

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

**TUESDAY, 26 JULY 2022
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:

Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner Supervisor
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
Khan Shibly
Hal Schirmer
Herb Schultz, Studio HS4
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Vy Le
Nancy Pontone
Jesse Bacon
Gabrielle Canno, CANNO design
Jay Farrell
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Tamar Fox
Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos Architecture
Julie Scott, Reku Design
Joseph Perry
David Landskroner
Michael Bucci, g_space LLC
Charles Long
A. Eberhardt
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance

Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Jake Blumgart
Jessica Vitali, Coscia Moos Architecture

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 700-02 AND 704 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish building, construct addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: 700 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Herb Schultz, Studio HS4

History: 1922; Washington Square Building; Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Chestnut Street East Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2021

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street and the construction of an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street. Currently, both buildings, at 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street, are classified as contributing to the Chestnut Street East Historic District. In parallel with this application, the applicant is requesting that the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission reclassify the property at 704 Chestnut Street as non-contributing to the historic district. If the Historical Commission declines to reclassify 704 Chestnut Street as non-contributing, then it cannot approve the demolition without a finding that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building has no feasible reuse.

The addition would be constructed at 704 Chestnut Street and would extend onto the six-story historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street. The addition would be 13 stories tall, with seven new stories on the six-story historic building. The historic building is 76'-4" tall to the roof. The enlarged building would be 160'-3" to the roof and 171'-7" to the top of the mechanical penthouse.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish the three-story building at 704 Chestnut Street;
- Construct an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street.

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 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 If the building at 704 Chestnut Street is classified as contributing, the demolition of the building will destroy historic materials and features, and therefore will not satisfy Standard 9.
 - o If the addition is constructed, it will not be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the building at 700-02

Chestnut Street or the historic district as a whole and therefore will not protect the integrity of the property and its environment, and will not satisfy Standard 9.

- *Section 14-1005(6)(d): Restrictions on Demolition No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... or of a building ... 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 ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.*
 - o If the building at 704 Chestnut Street is classified as contributing, the demolition of the building cannot be approved in satisfaction of Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance 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 ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9 and, depending on the outcome of the reclassification review, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibitions against demolition.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Michael Phillips and architect Herb Schultz represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Chantry informed the Architectural Committee that the Committee on Historic Designation voted at its 20 July 2022 meeting to recommend that the Historical Commission retain the contributing classification of the property at 704 Chestnut Street in the Chestnut Street East Historic District.
- Mr. Phillips stated that he is seeking an in-concept approval of the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street and the construction of an addition at 700-02 Chestnut Street. He noted that although the Committee on Historic Designation recommended against reclassifying the property at 704 Chestnut Street, the staff had recommended in favor of the reclassification.
- Mr. Schultz introduced the Architectural Committee to the project and showed the architectural drawings and photographs. He discussed the massing of the proposed overbuild as well as the materials proposed for the cladding.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the current occupancy of the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street.
 - o Mr. Schultz responded that it is mostly vacant. One storefront on 7th Street may still be occupied. Some of the upper floors are being gutted. One floor of offices may be occupied. He noted that the building has one elevator and one stair. It does not satisfy egress requirements, which mandate two stairs. The building will be brought up to code when the project is undertaken. It is not ADA compliant.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that this is a new historic district that was designated just last year. At the time of designation, the Historical Commission determined that the building at 704 Chestnut Street is contributing to the historic district. He asked why

- the developer chose to demolish the building rather than incorporate it into the project.
- o Mr. Phillips responded that the building at 704 Chestnut Street lost two floors as well as much of its architectural detailing. It does not warrant the contributing classification. The two surviving bay windows do not merit the retention of the remnant building.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that the building in question has wood floor framing spanning between the party walls. The floors in 704 do not align with the floors in 700-02. The building at 704 cannot accommodate an elevator or set of stairs. Building a new building with the vertical circulation at 704 would reduce the impact of the overbuild on 700-02. He added that the building at 704 has been heavily modified and retains almost none of its original character.
 - o Mr. Detweiler noted that, although he is just one of seven Committee members, he finds that the building at 704 retains sufficient historic character to merit preservation.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the proposed overbuild overwhelms the historic building. He suggested that a much smaller overbuild, set back from the street facades, may be acceptable. He stated that a two-story overbuild may be inconspicuous from the street. He added that the 700-block of Chestnut Street is primarily a four and five-story block.
 - o Mr. Schultz countered that the buildings across 7th Street on both sides of Chestnut Street are taller than the proposed overbuild. This building would be a transition to the taller buildings to the east.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey again reiterated that the proposed overbuild is too tall.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if the existing building at 700-02 could support the overbuild or would need to be reinforced.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that the change from office to residential use would allow the existing building to carry most of the load, but the structure would need some reinforcing. He stated that the addition would carry the lateral loads.
 - Mr. Detweiler suggested setting the addition back from the street facades. He also suggested reconstructing the missing floors at 704 and build the addition behind the reconstructed facade at 704.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that the overbuild falls within the skyline requirements.
 - Ms. Lukachik states that she understands the challenges documented in the structural report. She asked if they could keep part of the historic building at 704 and reduce the height of the overbuild. She stated that it will be difficult if not impossible to satisfy structural requirements at 704. She suggested rethinking the entire project.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he is opposed to any demolition.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested maintaining the façade at 704 and some part of the building behind it. He asked the applicants to consider rebuilding the historic façade at 704 and then building an addition behind it. He asked if any of the original storefront survives.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that he does not believe that any historic features survive behind the storefront.
 - Mr. Phillips stated that the site has CMX-5 zoning, which allows for additional height.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented in opposition to the demolition of 704 Chestnut Street and the height and massing of the proposed overbuild.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Currently the buildings at 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street are classified as contributing to the Chestnut Street East Historic District.
- In parallel with this in-concept application, the applicant is requesting that Historical Commission reclassify the property at 704 Chestnut Street as non-contributing to the historic district.
- At its 20 July 2022 meeting, the Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission retain the contributing classification of the property at 704 Chestnut Street in the Chestnut Street East Historic District.
- If the Historical Commission declines to reclassify 704 Chestnut Street as non-contributing, then it cannot approve the demolition without a finding that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building has no feasible reuse.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- If the building at 704 Chestnut Street is classified as contributing, the demolition of the building would destroy historic materials and features, and therefore would not satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed addition would not be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street or the historic district as a whole and therefore would not protect the integrity of the property and its environment and would not satisfy Standard 9.
- If the building at 704 Chestnut Street is classified as contributing, the demolition of the building cannot be approved in compliance with Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance 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 cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9 and, depending on the outcome of the reclassification review, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibitions against demolition.

ITEM: 700-02 and 704 Chestnut St.					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
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: 2216 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Construct third-floor rear addition with roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jordan Brody

Applicant: Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor rear addition with roof deck and pilot house on top of an existing two-story rear addition, a large portion of which dates to a 1981 reconstruction of the rear addition. The enlarged rear addition would be visible from Latimer Street at the rear, which is a service alley on this block. The proposed pilot house appears to sit on the rear wall of the main block. Existing window openings on the rear addition are proposed to be infilled or otherwise modified; however, most of these are not visible from the service alley at the rear and are on the 1981 reconstructed addition.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct additional story on existing two-story rear addition.
- Construct roof deck and pilot house on rear addition.
- Alter window openings on 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 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 majority of the rear addition was constructed in 1981; therefore, this section of the rear addition is not historically significant, and its alteration meets Standard 9.
 - o The proposed rear addition maintains the historic width of a rear ell rather than expanding to the full width of the property, satisfying Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:32:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Lauren Thomsen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Thomsen explained the project scope and showed examples of precedents for larger rear additions on this block.
- Ms. Stein asked about the original rear ell, if an existing chimney is historic, and if the chimney would have to be extended in height.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- o Ms. Thomsen responded that it is not currently an active chimney. She explained that a zoning document from 1981 shows that a two-story rear addition was demolished, and a new two-story rear addition was constructed; the new addition was depicted as approximately 35 feet in length.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if it is possible to add the additional story without it encroaching onto the main block.
 - o Ms. Thomsen responded that the intent is to maintain the original stair, which sits in the inset on the first and second floor.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if it is necessary to maintain the parapet all the way through to the main block. He stated that it hits the original main block in an awkward way and asked if it could be dropped just below the eave line. He asked if the pilot house needs to be as wide as it is shown.
 - o Ms. Thomsen responded that the parapet could be dropped, and the pilot house may be able to be narrower.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the addition should not encroach on the rear cornice of the main block. He suggested an offset of the last run of the stair up to the pilot house, allowing it to shift over, which would allow the rear cornice line to read and would also assist with drainage.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about a trellis on the roof deck, which is noted on the plans but not shown in elevation. She expressed concern about visibility of the trellis on the rear addition from the street.
 - o Ms. Thomsen responded that the trellis could be omitted, but that a trellis does make for a more functional and comfortable roof space.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the floor to ceiling heights of the second and third floors.
 - o Ms. Thomsen responded that they match the existing floor heights, so nine feet, eleven inches floor-to-floor to match the second floor in the front.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the new windows are too large and clustered. He suggested that they be smaller separate punched openings on the side wall.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the pilot house have a shed roof, the addition drop by one foot, and the rear addition windows be more residential in appearance.
- Mr. Detwiler asked that a section drawing through the stair be provided for review by the Historical Commission. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that it be a whole building section.
- Mr. Detwiler encouraged Ms. Thomsen to make the revisions and supplements to the application in time for the review by the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The majority of the rear addition was constructed in 1981; therefore, the section of the rear addition in question is not historically significant.
- The proposed pilot house encroaches slightly onto the main block and is the full width of the rear addition.
- The existing windows on the rear wall of the main block will remain.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed rear addition maintains the historic width of a rear ell rather than expanding to the full width of the property, satisfying Standard 9.

- The proposed rear addition rises slightly higher than the rear eave of the main block, altering the spatial relationship and massing which characterizes the historic property, and therefore it does not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 2216 Locust 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				

ADDRESS: 704 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions and detached garage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lisa & Greg Millhauser

Applicant: Matthew Price, CANNO design

History: 1810; c. 1961, new sash, door, and transom

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct rear additions and a two-story garage at the rear of 704 Pine Street. The existing rear of the building is the result of numerous alterations over the years, as documented in the application materials. This application proposes additional alterations to the already-altered rear, expanding it in footprint and in height. At the far rear of the property along Addison Street, this application proposes the construction of a two-story structure, with garage and living space above. This side of Addison Street at the rear is lined with garage structures. The restoration or replacement of some front façade features is proposed as part of this application, which can be reviewed by the staff. Many of the existing front façade features, including windows, door, and transom, date to a 1961 renovation.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rear additions.
- Construct two-story detached structure at rear.
- Restore and replace front façade features.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

- *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 Replacement of front façade features dating to a 1961 renovation, such as windows and doors to match the historic appearance, satisfies Standard 6.
- *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 majority of the rear of this building is the result of numerous alterations over the years; therefore, the rear is not historically significant and its alteration meets Standard 9.
 - o The proposed detached two-story structure along Addison Street is differentiated from the old, and compatible with the massing, size, and scale of other garages on Addison Street, satisfying 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 rear additions and detached rear structure does not alter the essential form and integrity of the historic property, and could be removed in the future; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gabrielle Canno represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Canno explained the project scope and the alterations that have occurred to the building over the years.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the height of the proposed office space at the rear. He expressed concern about drainage and the overall height of this part of the addition. He acknowledged that the new element is not blocking the visibility of a historic element but opined that it is too tall.
 - o Ms. Canno responded that the height is 10 feet at the interior, but it is not taller than the primary roof ridge line. She stated that an interior roof drain would be used.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed about the height of the rear addition rising above the rear gable. He suggested that it “thin up” and act more like a shed dormer. He stated that it will be a drainage nightmare as proposed. He suggested something more dormer-like that could pitch back to connect into the roof.

- o Mr. McCoubrey suggested a gable or cross-gable that intersects but does not span the full width. He suggested that another option would be to remove the mass entirely and instead have a large deck.
- o Ms. Canno responded that she will explore options for a gentler transition.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the proposed slate material. He opined that it is not appropriate for the garage piers. He asked if the garage façade could be all brick. He stated that the garage façade looks top-heavy. He stated that the slate would be acceptable as an accent but not on the piers to either side of the garage door.
 - o Ms. Canno responded that the slate is fiberglass-backed real slate, is very thin, and comes in sheets. She stated that she can remove it from the piers and have those be brick.
- Mr. McCoubrey expressed appreciation for having occupied space with windows above the garage on Addison Street.
- Mr. Cluver suggested reconsidering the height of the garage door because it appears too short in the drawings and renderings.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the roof on the garage structure.
 - o Ms. Canno responded that it is a green roof with no deck or occupancy, and with a minimal parapet.
- Mr. Detwiler asked that Ms. Canno include the adjacent properties on the elevation drawings for review by the Historical Commission for the garage and rear elevation.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the front railings are original. He noted that the drawings call for replacement to match existing. He asked why this was necessary. He stated that the railing is original. He stated that a metalworker could replace parts that are rusted.
 - o Ms. Canno responded that the existing railings are not in great condition, and the neighbor replaced their railings to match the existing during their renovation project several years ago.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro asked the scope of the neighbor's renovation project.
 - o Ms. Canno responded that it was a complete renovation with a new 16-foot-tall one-story rear garage.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that the railing is special and should be restored.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the front entrance door and transom. He asked why a new entrance door and transom is needed. He asked if the entire door frame must be replaced. He suggested that the door and transom are original.
 - o Ms. Canno responded that there is quite a bit of rot around the frame of the existing door. She stated that she believes the frame needs to be replaced. She questioned if the existing door and transom are original.
 - o Ms. Chantry reiterated the staff overview, which explained that the existing door and transom date to a 1961 renovation and are not original, and the staff can approve a new door and transom to replicate the historic appearance.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro responded that replicating is acceptable, but the drawings say "in kind," which, he suggested, could lead to the staff approving a plastic door.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the staff is capable of reviewing these façade elements.
 - o Ms. Chantry noted that the drawings call for the Historical Commission's review and approval of shop drawings for the new door and transom. She added that the staff reviews door shop drawings daily.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that shop drawings do not provide the information needed for review.

- o Mr. Detwiler asked what the transom should look like, noting that the existing transom is rather tall.
- o Ms. Chantry responded that the staff would review the details, and agreed that the existing transom is tall but noted the masonry opening is taller than the adjacent door.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and stated that this is why the existing frame should be repaired rather than replaced.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing rear of the building has been altered numerous times over the years.
- Many of the existing front façade features, including windows, door, and transom, date to a 1961 renovation.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The replacement of front façade features dating to a 1961 renovation, such as windows and doors to match the historic appearance, satisfies Standard 6.
- The rear of this building has been altered numerous times over the years; therefore, the rear is not historically significant, and its alteration meets Standard 9.
- The proposed detached two-story structure along Addison Street is differentiated from the old, and compatible with the massing, size, and scale of other garages on Addison Street, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed rear additions and detached rear structure do not alter the essential form and integrity of the historic property, and could be removed in the future; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the fourth-floor office addition is redesigned to be lower and narrower, brick is used for both stories on the front elevation of the Addison Street structure, and the existing front railing is restored rather than replaced, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 704 Pine St. MOTION: Approval with conditions 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	7				

ADDRESS: 2204 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct 10-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Flamingo Bay Investments LLC

Applicant: Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos Architecture

History: 1870; Furness & Hewitt; Refaced c. 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-contributing building and construct a 10-story, mixed-use, commercial, and residential building at 2204 Walnut Street in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The overall height of the building would be 117 feet. The upper stories would be set back 10'-2" from the lower front façade at the fifth floor and an additional 5'-3" at the seventh floor. Floors one through six will be clad in a buff color brick and floors seven through ten will be glass reinforced cement panels in a similar color.

In 2019, the Historical Commission approved a two-story rooftop and rear addition for the existing four-story building. The addition would have been set back from the front façade.

In May 2022, the Historical Commission reviewed an application proposing the demolition of the existing building on the property and the construction of a new building. While the demolition was approved, the Historical Commission voted to deny the new building for the following reasons:

- The historic buildings in the immediate area of 2204 Walnut Street are between three and five stories in height. At 10 stories and 117 feet tall, the proposed building is too tall and therefore not compatible with the streetscape or historic district.
- The colors of the historic buildings in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District are typically muted earth tones. The proposed building is white. The color of the proposed building is too bright.

Since the last review, the color of the proposed building has been adjusted and is now more of an earth tone like the extant building. The design of the upper stories has been revised, but the building's height has not changed. The party walls have been articulated.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing building.
- Construct 10-story building.

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 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 At 10 stories and 117 feet tall, the proposed building is not compatible with the streetscape or historic district. The historic buildings in the immediate area are

between three and five stories in height. The application does not comply with Standard 9. The height of the proposed building should be reduced to a maximum of six stories, with the upper two stories set back from the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the demolition but denial of the new construction, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:16:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jessica Vitali represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein said she appreciates the applicant's response to the Architectural Committee's previous color comment and noted the color tone is improved. She said that the applicant should respond to the previous recommendation to reduce the building's height. Ms. Stein observed that the proposed building is double the height of most buildings on the block and it overwhelms the neighboring buildings. She said the building massing is too tall and is not sympathetic to the historic context of the location.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the color of the façade has been improved and is now an appropriate color but the overbuild remains inappropriate.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the overbuild was unacceptable, especially the view from the S. 22nd Street corner where the party wall of the proposed building would loom over a three-story historic building. He observed that the proposed building is at mid-block, so the setbacks could be revised to make it feel compatible. He continued that it is the oblique views from the street corners that show the building's party walls and how they would overwhelm the block. Mr. McCoubrey said the scale of this block needs to be carefully considered on its own. He added he appreciates the exterior color change.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the window size and scale and the ratio of openings to wall surface are not in keeping with the other historic buildings on this street. He noted the proposed building is not like the rest of the block.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver. He recalled making a similar comment at the previous review.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the left-side rendering shown on page H14 in the application. He commented that the view of the setbacks with the cantilevered balconies appears very heavy and overwhelming. Mr. McCoubrey acknowledged that this is a difficult site on which to build. He pointed out the massing that was previously approved by the Historical Commission for this site, which was included in the staff recommendation. Mr. McCoubrey explained that this earlier applicant wished to build higher as well. He said the Commission worked hard to devise a massing that was appropriate. He added that, unfortunately, the current proposal far exceeds this approved massing.
- Mr. Detwiler said he wishes the overbuild was a different color because, in its current form, the entire building blends together. He explained that a tone change between the lower and upper sections would make the setback feel smaller. Mr. Detwiler recommended making the upper, set-back areas a lighter color.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The height of the proposed building is exactly the same as the height in the earlier proposal, which was rejected.
- The façade color was changed as suggested in the first review.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- At 10 stories and 117 feet tall, the proposed building is not compatible with the streetscape or historic district. The historic buildings in the immediate area are between three and five stories in height. The application does not comply with Standard 9. The height of the proposed building should be reduced to a maximum of six stories, with the upper two stories set back from the front façade.
- The window size and scale, and the ratio of openings to wall surface is not in keeping with the other historic buildings on this street. The application does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 2204 Walnut 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	7				

ADDRESS: 1822 CHRISTIAN ST

Proposal: Construct third floor addition, pilot house, and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jesse Bacon and Tamar Fox

Applicant: Michael Bucci, g_space LLC

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Christian Street/Black Doctors Row Historic District, Contributing, 7/8/2022

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-story addition, green roof, deck, and pilot house on the building at 1822 Christian Street. The building is a contributing historic

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

resource to the Christian Street/Black Doctors Row Historic District. The application proposes to remove a section of the existing roof and construct a third-story addition at the third-floor rear. A green roof, a pilot house, and deck would be constructed above the third level. The green roof at the front of the building would be constructed on top of the existing roof and would add a parapet wall to the top of the existing cornice. The rear of 1822 Christian Street is not visible from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish a section of third-story roof.
- Construct a third-story addition.
- Construct a green roof, roof deck, and pilot house.

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 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 proposed green roof would include a new parapet wall that would rise above the historic cornice at the front of the building. This alteration would change the historic character of the front façade and would not be compatible with the historic building; therefore, it would not meet Standard 9.
- *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 new parapet, and potentially the pilot house, would be visible from the public right-of-way along the 1800 block of Christian Street; therefore, this addition would not meet the Roofs Guideline.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:28:48

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Michael Bucci and Angela Bucci and property owner Jesse Bacon represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Bucci summarized the project for the Architectural Committee members.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Bucci to confirm that the rear overbuild will be constructed on the existing structure. She inquired if an engineer has confirmed that the bearing walls can support the overbuild.
 - o Mr. Bucci confirmed the third-floor addition will be constructed on top of the existing rear ell. He said that they have engaged an engineer, who is about to conduct a structural assessment.

- Ms. Gutterman asked if they had thought about pulling the front parapet wall back five or 10 feet from the front façade so it would not be visible. She noted that the roof deck does not need to cover the entire main block.
 - o Mr. Bucci responded that 10 feet would eliminate the front deck area. He explained the owners were not planning to use the rear area as a roof deck but rather a green roof for growing space and vegetable garden area. Mr. Bucci added that the front area would have chairs and the entertaining area. He noted that there are better views from front area of building.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated the dilemma is that there is an existing roof deck that was built on the front roof prior to the designation of the historic district and the initiation of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over the property. Now that the Historical Commission has jurisdiction, new roof decks must comply with the Roof Guidelines, which encourages the placement of roof decks on the rears of properties. Mr. McCoubrey explained that, since this application proposes an entirely new roof deck, not just the repair of an existing deck, the Architectural Committee is obligated to apply the Roof Guidelines in its review. He continued that, in this case, the front parapet and railing would have to be pulled back and be minimally visible and inconspicuous from the street. Mr. McCoubrey said that, in a situation like this, the deck should be located at the rear of the building to comply with the Standards.
- Ms. Bucci inquired about removal of existing deck to repair the roof underneath and the type of review required.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the owner would need the Historical Commission's approval to remove and then rebuild the deck.
- Mr. Bucci asked if deck needed to be set back 10 feet from front façade.
 - o Ms. Gutterman explained that a physical mockup could be set up of the railing and the required set back distance would be determined based on the visibility from the public right-of-way along Christian Street.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey added that it should be viewed obliquely and from across the street along Christian Street. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the zoning code requires decks to be set back a minimum five feet from edge of front façade, but the Historical Commission could require an additional setback.
- Ms. Gutterman reiterated that she continues to be concerned about the amount of weight being put on the building without having access to an engineer's report.
 - o Ms. Bucci responded that a structural engineer's report is a requirement of the City for all deck projects and that this is in process.
- Mr. Bucci asked about a mockup review and whether the Architectural Committee would need to weigh in on the results of such a review.
- Ms. Gutterman said she would be hesitant for this to move forward without the engineer's report.
- Ms. Lukachik said that Ms. Gutterman had summarized a lot of her concerns. She noted an engineering assessment could alter the overall design of the deck and rooftop project and could change its impact on the historic fabric.
- Mr. Cluver agreed that, when the structural engineering assessment is complete, the appearance of this project may change.
 - o Mr. Bucci explained their team is experienced with green roofs and they use the same structural engineer on all their projects. He is confident they will not have structural problems with the proposal, even if the even if the engineer has to modify some details.
- Ms. Bucci expressed concern about the potential changes based on the Historical Commission's review criteria and the time frame necessary for an approval.

- Mr. Detwiler said the Architectural Committee is suggesting minimizing the height of the pilot house as much as possible, owing to concerns about visibility.
 - o Mr. Bucci said the height and details of the pilot house design are related roof drainage requirements.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey explained that the applicant can work with the staff on many of the details.
- Mr. Cluver said that the Architectural Committee's main point is the final design should not include any additions that are readily visible from the public right-of-way or that detract from the building's historic character. He continued that the pilot house may or may not be visible; this is still an unknown. Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed alteration to the parapet at the front of the building is the most alarming part of the proposal. He noted that the applicant said there was already a setback of five feet, but he disagrees. Mr. Cluver said he sees the setback of only 12 inches. He explained that what is critical is what additions can be seen from the public right-of-way. He said that the application should be updated so that there is minimal visibility of the additions on the roof from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Bucci described the challenges presented by the required setbacks and designing roof drainage. He noted that it is not as simple as just moving to the front of the green roof back 10 feet.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that it is all interrelated. He said that the Architectural Committee is providing the applicant with requirements that they need to meet and solving the drainage issue will be up to them.
- Mr. Bucci said he understands they need to schedule the sightline studies and show what can and cannot be seen from the public right-of-way. He inquired if there was any acceptable level of visibility from the street. He asked if the rooftop additions need to be inconspicuous or invisible.
- Mr. McCoubrey said they should start with invisible and work from there. He said they cannot respond to hypothetical situations and recommended working with the staff, who can assist. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the applicants should work with the staff and explained that they have the option of making revisions, based on the Architectural Committee's feedback, and present the revisions at the upcoming Historical Commission meeting. He recommended working with the staff as soon as possible.
- Ms. Chantry stated that staff member Allyson Mehley is the assigned contact for the project but could not attend today's meeting. Ms. Chantry also offered to meet with the applicant to look at an onsite mockup as soon as possible. She noted she would send an email to the applicants after the meeting.
- Mr. Detwiler addressed the overbuild on the rear of the third floor. He commented that the third-floor windows should match the size of the lower windows. Mr. Detwiler said that, historically, upper windows were not larger than lower windows.
 - o Mr. Bucci asked if three windows would be acceptable on this level, if they were a similar size. Ms. Bucci explained that their client requested larger windows. She noted this part of the property cannot be seen from the street.
 - o Mr. Detwiler said that allowances may be possible if this section of the building is not visible from public right-of-way.
- Mr. Bacon confirmed the rear of the property is not visible from the public right-of-way. He said there is not even a proper alley at the rear of the property. He said it sounds like they will be able to figure out a solution for their deck design. Mr. Bacon also added that it also sounds like, if need be, they could repair existing deck and it would not hold up the larger project.

- o Mr. McCoubrey said they could repair that deck and construct the third-floor addition.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- A structural engineer's assessment has not yet been completed to confirm existing building can handle the weight of proposed green roof, deck, and third-floor addition.
- As currently proposed, the alteration to the front cornice with a new parapet wall will be visible from the public right-of-way.
- No mockup was undertaken to determine the visibility of the deck and pilot house.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed green roof would include a new parapet wall that would rise above the historic cornice at the front of the building. This alteration would change the historic character of the front façade and would not be compatible with the historic building and the historic district; therefore, it would not meet Standard 9.
- The new parapet, and potentially the pilot house, would be visible from the public right-of-way along the 1800 block of Christian Street; therefore, this addition would not meet the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 1822 Christian St. MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 339 AND 341 S 25TH ST

Proposal: Combine properties; construct third floor and rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Brooks Tanner

Applicant: Julie Scott, Reku Design

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make extensive modifications and additions to two contributing two-story rowhouses in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District to create a double-wide three-story house. The proposal calls for the demolition of the entire party wall between the two buildings, the demolition of both roofs, and demolition of most of the rear and side walls of the ends of the properties. The third floor of the new construction would be set back five feet from the front façade on the 341 portion of the property and 15 feet back from the front façade of the 339 portion, with a front deck set back five feet. The new construction would also fill in the space between the ends. The new construction would be clad in sanded finish fiber cement panels.

In March 2021, the Historical Commission approved a rooftop addition at 341 S. 25th Street. This application is comparable to that application only in the proposed five-foot setback of the addition from the front façade. While the previous addition would have been visible from the public right-of-way, it was limited to the footprint of the existing building, did not involve the demolition of the exterior walls or party walls, was eight inches lower at the front, sloped towards the rear instead of the front, and was clad in fiber cement siding rather than panels.

This application would likely constitute a demolition as defined by the Department of Licenses and Inspections, as it appears that all that would remain of the historic buildings are the front facades, side exterior walls, and small portions of the rear walls. Structural drawings have not been provided.

The application also proposes to whitewash the existing brick to give the buildings a more uniform appearance.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish majority of buildings behind front facades
- Construct additions
- Whitewash facades

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 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 proposed project destroys historic materials and spatial relationships that characterize the properties. The application does not 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 will be unimpaired.*
 - o If removed in the future, the front facades and south wall of 341 S. 25th Street are essentially all that would remain of the historic properties. The application fails to meet this standard.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:59:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Julie Scott represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Architectural Committee members asked about the structural work needed to allow for the removal of the party wall between the buildings.
 - o Ms. Scott noted that they have not had structural drawings done yet, but that they show posts going through. She noted that the floor joists would be remaining and that floor level differences between the two buildings would be addressed by sistering the joists and adding a large beam where the party wall was.
- Ms. Scott explained that since the approval in 2021 at 341 S. 25th, the owners purchased the adjacent property at 339 S. 25th, so they started to redesign the project. She opined that the third-floor addition is similar to what was previously approved at 341 S. 25th Street. Ms. Scott pointed to the addition at 331 S. 25th Street as a comparable addition.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale noted that that addition at 331 S. 25th Street, which is visible from the street, predates designation.
- Ms. Scott noted that the proposed addition slopes down to the back but that they could change the slope back to what was previously approved.
- Ms. Scott explained that her clients did not like siding that was approved previously and prefer the stucco-looking panels as currently proposed.
- Ms. Scott remarked that they would like to whitewash the brick of both facades to make the two buildings look more like one property, noting that some neighboring properties are painted.
- Ms. Scott explained that the driving force behind most of the project has been providing the space her clients want on the interior, rather than focusing on the exterior. She noted that they had previously looked at keeping the ells as was previously proposed for 341 S. 25th Street but found the first-floor layout was constrictive to get the open space they wanted. She explained that the owner is a professional chef and wants a large kitchen.
 - o At Mr. McCoubrey's request, Ms. DiPasquale presented the application approved by the Historical Commission in March 2021.
 - o Ms. Scott explained that the previous iteration was only for 341 S. 25th Street since the owners only owned that property at the time. It had a five-foot setback from the front, one-foot overhang at the rear, had fiber-cement siding, and did not eliminate the ell.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the amount of demolition proposed, and the removal of the character-defining ells of the properties. She remarked that the project

is trying to make a larger structure from two charming smaller properties and changes the character of the historic properties and the block in an irreversible manner.

- Mr. Detwiler agreed, commenting that the project is essentially a facedectomy, removing everything except facades. He opined that there are ways to go about these projects more sensitively, and to find ways to create larger openings within the party wall without removing it entirely. He opined that demolishing everything is too substantial, and that all that is left is a façade, which they are then proposing to whitewash and change the character of that, too.
- Mr. Detwiler argued that one of the character-defining features of the neighborhood is wonderful individual jewel-box houses. He opined that overbuilds are one thing if they are set back considerably but remarked that the current project is too much and detracts from the character of the properties and the district.
- Ms. Gutterman noted she is opposed to the whitewashing of the facades and deck at the front of the roof.
- Ms. Lukachik commented that she does not see the need to whitewash the facades, since the project will not have a cohesive result anyways owing to the differences between the two buildings in the existing windows, cornices, proposed setbacks of the additions, etc. She opined that the whitewashing would diminish the character of the properties for no good reason.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that they do not need to whitewash the facades and could take that portion of the project off the table.
- Ms. Lukachik remarked that it does not seem necessary to remove nearly all of the existing walls, and that there are ways to stitch the buildings together without doing so.
- Ms. Scott noted that they had a previous version of the project where they kept the ells and asked how the Architectural Committee would feel about that.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that without seeing the proposal it is hard to determine its appropriateness. She noted that, in a different scenario, they could keep everything the same with the existing proposal, but retain one interior stair and the rear ells.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that while the Historical Commission's jurisdiction is technically over the exterior of the property, that includes the structure of the building, and this proposal destroys the entire interior structure with the removal of the party wall and significant portion of the exterior.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that the engineer felt that once they started taking out the party wall, it would be easier to remove all of it. She opined that it is difficult on the first floor to achieve the openness the clients wanted and commented that they do not want the fireplaces at all.
 - o Mr. Detwiler replied that chimney masses are character-defining features of buildings like these.
 - o Ms. Gutterman agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that another issue with the project is the scale of overbuild as it relates to the building below, particularly the right half at 341.
 - o Ms. Scott replied that they can revise that portion to keep it more in line with the original approval and could also make the windows smaller to match below.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether the floors between the two buildings align.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that they plan for the flooring to remain on 341, and to reuse and sister the joists of 339 to bring the floors on that side up five inches.

- o Mr. D'Alessandro objected to removing the party wall, which he claimed would be too much demolition.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the front doors, asking whether one would just be made inoperable.
 - o Ms. Scott responded affirmatively. She noted that in earlier schemes, they left one as access to the basement. She noted that they will need to do something with the threshold.
- Ms. Lukachik asked about the interior ceiling heights.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that she does not know off the top of her head. She believes the first floor is 12 feet and the second is 9 feet 6 inches or so, and the new addition is 8 feet.
 - o Ms. Lukachik questioned whether the structural post proposed would continue up the full height of the first and second floors.
 - o Ms. Scott responded affirmatively but noted that there are walls that are located where the post is on the second floor.
 - o Ms. Lukachik asked if they are existing walls or whether they are walls that will become load bearing.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that they have only briefly spoken to the structural engineer about what they could do, and that the post would go all the way up and then there would be some load bearing walls going east-west and a large beam at the first floor.
 - o Ms. Lukachik questioned whether there would be a soffit.
 - o Ms. Scott responded affirmatively.
 - o Ms. Lukachik asked how the mechanical system works with the proposed alterations.
 - Ms. Scott responded that they have not worked that out yet, perhaps through two chases.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the proposed panel cladding system on the addition is not appropriate, and that siding would be more appropriate. He argued that a panelized system makes it look and feel commercial, and that it should be a residential scale with more of a clapboard appearance. He also noted that the windows on overbuild differ from what was previously approved with two punched openings that were more related and scaled to the historic building.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that they are open to changing the window configuration but noted that she likes the big window and thought it would be nice to have more light in the den space of the addition. She noted that they could make it the height of the window below.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that he would like to see the relationship of solid to open.
- Ms. Scott acknowledged that the application would need revisions, and that they will look into keeping the eels, but that she is not sure how much say the Historical Commission has over the demolition of the party wall since it is interior.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the Historical Commission does have jurisdiction over the amount of demolition of the structure.
- Ms. Scott questioned whether the roof deck would be problematic.
 - o The Architectural Committee members responded affirmatively.
 - o Ms. Scott questioned whether it would be better to flip the proposal and have the deck at the rear.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that it is a question of visibility and what can be seen from both the primary and secondary streets.
 - o Mr. Cluver opined that the deck is less of an issue than other parts of the project.

- o Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee would need to see any revised scheme.
- o Ms. Scott noted that there is an existing roof deck at the rear.
- Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the new work changes the characteristics of the historic building, and that jewel-box scale, rhythm, and textures.
- Mr. Detwiler remarked that the addition needs finer articulation. He noted that there is no need to historicize but commented that the giant panels of the proposed cladding with no relief make them feel bolder. He suggested that the overbuild should be better articulated to help reduce its mass of the additions and make it more sensitive.
 - o Ms. Scott reiterated that her client does not like the siding and feels like they look detached from the property below. She acknowledged the comments about scale but opined that the proposed cladding is in the vein of a stucco addition. She noted that the clients are wary of real stucco.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that there is a tradition of overbuilds being lighter frame with siding, either horizontal or vertical. He opined that stucco has a masonry not wood appearance and makes the addition heavier. He explained that emphasizing the lightness of system will help with scale.
- Mr. McCoubrey explained that the buildings are significant as two smaller workers' houses with little ells that are character-defining features, and that they should be kept identifiable and readable as smaller-scale, individual buildings, even as they are combined into a single use.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that Image D in the application shows that the rear is visible, and suggested that the applicants be cautious in terms of visibility since they are proposing to add a full story.
 - o Ms. Scott replied that there are taller buildings on neighboring blocks such as Pine Street.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the review of the proposal is based on the history of these specific buildings, which are lower scale. It does not matter that there might be a taller building a block or two away.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that there is a taller building next door on Pine Street.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that this specific block is low and intact.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the applicant needs to be careful in addressing the context and history of these specific buildings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Hal Schirmer commented that it might take a while to live in the houses before developing better ideas to adaptively reuse the houses.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the staff recommendation of denial. He noted that this block is also part of a National Register historic district that recognizes the neighborhood's history as a community of workers houses oriented towards the Schuylkill River waterfront and its support facilities. He explained that, originally, when the neighborhood was being built, larger homes were constructed on bigger streets such as Pine and Spruce for affluent families, while smaller houses were built on the narrower side streets for working-class families. Now that it is a highly desirable neighborhood, homeowners are trying to shoehorn larger living spaces into smaller homes originally designed for working-class families. He argued that the scale is a defining characteristic of the block. He urged the Historical Commission to be careful in how they manage this trend, so that it does not undermine the historic character of the block and the historic district as a whole. He opined that the proposed project is too aggressive in the amount of demolition it

seeks, which would reshape the original character of these houses in search of more living space. He opined that the Architectural Committee provided some good suggestions on how to approach the project in a more sensitive way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The two existing two-story buildings are both listed as contributing in the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District.
- The rears of the properties are partially visible from Panama Street.
- Historically, two-story workers houses such as these were found on side streets such as 25th Street while larger houses were constructed for wealthier people on primary streets such as Pine and Spruce Streets. The change in scale between the blocks is a character-defining feature of the district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project removes a considerable amount of historic fabric, including the roofs, rear ells, and party wall, destroying historic materials and spatial relationships that characterize the properties, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed project dramatically alters the character of the jewel-box houses and the district, trying to create one large house out of two small houses, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- The large panel system proposed for the cladding of the additions is out of scale with the historic buildings and their environment, failing to satisfy Standard 9. Finer-scale siding and other details that makes the additions appear as light frame construction rather than stucco or masonry would be more appropriate.
- The proposed additions and deck would be visible from the public right-of-way, and are incompatible in scale, proportion, and materials to protect the integrity of the historic properties and their environment, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- If removed in the future, the front facades and south wall of 341 S. 25th Street are essentially all that would remain of the historic properties, failing to satisfy Standard 10.

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

ITEM: 339 and 341 S 25th 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: 8110 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Construct ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Sons of Union Veterans

Applicant: Joseph Perry, Grand Army of the Republic Civil War Museum

History: 1805; Lewis-Pattison House

Individual Designation: 2/4/1982

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make accessibility modifications to a c. 1805 building in northeast Philadelphia as it is converted from a residential building to a Civil War museum. The application proposes to remove the existing concrete sidewalk and stoop and to install a new extended concrete stoop and switchback ADA ramp to the front entrance. The application also proposes to slightly modify a c. 1915 rear frame addition to accommodate a new accessible restroom by decreasing the slope of the roof and infilling the rear windows. The existing side windows of the addition, which are visible from Frankford Avenue, would be retained, and new siding installed to match the existing.

The Historical Commission reviewed a similar application in June 2022 and made several recommendations for improving the design, including by limiting the railing to the sloped portions of the ramp, cladding the sides of the ramp in brick or stone, providing grass/landscaping in the center of the U shape created by the ramp, and installing a slip-sheet between the existing historic stoop and the new landing. The current application addresses some of the concerns by calling for a stone veneer on the exterior of the ramp and the installation of grass in the U shape at the center of the ramp, but continues to call for railings at all sides of the ramp and for the new stoop to be cast directly over the existing stone stoop with no comment about a slip-sheet. The application does not provide a sample or example of the proposed stone veneer.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install ADA ramp
- Modify rear addition to accommodate ADA restroom

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 ramp is set away from the historic building and could be removed in the future without causing damage if there is a change in use that no longer requires accessibility.
- *Accessibility Guideline | Recommended: Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.*
 - o While the exterior ramp would be visible from the public right-of-way, there are limited alternative locations where an accessible entrance could be provided, and the installation of the ramp does not impact the historic features of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the stone veneer is compatible with the historic structure and the railings are required by code, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:33:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Joseph Perry represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey clarified that revised materials submitted to the Historical Commission following the previous application determined that the front door is wide enough to provide ADA access and that the Historical Commission concluded that ADA access should be provided through the front of the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant to explain the changes.
 - o Mr. Perry responded that they addressed the cosmetics requested by the Historical Commission, including adding a stone veneer cladding to the ramp and grass in the middle, and that everything on the existing building would remain and be visible. He claimed that the stoop would also be protected. He opined that the railing would be the same design as the existing front railing and there would not be any difference in the appearance from the railing height up.
 - o Mr. Perry explained that they are anxious to get the project underway as they currently have a supportive benefactor and the funds to install the ramp but argued that each revision and delay in time makes the project more expensive.
- Mr. Cluver questioned Mr. Perry's assertion that the ramp railing will be similar to that at the front of the property, noting that is not what is shown on the drawings, which is a typical inch and a half tube railing.
 - o Mr. Perry responded that the railing will not be that visible, and that it is a matter of safety and affordability. He noted that he did not look closely at the plans.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the hairpin fence railing would not be able to be replicated because it does not meet code.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the railing should be painted black.
- Mr. Cluver noted that at the previous meeting he had raised the thought that for the amount of height the ramp is going up, it might be possible to install a sloped walkway at a 1/20 slope rather than a ramp, eliminating the wide landing and turn area and make it much more discreet. He asked whether that option was explored.
 - o Mr. Perry responded that then someone would have to wheel up or push up a longer slope and suggested that it would be better to have a short slope, flat area, then another short slope.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that the idea is that it would be a more gradual slope, to the point where it would not even qualify as a ramp.
 - o Mr. Perry responded that to do that, they would have to pay for the plans to be redone and come back for another review. He argued that there is only so much they can do to accommodate the Historical Commission. He explained that they are a historic museum and are interested in preservation and will not do anything without the Historical Commission's review but expressed frustration at additional delays and asked what the Architectural Committee wants them to do at this point.

- o Mr. Cluver responded that at his point the applicants have backed themselves into a corner by ignoring the suggestions that were made at the May 2021 meeting. Mr. Cluver noted that it might not be possible, but that it sounds like the 1/20 slope idea was not even explored.
- o The Architectural Committee members noted that a gradually sloped walkway could be considerably less expensive than a ramp.
- o Mr. Perry asked the Architectural Committee to give them exactly what they want so that they can get it done once.
- o Mr. Cluver responded that it is not the Architectural Committee's job to design the project, that is the job of the architect. He asked again if the option was explored.
- o Mr. Perry responded that he does not think it was. He noted that he was not at the first meeting.
- o Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Architectural Committee's previous suggestions were in the meeting minutes as well as detailed in an email that she sent to Mr. Perry following the May meeting.
- Mr. Cluver noted that there are numerous changes that would improve the ramp design if a switchback ramp were necessary by code, but that the current plan does not appear to meet code. He noted that the plans do not show a railing going up the steps, but that they could be amended so that U-shaped railing extensions turn back on themselves and becomes a defacto handrail for the step going up and then the railing at the left side at the bottom of the step could turn in the direction of travel, and at the top it could turn to the right towards the building and protect against the change in grade between the stoop and the areaway below. With it being a public facility, a railing will also most likely be necessary on the left side of the stoop as well, which is not shown.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that someone could just roll off the stoop as designed and opined that the application as presented would be rejected by the Department of Licenses and Inspections.
- Mr. Perry asked whether the suggestions would be provided in the minutes verbatim.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale responded that the suggestions will be summarized in the minutes but that the recording of the meeting will be available immediately following the meeting.
 - o Ms. Gutterman noted that the applicants could submit revised plans to the Historical Commission so that the application can stay on track.
 - o Mr. Detwiler explained that the Architectural Committee is advisory to the Historical Commission and there is an opportunity to revise the plans noted that it should not take much time to revise the application before it is presented to the Historical Commission and that Mr. McCoubrey serves on the Historical Commission to represent the Architectural Committee.
 - o Ms. Gutterman suggested that the architect study Mr. Cluver's suggestion for no ramp, and if not, the architect should make the appropriate revisions to the railings.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the calculations for sloped paving suggestion are fairly simple in determining the amount of grade they have to make up.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that there could be a significant cost savings to the sloped paving suggestion rather than a full ramp.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the applicants also look at Detail 6 on Sheet A2 Detail 6, which calls for the raising of the rear roof without replacing the roof. He opined that the change in pitch makes it so that the roof is almost flat; the shingle

roofing material may no longer work and the process of raising the roof will also break the seals.

- o Mr. Perry responded that he is not an architect.
- o Ms. Gutterman questioned why raising the roof is necessary in the first place.
- o Mr. Cluver replied that they are replacing the existing door with new 6-foot 8-inch door.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- A single point of entry for all visitors at the front of the building is necessary from an equal access and ADA standpoint.
- The front door, doorway, fence, and yard are character-defining features of the property.
- No additional information has been provided as to whether a sloped landscaped approach with a 1/20 pitch could be provided to the front door rather than a switch-back ramp, as suggested by the Architectural Committee in May 2022 and Historical Commission in June 2022.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As presented, the application does not appear to satisfy ADA requirements, lacks information, and negatively impacts the historic property, failing to satisfy Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.
- Every effort should be made to minimize the impact of the ramp on the front door, doorway, fence, and yard.
- If a switch-back ramp is necessary, in addition to an appropriate exterior masonry cladding, the railing should be painted black, and a slip sheet installed between the existing historic stoop and new landing so that the historic materials remain in place.
- The applicant should look at whether the roofing material on the rear addition roof is able to remain or will need to be replaced.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ITEM: 8110 Frankford Ave.					
MOTION: Denial as presented					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
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	7				

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2022

28

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:50:54

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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