stated that the Committee would have recommended denial if this were submitted as a proposal for construction because it is not inconspicuous. She stated that the deck would need to be set back from the front of the building. She stated that the Committee must review this application as if it were a new design because it is so vastly different from the makeshift deck that was there at the time of purchase. She opined that installing copper in front of the wood structure does not help because it is not something one would typically see in this neighborhood and it is not contextual to the historic property.
 - Ms. Baackes explained that the deck design is not what was intended or discussed with the contractor, and that the intention was to have the deck be under twelve inches above the roof. She observed that the deck with any amount of setback will be visible because of the surface parking lot across the street that extends from Chadwick Street to S. 17th Street. She stated that other large roof decks on the block do not have a setback. She explained that they have hired an architect to help find a solution. She noted that a letter of support from 12 neighbors was submitted to the staff the evening prior. She stated that they are open to suggestions on material to cover the structure, but that they chose copper because another house on the block uses it.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that other decks on the block are not as high above the roof, being 12 inches compared to three feet. She stated that the deck would have to be pulled back considerably to make it inconspicuous.
 - Ms. Baackes explained that the roof deck on the closest house sits on a roof that pitches front to back, whereas her roof pitches from the back to front, which is why it sits so high in order to be level.

- Ms. Lukachik commented that the prior deck was not so imposing from the street, and it was lower and did not make its presence felt like the current deck.
 - Ms. Baackes responded that she believes that covering the support structure will allow the deck to blend nicely with the house. She noted that the prior deck was sloped. She explained that they replaced the roof out of necessity, and the roof slope increased owing to old layers of roofing that were removed. She stated that they would have liked to have replaced the deck in kind but could not.
- Ms. Stein asked for clarify on the process up to this point.
 - Ms. Baackes explained that when they had to replace the roof, they were incorrectly told that they were replacing what was there and therefore did not need a permit. She acknowledged that they should have done their due diligence. She explained that they agreed with that contractor that there would be one small step up, but they were out of town when the deck was constructed. When they returned home, the deck was complete and there were three steps up. She reiterated that this is not what was agreed upon, but that they have now hired an architect to work with them on this process moving forward.
- Ms. Stein asked if the architect thinks it is possible to push the deck back from the front of the building.
 - Mr. Lombardi explained that the existing pilot house is six-feet six-inches back from the edge of the roof, so if one were to exit the pilot house door and have a three foot landing, the most the railing could be moved back is three-feet six-inches, so that there would still be enough room to exit the pilot house. He confirmed that the pilot house door could not be on the opposite side because the stairs go straight up with no landing.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the footprint of the prior deck compared to the new deck, noting that they seem fairly comparable.
 - Ms. Baackes agreed, and explained that the only change is not having the new railing cut around the condenser.
- Mr. Cluver stated that his objection is to the height of the deck. He asked if it is possible to step the deck down, and to have the back half be higher and to have the front half stepped down. Mr. Detwiler agreed, and noted that the prior deck was essentially a carpet on a roof that followed the roof slope. He observed that the new structure sits on top of the parapet, but the more you pull it back, the higher it will appear.
 - Ms. Baackes agreed that setting the deck back a few feet will help with visibility from the street but that it does not help with visibility from the surface parking lot and it may appear awkward and higher to have the deck set back. She stated that their strong preference is to leave the deck as-is and find an appropriate cover for the structure, owing to cost concerns but also usability of the space.
- Ms. Lukachik asked why the deck ended up being this tall. She noted that if it had been pulled in from the parapet, it could be lower.
 - Mr. Lombardi agreed, and opined that the contractor sat it on top of the parapet at the rear to make it easier, and that set the overall height. He stated that it would have been eight or nine inches lower if the contractor had built it on the roof side of the parapet rather than on top of it, but that it would still be taller than the prior deck because of keeping it level rather than sloped.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that it is unfortunate that the contractor built it this way, but that the Committee cannot recommend approval. She stated that covering the face will not help with the issue of the height above the roof. Mr. Detwiler agreed, and explained that every property owner is held to a consistent standard, and that this

- would not receive a recommendation of approval if it were presented to the Committee as a proposal for construction of a deck.
- Ms. Baackes asked if the Committee would consider approval of a revised design where the deck steps down at the front.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that she would need to see the drawings before opining on it.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that if this were a typical application for a deck, the Committee would recommend that it be set back significantly from the front façade so that it is inconspicuous from the sidewalk across the street.
 - Ms. Baackes asked if the prior railing was in violation.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that it was likely there prior to the historic designation of the building, and so it was grandfathered in until its removal.
 - Mr. Lombardi asked for guidance on where the sightline studies should be from.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested from the sidewalk on the opposite side of Chadwick Street. Mr. Detwiler suggested also from the corner of Pine and Chadwick Streets. Committee members agreed that the view from or past the surface parking lot was not necessary to consider.
 - Ms. Stein suggested that the applicants provide photographs from the street of a mockup to show visibility of a revised setback.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The roof deck was constructed without Historical Commission approval or a building permit from the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The constructed deck is not compatible with the historic features of the property, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The as-built deck is highly visible from the public right-of-way. If modified as proposed in the submitted drawings, the deck would remain conspicuous from the public right-of-way, and therefore the application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 321 S CHADWICK ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 26 N 3RD ST

Proposal: Modify and legalize vinyl windows and repainting of façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Demesquita

Applicant: Magdalis Melo, Magda Green Design, LLC

History: 1866

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

In February 2021, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for work to the façade at 26 N. 3rd Street which was neither permitted nor reviewed by the Historical Commission. This work, which occurred in 2019 but was more recently brought to the staff's attention by a neighbor, included repainting of the front façade and replacement of the windows in floors two through four.

The historic windows were four-over-four in pane configuration. The windows installed in 2019 are vinyl one-over-one hung windows with a transom to build down the height in floors two and three. The applicant is seeking approval to retain the vinyl windows, and apply an exterior muntin to the sash in order to create the appearance of four-over-four panes. The transoms would remain unmodified on the taller windows.

The application does not address the repainting of the façade, but the staff notes that the façade was painted a light color at the time of historic designation, but not the color of the underlying masonry.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Apply exterior muntins to existing vinyl windows.
- Legalize repainting of façade and modified vinyl windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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.

- The vinyl windows, with or without the proposed applied muntins, do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. The white paint on the façade is not the color of the underlying masonry.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:23:40

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman stated that the transoms and vinyl windows do not meet preservation standards, and that the Committee should agree with the staff recommendation of denial. Other Committee members agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The façade work was undertaken without Historical Commission approval or a building permit from the Department of Licenses and Inspections.
- The applicant was not present to discuss the application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The vinyl windows, with or without the proposed applied muntins, do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. The white paint on the façade is not the color of the underlying masonry. Therefore the proposed work does not satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 26 N 3RD ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2008 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct seven-story building along Chancellor Street

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Warren Lexton

Applicant: David Whipple, Assimilation Design Lab LLC

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a seven-story building to be located on the vacant area at the rear of 2008 Walnut Street. The new construction would face Chancellor Street and would not connect to the historic building. As proposed, the building would be seven stories and contain 13 residential units. It would have a roof deck for residential use, on-site and off-site parking, and mechanical basement space. The proposed cladding materials are brick at the first three floors of the building and metal standing seam siding for the upper floors. The windows would be a black aluminum clad with simulated divided lites. It would have an open parking area at the first floor.

A new building of a similar scale stands adjacent to this property at 2010 Walnut Street. It was approved by the Historical Commission in 2016.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct new seven-story building with roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

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

- Since Chancellor Street is primarily composed of low-scale buildings, the proposed new construction should be reduced in height or incorporate setbacks to meet Standard 9. Although the approved project at 2010 Walnut Street is seven floors, the top floor steps back to mitigate the appearance of height.
- Screen or enclose the first-floor parking area to satisfy Standard 9.
- *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 will be unimpaired.*
 - Since the new construction is separated from the historic building, the application satisfies Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:26:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect David Whipple and developer Yoav Schiffman represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Whipple indicated that he had reviewed the full staff recommendation. He said that, after discussing it with the owner, they felt they could respond to concerns about the first-floor parking and upper-floor setbacks.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed her concerns that the application did not meet Standard 9 because its design is not compatible within the context of the historic district.
 - Mr. Whipple pointed out that the new building would be completely separate from the historic building and would not involve the removal of any historic fabric. He said that the first three floors are intended to be compatible with the buildings along Chancellor Street and then would switch to a different material above that. Mr. Whipple continued that the vertical metal picket railings, windows, and wood on the balconies are material referenced from the design of other buildings along Chancellor Street.
- Ms. Stein asked about the staff comment on building height. She contended that the proposed building is taller than anything else on the street. Ms. Stein asked if they were willing to reduce the height.
 - Mr. Whipple replied that the adjacent building is taller, but it steps back at the top floors. He noted that the proposed building is not as tall, but does not step back. Mr. Whipple pointed out that the height is compatible with other buildings on Walnut Street and others in the surrounding context.
- Multiple Committee members expressed concern about the proposed height. They stated they cannot approve a building that appears taller than 2010 Walnut Street.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that the adjacent building at 2010 Walnut Street steps back at the top levels and the proposed building does not. She said the height and massing are too much for Chancellor Street.
- Ms. Gutterman said she is concerned about the mix of exterior materials proposed. She added that it is too busy for the neighborhood.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the adjacent newer construction at 2010 Walnut Street provides a guide for what would be acceptable to the Historical Commission. He

- specifically noted 2010 Walnut Street's six floors facing Chancellor Street and the setbacks on the seventh and eighth floors.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the top of the building, specifically the tall parapet or spandrel area above the top-level windows.
 - Mr. Whipple replied that it is concealing mechanical equipment.
 - Ms. Stein stated she is opposed to wood as a primary façade material given the scale of the building. She noted that larger panels may work but that clapboard as a primary material on this building is not appropriate in the historic district. Other Committee members agreed.
 - Mr. Schiffman pointed out the materials on 2010 Walnut Street, specifically the metal panels.
 - Ms. Stein said that metal panels are preferable as a primary façade material rather than clapboard. Mr. Detwiler suggested Hardie panels as another option.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Ben She stated that he believed with certain design revisions the proposed building would be compatible with historic district.
- Chris Mejia-Smith agreed with Mr. She's comments and also commented that imposing height limits on a building in Center City is misplaced. He believed that with appropriate revisions to the façade and materials, the proposed building would not have an adverse impact on the neighborhood.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The current height and mass are not compatible with Chancellor Street.
- The building cannot appear taller than the rear addition to 2010 Walnut Street.
- The cladding materials should be compatible with the historic district and appropriate for a seven-story building.
- The first three floors must be visually integrated into the smaller, residential scale of Chancellor Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Since Chancellor Street is primarily composed of low-scale buildings, the proposed new construction should be reduced in height or incorporate setbacks to meet Standard 9. Exterior materials should also be compatible with the surrounding historic district to meet Standard 9.
- Since the new construction is separated from the historic building, the application satisfies Standard 10.

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

ITEM: 2008 WALNUT ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1819 ADDISON ST

Proposal: Construct pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bohdan & Elizabeth Kulchychy

Applicant: Ed Barnhart, Always by Design

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes alterations to the front elevation, rear elevation, and roof of 1819 Addison Street. The property is a three-story brick row house with a low pitch gable roof. The majority of properties along this block of Addison Street are a similar height and scale. The rear of the property faces Waverly Street, used primarily as a service alley for parking, trash receptacles, and mechanical equipment.

SCOPE OF WORK:

Front elevation:

- Replace existing front door with a traditional solid 6-panel wood door and install storm door.
- Replace existing front windows with double-hung, six-over-six, simulated-divided-light, aluminum-clad wood windows.

Rear elevation:

- Remove roof canopy and column above existing rear entryway.
- Relocate rear door to underneath existing two-story "tower" wing.
- Insert column under existing two-story "tower" wing.
- Alter rear window configurations to suit interior room changes using casement and awning type windows without muntins.
- Relocate HVAC condensers from street level to roof level.

Roof

- Insert two low-profile skylights to front roof.

- Add roof deck above existing roof. New roof deck includes pilot house, parapets, railings, and hot tub.
- Install HVAC condensers at new roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New addition, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spacial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will 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.*
 - Proposed work on the front façade satisfies Standard 9.
 - Owing to Waverly Street's much altered and non-historic streetscape as well as its use as a service alley, the majority of the proposed work at the rear facing Waverly satisfies Standard 9. Window openings should be maintained as much as possible and replacement windows should be maintained as double-hung where possible in order to satisfy Standard 9.
 - The proposed rooftop work does not satisfy Standard 9, as explained below.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The proposed front skylights satisfy the Roofs Guideline.
 - The proposed deck covers a portion of the front roof and all of the rear roof, including the ridge. The proposed deck would not be inconspicuous or minimally visible and would significantly alter the spatial characteristics of the character-defining gable roof, the roof deck does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the roof deck, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline; approval of the work proposed to front and rear façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:46:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ed Barnhart and owner Liz Kulchychy represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver said his main concern is the projection of the deck over the roof ridge line toward the front of the house. He expressed concern over the potential visibility of the roof deck along Addison Street.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Historical Commission has a precedent of approving decks that sit behind the gable ridge and on the rear roof.
 - Mr. Barnhart replied that the depth of the house is approximately 28 feet and the owner wished to have specific amenities on the roof. These amenities would require additional space, and this is the reason for bringing the roof deck over the ridge and on to the front roof.

- The Committee members inquired if a structural engineer was on the project to review the additional weight added through the addition of a deck that includes a hot tub.
 - Mr. Barnhart confirmed there is a structural engineer on the project as everything underneath the existing slope will need to be rebuilt to accommodate the added weight.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he understands the desire for a roof deck given the limited outdoor space. He stressed that he still believes the deck should only be located behind the ridge and on the rear slope of the roof.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about rear elevation changes and how the size of the proposed windows openings compare to the existing ones.
 - Mr. Barnhart explained that it depends on the window location and the updated interior plan. He confirmed that some windows will be infilled as shown in the proposed rendering.
- Mr. Cluver asked why the window style is changing from double-hung windows.
 - Mr. Barnhart responded that the owner prefers casement and awning windows on the rear.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated his preference is for double-hung windows along with the existing openings to remain as much as possible on the rear elevation. He noted that there is the visual rhythm and historic precedent of double-hung windows on the rear elevations along this block of Waverly Street.
 - Mr. Barnhart replied they could try to do that as much as possible but would need to make some changes based on the proposed interior changes.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro said the existing openings could remain in place and the interior changes could be made behind them.
- Ms. Lukachik inquired about the white screen wall on the ground level of the rear elevation.
 - Mr. Barnhart said it is existing but will be painted. He noted that it could be altered as a fence in the future.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the wall could be extended, and they could create a yard in the back rather than placing the outdoor space on the roof.
 - Mr. Barnhart said the rear service and parking area was not the kind of place where you would want to spend time.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the repair work needed for the rear façade.
 - Mr. Barnhart responded that the goal is to make a unified rear brick façade, but they could consider keeping the stucco portion at the base of the first floor.
 - Ms. Stein said she is concerned it will appear as a patchwork given the amount of work proposed. Ms. Lukachik agreed with this comment.
- Ms. Kulchyj commented on dingy environment of the service alley along Waverly Street and that their goal to improve the rear elevation's appearance. She said they wished to bring in as much light as possible into the rear of the property and requested that Committee members take this into consideration.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out the existing window openings on the rear elevation look like they are presently built down and if taken back to their original frame size, they would gain additional light as a result.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission has a practice of denying roof decks set above and/or in front of the ridge lines of gable roofs. It requires that roof decks are set behind and below the roof ridge when located on gable roofs.
- The proposed deck would cover a portion of the front roof and all of the rear roof, including the ridge.
- Many of the rear windows and windows openings facing the rear service alley would be altered from their historic locations and configurations.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work on the front and rear façade satisfies Standard 9, but it is suggested that the existing rear window openings and the double-hung window configurations should be retained as much as possible.
- The proposed deck would not be inconspicuous or minimally visible and would significantly alter the spatial characteristics of the character-defining gable roof, and would therefore fail to satisfy Standard 9 or the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the roof deck, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline; approval of the work proposed to front and rear façade, with the suggestion that the rear window configurations and openings should be retained, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1819 ADDISON ST					
MOTION: Denial of deck; approval of other work					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 413 S ISEMINGER ST

Proposal: Construct shed dormer and rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Hardt

Applicant: Susan Miller Davis

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a front dormer and rear third-floor addition with deck on this mid-block rowhouse. The existing roof slopes in a continuous plane from back to front, as do the roofs of several adjacent houses on the street. The adjacent houses at 409, 411, and 415 S. Iseminger Street have wide shed dormers at the front. The wide shed dormer at 411 S. Iseminger Street dates to 1958 and predates the designation of the property. A wide shed dormer at 421 S. Iseminger Street was approved by the Historical Commission in 2002. The wide shed dormer at 415 S. Iseminger Street was approved by the Historical Commission in 2005, seemingly to be consistent with the 2002 approval for 421 S. Iseminger Street, according to the meeting minutes. The rear of this property is not visible from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct 8'-6" wide front dormer.
- Construct additional story on existing two-story rear addition with deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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 work will 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.*
 - The existing sloped roof, which is not discernable from the street, is not a character-defining feature of the building, and the new dormer will have the same impact on the street as the existing wide shed dormers found on adjacent properties, which is minimal. The dormer will be compatible with the block and will not impact the integrity of the environment.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:14:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Susan Miller Davis represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked the staff if the proposed dormer would be the same size as the existing dormers at the adjacent houses.

- Ms. Schmitt replied that her understanding was that the dormer was proposed to be the same size as the others.
- Ms. Davis confirmed that she was using the adjacent dormers as her model and had designed the dormer for the subject property to be the same size.
- Ms. Gutterman asked what kind of cladding would be used at the dormer.
 - Ms. Davis responded that she proposed to use the same siding as the neighboring houses, which was likely wood.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that because Ms. Davis was basing her proposal on dormers that had been approved previously by the Historical Commission, the design was definitely precedent for an approval, with the staff to review the details.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern that the neighboring dormers had shingles rather than wood at the cheek walls.
 - Ms. Davis confirmed that she would use wood cladding.
- Ms. Stein asked Ms. Schmitt about the rear deck that was proposed to cantilever off of the back façade. She asked whether it was still under the purview of the Historical Commission even though it would not be visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Stein expressed concern about such a large deck cantilevering off the rear wall of this individually designated building. She suggested that reducing the deck from four feet to two feet would be more appropriate.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that the staff's recommendation of approval was owing to the fact that the deck would not be visible from the right-of-way.
 - Ms. Davis said that she had an engineer on the team but was waiting for comments from the Historical Commission before engaging her. She remarked that reducing the depth of the deck could be easily done.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicant provide an elevation drawing and photos of the existing conditions of the rear of the property to the Historical Commission for its review.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This application was in keeping with previous Historical Commission approvals for the construction of dormers at adjacent properties.
- A Juliet balcony with a two-foot depth would be more appropriate for the rear of this house.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The current proposal would have the same minimal impact to the streetscape as those dormers that were previously approved, satisfying Standard 9.
- The balcony at the rear, once reduced in size, would be more appropriate and inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the depth of the proposed rear deck is minimized to two feet and the dormer is designed to closely match the dormers at the adjacent houses, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 413 S ISEMINGER ST MOTION: Approval with condition MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2409 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct addition with decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jessica & Gregory Phillips

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects, LLC

History: 1963, William Weissman, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The property at 2409 Delancey Place is part of a row of buildings on the north side of the 2400-block of Delancey Place constructed in the about 1963 by architect Walter Weissman. The building at 2409 Delancey Place is one story tall along the street with a second story set back from the front façade. It is classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fittler Historic District.

This application proposes to construct a third and fourth-story addition with decks. Currently, the ground floor facing Delancey Place is finished with smooth stucco and board formed concrete. The façade materials proposed for the addition includes wood cladding and metal panels.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a third and fourth-story addition with decks.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition appears to be compatible in materiality and massing with the other buildings on the block; however, the applicant should clarify how the overall height of the proposed building relates to the adjacent structures. Owing to its location within a row of non-contributing structures, the proposed

- building would not destroy any historic materials, nor would it impact the historic integrity of the surrounding environment. The work complies with this standard.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - *Recommended: Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
 - The proposal adds a third and fourth story to a non-contributing building located in a row of non-contributing buildings. The proposed addition is compatible in materiality and massing and would have no visual impact on the historic district. The work complies with this guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:25:24

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gabriel Deck represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked if there were any four-story buildings on this block.
 - Mr. Deck responded that there were some four-story buildings directly behind the subject property. He pointed out that there was also a three-story building at the corner that was much higher than the height he was proposing for this project. Mr. Deck acknowledged that the subject property was situated between two three-story buildings. He explained that the proposed roof deck was placed on the roof of the third story rather than on the roof of the fourth story.
- Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern that the application materials did not provide enough context to explain how the proposal fit in with the adjacent properties or the block.
- Ms. Lukachik asked the applicant to explain why they were proposing to expand the cellar.
 - Mr. Deck replied that his client wanted to extend the cellar to match the floor print of the ground floor.
- Mr. Cluver asked the staff to confirm that the subject property was located within a row of non-contributing buildings.
 - Ms. Schmitt confirmed this was accurate.
- Mr. Cluver asked if there were contributing structures across the street from the subject property.
 - Ms. Schmitt said that there were a few contributing building across the street.
- Mr. Cluver commented that what was pertinent for this review was how the proposed design would impact the historic district. He opined that this block was not a particularly strong contributor to the historic district overall, and his biggest concern was really with the fourth story. Mr. Cluver remarked that the application did not provide sufficient information about the context surrounding the subject property. He

added that if the proposal was for a three-story house, no further discussion would be necessary, but the fourth story was giving him pause.

- Mr. McCoubrey said that he was also concerned with the proposed use of wood cladding. Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Cluver agreed.
- Mr. Cluver asked the staff what the expectation of the applicant was when the staff stated that the height of the proposed building must be shown to be compatible with its surroundings.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that the staff's concern was with the proposed overall height, not necessarily with the number of stories.
- Mr. Deck asked if the request of the members of the Architectural Committee was to provide additional materials that would demonstrate how the proposed design fits into its immediate surroundings.
- Ms. Gutterman responded that normally they would request a mock up. However, that did not seem feasible in this case. She told the applicant that ultimately they needed to show how the massing and height of the proposed design would impact the adjacent structures and the context of the block, as well as the historic district overall.
- Mr. Cluver agreed, adding that the applicant's task is to provide materials that show that the fourth story would have a negligible impact on the overall historic district.
- Ms. Gutterman added that the applicant also needed to come up with alternative materials to the proposed wood cladding.
 - Mr. Deck asked why the wood cladding was unacceptable.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that wood was not a material seen throughout the historic district and that the building materials needed to be more compatible with the surrounding structures.
- Ms. Stein said that because of the setback of the addition, she did not object to the massing and scale of the design as proposed. She said that she was in complete agreement with the other members of the Architectural Committee about the inappropriateness of the wood cladding as a primary façade material.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he was inclined to agree with Ms. Stein's comments about the scale and massing. However he hesitated because he did not feel as though he could understand how the design would fit into its context and the streetscape. He suggested that the applicant add additional details of the streetscape to the renderings that had been provided. Mr. Detwiler added that he was in agreement that wood cladding was not appropriate for this historic district.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application did not provide sufficient information about how the proposed fourth story would fit into the context of the adjacent buildings, the block, or the overall historic district.
- The use of wood cladding as a primary façade material was not compatible with the materials commonly found in the historic district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The applicant should provide more documentation to establish that the proposed fourth story will have a negligible impact on the adjacent structures, the block and the

overall historic district, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and New Construction.

- Alternative materials that are compatible with the historic district should be selected in place of wood cladding, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to a lack of information about the appropriateness of the proposed fourth story and to the proposed use of wood cladding as a primary façade material, pursuant to Standard 9, and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ITEM: 2409 DELANCEY PL					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	7				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2411 DELANCEY PL, UNIT A

Proposal: Construct four-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Eugenia & Steven Galetta

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects, LLC

History: 1967

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The property at 2411 Delancey Place, Unit A, is part of a row of nondescript buildings constructed in the late 1960s on the north side of the 2400-block of Delancey Street. They are part of the development of Bauhaus-style structures that stand to the south on Delancey Street, but do not share the Bauhaus styling. Both the Delancey and Cypress sections of the development are classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. The fronts of the buildings face an interior court between Delancey Place and Cypress Street, and the rears of the buildings face directly onto Cypress Street. The south side of the 2400-block of Cypress Street consists of seven non-contributing buildings, while the rears of the Spruce Street properties, which include numerous roll-down gates, comprise the block's north side. No contributing structures front onto the street.

Within the past couple years, a fire destroyed an adjacent building and caused significant damage to 2411 Delancey Place. The Historical Commission staff approved a permit for complete demolition of the fire-damaged structure on 4 December 2020. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued the permit in January 2021, and the four-story building was subsequently demolished.

This application proposes to construct a four-story building with a roof deck and pilot house in place of the previous non-contributing structure. At its Cypress Street elevation, the new building would feature a brick base and balcony at the second story. It would be clad in composite panel siding with flat metal accent panels. Like the previous building, the new structure would have a garage door at the first story.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story building with pilot house and roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed four-story building would replace a previous building of approximately the same size. The new building would be compatible in massing, size, and scale. Owing to its location within a row of non-contributing structures, the proposed building would not destroy any historic materials, nor would it impact the historic integrity of the surrounding environment. The work complies with this standard.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - *Recommended: Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
 - The proposed building would be visible only from Cypress Street, where no fronts of contributing or significant structures are located. The proposed building is compatible in massing and size and would have no visual impact on the historic district. The work complies with this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:47:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MAY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Architect Gabriel Deck represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Deck explained that, owing to the fire at an adjacent building, he is proposing to replace the building's massing in kind. He noted that the front courtyard elevation would be clad in brick and that the Cypress Street elevation would be clad in a large-format composite panel system in lieu of stucco. New construction, he added, has been permitted to the east of this property.
- Mr. Cluver questioned whether the roof deck and pilot house would be visible from Cypress Street, noting that they are not represented in the rendering but that the roof deck extends to the edge of the building.
 - Mr. Deck responded that the building includes a 42-inch parapet that would serve as the railing and would eliminate views of the pilot house from Cypress Street.
- The Committee discussed the chimney on the adjacent property and questioned whether any alterations would need to be made to it owing to the proposed new construction. The Committee concluded that it was outside the scope of the application under review.
 - Mr. McCoubrey recommended incorporating a reveal or other feature to distinguish the chimney from the façade of the new building.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether any other balconies exist along Cypress Street.
 - Mr. Deck replied that photographs of the block are included in the application and that the previous structure did not have a balcony, but that it was the preference of the owner to try to provide some outdoor space to the second story. He noted that he received zoning approval for it.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked that it not be included.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested that it be reduced to a Juliet balcony.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned why Mr. Deck proposed panels for the Cypress Street façade rather than stucco like the other buildings in the row.
 - Mr. Deck responded that there are metal panels only between the window groupings and that the majority of the building would be clad in large-format Viroc or fiber cement panels with a smooth finish to blend with the adjacent stucco. He added that there were concerns with using stucco.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the operability of the proposed windows.
 - Mr. Deck explained that the larger window in the groupings would be operable and the smaller would be fixed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- A fire damaged the four-story, non-contributing structure that previously stood at 2411 Delancey Street, Unit A. The building was demolished under a valid demolition permit.
- The application proposes to construct a four-story building of the same massing as the previous building; the new building would include a roof deck and pilot house.
- The building's design would include a 42-inch parapet wall that would disguise the roof deck and pilot house, eliminating visibility from Cypress Street.
- The building would feature a second-story balcony on the Cypress Street elevation.

- The Cypress Street façade would be clad in large-format fiber cement panels to mimic the appearance of stucco.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The balcony on the Cypress Street elevation should be reduced in size to match the width of the opening.
- The proposed building approximates the massing and size of the previous building and is compatible with the adjacent buildings in massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The work complies with Standard 9.
- Owing to its location with visibility only on Cypress Street, the proposed building would have no visual impact on the historic district. The work complies with the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the suggestion that the width of the balcony at the Cypress Street elevation be reduced to match the width of the opening, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ITEM: 2411 DELANCEY PL, UNIT A MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1016 PINE ST

Proposal: Demolish rear slope of roof and rear ell; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dov Blutstein

Applicant: Andrew Miller

History: 1830; Queen Anne storefront added, 1885

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear three-story addition at 1016 Pine Street. According to the Department of Licenses and Inspections' records, the property suffered a fire in September 2018 and has since remained vacant. The extent of damage caused by the fire remains unclear to the staff; however, aerial photographs from 2020 show that the exterior roofs, dormers, and ell remain intact.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MAY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The proposed addition would require the demolition of the rear ell, which dates to the early twentieth century, as well as the rear roof and rear dormer of the historic main block. While the rear of the property is minimally visible from Waverly Street, the amount of demolition is substantial and would leave only the front façade and front roof and dormer of the historic building. The plans do not clearly indicate whether the rear wall of the main block would be retained.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear roof, rear dormer, and rear ell; and
- Construct three-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed new addition would require significant demolition at the rear, causing the loss of the character-defining roofline and rear dormer. The application shows that the rear ell, constructed between 1910 and 1916, is in poor condition and may be compromised. If the ell requires replacement, the new construction should be undertaken in a manner that does not require the demolition of the roof of the main block. As proposed, the addition is not compatible in massing, size, and scale. The work does not comply with this standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The addition would cause the removal of the rear roof slope and dormer and would reconfigure the shape of the roofline, altering its historic form and appearance. If removed in the future, the form of the main block would be impaired. The work does not comply with this standard.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:01:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Andrew Miller and architect Leonid Chachkes represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Chachkes stated that the windows and doors at the front façade are currently blocked with plywood and that the only work to the façade would be to install new windows and doors. The façade would be retained, he added. He elaborated that the rear of the property is not street-facing and claimed that the addition would match the other rears of the row, adding that the addition would not extend above the ridgeline.

- Ms. Gutterman inquired how much fire damage the interior sustained and asked if Mr. Chachkes has photos showing the current condition.
 - Mr. Chachkes answered that the damage was extensive but that he does not have any photographs of the interior.
- Ms. Stein asked whether one can walk on the second-floor joists.
 - Mr. Chachkes answered that he could walk on the stairs but that it was too dangerous to walk in the rear ell. He noted that he could walk in the main block of the building.
- Ms. Lukachik inquired whether a condition assessment of the property had been undertaken after the fire.
 - Mr. Chachkes responded that the building needs to be rebuilt without question and that it cannot remain in its current state. He contended that it will continue to deteriorate and that in a few years there will be nothing to preserve.
- Ms. Lukachik commented that the Committee does not understand the conditions because no interior photographs or condition assessment was included in the application.
- Ms. Stein asked whether a structural engineer has assessed the property and whether the roof joists and floor joists need to be replaced due to the severity of fire damage.
 - Mr. Chachkes replied that he is a registered engineer. He commented that the joists are severely damaged only at the rear of the building. He clarified that the front section of the roof and floors will remain.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that the plans show that the rear slope of the roof of the main block will be removed.
 - Mr. Chachkes responded that any portion of the building visible from Pine Street will remain.
- Ms. Gutterman asked that Mr. Chachkes submit an illustrated report showing the condition of the framing, so the Committee can understand how much work has to be done to make the building safe. She elaborated that the Committee cannot base its recommendation off of verbal statements made by Mr. Chachkes when no documentation has been submitted. The current application, she continued, proposes to remove most of a historic resource without submitting documentation that supports that decision.
 - Ms. Lukachik agreed, adding that the report should note the condition of the floors, walls, and roof as it relates to the fire damage. She asked that, in addition to the current condition, the building's capacity to be reused be included.
 - Mr. Chachkes countered that the portion of the roof to be removed is shown on the longitudinal cross section. He also stated that he has not been inside the building in three years and that it has deteriorated further. He claimed that in another three years it will collapse completely.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that if the building collapses, the owner will be responsible for reconstructing it to its historic appearance. She further acknowledged that the drawing shows how much of the roof is proposed for removal but reiterated that there is no supporting documentation that explains why the roof needs to be removed.
 - Mr. Chachkes argued that the roof is damaged and questioned why the rear roof slope would need to be retained if it is not visible from the public right-of-way. He contended that if he needs to retain the roof he will not be able to install insulation the way it is supposed to be installed. He argued that not only would

- he have to preserve the building, but he would have to contend with the latest code requirements. He reiterated that he is not proposing to alter the front.
 - Ms. Gutterman countered that the concern is not solely with the front of the building but with the building exterior in its entirety.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the application qualifies as a demolition, owing to the extent of removal, which includes the rear roof and rear ell.
 - Mr. Chachkes argued that there is no roof at the rear, though a 2020 aerial image shows the roof intact. He asked if the Committee would like to leave the building for three more years and allow it to collapse.
- Ms. Stein asked whether Mr. Miller was the owner of the property.
 - Mr. Miller replied that he is counsel to the owner but that he understands the Committee's comments and requests. He asked for the opportunity to respond to the Committee's concerns and to provide an assessment with the details requested.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked that the report distinguish between the main block and rear ell.
- Ms. Stein noted that the current plans propose to demolish and reconstruct the rear ell much larger than it is. She asked that if the rear ell does need to be reconstructed owing to fire damage that the addition sit below the rear cornice line of the main block. She suggested that it be a three-story addition rather than the four-story addition as currently proposed.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the rear dormer and roof slope are character-defining features of the building and would need to be preserved or reconstructed.
 - Mr. Chachkes argued that the front dormer will remain.
 - Mr. McCoubrey countered that both dormers need to remain. He observed that the neighboring buildings all retain their front and rear slopes.
 - Mr. Chachkes claimed that the rear dormer no longer exists.
 - Mr. McCoubrey reiterated that the front and rear slopes and front and rear dormers are character-defining features and that if the dormer or slope no longer exists that it would have to be reconstructed.
- Mr. McCoubrey remarked that regardless of how much of the building needs to be removed owing to fire damage, he would not support the proposal to raise the roof at the rear and construct a four-story rear ell.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed, adding that the building would need to retain its current form, which is also found at the adjacent buildings in the row.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Contractor Lucky Re'em stated he has been inside the building and that it is not safe to walk through. He argued that it is unrepairable and that the rear wall is collapsing. He contended that the Committee should not consider the proposed work as a demolition, because the building is already collapsing. He asked that it be considered a "removal of debris."

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 1016 Pine Street suffered damage from a fire in 2018. The extent of damage has not been documented.
- The proposed work would retain the front façade and front roof slope and dormer, but the entire rear of the building, including the rear roof slope and dormer of the main block, would be demolished.

- A four-story rear addition is proposed to replace the existing two-story ell. The current ell dates to the early twentieth century and is not original to the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The rear roof slope and dormer are character-defining features and should not be removed. If removal is required, owing to the extent of damage, the features should be reconstructed to their historic appearance.
- A condition assessment of the property, which includes the condition of the floors, walls, and roof as it relates to the fire damage, should be submitted. The assessment should distinguish between the main block and rear ell. The assessment should include photographic documentation of the building's current interior.
- A rear addition should be limited to three stories and should not impact the existing cornice of the rear slope of the main block. As proposed, the addition is not compatible in massing, size, and scale and does not comply with Standard 9.
- The application constitutes a demolition, owing to the amount of removal proposed, which includes the removal of the rear roof and dormer and the rear ell. The work does not comply with Standard 10.

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

ITEM: 1016 PINE ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	7				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 04:23:15

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:24 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Architectural Committee are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MAY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES