

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

**TUESDAY, 19 DECEMBER 2023
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Brandon Lutz, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture
- Jake Blumgart
- Max Polichuk
- Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture
- Stephanie Boggs Magagna, Esq.
- Alexander Fidrych
- Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
- Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO design
- Tim Lux, Tierview Development
- Dennis Carlisle
- Lea Litvin, LO Design
- Sherman Aronson
- Mike Stanton
- Nancy Pontone

David Lo
Seth Brown
Jenn Patrino, Tierview Development
Kim Juszczak
Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association
Meredith Ferleger
Jerry Roller, JKRP Architects
Michael Ramos
Zuoda He
Hewson Baltzell
Steven Peitzman
Albert Starominsky
Jeff Watson
Michael Tucker
Chris Carickhoff
Virginia Baltzell
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Jay Farrell

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1423 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building; construct seven-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: K of C Federal Credit Union

Applicant: David Lo

History: 1980; K of C Federal Credit Union; Arthur Basciano, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for the construction of a seven-story, mixed-use building with ground floor commercial space and apartments on floors two to seven. The existing two-story building was constructed in 1980 and is non-contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. Demolition of the existing building can be approved without a finding of financial hardship or public necessity. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

The Architectural Committee reviewed proposals at its September and October 2023 meetings and in both cases the applicant withdrew the application prior to the Historical Commission's review to submit revised plans. The Architectural Committee had recommended denial in both cases. The October denial was based upon the building's seven-story height and design elements.

The proposed building would stand 75 feet tall, plus a parapet and pilot house, in the middle of the 1400 block of Spruce Street (primary elevation) and the 1400 block of Bach Place (secondary elevation). Setbacks at the fourth and fifth stories are a departure from the previous design in which the front façade is on a single plane. The fourth-floor cornice is similar in design and located at the same height as adjacent buildings. The fifth-floor setback includes a glazed railing for safety and is not intended for use as a balcony. The ground floor commercial storefront is mostly glass, surrounded by red brick. Floors two to seven of the Spruce Street façade feature four bays of one-over-one windows of unspecified material. The windows have been adjusted to better conform to the pattern on adjacent structures. The north, east, and west elevations will be clad in cementitious panels with a 4-inch exposure and the color to match the brick on the Spruce Street facade.

All buildings on the north side of the 1400 block of Spruce Street and the south side of the 1400 block of Bach Place, except for the easternmost parcel, are within the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District and all but one is contributing. These buildings are three and four-and-one-half stories tall, except the western-most structure, which is 19 stories tall. The contemporary Kimmel Center on the south side of Spruce Street is not within the district. There is little historically significant context fronting Bach Place; only one building's primary facade fronts this street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct seven-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 DECEMBER 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *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 setback design minimizes height differences with the three and four-story buildings extending along the 1400 block of Spruce Street, except for the tall corner buildings at Broad and 15th Streets. However, the height remains incompatible. The cementitious material on the highly visible east and west facades are incompatible with the historic context and therefore the application does not meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed building could be removed from the historic site in the future, leaving all surrounding contributing structures intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:58

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Zuoda He and property owner David Lo represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. He described changes to the design since the last review by the Architectural Committee in October 2023.
- Mr. Lo explained that the building needs to be seven stories in height for it to be financially viable.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the seven-story height is too great for a block where no mid-block building is more than four-and-a-half stories.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the construction of the glass railing at the fifth-floor setback.
 - o Mr. He responded that the railing is for safety reasons and is not intended to provide a balcony space.
- Mr. Detwiler and Mr. Cluver suggested the fourth floor be aligned with the setback of floors five through seven, and that the exterior material of those upper floors be limestone or stucco but not brick.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the exterior cladding on the side elevations.
 - o Mr. He replied that this is proposed to be cementitious panels that match the color of the brick.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the third-floor cornice could be extended to be even with the setback of the fourth through seventh stories and the brick turn the corner to be even with the cornice. Additionally, the fourth through seventh stories could be treated in a different exterior material.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated his opposition to a seven-story building in the middle of the block of three to four-and-a-half story buildings. He suggested that the only acceptable solution is a building where the upper stories are so far back that they appear as a taller building on the block behind the main building.

- o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. McCoubrey.
- Mr. Detwiler wondered if the height is problematic, considering that overbuilds have been approved in historic districts.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey replied that the height of the proposal overwhelms adjacent three-story buildings. It was also noted that this is not a proposal for an overbuild but rather for new construction.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that, if a seven-story building is approved for this block, all future development projects will seek the same height.
 - o Mr. He observed that there are very tall buildings at both corners of this block, being Broad Street and S. 15th Street.
 - o Mr. Lo stated that the mid-block building recently constructed at 262 S. 16th Street was approved on a block of relatively short buildings within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. He also noted that the proposed building complies with zoning regulations.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the applicant should resubmit a proposal and include images regarding the referenced project at 262 S. 16th Street.
- Mr. Farnham recommended that the applicant proceed to the Historical Commission and get its response to the proposed seven-story height. He noted that the Historical Commission has yet to review this project, as the applicant has previously withdrawn the application prior to the Commission's meetings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, opined that the project is moving in the right direction and that the design advice from the Committee is helpful in leading to a better design for the proposed infill building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposal is for a seven-story building with setbacks at the fourth and fifth floors.
- The proposal is for a brick front on the Spruce Street façade and cementitious panels on the other three facades.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The massing of the seven-story building is inappropriate at this location and fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- Design details such as the fourth-story glass railing and the arrangement of materials are inappropriate and fail to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1423 SPRUCE ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein					X
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 208-10 REX AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition and two freestanding houses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William H. Baltzell

Applicant: Jeffery Watson, BartonPartners

History: 1857; William L. Hirst/H. Louis Duhring House; additions 1893; 1927 by H. Louis Duhring

Individual Designation: 2/12/2021

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition and two freestanding residential buildings on the parcel at 208-10 Rex Avenue. The existing property features a large Italianate villa with an Arts and Crafts addition designed by H. Louis Duhring, who was also the owner of the property from 1919 to 1946. The historic building is surrounded by a large yard and has featured a semi-circular driveway since at least 1876.

In February 2021, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for the construction of four additional twin residences on the property at 208-10 Rex Avenue. At that time, the Historical Commission commented that some additional construction on the site would be acceptable, provided viewsheds of the historic mansion are preserved, the curvilinear driveway is retained, the new buildings are residential in scale and appearance, and development is pushed back on the site and away from the historic house.

This application responds to the previous concerns raised by the Historical Commission regarding new construction on the parcel. The new construction is limited to two freestanding buildings, set back and away from the historic building and accessed from a driveway offshoot from the original semi-circular driveway, which is retained. The three-story houses would feature stone veneer, fiber cement siding, and gable roofs with large dormer windows.

The application proposes to construct a two-story addition at the rear, below the eave line of the gabled roof of the 1927 Duhring addition. One rear dormer window would be removed, and other windows infilled at the center of the rear façade, which is not visible from the public right-

of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate historic building.
- Construct rear addition.
- Construct two free-standing buildings and new driveway

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed project involves limited removal of historic materials and retains the spatial relationship of the historic building to the curved driveway and large yard.
 - o The new construction will be differentiated from but compatible with the historic materials, features, and massing to protect the property and its environment.
 - o The application satisfies this Standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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 If the proposed rear addition and new construction buildings were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would remain, satisfying Standard 10.
- *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 rear addition is located on the least visible elevation, is subordinate to the historic building, and is set back from the wall plane of the historic building.
 - The new construction is located far enough away from the historic building to limit the impact on the building's character, site and setting.
 - The application satisfies this Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Guideline for New Exterior Additions and Related New Construction.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:46:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Meredith Ferleger, architect Jeff Watson, developer Mike Stanton, and owners Virginia and Hewson Baltzell represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Ferleger gave a brief overview of the history of the proposed development and neighborhood discussions.
- Mr. Watson explained that their intent is to preserve the spatial relationships of the site, highlight the existing historic building as the key focal point of the property while adding an addition at the rear and two freestanding single-family residences on the property.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed his appreciation that the project went back to the drawing board after the last, failed iteration, and opined that the current proposal is a much better solution than seen previously. He did, however, acknowledge that he was unhappy with the amount of information in the packet, noting that the floor plans and elevations of the proposed freestanding buildings were insufficient, making it difficult to review.
- Regarding the design of the freestanding buildings, Mr. Detwiler commented that the scale of dormers in particular need work. He explained that, in traditional design, scale tapers as it goes up, and that new construction projects often fail because they look too top-heavy.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned why it is necessary to remove the existing dormer on the rear elevation of the Duhring addition and opined that it should be retained.
 - o Mr. Watson responded that they do not need the dormer and did not think the addition would be constructable with the dormer in the location it is.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that the dormer is valuable and its loss unnecessary, and the roof of the new addition could drop slightly to have enough of a flashing course to make it work.
 - o Mr. Stanton noted that the rear dormer on the Duhring addition is not visible from anywhere except the train tracks and explained that they are challenged with the distance between the addition and the new house so they cannot further modify the footprint of the addition.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that he does not think altering the roof of the addition slightly to retain the dormer will impact the usable space at all. He noted that if the drawing is even remotely accurate, they could lower the roof slightly or take a scoop out of it, but that it is not necessary to lose a whole window.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the windows on the rear of the Duhring addition are steel or wood.
 - o Mr. Watson replied that he thinks they are wood but can check.
 - o Mr. Detwiler noted that he is opposed to replacing steel windows with wood windows.
- Mr. Detwiler explained that Louis Duhring was a significant Chestnut Hill architect of the period, and so it is important to treat the Duhring addition sensitively.
- Mr. Cluver noted that there appear to be some proportional discrepancies between the drawings and the photographs of the existing building, and noted that the replacement elements need to keep the existing proportions.

- o Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that the applicants should tighten up the discrepancies in the drawings.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that there is a metal balcony note that says “remove, repair and replace,” and asked whether the intent is to repair and reinstall or to replace.
 - o Mr. Watson responded that he is not sure what will be necessary.
 - o Mr. Cluver replied that the wording should be adjusted as it is presently misleading. He suggested that if it needs to be replaced, it should be replaced in kind.
- Mr. Cluver questioned whether the intent on the new construction is to have horizontal windowpanes as shown in the renderings or if the renderings are missing divisions, suggesting that they be more vertically oriented. He also questioned whether the overhang of the roof is accurately depicted.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that, conceptually, the massing of the freestanding buildings seems fine, but there is not enough information on the new construction to make a complete determination, particularly about the detailing.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the scale of windows on the proposed addition are a bit big and could be a little smaller to fit the architecture of the historic house better.
- Mr. Cluver noted that there is a roof overhang on the addition shown overlapping with a window on the “left” elevation and suggested the applicants take a closer look to avoid drainage issues.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the application shows Azek trim on fiber cement siding and suggested that Boral or fiber cement trim would be more compatible with fiber cement siding.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the windows on the addition are casements.
 - o Mr. Watson responded that they are double-hung windows.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that he is not fan of half stone/half wood for the cladding of the addition and new construction and would prefer to see a lower stone base with siding above.
- Mr. McCoubrey explained that there are important site features on the property that are not shown in the site plan. He noted that the landscape treatment is showing a big green yard but suggested that some plantings or new trees could direct views toward the main house and make the new construction look more independent.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the proposed driveway offshoot be moved away from the historic house and porch, as it is presently shown being too close to the historic building.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked what the chevron on the site plan is, noting that he is aware there are grade changes towards the rear of the property.
 - o Mr. Watson responded that it is a fire truck turnaround, and explained that they are working through grading challenges, able to grade with existing slopes.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed that it is a significantly improved concept for the site.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed. He noted that the existing house is wonderful and as quirky as they come, and that the proposed project does a great job preserving the character of the place.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the addition and new construction should be wood buildings with stone bases, with the stone extending just to the first-floor window sills rather than the full height of the first floor. He also noted that this would save money.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the flow of pedestrian traffic on the site.
 - o Mr. Watson responded that the majority of people entering the existing structure will do so from the front or the Crefeld side entrance. He explained that there is a beautiful landscape wall and gate that will lead to a residential entrance on that

side. He noted that the new driveway is really only intended to provide access for the addition and two single-family houses.

- Mr. Detwiler noted that he is not comfortable giving full approval of the cottages.
- Mr. Watson asked if they were to subdivide the parcel whether the Historical Commission would be able to review the proposed construction.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Historical Commission would retain jurisdiction over any new construction on a parcel subdivided from the historic parcel.
- Mr. Stanton asked what additional information is needed.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that in addition to the materials provided, full drawings of the proposed freestanding houses should be provided, including elevations, plans, sections, and details would also be helpful. He also noted that the existing drawing set should be tightened up to accurately depict the existing details.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Louis Duhring was a significant Chestnut Hill architect, and his addition should be treated as sensitively as the main block of the house.
- The rear dormer of the Duhring addition should be retained by adjusting the roof of the proposed addition slightly.
- The scale of the windows on the proposed addition should be adjusted so they are not larger than those of the historic building.
- The stone cladding on the first floor of the proposed addition and freestanding houses should be limited to the first-floor window sill height.
- The proportions of the freestanding buildings should be adjusted so that the scale tapers as it goes up, particularly at the dormer level.
- Boral or fiber cement trim would be more compatible with fiber cement siding than Azek trim.
- The new driveway offshoot is too close to the historic building and should be moved away from it.
- Landscaping should be utilized to direct views towards the historic building and make the new construction look more independent.
- The applicants should provide scaled plans and elevation drawings of the freestanding buildings, not just renderings, along with sections and details.
- The notations and proportions on the drawings of the existing building should be carefully looked at to ensure they are accurate and discrepancies within the submission set be eliminated.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project involves limited removal of historic materials and retains the spatial relationship of the historic building to the curved driveway and large yard, satisfying Standard 9.
- The location and overall massing of the new construction will be compatible with the historic property and its environment; however, the proportions and features of the current proposal are overly differentiated from the historic and the information provided is insufficient to demonstrate compliance with Standard 9.

- If the proposed rear addition and new construction buildings were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would remain, satisfying Standard 10.
- The proposed rear addition is located on the least visible elevation, is subordinate to the historic building, and is set back from the wall plane of the historic building and the new construction is located far enough away from the historic building to limit the impact on the building's character, site and setting, satisfying the Guideline for New Exterior Additions and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition, provided the existing dormer is maintained and the masonry on the addition is lowered to first-floor sill height and below, and existing steel windows be maintained or replaced in kind; and approval in-concept of the freestanding houses, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Guideline for New Exterior Additions.

ITEM: 208-10 REX AVE MOTION: Partial approval with conditions MOVED BY: Detwiler 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	5				2

ADDRESS: 1716 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Construct four-story building at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sergeant Glass of 0818 LLC

Applicant: Christopher Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture LLC

History: 1855; rear garage built 1955

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 1716 Spruce Street extends from Spruce Street to Delancey Place. No work is proposed in this application for the historic building at 1716 Spruce Street. The proposed new construction on Delancey Place is a four-story, red-brick, single-family dwelling with front-loaded garage, roof deck, and pilot house. It will replace a non-historic one-story garage which was constructed in 1955.

SCOPE OF WORK:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 DECEMBER 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Construct four-story single-family dwelling at rear of 1716 Spruce Street, fronting Delancey Place.

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 building is compatible with the historic district in terms of size and overall massing, but the proportions of the building should be reconsidered to be of a more typical appearance, with a taller first floor and less prominent mansard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the proportions and scale of the architectural features are reconsidered to be of a more typical appearance, with a taller first floor and less prominent mansard, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:16:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Christopher Carickhoff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Carickhoff provided an overview of the project.
- Mr. Cluver recommended revising the rendering to show additional street context.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the scale of the mansard and dormers is too heavy compared to the floors below.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that ceiling heights traditionally reduced as one moved up in the building, with a taller first floor and shorter top floor.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey suggested lightening the dormer color. He stated that the parapet should be eliminated to reduce the massing of the mansard.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the front façade features several arched openings with different scales. He recommended that these are standardized to create a less busy design. He suggested that the second-floor arched transom could be designed more like the first-floor arched transoms so that the panes of glass are not as small on the edges.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed and noted that these details could be revised to be more in keeping with the traditional design.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey suggested that it could be a flat lintel rather than arched for the transom.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the side bay is on the property line.
 - o Mr. Carickhoff responded that it is on the property line which is why there are no windows on the side of the bay.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant look more closely at 1718 Delancey Place, an example across the street which features several arched openings.

- Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed light fixtures on the first floor and recommended reconsidering their placement.
 - o Mr. Carickhoff responded that he can eliminate the fixture at the far edge and raise the height of the fixture by the front entrance door.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the garage door appears small in scale.
- Mr. Detwiler observed discrepancies between the rendering and elevation drawing. He stated that the rendering is more successful, but that the rendering and elevation drawing need to match.
- Mr. Cluver recommended reconsidering the corbeling detail to account for proper water runoff.
- Mr. Detwiler noted the nine-foot height of the pilot house and recommended reducing it in height to the maximum extent possible.
- Mr. Detwiler thanked the applicant for a complete application that needs only tweaking of details to be considered approvable.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed and thanked the applicant for the quality of materials and overall sensitivity to the historic context.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, commented in support of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The non-historic one-story garage at the rear of the property will be demolished.
- No work is proposed in this application for the historic building at 1716 Spruce Street.
- The applicant can submit a revised design based on Architectural Committee's comments for review by the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is compatible with the historic district in terms of materials, size, and overall massing, but the proportions of the building need to be adjusted to reflect a more traditional appearance. As presented, the application fails to satisfy Standard 9 because of the proportions of the mansard, dormers, and first- and second-floor openings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, but approval of a revised design provided the comments regarding the mansard, dormers, second-floor arch, and first-floor door openings are reflected in a revised design, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1716 SPRUCE ST MOTION: Denial as presented MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein					X
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 500 N CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS BLVD

Proposal: Construct five-story rooftop addition on piers, cut windows

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 500 NCCB FEE LLC

Applicant: Jerry Roller, JKRP Architects

History: 1891; Philadelphia Warehousing & Cold Storage Company

Individual Designation: 1/8/2021

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept review proposes constructing a rooftop addition at 500 N. Christopher Columbus Boulevard. This complex of buildings, historically known as the Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, was constructed between 1891 and 1910. When the property was designated in 2021, the eight-story building known as “Building B” was deemed contributing. This project would convert Building B from its original use as a storage warehouse to residential use.

The proposed five-story rooftop addition would be constructed on piers at the top of the historic building. The addition would add 65 feet of height, for a total height of 169 feet when complete. The proposed cladding is glass and metal arranged in a grid pattern. Windows would be inserted on three elevations of the historic building. Currently, the building has a small number of windows but adaptive use to residential space requires the addition of a significant number of new window openings.

As part of the conversion to the new use, the existing mural is proposed to be moved to the west elevation of “Building C.” The applicant is working with Mural Arts on this element of the project.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct five-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 DECEMBER 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *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 rooftop addition is not compatible with the historic building as it is currently presented. Although the precedent of the Wythe Hotel is an excellent example of compatibility between old and new, in this proposal the addition of the piers and exaggerated grid pattern creates too much physical and visual separation between the historic building and addition. In terms of hierarchy, the addition does not complement the historic building but rather draws attention away from it; therefore, the proposal does not meet Standard 9. The overall massing of the proposed addition could meet Standard 9. In order to create compatibility, the placement of the addition should be reconsidered, eliminating the separation from the historic roof, and developing a more subtle grid pattern.
 - o The proposed insertion of the windows could meet Standard 9. Currently there are two main issues with cutting of new openings and insertion of windows. The first is the proposed vertical line within the window openings on the south elevation. Although there is an attempt to connect the vertical lines of the rooftop addition to the vertical line in these window openings, this strong element makes the windows appear out of place on the historic façade. Second, the insertion of windows at the top of the building suggests the removal of the historic ghost sign. The insertion and window configuration should be revisited. As proposed, the proposed windows do not meet Standard 9
 - o The entrances proposed on the east and west elevations take advantage of the tall historic openings that currently exist. The entrances as proposed meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The overall form and massing of historic "Building B" will retain its essential form and massing once this project is complete. Both the roof addition and window openings could be infilled if a future owner wished to return it to its original appearance as a storage warehouse; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:41:52

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jerry Roller, attorney Brett Feldman, and owner Seth Brown represented the in-concept application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Roller stated their application is a request for conceptual approval. He said they have a concept and are looking for an approval in concept so that they can move ahead with the design. Mr. Roller explained that, if they receive approval, there is a certain amount of investigative work that needs to be done, owing to the condition of

the building. He pointed out that Building B's walls are constructed with seven to 10 wythes of brick and it will be difficult to cut cleanly through the wall to create window openings. Mr. Roller said they are looking at designing new window openings based on the adjacent historic building's windows and existing Building B windows. He pointed to the Wythe Hotel in Brooklyn, New York, which was illustrated in their application, as a precedent of what could be done with Building B and the goal is to make the building usable while respecting its history. He indicated that they were also taking design cues from a new construction project, Building F, recently approved by the Historical Commission. Mr. Roller indicated their team is looking to a framed industrial genre versus the heavy masonry brick that historically is on the site. He contended that they believe the proposal for the Building B addition conforms with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and that they are adding to the building without detracting from the heavy masonry mass that does characterize this particular site. Mr. Roller responded to the staff comments regarding the separation between the historic building and addition explaining they are not separated by piers and confirmed that there would be a connecting floor between that would offer amenity space to residents. He noted the current design is intended to provide a visual separation between the heavy mass of the existing building and the light framework of the addition. Mr. Roller reiterated that the application images are diagrammatic in their presentation, and they are presenting a concept only. He stated they are not requesting approval of the particulars because they still need to do more study and investigation of the building, especially what is required to insert new window openings into three of the building's elevations. Mr. Roller said a conceptual approval will give their team the confidence needed to begin their investigations and start speaking to contractors, and before they eventually come back to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission with a more detailed application and completed design for final approval.

- Ms. Lukachik stated that if the building walls are 10 brick wythes thick, it will be very costly to add openings and they may need to reduce the number of openings. She expressed concern about creating openings in the historic walls and the number of openings feasible. Ms. Lukachik said she would advocate for fewer openings. She also expressed concern about the images of structural deterioration shown and noted that the number of changes made on the interior to upgrade the structural system may influence the final exterior appearance of the building and new addition. Ms. Lukachik stated that the exterior appearance of the new overbuild looks like oversized dunnage or chiller support with the heavy black lines and stilts. She noted the success of the Wythe Hotel precedent is that it does not have heavy verticality or framing. She said that the overbuild proposed looks mechanical and she is not sure if this is the applicant's intent.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Lukachik's comments on the feasibility of the large number of window openings. He pointed out that this site is a campus of buildings, with a variety of visual things happening and he wished that it would connect with itself more. Mr. Detwiler referenced the new construction of Building F and that he wished the new addition proposed for Building B would visually connect more with that building. He said the addition looks like a foreign box on top of the building and does not relate to the other elements. Mr. Detwiler contended that part of the success of this complex would be unity because it is already chaotic enough and the modern interventions should relate to each other.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he mourns the loss of the existing mural and believes it is one of the most iconic in the City of Philadelphia. He commented that it was initially

done in reaction to 9/11 and was seen as a moving gesture. Mr. Detwiler said he appreciates that Mural Arts is working with the applicant. He noted that he does believe a lot of people will be upset by the removal of the mural but that he recognizes the functional need for its removal.

- Mr. Detwiler said he wondered if the window openings can be clustered into larger voids in the building rather than a series of punched single openings. He commented that he almost wants to see vertical bands of openings, something that is a larger hole in the brick and fewer of the smaller openings.
- Mr. Detwiler said he is also mourning the loss of the ghost signage and he does not understand why it would be removed.
- Mr. Cluver said that his biggest objection to the addition is the dark black color and if it was more in the gray color used on the adjacent new construction it would make it less heavy and imposing. He noted that the introduction of gray would also connect it more to the new construction on the site. Mr. Cluver continued that he appreciates the rigidity of the structural lines of the proposed addition and its relationship to the historic building below. He noted his appreciation of the strength of repetition in the window openings. Mr. Cluver said he typically advocates for variation in plane and rhythm but observed this is one building that this kind of repetition serves well, owing to its boxy nature. He continued that he likes the way the amenity space pulls back from the structure and stands off from what is below. Mr. Cluver said because it is a cold storage building, the proposed design made him think of ice cubes.
- Mr. Cluver said he acknowledges that the flag mural is recognizable by many in the city but believes it falls outside of the Architectural Committee's purview.
- Mr. Cluver said he does not have strong feelings about the ghost sign and does not think it should get in the way of redevelopment of this building. Mr. Cluver said that the application for final approval should show how the windows interact with the existing ghost sign.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the ghost sign corresponds with an existing floor or if they are inserting a floor behind it. He encouraged the applicant to retain the ghost sign.
 - o Mr. Roller confirmed the sign is located at the existing eighth floor of the building. He said it was not their intention to remove the ghost sign. He pointed out that the existing flag mural overpaints certain areas of the ghost sign.
- Ms. Lukachik said although she is concerned about the proposed design details of the addition, she agrees that an overbuild addition of the proposed shape and verticality in this location makes sense. She stated she is also fine with the in-concept window proposal but believes they are going to be challenged by the cost and complexity of creating the window openings.
 - o Mr. Roller agreed with Ms. Lukachik's concerns about creating window openings and said they are starting to explore the possibilities. He said their intention was to get an approval for this general concept of creating window opening so that they can move ahead with the confidence that the Historical Commission is supporting the introduction of windows into Building B. Mr. Roller discussed the interior structural changes that are tentatively planned that would allow for and support the roof addition.
- Ms. Lukachik asked if the floor-to-ceiling height at eighth floor where the ghost sign is located is the same as at other floors.
 - o Mr. Roller confirmed that the floor-to-ceiling heights in the historic building are a uniform height.
- Mr. Brown said that he is not sure how this building would be reused without the window openings.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he is comfortable with this application as a conceptual approval with all of the comments that have been made by the Architectural Committee members. He added that he would recommend a more recessive overbuild without the bumps on the top. He noted the recessed floor is fine and he understands the need to do a lot of work with the windows.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia, thanked the property owner for his dedication to the historic site and overall project. Mr. Beisert supported the in-concept application.
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, supported the in-concept application. He also voiced support for the applicant's proposal to relocate a flag mural to another building in the historic complex.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed massing of the addition is approvable. The design should be revised for greater compatibility with the historic building.
- The proposed insertion of windows is approvable. The building's structural challenges will shape how the new window openings are inserted. Owing to this, the window configuration may change significantly in the final design.
- The ghost sign should be retained and incorporated into the final design.
- The jurisdiction over the existing flag mural is limited. The mural is important, but its removal may be required to successfully adapt the building for a new use.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The in-concept application satisfies Standard 9 as the new addition will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- The in-concept application satisfies Standard 10 as historic "Building B" will retain its essential form and massing once this project is complete. Both the roof addition and window openings could be infilled if a future owner wished to return it to its original appearance as a storage warehouse; therefore, the in-concept proposal meets Standard 10.

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

ITEM: 500 N CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS BLVD MOTION: Approval in-concept MOVED BY: Lukachik 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	5				2

ADDRESS: 2313 GREEN ST

Proposal: Demolish garage, construct three-story residential building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Laura and Anil Nanda

Applicant: Lea Litvin, LO Design

History: 1908; garage built 1954

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolishing a non-historic garage and constructing a three-story residential building at the open rear area of 2313 Green Street. The new construction would face Wallace Street and would not connect to the historic building. The proposed building is planned as three stories tall and would contain five residential units. The proposed cladding material is a mix of red brick and gray metal standing-seam siding. Windows are proposed as single-light openings. A garage with a roll down door would be located on the first level facing Wallace Street.

Views of the proposed new building are largely obscured by surrounding buildings, fencing, and landscaping. The most visible area of the building would be the north and west elevations. The north elevation would be visible from a driveway entry along Wallace Street. The west wall would be visible from Wallace Street during part of the year or if one or more trees were removed from the adjacent property.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish a non-historic two-story garage.
- Construct a three-story building with a roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible*

with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

- o The 1954 garage building was constructed outside of the historic district's period of significance (1901-1950) and is not physically connected to the historic building. Therefore, it is not considered contributing to the property and may be demolished, meeting Standard 9.
- o The size and scale of the proposed building is compatible with the historic building and district, meeting Standard 9.
- o The proportion and features of the window openings and single-light windows are not compatible with the overall historic district and do not meet Standard 9.
- o While the red brick is compatible with the historic district, the dark standing seam siding is not. Although much of the new building will not be seen from the public right-of-way, owing to the visibility of the standing seam metal on the north and west walls. The application does not meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o Since the new construction is separated from the historic building, the application satisfies Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:25:46

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Lea Litvin and Evan Litvin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the vast expanse of metal panels on the west elevation. He noted that the facade would not be highly visible to the general public but could be improved if brick were to come up at least to the two-story height with the metal panels above it. He noted that the highest visibility would be the view down Wallace Street. He commented that he appreciates that they are not trying to maximize the volume of the new building on the site. He stated that the proposed building has a nice scale to it, but the openings on the front façade facing Wallace Street are rather large and unbroken. He noted that the third-floor metal panel comes right to the front and is not set back. He indicated that a full brick front may be preferable but at a minimum the metal should be set back from the brick façade. He inquired if the new façade would line up with the façade on the adjacent building or if it would be set forward similar to the existing garage in place.
 - o Mr. Litvin responded that the new front façade will sit slightly in front of the adjacent façade.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the large plate glass window on the front facade is out of scale and will be visible from Wallace Street.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out the proximity of the rear wall of the new building to the rear wall of the historic building.
 - o Ms. Litvin responded that the distance between the buildings is 19 feet, but that the rendering makes it appear a shorter distance. She added that the lot is not

- being subdivided and will remain one parcel with the area in between the buildings functioning as a courtyard and shared outdoor space.
- o Mr. Detwiler suggested additional space between the buildings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, spoke in support of the project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The size and scale of the proposed new construction is compatible with the historic building and district. The proposal does not seek the maximum height and square footage allowed by zoning.
- The majority of the building will not be visible from the public right-of-way. The visible areas of the building will be the front façade and the west elevation.
- The oversized windows on the front façade appear out of scale with the building and district.
- The west elevation is mostly clad in dark metal panel.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application mostly satisfies Standard 9, as the features, size, scale, and proportions meet Standard 9. To fully satisfy Standard 9, additional brick should be added to west elevation. The demolition of the garage meets Standard 9 because it was constructed outside of the period of significance for the historic district.
- The application satisfies Standard 10, with the new construction separated from the historic building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided additional brick is added to the west elevation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 2313 GREEN ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Detwiler 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	5				2

ADDRESS: 6915 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Construct four-story residential building on subdivided parcel

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tier View Development

Applicant: Zach Jones, CANNO Design

History: 1798; Joseph Gorgas House

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 6901 Germantown Avenue, located at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Gorgas Lane, includes a late-eighteenth-century stone structure, the Joseph Gorgas House, and a large parking lot at the side and rear. The property's large open space historically functioned as a side and rear yard. Aside from a wood-frame shed or stable building at the rear of the stone house, historic maps show that no other structures existed on the site. The property was recently subdivided along the western edge of the Joseph Gorgas House to create 6903 Germantown Avenue, which was then consolidated with the neighboring property at 6915 Germantown Avenue. This application proposes to construct a four-story, multi-unit building on this newly consolidated lot with frontages on Germantown Avenue and Gorgas Lane. The building would be clad in green brick on its street elevations and cement board siding on the remaining elevations. While the corner closest to the Gorgas House maintains the setback of the historic structure from Germantown Avenue, the façade bends toward the street before arcing back at the northern end of the elevation.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a four-story, multi-unit building with roof deck on a consolidated parcel which includes a portion of a designated property.

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 four-story building would be differentiated from the historic building, though it would not be compatible in scale or style. The proposed building is much too large in massing, size, and scale, given its proximity to the Gorgas House. The chosen materials and style do not reflect the surrounding structures.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - o Recommended: *Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - o Recommended: *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 Recommended: *Distinguishing the addition from the original building by setting it back from the wall plane of the historic building.*

- o Recommended: *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.*
- o Not Recommended: *Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
 - o The proposed building is sited too close to the historic resource, diminishing the Gorgas House by virtue of its much larger scale.

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: 02:38:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carey Jackson Yonce represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler noted that the Gorgas House was designated in 1957, one of the first buildings so protected in Philadelphia. He further commented that the lot division will disrupt the residential rhythm of the neighborhood.
 - o Mr. Yonce replied that the proposed setback is intended to continue the green space from the park through to the Gorgas House.
- Mr. McCoubrey concurred with Mr. Detwiler's comments and expressed the opinion that the green space between buildings was a different matter and that the proposed building appeared to occupy the maximum space available. He noted that the scale is more commercial than residential,
 - o Mr. Yonce responded that the proposed building would cover less of the lot than allowed by zoning.
- Ms. Lukachik agreed with her colleagues and suggested that there should be more like a house width between the historic house and the proposed building.
- Mr. Cluver asked for more detail on the materials proposed for the façade immediately facing the Gorgas House.
 - o Mr. Yonce replied that it would be a cement-board siding but that he was open to a short return of brick at the corner, or possibly the whole façade could be brick.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, spoke in opposition to the proposal, citing the proximity to the historic building and the overall scale of the new building.
- Allison Weiss, representing SoLo Germantown, expressed opposition to the proposal.
- Paul Steinke, of the Preservation Alliance, spoke in opposition to the proposal and suggested that the new building needed to show deference to the historic property in its style and suggested that adding a cornice would be one way to do that better.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed building's scale and its proximity to the historic Gorgas House diminishes the designated building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 and interrupts the existing relationships of the Gorgas House to its surroundings.
- The application fails to satisfy the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction. Shifting the new building further from the historic one could improve the relationship between the two structures.

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: 6915 GERMANTOWN AVE					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
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				2

ADDRESS: 1200 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct two-story addition with roof deck, interior alterations

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dimitry Starominsky; Programs for Exceptional People; Programs Employing People Inc

Applicant: Brandon Lutz, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: 1954

Individual Designation: pending

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story addition with a roof deck on an existing three-story building that is currently under consideration for individual designation. The nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission on 27 July 2023 and the notice of the consideration of the designation was sent to the property owner on 15 September 2023. The building was constructed in 1954 and is three stories tall with a flat roof. The existing third story only occupies a portion of the building's footprint near the rear. The building has a prominent facade with large windows on Broad Street and its Federal Street side features an open courtyard with a low wall. It has secondary facades on Carlise Street and where it abuts the neighboring property. The nomination is available on the Historical Commission's website.

The application proposed to demolish the small existing third story and construct a new two-story addition on top of the existing building to convert it into use as apartments. The existing courtyard that is open to Federal Street will be enclosed resulting in a four-story building with a roof deck. The footprint of the addition almost matches that of the historic building and builds up from the existing, distinctive flat roof. The addition will be clad with aluminum panels and feature an assortment of windows with irregular spacing. The new addition will be prominently visible on top of and around the historic fabric of the existing building.

The building is being nominated under Criteria A, C, D, E, and J. It was constructed as the headquarters for the Order Sons of Italy, Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, an organization of great importance to the Italian American community history of the city. It is described as a notable example of the Modern architectural style, and it was designed by the significant architecture firm of Carroll, Grisdale & Van Alen.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a new two-story addition with roof deck at 1200 S Broad Street.
- Demolish existing partial third story of existing building.
- Infill open courtyard of building facing Federal Street.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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.*
 - o The proposed addition does not meet Standard 2. It is too large and occupies too much space on top of and interferes with the spatial relationships of the long, low, flat roof of the historic building, a distinctive characteristic of its architecture.
- *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.
- *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 proposed roof deck does not meet the Roofs Guideline because it will be visible from the public rights-of-way along Broad Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and the Roofs Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 002:55:58

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 DECEMBER 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Attorney Stephanie Boggs Magagna, architect Rustin Ohler, and property owner Michael Tucker represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Boggs Magagna explained about the additional application materials and how they do not reflect any changes to the design. She further explained the context behind the project in that it was designed before a nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission to designate the property as historic. It has been owned and used by Programs Employing People (PEP), a nonprofit, for many decades. PEP decided to sell the building in April 2023 for financial reasons and came to an agreement with the applicants that will allow the organization to remain as a tenant in the building and continue its operations. The applicants have also presented their current plan to the Zoning Board of Adjustment and are currently appealing an initial denial. Furthermore, the applicants were the only ones to make an offer that did not propose demolishing the building.
- Mr. Tucker provided a brief overview of Programs Employing People, explained its mission, and how the sale agreement the organization negotiated with the applicants enabled it to remain in its current workspace via a lease back agreement at a very favorable rate.
- Mr. Ohler presented the design to the Architectural Committee. He explained the existing building's conditions and site layout. He explained that they are proposing to remove the existing third-floor, mechanical portion of the building. All other demolition will occur in the interior. He presented the proposed floor plans and explained that they are proposing to add floors to the current open end of the courtyard, though they designed that area largely in glass and set it back slightly to retain the open feel of the space. New third and fourth floors will be added and a roof deck will be located on top of the building but will not be visible from surrounding rights-of-way. He further explained that the building is in disrepair currently. He outlined the proposed elevations and the restoration of the existing first- and second-floor Broad Street storefronts, limestone, and paint. He explained that the additions have a vertical banding that reflects the colonnades on the historic building, and they are retaining the existing cantilevered roof overhang with a four-foot setback above it. He explained that they are restoring the appearance of the Carlisle Street façade, which currently has boarded-up windows.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he can see how the property has many challenges related to deferred maintenance, but there are fundamental elements of the historic building design that will be impacted by the addition, notably the Broad Street storefront with columns and the very thin, flat roof. He added that the proposed additions build up the overall height and thicken the band above the floor as well as fill in the Federal Street courtyard, which gives a sense of rhythm to the street and is a character-defining feature of the building.
- Mr. Detwiler added that the proposed overbuild is overly complex, which detracts from the purity of the historic building below. He stated that the existing building has a wonderful simplicity, and the proposed addition appears too heavy. He added that it would be helpful to see renderings as the building is best understood in three dimensions. He went on to highlight the existing building's roofline with its thin profile and overhanging projection and how that stands as an important feature. He stated that the addition needs to come down in such a way to reinforce the original thinness.

- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the overbuild doubles the size of the building and overwhelms the simple U-shaped building and courtyard. He stated that the courtyard is an important feature of the existing design. He suggested that any overbuild needs to be very simple, almost just a glass box. He further commented that he would prefer to see a single story instead of two stories, which may help maintain the primacy of the scale below. He noted that there are likely economic factors that the Architectural Committee does not necessarily consider in its review.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that the proposed design is the minimum size that will allow the project to be financially viable.
 - o Ms. Boggs Magagna emphasized that the design was completed before the nomination was submitted and that the sale agreement between PEP and the buyers allows PEP to remain in the building.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey acknowledged that the agreement is praiseworthy and lends significant weight to a financial argument for the project, which can be considered during the review by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Detwiler acknowledged the challenges of designing an overbuild for this building. He stated that the building has such a pure and simple design that the task of trying to add something on top is very difficult. He highlighted the idea that less is more, and the abundance of shadow lines and various windows may be too busy in this case.
- Mr. McCoubrey added that the new addition almost needs to be simpler than the original building, which is already very simple in its design. He expressed opposition to infilling the courtyard.
- Mr. Detwiler posited that a glass box without additional piers may work. He commented on the beauty of the stone panels on the existing building and questioned whether it was the same type used on the Philadelphia Art Museum.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented on the proposed design and his hopes that it can be revised in a way which is acceptable to all parties. He added that the timing of the nomination and the proposed design may suggest additional flexibility. He reiterated that the project was already conceived prior to the Alliance submitting the nomination, and that the nonprofit is staying in the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes to demolish the small existing third story and construct a new two-story addition on top of the existing building to convert it into use as apartments. The existing courtyard that is open to Federal Street will be enclosed, resulting in a four-story building with a roof deck.
- The building is currently under consideration for individual designation. The nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission on 27 July 2023 and the notice of the consideration of the designation was sent to the property owner on 15 September 2023.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2. The proposed addition interferes with the spatial relationships of the long, low, flat roof of the existing building, which is a character-defining feature of the building.

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9. The proposed addition is too large and is not compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the existing building.
- The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline because the proposed addition and roof deck will be visible from the public right-of-way along S. Broad Street.

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

ITEM: 1200 S BROAD ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein					X
Total	5				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:21:41

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:22 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.