

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

**TUESDAY, 23 APRIL 2024
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 9:08 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair		X	Arrived 9:24 a.m.
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		

The meeting was held remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Aaron Holly
Aaron Miller, cbp Architects
Andrew Zakroff, Urban Conversions
Ben Weinraub
Bill Klotz
Jake Blumgart
Brent Ainley
Brett Feldman, Esq.
C. Dorsaneo
Ed Houlne, Verizon
Edward Platt
Eric Leighton, cbp Architects

Erica Darken
Erin Abraham
Frank Renner
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Isabella Kitchen
Jay Ernst
Jay Farrell
Jim Boris
John Hunter
Judy Fagin
Kevin Flynn, AKRF
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Matthew Mowrer
Megan Schmidt
Michael Ramos
Michelle Diccico
Nancy Pontone
Nina Solomonick
Nusaybah Estes
Danny McGoldrick
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Peter Angelides, Econsult Solutions
Philip Radomski
Rustin Ohler, HDOA
Ryan Solimeo, HDOA
Stephan Potts, Stanev Potts Architects
Sue Patterson, Philadelphia Water Dept
Timothy Kilgore

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 4045-61 MAIN ST

Proposal: Demolish mill complex, construct residential building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: GJ Littlewood & Sons Inc.

Applicant: Adam Laver, Esq., Blank Rome

History: 1869; Littlewood & Co., Dyers and Bleachers

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, Significant, 12/14/1983

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolishing all but sections of the front facades of the buildings at a mill complex and constructing a seven-story residential building at 4045-61 Main Street at the corner of Main Street and Shurs Lane in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. The application claims that, owing to the configurations and conditions of the mill buildings as well as their location within the floodplain, the structures cannot be feasibly adaptively reused for any purpose. Several generations of the Littlewood family operated a dye house at the site from 1869 to 2021, when flooding from Hurricane Ida inundated the property and forced the closure of the business.

The mill complex is located in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District, which was designated by City Council by ordinance in 1983, before the Historical Commission itself had the authority to create historic districts. The properties in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District are subject to the provisions set forth in Section PM-804 of the Property Maintenance Code, which provides a concise set of design review criteria for permit applications but does not directly address demolition. Supplementing the limited nature of the provisions in the Property Maintenance Code for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District, Section 18 of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations authorizes the Historical Commission to apply the provisions of the historic preservation ordinance, Section 14-1000 of the Philadelphia Code, to properties in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District, provided those provisions do not conflict with the Property Maintenance Code. In this instance, the Historical Commission should apply the demolition provisions and the review criteria for new construction in the historic preservation ordinance.

Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance expressly prohibits the Historical Commission from approving demolitions of historic buildings unless it determines that:

- the demolition is necessary in the public interest; and/or,
- the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

In the first instance, the ordinance authorizes the Historical Commission to approve demolitions for public policy reasons, when the public interest advanced by the demolition greatly outweighs the public interest in the preservation of the building. In the second instance, the ordinance authorizes the Commission to approve demolitions when regulation of the property for preservation purposes would deny all economically viable use of it and thereby inflict a financial hardship on the owner. This application asks the Historical Commission to approve the demolition because the complex of buildings cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

The Main Street Manayunk Historic District was designated without a nomination and inventory. The nomination and inventory for the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District have been traditionally used in place of the missing nomination and inventory. The National Register inventory classifies this site as significant to the district.

The application materials identify 10 interconnected structures at the site. The oldest structures date to about 1869, when the business was founded. Structures were added, modified, and interconnected throughout the lifetime of the business as it grew during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. About 1899, the former Fountain Hotel, which was adjacent to the mill, was added to the complex as an office building. It is labeled Structure 1 in the application materials. The Fountain Hotel was noted as early as 1843 on a map of the County of Philadelphia. By 1885, the hotel had fallen from grace, when the *Inquirer* reported that the "Fountain Hotel, a sort of cheap lodging house at the foot of Shur's lane, near Main street, where about 18 families live, is the scene of great destitution. The poorest of all the poor live in this house." Located at the lowest point in Manayunk along the Schuylkill River, the hotel and mill flooded repeatedly in the nineteenth century, including in 1850, 1869, 1875, and 1889, as local newspapers reported. That pattern of flooding has continued to this day and is accelerating, owing to climate change.

The application includes an affidavit providing the information required by the preservation ordinance for hardship applications, an assessment of the existing conditions at the site, a report on flooding and its impact on redevelopment of the site, a planning analysis of the site and surroundings, an economic analysis of potential reuses of the property, a set of photographs and historic maps documenting the site, and architectural plans and renderings of the proposed building.

The application argues that there is no feasible way to adapt the mill complex to overcome the chronic flooding at the site. The application reports that the site is located in a Special Flood Hazard Area with a Base Flood Elevation of 41.40 feet and a Design Flood Elevation of 42.90 feet. The Base Flood Elevation (BFE) is the elevation that floodwaters have a 1% chance of reaching at the site in any given year. The Design Flood Elevation (DFE) is 18 inches above BFE and is the code-mandated elevation that is considered safely above expected flooding levels. The lowest elevation at the site is 29.11 feet, or 13.79 feet below the DFE. There are two methods for constructing or retrofitting buildings to survive in the floodplain. Dry floodproofing is a method used to render the building's structural envelope substantially impermeable to floodwaters. To dry floodproof a historic building, one would add an impermeable barrier around the building to the DFE to prevent floodwaters from entering the building. Wet floodproofing is a method that allows floodwaters to circulate through the lower sections of a building without substantial damage because occupied space and utilities have been elevated above the DFE. To wet floodproof a historic building, one would either raise the entire building up on piers above the DFE or leave the building in place and raise the occupied space and utilities like electrical and HVAC equipment within the building up above the DFE. This application claims that it is not feasible to dry or wet floodproof the mill complex. It claims that dry floodproofing, which would entail constructing a barrier or dam of sorts that would be almost 14 feet tall at the highest point, is not feasible and the resulting dam would be several times taller than floodproofing standards allow. It claims that wet floodproofing is also not feasible. The entire complex of historic interconnected masonry structures could not possibly be raised up on piers above the DFE. And the occupied space and utilities could not feasibly be elevated within the structures above the DFE by raising the floor levels and moving equipment; the buildings are primarily one story in height, limiting the amount of elevated floor space that could be achieved. The application concludes that the mill complex cannot be feasibly retrofitted for any possible new use, including

industrial, commercial, or residential. The application asserts that the only way to profitably reuse the site is to demolish the mill structures and construct a new building that is designed to withstand occasional flooding.

The proposed building that would replace the mill complex would be seven stories tall and include 167 residential units, 160 parking spaces, residential amenities, and a loading dock. The seventh story would be set back from the planes of the street facades. Occupied space and mechanical equipment would be located on and above the second floor, above the DFE. Walls from the mill complex along Main Street would be retained and incorporated into the new building. Windows and doors in the old walls would be restored. The new building would be clad in brick and corrugated metal.

The Committee on Financial Hardship reviewed the hardship portion of the application at its public meeting on 3 April 2024 and recommended that the Historical Commission find that the mill complex at 4045-61 Main Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, and approve the demolition, provided the site is recorded to HABS standards, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the City's historic preservation ordinance.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish all structures except portions of the facades along Main Street.
- Construct a seven-story building, incorporating the retained facades.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
- *Standard 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.*
 - o The complete demolition of the structures fails to satisfy Standards 2, 5, and 9.
 - o The proposed new building will be differentiated from the old. The size, scale, and massing of the proposed building will not be compatible with the historic district; it is much larger than the existing mill buildings as well as the nearby buildings in the historic district.
- *Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the City's historic preservation ordinance: No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.*

- o The Committee on Financial Hardship recommended that the buildings at 4041-65 Main Street cannot be used for any purpose for which they are or may be reasonably adapted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission find that the mill complex at 4045-61 Main Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, and approve the demolition, provided the site is recorded to HABS standards, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the City's historic preservation ordinance. The staff recommends that the proposed building fails to satisfy Standard 9 because its size, scale, and massing would not be compatible with the historic district. The Historical Commission could potentially approve a new building that does not satisfy the Standards, if doing so is the only way to viably redevelop and thereby restore some value to the property, but the application does not make that case.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:57

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Eric Leighton and consultants Kevin Flynn and Peter Angelides represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver stated that the application includes two parts, the documentation of the claim of hardship and the new construction proposal. He noted that the Committee on Financial Hardship has already reviewed the hardship claim. While the Architectural Committee may comment on the hardship claim, its primary focus should be the design of the new building.
- Ms. Stein asked Mr. Farnham what City agency ensures that construction projects comply with the floodplain regulations.
 - o Mr. Farnham replied that the Department of Licenses and Inspections ensures that construction projects comply with the floodplain regulations.
- Mr. Leighton introduced himself and noted that attorney Adam Laver was unable to attend today's hearing. He also noted that the Committee on Financial Hardship recommended that the application demonstrated that there is no feasible reuse for the site and in favor of complete demolition.
- Mr. Flynn, the floodplain resiliency consultant, stated that he was hired to evaluate flood risk at the property and then also to analyze potential redevelopment scenarios with respect to flood risk. He stated that his evaluation included an analysis of the existing structure, elevations at the site, interviews of the current property owner, and a study of historic flood events at the site. He showed a photograph of the subject property taken during the aftermath of Hurricane Ida at the corner of Main Street and Shur's Lane. During that flooding event, the water exceeded the building's finish floor elevations and compromised egress from the building. The owners had to escape out on the rooftops. The flooding ultimately prevented the continued business operation at that property. Mr. Flynn stated that he evaluated continued industrial use at the site and then also the renovation of the existing office building for various commercial uses. He stated that he concluded that the reuse of the existing structures under the redevelopment scenarios would require extreme and impractical floodproofing measures to comply with the City's flood hazard regulations. He stated that he reached that conclusion because of the property's location, which is one of the lowest sites in the historic district, and then

because of the significant flood depth at that location, which is the basis of design for compliance with the regulations. He pointed out that the Design Flood Elevation is nearly 14 feet above ground level at the lowest corner of the building. He showed an image of the front of the complex and explained that the yellow line represents the Design Flood Elevation, which is the basis of the City's floodplain regulations. The Design Flood Elevation is not based on a specific historic flood event, but it is calculated from FEMA's flood insurance study for the Schuylkill River. Mr. Flynn explained that he evaluated two redevelopment scenarios and considered two different options for compliance with the City's floodplain regulations: dry floodproofing, or making the structure impermeable to flood waters up to that Design Flood Elevation, and wet floodproofing, or allowing water to enter and exit the structure during a flood event because finished floors have been moved above the flood waters. Mr. Flynn stated that he analyzed all flood events at the site over the past 30 years. In addition to the catastrophic flooding of Ida, the site has faced frequent flooding from smaller events with as many as seven flood events estimated to have exceeded the finish floor elevation of the manufacturing space over the last 30 years. He showed a photograph of the owner's dry floodproofing efforts, which ultimately proved insufficient to maintain operations at the site. Mr. Flynn explained that he evaluated the site for a new industrial use. He considered wet floodproofing by elevating the finish floor, but that was deemed impractical because of the need to move supplies, inventory, and equipment between street grade and the Design Flood Elevation. He stated that he then evaluated dry floodproofing, making the facades impermeable to flood waters. He explained that the dry floodproofing measures would need to be nearly 14 feet high, but the technical guidance provided by FEMA does not recommend the use of dry floodproofing systems in areas where the water depth is greater than three feet. He concluded that neither wet nor dry floodproofing for continued industrial use is possible. Mr. Flynn reported that he evaluated reusing the existing office building for commercial uses. Dry floodproofing for the office building would need to be approximately 11 feet high, which again significantly exceeds the FEMA technical guidance as well as guidance that is specific to floodproofing for historic structures. He stated that he then considered wet floodproofing by raising the finished floor of the office building. He explained that the finished floor would need to be raised by nearly four feet from the existing second-floor elevation. Moving that floor up would limit the three-floor structure to just one floor. It would limit space for mechanical equipment, egress, and stairs. The new finish floor level would be about 2.5 feet above the bottom of the windows, meaning that the new floor would cut across the windows. Providing emergency egress for the building would be challenging. He concluded that floodproofing measures would not be successful at this site, owing to the significant flood depths in this location. He noted that it may be possible to pursue an exemption for this historic site from the flood regulations, but he would advise against such an exemption because of the significant flood depths in this location. An exemption could leave the property susceptible to continued, reoccurring flooding, and potentially create a safety risk for the future occupants and for the surrounding neighborhood.

- Mr. Angelides introduced himself and stated that he is the president of Econsult Solutions, a company that undertakes analyses related to economic development, transportation, public policy, real estate, and financial hardship. He presented his conclusion: There is no use to which this property may reasonably be adapted given the limitations of the flood zone, the configurations and conditions of the buildings, the cost of renovations, and the revenues that could be expected from any new uses. He stated that it is important to remember that this is a collection of buildings, not one building. It is several buildings, 10 of them with lots of load-bearing interior walls that separate the interior spaces and that have many different floor levels. He showed photographs of the

interiors of the buildings. He commented that the interior space is chopped up and has many floor levels, even within rooms. He showed photographs of the office building, which has a ground floor, main floor accessed by exterior stairs, and an attic floor, which has a low ceiling. He stated that the office building is in poor condition and would need new systems. The buildings have no insulation and very limited natural light. Mr. Angelides showed an image of the office building with the Design Flood Elevation indicated on it. He discussed why both wet and dry floodproofing would be infeasible. He stated that he evaluated five potential reuses: industrial, restaurant, office, multi-family residential, and hospitality. He indicated that an industrial space needs good access to highways, good loading areas, and big, wide-open spaces. This site does not have those characteristics and it is in the floodplain. He stated that raising the floor levels out of the floodplain would not be practical and, even if you did find someone willing to pay to do that, no bank would ever lend money for the work. He noted that, while the site is fairly close to highway access, Main Street is not conducive to large truck traffic. The site has no good loading area; when the site was used, loading was done on the sidewalk. The interior space is chopped up, uneven, and unlevel. Mr. Angelides stated that there is plenty of good industrial space available in the area that does not have the restrictions of this site. Reusing this site for a new industrial use is not feasible. Mr. Angelides stated that reusing the space for restaurant and retail would face the same challenges. He stated that the only space available for a restaurant or retail would be located on the second floor, owing to the flooding. Restaurant and retail space needs doors and windows on the sidewalk. He stated that second-floor retail restaurant and retail space simply does not work, even in very vibrant areas. It certainly will not work here. Mr. Angelides stated that the building configuration does not work well for office use. There are too many floor levels. There is not much light and air. He stated that the office market is particularly challenged these days and will likely be so for the foreseeable future. He stated that if anyone was willing to rent the space for office use, the rent would be de minimis, not enough to even cover the operating costs. Office use is not feasible. Mr. Angelides stated that the site faces the same challenges for residential reuse. In addition to the floodplain problems, there are issues with the lack of light and air, as well as access issues. He noted that the residential market is not strong and concluded that residential reuse of the existing buildings is not feasible. Regarding the office building specifically, its reuse would require raising the main floor and removing the third floor, leaving only one floor in the building. Accounting for space for access and mechanical equipment would only leave approximately 1,200 square feet of rentable space, which might result in two regular or three small apartments. Such apartments would be rentable at \$2 per square foot, which translates to a value of approximately \$256,000. However, it would cost multiple times the \$256,000 to renovate the space. Residential reuse of the office space is not feasible. He stated that renovating for a hospitality reuse is essentially the same as a residential use. The space is not large enough for a hotel, so it would need to be an Airbnb-type space. Rooms like this rent for about \$100 per night, meaning that the resulting space would be worth about \$325,000. Hospitality is not a feasible reuse. Mr. Angelides concluded that there is no feasible reuse for this structure.

- Mr. Leighton showed site plans and photographs and described the site. He noted that the grade rises steeply at the rear of the property up to an adjacent property on Shur's Lane and the railroad viaduct. He stated that they are proposing a long building parallel with Main Street with two wings extending out to the rear. The lower level, which is in the floodplain, will be used for parking. There is a rock outcropping at the rear of the site that must be avoided. There is also a retaining wall along the property line that is holding up the adjacent parcel. The primary entrance will be located on Main Street and the lobby

will be located on the second floor. A secondary entrance will be located at the corner of Shur's Lane. The parking entrance will be located on Main Street. Sections of the front walls of the mill buildings will be retained and incorporated into the exterior of the new building. He explained that the dwelling units will be raised slightly above the Design Flood Elevation. The amenity space will be located on the second floor, along with utility spaces. He pointed out the loading area. There will be pedestrian egress to the highest point of the site, which is just above the flood elevation. There will also be automobile egress through the loading dock to Shur's Lane. Mr. Leighton showed plans of the typical floor levels with the dwelling units. He noted that the seventh floor will be set back from the street facades. Mr. Leighton showed images of the elevations and pointed out the mill building facades that will be retained and incorporated into the new facades. The parking will be screened. The facades will be brick in a Wissahickon schist tone and corrugated metal, which suggests the industrial past. He explained that spaces like the lobby, amenities, and utilities that would normally be located in the basement or on the first floor must be located on the second floor and above, owing to the flooding. Mr. Leighton reported that, owing to the economics of the site, they need to build a critical number of dwelling units to make the project viable. He stated that the demolition will be expensive, the rock outcropping will raise complex issues, and an existing storm sewer that comes down from Crescent Street and crosses the site will need to be rerouted, and the construction of the podium to get everything up out of the floodplain will be costly. He noted that they will use quality materials and detailing. Pushing the building back on the site is not viable, in part because of a proposed building planned for the adjacent site on Shur's Lane. He also noted that the need to design a column grid that works with the parking. He concluded that his firm has undertaken many adaptive reuse projects with historic buildings, but there is nothing at this site that can be feasibly preserved. He asked the Architectural Committee to recommend approval of a building of this size, owing to the financial difficulties of making a project like this work in the floodplain, especially while providing one-to-one parking, as the community has requested. He concluded that this block of Main Street has long been a desolate block. This project would bring needed vitality with green elements, lights on, which leads to passive security and more population. The building will foster a stronger connection along this seemingly neglected stretch between the more vibrant mixed-use area to the west and the soon to be updated with the Wissahickon Transportation Center and the development that that may spur to the east.

- Mr. Detwiler stated that this is a very complicated application. He suggested that the Architectural Committee review it twice, once as an in-concept application and once for final approval. He stated that the scale of the building and its materials are inappropriate for Manayunk. He objected to treating the historic facades like "wallpaper."
- Ms. Lukachik stated that she would not want this complex to be demolished, but she does understand the arguments for it. She objected to the use of the historic facades as "wallpaper" and suggested retaining more of the historic buildings to give them a sense of depth and volume.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he appreciated having an opportunity to review the demolition and new construction at the same time. He stated that it is important to know what would replace the mill complex. He asked the applicants if they were seeking an approval of the demolition prior to an approval of the new construction. He stated that the demolition portion of the application is well documented, and the case is made regarding flooding and structural issues.
 - o Mr. Leighton showed images in his presentation of nearby residential buildings that are five to seven stories tall. He claimed that the proposed building is not without

- precedent regarding its height. He also displayed a view of Manayunk created in 1907, which showed many large mill buildings in the area. He showed an image of a building on Venice Island that is eight stories tall.
- o Mr. Cluver agreed that there were and are large buildings in the area, but not directly on Main Street. He stated that he objects to the size of the proposed building.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed that seven stories is too tall for Main Street.
 - Mr. McCoubrey objected to the height of the proposed building and to the lack of depth or volume of the preserved facades. He stated that the buildings on Main Street are typically three and four stories, not seven.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that the complex is classified as significant in the National Register Historic District. More of the complex should be preserved.
 - Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Farnham if the adjacent property at 11 Shur's Lane is in the local historic district.
 - o Mr. Farnham stated that it is in the local historic district.
 - Mr. Cluver asked if the City's floodplain manager had reviewed the application.
 - o Mr. Leighton responded that the development team's flood resiliency consultant had met with the City's floodplain manager to develop the analysis presented today.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance registered the Alliance's opposition to the application. She suggested that a more contextual proposal that would retain a greater percentage of the historic fabric on the site would be more appropriate. She objected to the use of the historic facades as "wallpaper." She objected to the size of the proposed building, which is too large. She stated that a finding of financial hardship should not be used to justify an inappropriately large new building. She urged the Architectural Committee to recommend denial.
- Kevin Smith of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council asked if the City's floodplain manager had been involved in this application. He stated that there is access to the site above the floodplain from Shur's Lane. Mr. Smith referred to his written submission for photographs of the site not shown in the consultants' reports. He objected to the false premises of the reports. He objected to the fact that they treat the site as a whole and suggested that some parts of the mill complex may be able to be preserved. He objected to the claim that the Design Flood Elevation is so high that no part of the site can be reused without extensive modifications. He claimed that the applicant's documents provide no information apart from some fragmented information on the hotel building on the internal makeup of the site. He asserted that they provide no floor plans, building outlines, measurements, or materials, virtually no information relevant to historical preservation. He claimed that Ida was not a 100-year storm; it was a 400-year storm. He stated that his analysis shows that the Hurricane Ida flood level in Manayunk was approximately 2.6 feet above the 100-year flood level. He observed that Ida was topped only by one other hurricane, in 1869, which reached 17 feet. He stated that the consultants' reports relied heavily on descriptions of flooding from Hurricane Ida and, perhaps, as a result, are wildly off base from reality. The Design Flood Elevation used in the applicant's submission is 48 inches above the 100-year flood, or above the 400-year flood level of Ida. The true Design Flood Elevation should be 18 inches above the 100-year flood level, or about 62 inches or a little over five feet lower than the applicants assert. This level of misrepresentation would, of course, profoundly affect how the site would be evaluated. Mr. Smith stated that the true flood levels were determined from his

own photographic evidence coordinated with flood gauge levels from the USGS Manayunk gauge and the Philadelphia gauge across from Boathouse Row and the elevations supplied in the applicant's own submission. Historical preservation standards should allow for uses at the 100-year flood level. He stated that he has identified several obviously significant areas of the site with floor space above the 100-year flood level, areas that are possibly worth preservation for their architectural significance. Uses such as parking, storage, durable materials, or access to a new development elsewhere on the site like entrance or lobby can be in the floodplain. The Committee on Financial Hardship's recommendation was based on this misleading and incomplete information. He asserted that the recommendation should not be accepted, and the site should be reevaluated based on actual flood levels and a thorough site inventory and evaluation. The Committee on Financial Hardship recommended that the property should be recorded to HABS standards prior to any demolition. A thorough evaluation of the site is a necessary prerequisite to any consideration of demolition or redevelopment. Mr. Smith stated that his written submission also addressed the design and scale of the proposed building.

- Brent Ainley agreed with the Architectural Committee's concerns about the preserved facades looking like "wallpaper." He stated that the new building would look like an appendage on top of the historic facades. He stated that the proposed building is completely out of scale for Manayunk. He asked if the applicant currently owns the site. He stated that the large buildings in Manayunk are set back from Main Street, not on it. He concluded that he is opposed to the project.
- John Hunter of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council stated that, although this application proposes a seven-story story building, it is a very tall seven-story building. The second floor would be located almost 15 feet above the sidewalk level in certain locations, owing to the Design Flood Elevation. The second to third floor height is 12 feet 4 inches, and the remaining floor heights are each 10 feet 4 inches. The building would be 82 feet tall, which is more like the height of an eight-story building. Mr. Hunter noted that two buildings across the street were recently purchased for reuse. He then mentioned a project on the 4100 block of Main Street, where set-back additions were constructed at the rears of buildings facing Main Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Committee on Financial Hardship reviewed the hardship portion of the application at its public meeting on 3 April 2024 and recommended that the Historical Commission find that the mill complex at 4045-61 Main Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, and approve the demolition, provided the site is recorded to HABS standards, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the City's historic preservation ordinance.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The retained facades of the mill buildings would look like wallpaper pasted onto the front of the new building. The mill buildings should be retained to a greater depth. The application fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed building would be too large in size, scale, and massing for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District and therefore fails to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the demolition as well as the new construction, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 APRIL 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ITEM: 4045-61 MAIN ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler 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: 135 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Install illuminated signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 135 South 18th Street Associates, L.P.

Applicant: Stephan Potts, stanev potts architects

History: 1913; McIlvaine & Roberts, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install three illuminated signs at the roofline of 135 S. 18th Street, a high rise building at the northeast corner of Rittenhouse Square. Originally designed as an apartment building by McIlvain & Roberts in 1913, it is currently home to AKA Rittenhouse Square, a luxury boutique hotel specializing in extended stays. This application proposes to install face-lit acrylic letters spelling “hotel aka” on the east, west, and north façades of the property, just below the roofline. The letters would be mounted directly onto the wall within existing grout lines.

The applicant initially submitted this proposal as part of a larger package which also included street-level signage at the second-floor belt course. The Historical Commission's staff has already approved the street-level signage. The upper signage is outside the staff's authority to approve in light of the Historical Commission's 2018 denial of rooftop signage at this address.

The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviewed an application for signage at this address in the fall of 2018. At that time, signage was proposed for the rooftop that extended more than 15 feet above the parapet, and for street-level signage at the 3rd story corner. The Historical Commission denied that proposal.

In the spring of 2020, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved an application for street-level signage at the third-story corner that differed from the 2018 proposal. The signage was never installed.

This application proposes to install three illuminated signs at the roofline of 135 S. 18th Street that are different in scale and placement from the rooftop signage denied by the Historical Commission in 2018.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install illuminated signage on three facades near the roofline

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.*
 - o The signage would not destroy historic materials and would be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:18:54

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Stephan Potts represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked the applicant to define the targeted audience for the signs, and whether it was vehicular traffic or pedestrian traffic, or both.
 - o Mr. Potts responded that it was intended for both of those audiences and was also intended to be a source of branding and identification for the hotel.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the hotel clientele would already know where they were going as this was not an obscure location. He stated that he viewed this as an application for advertising as opposed to wayfinding. He contended that signage on three facades was excessive.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver and added that not only was this hotel at a major corner, but its clientele also had access to GPS on their phones, and that he did not believe people would be looking at rooflines to find their way.
 - o Mr. Potts responded that this application would serve as both a wayfinding and a branding tool. He noted that in the zoning code, roofline signage is not counted towards the overall allowable amount of signage at street-level and that, in his opinion, the proposed application was for a discrete and modest amount of signage. He noted that Korman Communities, a company with roots in Philadelphia, owned the building along with hotels in other cities but that it considered this its flagship building, thus, would like the ability to put signage on the roofline.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that that the east facade signage would be the most functional and visible with people driving down Walnut Street. He opined that three roofline signs may be too many given the scale of the building. He added that the signs, as proposed, may be difficult to read because, they would be pushed up too

high to the edge of the parapet and from below they would appear to run off the edge of the parapet.

- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he believed there should be no signage attached to the parapet of this historic building. He noted that there had been many issues with signage attached to parapets in the past and he believed they would only cause problems for the structure.
 - o Mr. Potts asked if Mr. D'Alessandro could elaborate on that opinion.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro explained that signage should not be attached to a parapet that was never meant to have signage attached to it.
 - o Mr. Potts disagreed with Mr. D'Alessandro and opined that this was why architects and engineers were involved in projects like this. Mr. Potts further explained that the reason the signage was proposed at those locations was owing to the parameters set by the zoning code for Building Identification Signs, which allows by-right signage above 150 feet and below the roof line, without necessitating a zoning variance.
- Ms. Lukachik voiced that she had no objections to this proposal other than perhaps eliminating the sign on Moravian Street. She noted that she thought the signs were not distasteful.
- Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the proposal hid the coping of the wall, as was shown in the parapet signage detail drawings.
 - o Mr. Potts stated that if the application were to be close to a recommendation of approval, details such as moving the letters below the coping line could easily be amended, or there could be conditions placed on the recommendation of approval which could be reviewed later by the Historical Commission's staff.
- Ms. Stein summarized that the feedback had been generally that there was too much signage proposed and noted that in the application packet there were examples of other buildings with identification signage, but that none of those examples had five signs on a building, which was what this application was proposing. She referenced the street-level signage that had already been approved by the Historical Commission and the applicant's desire to add three additional signs to the roof line. She suggested for the applicant to choose two or three signs to focus on and asked what the priority of signage would be in the applicant's or client's mind.
 - o Mr. Potts responded that the street-level signage would rank as the most important. He followed by saying the sign on the 18th Street facade was important for visibility from Rittenhouse Square, but the other two signs were the most useful in terms of vehicular traffic and viewability from intersections.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the west elevation was the primary facade, while the other two were on secondary facades and had much better visibility. He stated that he would support the signs being located on the secondary facades but not the primary facade.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Adding the three proposed signs could result in excessive signage.
- The letters should be located below the terracotta coping of the roofline.
- A mockup of the east facade sign should be installed, which the staff can review.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application as presented fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- The application with recommended modifications would satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the parapet sign on the east elevation, provided it is shifted below the terracotta coping, with the staff to review details, but denial of the other signs, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 135 S 18 TH ST MOTION: Approval of east facade sign, with staff to review mockup and details 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: 1923 MANNING ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1923 Manning Street LP

Applicant: Brett Feldman, Klehr Herrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1850; front windows altered in the 1920s

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a rear addition at 1923 Manning Street. The three-story rowhouse at the property is contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The proposal shows a three-story addition that would primarily be constructed on the existing two-story rear ell but would also connect to the roof of the historic building's main block. When complete, the rear of the building would be five stories in height.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish the rear slope of gable and rear walls of second and third floors.
- Extend second floor at rear.
- Add three new stories to the existing rear ell and main block.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 APRIL 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The application proposes demolishing the rear of the gable roof and third-floor rear wall of the main block. This demolition does not meet Standard 9.
 - o The proposed features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing of the rear addition do meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o Demolition of the main block's rear wall and rear gable roof permanently alters the historic integrity of the property; therefore, these elements of the project do not meet Standard 10.
- *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.*
 - o The alteration of the main block's gable roof with extensive height added at the ridge line, does not meet the Roofs Guideline.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:41:58

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Brett Feldman, owner Ben Weinraub, and architect Frank Renner represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey said it was difficult to understand the impact of the proposed addition on the structures in the immediate vicinity such as the neighboring buildings and those on the block. He observed that, while there are larger buildings around 1923 Manning Street, it would have been helpful to have a better sense of how this volume fits within the block itself.
 - o Mr. Weinraub responded and pointed to page H-005 of their submission. He described how the changes at the rear of the property would relate to the property line and the nearby buildings. Mr. Weinraub said the alterations to their building would not extend the rear beyond that of the neighboring building.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey asked if the neighboring building shown in the center photograph on page H-005 was five stories tall.
 - o Mr. Weinraub confirmed that it was four stories but stressed that their proposed fifth story is set back further.
- Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the proposed addition would be an enormous overbuild given the size of the original house. He said he understands the lack of visibility from the street but that there is an order to these buildings that includes a main block and a wing. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the proposed five stories addition is overwhelming the original main block of the house.

- o Mr. Renner described the intent of including a fifth floor as a family gathering space, with an elevator for accessibility and aging in place.
- o Mr. Weinraub pointed out that getting the square footage while staying within the controls they are trying to meet, such as zoning, non-visibility from the public right-of-way, and a setback for the fifth floor, is challenging.
- Mr. Detwiler said it would have been helpful to see all of the building elevations instead of just two. He stated that this made it difficult to understand what was happening on all sides of the building and he asked that these elevations be added for the Historical Commission's review.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the ceiling heights unusually change in the addition. He said ceiling heights usually taper as they go up but, in the new addition, the fourth and fifth floors have nine-foot floor-to-floor heights tall while the third floor is only eight feet. Mr. Detwiler stated that the Committee generally recommends that new construction floor heights taper as they go up, as they do in historic buildings.
 - o Mr. Renner said they increased the third-floor height to eight feet but can certainly lower the heights of the fourth and fifth floors.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she is concerned by the overbuild on the main block. She commented that it would be very different if the application limited the addition to the rear ell. The Architectural Committee typically recommends approval of additions on rear ells.
 - o Mr. Weinraub remarked that the elevator makes it difficult for circulation and they need a vertical shaft that does not jog. He noted the special restrictions created by the elevator.
 - o Mr. Cluver indicated that it appears possible to slide the elevator further to the back.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he keeps hearing that the proposed addition will not be visible from the public right-of-way. He said he has reviewed the drawing sections. Mr. Cluver pointed out that one of the sections shows a head-on view, but the drawing do not account for the view up and down the street, where additions are often visible.
 - o Mr. Weinraub pointed to the photographs on page H-004 that show views of Manning Street.
 - o Mr. Cluver suggested that the addition might be visible, but the application materials provide no definitive answer to that question.
 - o Ms. Stein said she wanted to review a mockup. She noted that the goal would be for the addition to not be visible at all above the parapet. Ms. Stein asked if they had considered a wood structure as a mockup to photograph and test for visibility.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that it is the responsibility of the applicant to prove that the addition would not be visible. He noted that the Architectural Committee's comments indicate that the members are skeptical about the proposed addition not being visible.
 - o Mr. Weinraub inquired if they could obtain a recommendation of approval that would be contingent on working with the staff to prove that the addition is not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the skylights shown on the front slope. He asked if they exist or are new.
 - o Mr. Weinraub confirmed that the front skylights are part of their proposed scope of work.
- Ms. Stein asked if the chimney would remain above the front gable roof.

- o Mr. Weinraub confirmed the chimney would remain in use. He noted that there was one at the rear that would remain and need to be extended.
- o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the front chimney would need to be 10 feet away from any adjoining or proximate structure. He said he suspects that the chimney would need to be significantly raised as they are proposing to raise the structure right at the ridge line of the roof and this appears to be less than 10 feet away.
- Mr. Detwiler asked where the mechanical equipment would be located.
 - o Mr. Renner said it would be located at ground level and confirmed that the mechanical units would not be located on the roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that, regardless of the visibility, the proposed addition does not respect the separation between the rear wing and main block of the house. He concluded by stating that he would like the proposed addition to not extend higher than the main block of the house.
 - o Mr. Weinraub responded that he does not see this requirement in Standards 9, 10, or the Roof Guidelines.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed rear addition overwhelms the historic building and stands significantly taller than the main block.
- The application should be revised to include elevations of all sides of the proposed building.
- The floor-to-ceiling height at the fourth and fifth stories should be reduced to eight feet to better reflect the original heights within the historic portion of the building.
- The proposed overbuild may be visible from the public right-of-way. The applicant must create a mockup to confirm the lack of visibility of the addition from the public right-of-way.
- The current proposal may require increasing the height of the front chimney. The applicant should confirm the dimensions from the chimney to the new addition.
- The overbuild should not extend over the main block of the house.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, owing to the proposed features, size, scale, proportion, and massing of the rear addition and the impact on historic spatial relations.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 10, as demolition of the main block's rear gable roof permanently alters the historic integrity of the property.
- The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline, owing to the addition of extensive height at the main block's ridge line and directly behind the front gable roof.

FAILED MOTION: The Architectural Committee rejected a motion to recommend approval, provided that the two upper stores are lowered from nine foot to eight foot clearance; a mockup is erected onsite to confirm a lack of visibility from the public right-of-way; the chimney will not be extended; and the existing ridge line remain in place; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the Roof Guidelines.

ITEM: 1923 MANNING ST FAILED MOTION: Approval, with conditions 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			

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

ITEM: 1923 MANNING 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: 268 AND 270 DUPONT ST

Proposal: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jerry Hoggard

Applicant: Brett Harman, Harman Deutch Ohler Architecture

History: 1883

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Victorian Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 5/13/2022

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an elevated three-story semi-detached structure with pilot house and roof deck at 268 Dupont Street in the Victorian Roxborough Historic District. The property was historically the side yard of 270 Dupont Street until it was subdivided in 2021. The newly defined property at 268 Dupont Street is enclosed by a historic stone site wall with the adjacent property at 270 Dupont Street but does not have any other

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 APRIL 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

historic structures on it. This block of Dupont Street in the Victorian Roxborough Historic District is composed primarily of two to two-and-a-half-story twins and freestanding residential properties with gable and full mansard roofs with exposed stone and warm-hue stucco. The new construction is proposed to attach to the historically free-standing building at 270 Dupont and would be clad in white brick, cast stone, and white cement board lap siding. The front would feature a black standing seam metal mansard roof and black aluminum-clad windows. New steps would be cut into the historic retaining wall to provide access from Dupont Street, and a driveway and parking area would be created behind the property. This also necessitates the removal of a portion of the stone retaining wall on Fleming Street side of the property at 270 Dupont Street and partial paving of its rear yard to provide easement access.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story building with pilothouse and roof deck
- Remove portions of stone retaining walls at 268 and 270 Dupont Street
- Create paved driveway and parking areas.

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 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.*
 - o The proposed new construction is differentiated from the old but not compatible with the historic site and its context and alters the spatial relationships that characterize the properties. The scale, massing, materials, and colors are in stark contrast with the adjacent properties.
 - o The application proposes to remove a large section of the historic stone retaining wall along the Fleming Street side of the property at 270 Dupont Street but does not include details of that removal, and also removes portions of the wall along Dupont Street.
 - o The application fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- *Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction, Recommended:*
 - o *Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - o *Constructing a new addition on a secondary or non-character-defining elevation and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.*
 - o *Ensuring that the addition is subordinate and secondary to the historic building and is compatible in massing, scale, materials, relationships of solids to voids, and color.*
 - o *Distinguishing the addition from the original building by setting it back from the wall plane of the historic building.*
 - o *Locating new construction far enough away from the historic building, when possible, where it will be minimally visible and will not negatively affect the building's character, the site, or setting.*
 - The proposed new construction is taller than the adjacent historic buildings and will be highly visible.
 - Construction against the historically freestanding building at 270 Dupont Street encapsulates an exterior wall of the historic building and alters the spatial relationships that characterize the property.

- The application fails to satisfy this Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, 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: 02:07:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Ohler summarized the application materials for the Architectural Committee. He explained that they designed the building to match the setbacks and basement of the neighboring property but acknowledged that it is taller than the adjacent building.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned why the first floor is so much higher than that of the neighboring property.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that they have designed the building to have a habitable basement and have aligned the footings with those of the adjacent property, which does not have a full-height basement at the front.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the elevated first floor with steps up is a significant drawback of the design and that the floor levels should correspond to those of the attached historic structure.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the height was problematic and explained that the height is exacerbated by the extremely tall mansard, which screens a deck, making the building appear significantly larger than its historic neighbor.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the width of the building is dictated by zoning.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded affirmatively, noting that zoning requires an eight-foot side yard.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that he is concerned about a massive Hardie board siding wall being highly visible and broken up only by a small triangle of a mansard on the side elevation.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed, opining that the design is going to feel wrong on this site.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey elaborated that the side wall in particular is going to feel like a four-story wall next to a two-story house.
- Ms. Stein asked whether, now that the district has been officially designated, the owner would be willing to consider modifications to make the more compatible. She opined that it is hard to imagine approving the current design based on the context of the site but noted that if it was lowered by four feet or so and tweaks made to the overall design, it could be made more appropriate.
- Mr. Ohler noted that he has explained to his client that the Architectural Committee would likely prefer a lower building, but the client responded that a smaller building is not a viable project.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether they could lower the basement level so the building would become lower overall but maintain an occupiable basement.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that in order for the project to make sense financially, it needs the square footage of an occupiable basement, but that the cost of excavating and underpinning and shoring the neighboring building to lower the basement would make the project infeasible.

- Ms. Lukachik asked for clarification as to whether the adjacent building had a partial basement.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that the neighboring structure has a squat basement with a modified five-foot door.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that it is difficult when a historic property is subdivided and there was nothing on a property historically and the site limitations make it such that nothing fits with all the requirements. The historic house was a detached dwelling, not a twin, but this application proposes to turn it into a twin.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that the property was subdivided prior to designation.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the design does not fit within the character of the district, particularly in terms of height and the siding material. He noted that the building could be reduced by a few feet if eight-foot ceiling heights were specified.
 - o Ms. Gutterman noted that if the roof deck and parapet were removed, that would also reduce the overall height and make the design more palatable, but that the materials selection also needs work.
 - o Mr. Cluver noted that the French doors at mansard adversely impact the scale.
 - o Ms. Gutterman opined that if the overall height and materials were modified, the rest of the design could work.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the basement is driving the design so much.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that it is necessary in order to create the amount of habitable space needed to sell the property.
 - o Mr. Detwiler asked whether the square footage could be made up by extending the building to the rear instead of in height.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed that that would be a more viable option, if it works in the plan to get more area by extending in depth rather than height.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification on the shape of the mansard, noting that the elevations show it being straight, but the side elevation appears to show a triangular return.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that the return is flat on the side.
 - o Ms. Stein commented that the mansard also appears very tall, and that, if the parapet was removed and mansard dropped, it would fit in better.
- Ms. Stein suggested that the basement foundation be offset to avoid shoring the foundation of the adjacent building.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that they looked into that, but the building is only 17 feet wide, so offsetting the foundation reduces the amount of usable space.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 268 Dupont Street was historically the open side yard of 270 Dupont Street.
- The property at 268 Dupont Street was subdivided from 270 Dupont Street prior to the designation of the Victorian Roxborough Historic District.
- This block of Dupont Street is composed primarily of two to two-and-a-half brick and warm-hued stucco buildings.
- The floor levels and overall height of the proposed building are considerably greater than those of the surrounding structures.

- The use of siding on what will visually appear as a four-story elevation is out of keeping with the character of the block and historic district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new construction is differentiated from the old but not compatible with the historic site and its context in scale or materials, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed new construction is taller than the adjacent historic buildings and will be highly visible, failing to satisfy the Guideline for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ITEM: 268 AND 270 DUPONT ST 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	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 3629 HAMILTON ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Erica Darken

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design

History: 1871

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Powelton Village Historic District, Contributing, 11/09/2022

Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a two-part rear addition on an Italianate rowhouse at a contributing property in the Powelton Village Historic District. The building was constructed in 1871 and is three-stories tall with a one-story front porch, prominent cornice, and two-story rear ell. A two-story addition will be located at the rear of the building and project outward from the current rear wall of the ell by more than 26 feet. A second, smaller one-story addition will be constructed beside the current rear ell and extend to the property line on the east side. The two-part addition will expand the overall footprint of and extend slightly higher than the current rear ell of the historic building. Both portions of the addition will be clad in stucco and the two-story portion will feature a two-story bay window with siding at the rear elevation and windows along

the east facing wall. The one-story portion of the addition will feature a window in the rear wall along with skylights in its roof. The rear of the building and the proposed addition will be visible from the side and rear along neighboring N. 37th Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a two-part rear 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.*
 - o The proposed new addition does not meet Standard 9. It is too large, and is not compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building or district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:24:38

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Erin Abraham and owner Erica Darken represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Abraham introduced the project and described it as an addition to accommodate an in-law suite with an additional bedroom. She confirmed that the addition will be visible from N. 37th Street.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the addition would block the two skylights on the neighboring house.
 - o Ms. Abraham responded that it will partially block them but that the neighboring house is owned by the mother of the owner of the subject property, and they are aware of the placement.
- Ms. Stein asked about the overall length of the proposed addition. She added that rear additions are not out of context with the block, but asked if this one will extend beyond the additions at the rears of the other houses.
 - o Ms. Abraham responded that the addition is similar in length to its neighbor and will only extend out beyond that rear by the width of the window bay.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked for clarification on the length and referred to a site plan for the project. He noted that, according to that plan, the proposed addition appears to be longer than the neighbors.
 - o Ms. Abraham clarified that the site plan drawing does not include the bay on the neighboring property. She reiterated that the proposed addition's rear wall aligns with the neighboring addition but the bay on the rear extends out beyond that.
 - o Ms. Stein replied that, based on the plans and aerial views, it appears that the proposed addition extends beyond all of its neighbors by a significant amount. She noted that the submitted application lacks dimensions for these details.
 - o Ms. Abraham offered to add these dimensions to the drawings going forward.

- o Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any way to scale the addition back to better align with the neighbors' rear ells. Even if only the bay extends beyond the current neighboring ells, it still appears large in comparison.
- Mr. Detwiler commented on the materials proposed for the addition. He suggested that brick would be more contextual than the proposed stucco.
 - o Ms. Abraham responded that they proposed stucco because the smaller addition on the neighboring property is stucco.
 - o Mr. Detwiler replied that he would prefer to see brick on the addition rather than stucco.
 - o Mr. Cluver added that the addition appears aggressive and is worried that their recommending approval of it could trigger neighbors in the future seeking to build larger and larger additions.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the design of the bay and the wall space appearing above it. He wondered why the bay does not align with the top of the wall and added that the current design gives it a "looming" quality.
 - o Ms. Abraham responded that the owner has requested that they look at an alternative design for the bay that would meet the top of the wall and better mimic the neighbors. She has an updated design but was not able to provide it to the Architectural Committee on time for the meeting.
- Ms. Abraham asked if the Architectural Committee would be open to having the party wall remain stuccoed.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that the party wall is the most visible.
 - o Ms. Gutterman agreed and added that they would have to see a drawing of the proposal and it would be valuable to see the alternate design.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that rear ells like this one usually have sloped shed roofs.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed and added that they do not have parapets. He went on to say that one of the submitted section drawings for the addition looks like it has a sloped shed roof, but that is not reflected on the renderings.
 - o Ms. Abraham reasoned that the parapet is blocking the view of the sloped roof.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that showing that sloped roof may also help the addition look less obtrusive.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Ms. Darken addressed a few of the points made during the Architectural Committee's discussion. She pointed out that all the other houses in her row have larger rear ells than hers. She also added that they are already looking to change the position and design of the rear bay to better match the neighbors. She was concerned about the added cost of cladding the exposed wall with brick since it is a party wall and could be later covered. She also explained how the interior layout of the in-law suite with a bedroom and bathroom is driving the overall size of the proposed addition.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The houses on the 3600 block of Hamilton Street all feature rear ells of various designs.
- The proposed addition to 3629 Hamilton Street would be overly large and imposing compared to other rear ells on the block.

- The stucco material proposed for the addition is not in keeping with most of the materials seen on the surrounding buildings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9. It is too large, and is not compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building or district.

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

ITEM: 3629 HAMILTON ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein 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: 1631 ARCH ST

Proposal: Remove cornice rosettes

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Verizon

Applicant: Matthew Mower, O'Donnell & Naccarato

History: 1915; Bell Telephone Building; John Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 12/12/2008

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to remove terracotta rosettes from the cornice of the building at 1631 Arch Street. During recent façade work, one rosette fell onto scaffolding below and another two were found to be dislodged. Upon probing the fallen and removed rosettes, structural engineers found that the steel bars supporting the rosettes had been badly corroded. The property owner now proposes removing all of the rosettes and covering the resulting gaps in the cornice with lightweight weatherproof capping painted to match the surrounding terracotta.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove terracotta rosettes and cap the resulting gaps in the cornice.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 APRIL 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *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.*
 - o The rosettes are character-defining elements of the cornice and should be repaired or replaced, perhaps with an alternate material, rather than simply removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 2:42:40

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Matthew Mowrer and Frank Radomski represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver wondered why the existing rosettes could not be permanently re-secured.
 - o Mr. Mowrer replied that re-securing the existing rosettes would require taking apart the adjacent terra cotta, increasing the scope of the project significantly.
- o Mr. Cluver expressed opposition to replacing the rosettes with Fiberglass Reinforced Plastic (FRP). Instead, he argued for replacement FRP rosettes matching the existing terra cotta rosettes.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired regarding the structural integrity of the steel supports for the existing rosettes.
 - o Mr. Mowrer responded that steel components have not demonstrated the same corrosion as those securing the rosettes.
- Ms. Gutterman further asked if the weight of FRP rosettes had been compared to the weight of FRP panels.
 - o Mr. Mowrer said that calculation has not been undertaken.
- Ms. Lukachik inquired how many rosettes have been inspected.
 - o Mr. Mowrer replied that 50 of the rosettes on one elevation have been examined and 2 were removed. The 48 remaining are sound now but, with continued corrosion, there is a fear that others could fall in the future.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the rosettes are character-defining features, per the Secretary of the Interior Standards. He suggested reproduction of the rosettes in a lighter material.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that a method should be identified to reinforce the existing rosettes.
 - o Mr. Radomski reported that the existing rosettes are attached with a steel bar and there is no way to determine the soundness of the steel bar without removing the rosettes.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if a sounding method was used to determine the structural integrity of the rosettes.
 - o Mr. Radomski noted that three rosettes fell off during the sounding procedure and the other 47 rosettes did not fall when being evaluated.
- Ms. Cluver suggested removing three more rosettes determining if others are likely to fall. He noted that, if others are found to be unsound, then the solution is to replace them with lightweight FRP rosettes.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rosettes proposed for removal are character-defining features.
- The proposal is to remove the rosettes and replace them with FRP panels.
- Three rosettes fell from the building when undergoing a sounding test.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6 because the rosettes are character-defining features.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6 because at least some of the rosettes can be retained.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6 because installation of lightweight replica rosettes is feasible.

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

ITEM: 1631 ARCH 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: 1108 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Legalize addition, roof deck, and other unpermitted work

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lauren Revak

Applicant: William Klotz, Restoration Specialist Inc.

History: early nineteenth century

Individual Designation: 3/30/1965

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: Between December 2023 and March 2024, a significant addition was constructed at the rear of 1108 S. Front Street without a building permit or the Historical Commission's review or approval. The Historical Commission did approve interior demolition and make-safe permit applications in August and December 2023, respectively, but those permits did not cover the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 APRIL 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

new construction. When a Historical Commission staff member visited the site, he saw that the unpermitted addition was under construction despite a Stop Work Order issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections on 9 February 2024. The developer applied for a permit in late February 2024 that included details that showed what was described as an existing roof deck and pilot house. Photographs of the property submitted as part of this legalization application show that further modification has been made to the front cornice since the site visit.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize unpermitted rear addition, roof deck, pilot house, and work to front cornice and dormer.

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 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.*
 - o The rear addition is very large in comparison to the historic structure. The roof deck and pilot house are very visible from the public right-of-way and change the established spatial relationships of the property.
 - o A two-story addition with a roof deck on the rear ell rather than the main block may be able to satisfy this Standard.
- *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.*
 - o From the submitted floor plans, it appears that at least some of the existing rear walls were demolished without the Historical Commission's approval.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:59:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- William Klotz and Danny McGoldrick represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the application is incomplete. Ms. Gutterman concurred that detailed drawings are necessary.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the Historical Commission would not have approved the construction done without permits, especially given the properties status as an early, individual designation to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
- Mr. McCoubrey clarified that, to meet the Standards, the pilot house should not be visible from the public right-of-way, nor be located on the main block of the house.
- Mr. Klotz asked for direction from the Architectural Committee on how to remediate the project to meet the Standards.

- o Mr. McCoubrey directed Mr. Klotz to consult with the Historical Commission's staff.
- Ms. Gutterman clarified that the Architectural Committee provides non-binding recommendations, but that the Historical Commission makes final decisions on legalization.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the board mounted on the front elevation of the building.
 - o Mr. Klotz explained that it was for bracing during masonry work to comply with an unsafe conditions report.
- Mr. Klotz asked if taking down the pilot house and roof deck would be sufficient to legalize the work.
 - o Ms. Gutterman repeated that the Architectural Committee would need to see a complete proposal before giving any concrete feedback.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application did not contain enough information for the Architectural Committee to evaluate the project and the applicant should provide detailed drawings of the implicated elevations.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, owing to the size and significant visibility of the rear addition and roof deck from the public right-of-way.
- The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline by locating the roof deck on the main block of the building with a highly visible pilot house.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 10, owing to the removal of previously existing rear walls, which is not reversible.

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

ITEM: 1108 S FRONT ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman 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				

Mr. Detwiler excused himself from the meeting.

ADDRESS: 502-04 S JUNIPER ST

Proposal: Construct single-family residence

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James Ernst

Applicant: James Ernst

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a single-family residence at 502-04 S. Juniper Street. At its 8 March 2024 meeting, the Historical Commission voted to approve the demolition of the building at 504 S. Juniper Street, owing to a finding of financial hardship. As part of that application, architectural plans were provided that showed a reconstruction of the three-story historic building at 504 S. Juniper Street, with a four-story adjacent “addition.” However, the approval of demolition was pursuant to a finding of financial hardship and was not contingent upon the building at 504 S. Juniper Street being reconstructed. At its 26 March 2024 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept application and voted 6 to 1 to recommend approval in concept of a four-story single-family residence at 502-04 S. Juniper Street, with the suggestions that the fourth floor at 504 S. Juniper Street is a mansard or otherwise set back in a way to reflect the former roofline, the roof deck is not visible along the primary facade, and the brick returns on the sides of the building, pursuant to Standard 9. The applicant withdrew the in-concept application after the Committee review in order to implement the recommendations of the Committee for this final approval submission. This application for final approval reflects the suggestion of the Architectural Committee that the Juniper Street elevation read as two separate houses, with the fourth floor of the 504 S. Juniper Street redesigned as a mansard to differentiate the additional floor.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct single-family residence.

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 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.*
 - o The proposed new construction provides an appropriate massing, height, scale, materials, and features to project the integrity of the environment. Certain proportions of architectural features could be further refined through staff review of details.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:18:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner James Ernst represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked about the cornices, noting that the existing cornice on the building to be demolished at 504 S. Juniper Street is a brick cornice.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the cornice proposed for the 502 S. Juniper Street portion appears to be very flat, but that the cornice proposed for the mansard at 504 S. Juniper Street works well because of the introduction of the mansard in this new design.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the existing stepped brick cornice on 504 S. Juniper Street be replicated on the new construction at 502 S. Juniper Street. He recommended the cornice shown in Option 3 in the application materials for the mansard cornice.
 - o Ms. Lukachik agreed.
- Mr. Ernst agreed to revise the cornices as recommended by the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. Cluver suggested omitting flower boxes under the windows.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested omitting star bolts, as those are typically reserved for addressing structural concerns rather than being used on new construction as decorative features.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- At its 8 March 2024 meeting, the Historical Commission voted to approve the demolition of the building at 504 S. Juniper Street, owing to a finding of financial hardship.
- At its 26 March 2024 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept application and voted 6 to 1 to recommend approval in concept of a four-story single-family residence at 502-04 S. Juniper Street, with the suggestions that the fourth floor at 504 S. Juniper Street is a mansard or otherwise set back in a way to reflect the former roofline, the roof deck is not visible along the primary facade, and the brick returns on the sides of the building, pursuant to Standard 9.
- This application for final approval reflects the suggestion of the Architectural Committee that the Juniper Street elevation read as two separate houses, with the fourth floor of the 504 S. Juniper Street redesigned as a mansard to differentiate the additional floor.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new construction provides an appropriate massing, height, scale, materials, and features to project the integrity of the environment, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 5 to 1 to recommend approval, with the cornice option for the mansard roof as shown in Option 3 of the application, provided the star bolts and flower boxes are removed, and the cornice for the full four-story roof is revised to be similar to the existing brick cornice on the building at 504 S. Juniper Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 502-04 S JUNIPER ST MOTION: Approval with conditions 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	5	1			1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:34:50

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:44 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its advisory Committees are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video 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.