

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

**TUESDAY, 27 JULY 2021
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

Gussie O'Neill, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Mike Kitsios
Teri Anger
Omri Shitrit
Jennifer Robinson
Barbara Cunningham
J M Duffin
Julie Morningstar
Oscar Beisert
Kathy Dowdell
Joseph Lombardi
Nicole Cabezas

Scott Woodruff
Helen Farley
Nick Ziolkowski
Alex Canady
Nunzio Terra
Matt McClure
Pam Berretta
David Gest
Janice Woodcock
Lori Salamida
Dennis Carlisle
Mandy Doty
Anthony Tsirantonakis
Howard B Haas
Henry Siebert
Bob Henderson
Gabrielle Canno
David Whipple
James Campbell
Scott Murphy
Lea Litvin
Yoav Shiffman
Devon Beverly
Susan Syrnick
Lois Price
Jay Farrell
Matt Tucker
Tim Keene
Zane Colville
Aaron Levy
Ryan Kalili
Amanda Anderson
Adam Montalbano
Charles Schwartz
Kabir Hossain
Henry Siebert
Shimi Zakin
Marlene Schleifer
Frank Renner
Eileen Lowery
Mike Tester
Drew Palmer
Denise Lehmann
Rachel Pritzker, Esq., Pritzker Law Group
Stephanie Vituccio
John Dever

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 620-24 S 8TH ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; insert floor; replace windows and doors; construct deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Crucifixion Renovation LLC

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop Inc.

History: 1887; Church of the Crucifixion parish building; Isaac Pursell, architect; 1915

Individual Designation: 6/12/2020

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 620-24 S. 8th Street is a former parish building for the Church of the Crucifixion. It is proposed to be converted into a 16-unit multi-family residence, which includes the insertion of an additional floor. All existing windows and doors on the building are non-historic replacements, and in many locations, the original window openings have been partially infilled with brick. This project will reopen many of those to their original size and shape.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Complete rehabilitation of building:
 - Construct roof deck with pilot house;
 - Replace all windows and doors, and remove brick infill from some openings to restore to historic size and shape; and
 - Insert small dormer windows into existing roof.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed work will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed interventions could be removed in the future and the historic property would be unimpaired.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The proposed deck and pilot house would be minimally visible but inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The application satisfies the Roofs Guideline.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:10

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Detwiler recused from the review of the application owing to his firm's involvement with the associated chapel building.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Julie Morningstar and Adam Montalbano represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Morningstar summarized the scope of work.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the setback of the deck and pilot house.
 - Ms. Morningstar responded that the deck is set back from the face of the building, and the pilot house is sloped to reduce visibility.
- Ms. Stein asked if the existing mansard roof is being extended in height.
 - Ms. Morningstar responded that it is only being extended at the pilot house.
- Ms. Stein asked if consideration was given to pushing back the pilot house or centering it on the building.
 - Ms. Morningstar responded that the existing stair is tight, so the proposed location is where it needs to be in terms of the existing stair.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the deck railings could be pushed back.
 - Ms. Morningstar responded that she can review pushing back the railings.
 - Ms. Stein questioned if this building should have a deck and pilot house.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the arch top windows on the south side of the front façade, which were historically tall windows. He noted that the proposal will remove the brick infill. He asked if the arch top windows are operable. He observed that some of the window details are missing from the drawing.
 - Ms. Morningstar responded that the arch top windows are operable, and for operability, the window manufacturer recommended an inswing window so the outside brickmould follows the arch, and the window is allowed to be a more rectangular and swing in, but from the outside one could not tell that it is a rectangular window.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the spandrel panel be glass rather than metal.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, and suggested using a spandrel glass to make the opening look like it is fully glazed.
- Mr. Cluver asked about accommodations for accessibility.
 - Ms. Morningstar responded that they had their preliminary plan review with the Department of Licenses and Inspections, and there is an exception for fair housing for historic buildings, so they were not required to provide accessible units or an accessible entrance.
- Ms. Stein asked about the new fire stair at the rear.
 - Ms. Morningstar responded that it is required as a second means of egress for the roof deck because of the height of the deck.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the pilot house be reduced in height to the minimum required by code.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the width and design of the proposed entrance door. He noted that a three-foot-wide door with sidelight is proposed, but owing to a lack of requirement for accessible units, he asked if wood double-doors could be installed instead.

- Ms. Morningstar responded that the opening is approximately five feet in width, and that she could look into the suggestion for double doors.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed scheme is a good example of an adaptive reuse.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed interventions could be removed in the future and the historic property would be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.
- The proposed deck and pilot house would be minimally visible from the public right-of-way but could be pushed back to be more inconspicuous, per the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline, with suggestions that the applicant consider lowering the height of the pilot house, pushing back the railings from the roof edge, pushing back the condensers on the roof, using spandrel glass instead of metal panel on the front windows, and installing double doors at the front entrance.

ITEM: 620-24 S 8th ST MOTION: Approval with comments 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	5			1	1

ADDRESS: 1505 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark Berry and David McDonald

Applicant: Adam Zangrilli, Zangrilli Design

History: 1859; storefront, new brickwork, stucco and cornice, 1923

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 1505 Spring Garden Street is a three-story building with a two-story rear ell. At its February 2021 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application proposing to construct an addition so that the rear ell and most of the main block rose four stories in height. The addition was set back nine feet from the front façade, with a deck in the setback. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval of a rear addition with no massing or deck on the main block, pursuant to Standard 9. The applicant submitted a revised scope for review by the Historical Commission at its March 2021 meeting, which the Commission voted to remand to the Architectural Committee for review. The Architectural Committee reviewed the revised application at its March 2021 meeting. The revised application removed the roof deck and extended the setback of the rooftop addition from nine feet to eighteen feet. The Architectural Committee found that additional and revised drawings were necessary to be able to review the application sufficiently, concluded that the extent of demolition at the rear was too great, and recommended denial of the revised application. The Historical Commission reviewed the revised application at its April 2021 meeting and voted to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and owing to incompleteness.

The applicant has submitted this third application, which is similar in scope to the last application, but contains side and rear elevation drawings that were not included with the prior application.

The only work to the front façade called out in the application is the replacement of the non-historic storefront windows and a door, for which the staff can work with the applicant on the details.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct third and fourth floor addition

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The massing will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way and will not detract from the historic character of the row; however, the proposed scope includes substantial demolition of the roof and rear of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to the Historical Commission's April 2021 denial of the application. The current application is substantially unchanged from the denied application.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:19:35

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein stated that the addition over the main block is acceptable, but the amount of demolition proposed is not acceptable. She stated that the drawings still do not represent a real architectural and structural proposal yet.
- Ms. Lukachik agreed that the drawings are lacking in detail, and call for more demolition than is likely necessary.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he appreciates the additional elevation drawings, but that there needs to be more attention to detail, including windows, materials, and details on eaves. He commented that the windows as shown are not compatible.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the drawings show removal of the roof, rear wall of the main block, roof of the second floor wing, and then it is unclear what happens below that. He agreed that the massing is acceptable in concept, but the extent of demolition is too great.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed that the overbuild is acceptable, but not the amount of demolition proposed. He commented that the drawings are lacking in detail for everything that is new.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the documentation provided makes it difficult to analyze the project.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The current application is substantially unchanged from the application denied by the Historical Commission at its April 2021 meeting.
- The application materials lack details needed to understand the true scope of work.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As proposed, the extent of demolition at the rear is too great, and the proportion and type of windows proposed for the addition are not compatible, and therefore the proposal fails to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the Historical Commission's April 2021 denial of the application and the fact that the current application is substantially unchanged from the denied application.

ITEM: 1505 SPRING GARDEN ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 340 GATES ST

Proposal: Demolish building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Denise Lehmann

Applicant: Maurice Edwards, Demolition Man LLC

History: 1910; Lamon House

Individual Designation: Pending

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 340 Gates Street contains a c.1910 building on a large lot. A nomination to designate the property as historic was submitted to the Historical Commission, and the notice of the proposed designation was sent to the property owner on 3 June 2021. The property owner submitted a draft building permit application for the complete demolition of the building to eCLIPSE, L&I's online permitting system, prior to the Historical Commission's issuance of the notice letter. L&I had already issued a zoning permit for complete demolition more than one month before the notice was sent. Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, the so-called "transition rule," allows the Commission, its committees, and staff to consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation, including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications. The review of the nomination by the advisory Committee on Historic Designation is scheduled for 21 July 2021, and by the Historical Commission on 13 August 2021.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Historical Commission Rules & Regulations Section 6.9.a.10: The Commission, its committees, and staff may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The proposed work will destroy the features, materials, and spaces of the property, but would only violate Standard 2 if the property is deemed historic. The Historical Commission has not yet determined whether the property is historic. If it is, its character must be retained and preserved to comply with Standard 2.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff offers no recommendation because the Historical Commission has not yet determined whether this property warrants designation or whether the development plans in place at the time of the notice warrant special consideration.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:29:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Denise Lehmann, attorney Rachel Pritzker, and architect Scott Woodruff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Chantry stated that the Committee on Historic Designation found that the nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies several Criteria for Designation during its review the week prior.
- Mr. Woodruff started to discuss the nomination to designate the property as historic.
- Mr. Cluver asked for clarity on the Architectural Committee's role in reviewing this application, and if the information regarding the timeline of events is pertinent.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that the Architectural Committee's primary task is to determine if demolition of the building satisfies the Standards. The Committee could take up the issue of whether or not there was a significant investment in a project prior to the sending of notice, because the Commission's Rules and Regulations do authorize the Commission, its committees, and staff to take into consideration projects that are underway at the time of notice being sent to the property owner. He concluded that that is, however, ultimately a question for the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Detwiler asked when the nomination was received, when notice to the property owner was sent, and when the permit applications were filed.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that the nomination was received on 14 May 2021 and notice was sent to the property owner on 3 June 2021. A draft building permit application for the complete demolition of the building was submitted to eCLIPSE, L&I's online permitting system, prior to the Historical Commission's issuance of the notice letter. The zoning permit for complete demolition had been issued more than one month prior to notice being sent to the property owner.
 - Ms. Pritzker clarified that the building permit application was submitted in February 2021.
- Mr. Woodruff stated that he was hired to review the nomination, and disagrees that the property satisfies Criteria C and D.
 - Mr. McCoubrey explained that discussion regarding the nomination should have been made at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting. He stated that the

Architectural Committee should proceed with its review as if the property is designated, and the Historical Commission will officially determine whether or not the property is listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

- Mr. McCoubrey questioned if the Committee should defer consideration of the application until the Historical Commission determines the question of designation.
 - Ms. Pritzker asked if it would make sense for the Historical Commission to conduct its review of the nomination first before the consideration of the demolition application.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the Architectural Committee typically reviews applications for properties that are already designated as historic.
 - Mr. Detwiler clarified that, if the property is designated as historic, there would need to be a financial hardship or public interest argument made with any future demolition application.
 - Mr. Farnham clarified that the Historical Commission is obligated under the City's historic preservation ordinance to act promptly on building permit applications that are submitted, which is what triggered this review. The applicants submitted a building permit application for demolition which obligates the Historical Commission to consider it. The should base its review on the Standards but can also take into account evidence of steps taken toward redevelopment of the property.
- Mr. Detwiler clarified that the Architectural Committee's purview over the application is to determine whether or not demolition of the building would satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation. He opined that there is no evidence in the application that the building has any major structural flaws, and therefore there is no reason why the building should be demolished.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert opposed the application for demolition.
- Marlene Schleifer, President of the Ridge Park Civic Association, opposed the application for demolition.
- Neighbor John Dever opposed the application for demolition.
- Neighbor Mandy Doty opposed the application for demolition.
- Neighbor Susan Syrnick opposed the application for demolition.
- Neighbor Eileen Lowery opposed the application for demolition.
- Neighbor Teri Anger opposed the application for demolition.
- Patrick Grossi, of the Preservation Alliance, opposed the application for demolition and questioned the building permit application process in eCLIPSE and its impact on the review of nominations.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:

- After the motion for denial was made by Mr. Detwiler and seconded by Mr. D'Alessandro and presumably adopted by unanimous consent, Mr. Cluver stated that he believed the Committee was going to defer action and disagreed with the motion because he supported a deferral.
 - Ms. Pritzker agreed, asking that the Historical Commission determine the question of designation first.
 - Ms. Stein responded that the applicant must withdraw their building permit application for that to happen, since the submission of the permit application is what triggered this review. She stated that the Committee must act on the application because it was submitted.

- Mr. Farnham stated that the motion was made, seconded, and passed by a majority of Committee members. The motion was adopted.
- Mr. Detwiler reminded the applicants that the Architectural Committee is advisory to the Historical Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Committee on Historic Designation found that the nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies several Criteria for Designation.
- The application contains no information claiming that the building needs to be demolished.
- The Historical Commission has not yet determined whether the property is historic.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work, demolition, will destroy the features, materials, and spaces of the property, violating Standard 2, if the property is deemed historic. If it is, its character must be retained and preserved to comply with Standard 2.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2, which passed by a vote of 5 to 1.

ITEM: 340 GATES 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	5	1			1

ADDRESS: 6901 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Construct multifamily building in side yard

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dennis M. McCarthy and John V. Miglionico

Applicant: Lea Litvin, LO Design

History: 1798; Joseph Gorgas House; porch added, 1860

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 6901 Germantown Avenue includes a late-eighteenth-century stone structure, the Joseph Gorgas House, located at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Gorgas Lane, and

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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. This application proposes to construct a three-story, multi-unit building on the site of the parking lot. The new building would have frontages on Germantown Avenue and Gorgas Lane, would be clad in stone and blackened cedar siding, and would feature large dormers with terraces and a standing seam metal roof.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story, multi-unit building in location of existing parking lot.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed three-story building would be differentiated from the historic building, though it would not be compatible. While the standing seam metal roof and stone cladding reflect the materials of the historic building and surrounding context, the blackened cedar siding, the dominant material of the new construction, would not be compatible. The proposed building is too large in massing, size, and scale and should be reduced to more closely match the massing of the historic building.
- *Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:*
 - *Recommended: Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
 - The first-story wall fronting Germantown Avenue, the primary façade of the building, would be clad in stone with one door centered on the elevation. It would include no other fenestration. The lack of fenestration at this façade would adversely impact the historic streetscape, a main commercial corridor through Northwest Philadelphia, and should be modified to include punched window openings.
 - Owing to the massing, size, and scale of the new construction and its siting around the building, the new construction would result in the diminution of the historic character of the building.

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: 01:01:05

PRESENTERS:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Litvin explained the details of the project and noted that the property would be subdivided into two parcels.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he appreciates the setback and retention of the heritage tree, but that the three masses of the proposed building are not comparable to the historic structure. He observed that they would be taller and do not match the proportions. He argued that the dormers cover 75 percent of the roof area in width, which makes the proposed structure much larger than the historic structure. He contended that the proposed new construction does not respect the character of the historic property.
- Ms. Stein stated that the property was individually designated in 1957 and is an important building and site to the community. She noted that when a historically designated property is subdivided, the subdivided lot remains under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. Any new construction on the site, she continued, must be compatible with the historic building. She contended that the proposed new construction surrounds the historic building and changes its nature and presence in the community. She argued that it is overbuilt. She then commented that she is not opposed to building on the adjacent site facing Germantown Avenue, though she acknowledged that other Committee members may argue that no structure should be constructed, because it could alter the critical views of the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler responded that the building is an eighteenth-century country house in an extremely historic section of the city. He argued that the site is historic and that the proposed development is not sensitive or appropriate to the site, owing to its density, height, and design. He questioned whether work is proposed to the historic house, and noted that the renderings show different windows and no shutters.
 - Mr. Litvin replied that the owners will retain ownership of the historic building and plan to restore it with guidance from the Historical Commission. He explained that the rendering is for graphical purposes only and is not showing the actual condition of the building. The application proposes no work to the historic building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the subdivision is complete.
 - Mr. Litvin answered that an application has been submitted but it is not complete.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro contended that Parcel B is too large compared to Parcel A, where the historic building is located.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, adding that the property line abuts the historic building, and no buffer is offered to the building.
- Mr. Farnham clarified that the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over where an owner draws a property line or how it is divided, though it does have jurisdiction over any new construction on the subdivided parcel.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether archaeological potential exists on this site.
 - Mr. Farnham explained that the property was designated before the Historical Commission had the authority to designate for archaeological potential. At the time it was designated, he continued, the Historical Commission could only designate buildings. He opined that there would need to be an amendment to the designation to provide the Historical Commission with the authority to review archaeology, though he added that it is up to debate and is essentially a legal question.

- Ms. Litvin explained that the site plan shows the dimensional setbacks from the historic building.
- Mr. Litvin stated that he heard similar comments in advance of the meeting and asked if the Committee could give more specific feedback.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that the issue with providing specific feedback is that the starting point is too aggressive. He added that the project has gone down the wrong path from the first step and that he cannot offer points for discussion or refinement, because the massing is too much and the proposal is not appropriate.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the new elements compete architecturally in a negative way with the existing building. He elaborated that more deference to the quality of the existing building is needed and that the new building should be simplified. He remarked that he appreciates the analysis done but agreed with other Committee members that the massing is too large and the dormers are too aggressive with their depth and glass rails. He argued that they are not in keeping with the eighteenth- or nineteenth-century buildings on Germantown Avenue, which is a historic street. He questioned whether the form should be repeated three times across the lot.
- Mr. Litvin stated that he proposed a darker material with the idea that it would create a juxtaposition with the historic building and the black would appear as a background color. This block of Germantown Avenue in particular, he continued, does not consist of multiple buildings similar to the historic structure. He noted that the block instead contains a public library and institutional buildings.
 - The Committee countered that the historic building is the immediate context and needs to be considered.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned why the building appears to be elevated on a stone podium and stated that the proposed design is inconsistent with its fenestration patterns and relationship to the ground. The first-floor front façade on Germantown Avenue has no windows. He added that the buildings in the immediate area and across the city are typically masonry with punched openings.
 - Mr. Litvin asked Mr. McCoubrey whether height would be an issue if the footprint of the building was condensed.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that by lowering the parking area, the mass should be pulled down. He added that there is a further dilemma of how to articulate the parking level on the front façade. He commented that the Committee has too many fundamental issues, including the mass, footprint, relationship of the building to the ground, and scale of the elements, especially the dormers.
- Mr. Litvin asked whether the Committee would accept an increase in height that is concentrated at the rear in order to reduce the mass at the front.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that it is difficult to answer without seeing a plan. He opined that it would be visible from Gorgas Lane and that adding height at the rear would be difficult.
- Mr. Cluver stated that some Committee members have expressed concern that the site in general should not be infilled.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert opposed the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 6901 Germantown Avenue was individually designated in 1957, owing to its significance as an eighteenth-century stone residence along Germantown Avenue, the historic corridor of Northwest Philadelphia.
- The application includes a subdivision plan to create two parcels, where the historic house would be sited on a small parcel at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Gorgas Lane. The larger parcel would include the side and rear yards and would be drawn to abut the historic building.
- While the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over applications for subdivision, it would retain jurisdiction over all subdivided properties and any new construction on those properties.
- The proposed building would be located on the subdivided parcel that includes what was historically the side and rear yards of the historic house. The building would be three stories in height and would consist of three interconnected masses that would have frontages on Germantown Avenue and Gorgas Lane.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is incompatible in massing, scale, size, and architectural features. The application does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The design and materials of the proposed building are not appropriate to the character of the historic building or its context. The siting of the new building and its relationship to the historic building would cause the diminution of the historic character of the Joseph Gorgas House. The application does not comply with the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

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

ITEM: 6901 GERMANTOWN AVE					
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	6				1

ADDRESS: 2129 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Install windows at front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Aaron Levy

Applicant: Nunzio Terra, Renewal by Andersen of Greater Phila.

History: 1870; Mercer Tile refacing, 1913

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to replace four non-historic windows at the second and third stories of the front façade of 2129 Spruce Street. The property owner is seeking approval to use Andersen Renewal Series Fibrex replacement windows. The proposed configuration is a nine-over-nine double-hung window. The property is classified as significant in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, largely for the Arts & Crafts renovation of the house around 1913 that included the application of the Mercer tiles on the front façade. Research shows that the owner intended to create an Arts & Crafts statement on the façade, which was fashionable during the early twentieth century. Owing to this history, the windows should reflect the 1913 period. Casement windows would have been the appropriate choice for the Arts & Crafts style. In a 1968 photograph, most of the windows on the front facade of 2129 Spruce Street were casement windows. These were most likely installed during the 1913 renovation and would have replaced the original two-over-two configuration.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove windows at the second and third stories of the front facade.
- Replace existing windows (sash and frame) with Fibrex nine-over-nine double-hung sash windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Rehabilitation Standards of 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.*
 - The proposed material and configuration do not comply with Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:29:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Renewal by Andersen representative Nunzio Terra and property owner Aaron Levy represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Terra stated that the openings are too tall to accommodate casement windows, clarifying that Andersen's casements reach a certain height of about 80 inches and

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- the openings on the building are 88 inches. He contended that the glass of the windows would be very narrow. The biggest challenge with the property, he continued, is the tile frontage. He explained that a full-frame removal to install a new window would not work and claimed that the replacement would need to be an insert to avoid damaging the tile. He concluded that for the reason of avoiding damage, he is proposing a double-hung sash insert.
- Mr. Cluver questioned whether it would be possible to approach the replacement from the interior.
 - Mr. Terra answered that it could not be done solely at the interior and that the installation requires access to both the interior and exterior of the window.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked whether the installation of a casement is not possible because Andersen does not make a unit that tall.
 - Mr. Terra affirmed that Andersen's casement units are not tall enough.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that other companies make casements that would fit the opening, adding that he has used them. These windows, he continued, exceed Andersen's limits. He contended that the windows should be casements and argued that there are ways to replace a window from the inside out, though it is custom. Given that the significance of the building lies largely in its tile façade, he continued, it requires the extra effort to work within it.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned whether part of the issue with the size is that the material is Fibrex rather than wood.
 - Mr. Terra responded that the issue is more technical and that it relates to the operability of the window. He clarified that a window over 80 inches in height will not operate for as long as Andersen guarantees it, owing to deteriorating durability and functionality. He added that Andersen limits the size of the windows to guarantee that they will operate properly for more than 40 years.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that casements are essentially smaller French doors and argued that he believed such a system could be installed in these windows.
 - Mr. Levy stated that he has been lovingly restoring the property for almost two years and that it had been in disrepair when he purchased the property. He commented that he has had problems finding trained, experienced, and safe vendors to work on the property. The façade, he continued, is the treasure that makes this property meaningful and important. He commented that he has had bad experiences with other vendors on the rear of the building and argued that it does not make sense to pursue a casement that is not possible and in the process destroy the façade. He argued that the historic photograph shows that there was not an even application of casements, with three of the four openings having casements. He contended that the grids would replicate the historic appearance. He then claimed that the casement windows would render the property unlivable and, if casements are required by the Historical Commission, he would choose not to renovate the building. More than anything, he continued, he does not trust many vendors to respect the fragility of the façade.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that he appreciates the concerns over the size and the limits of the windows. He questioned whether the owner considered a custom window. If casements are infeasible and a double-hung is required, he continued, the muntin pattern is significant and could be replicated in a double-hung window by increasing the width of the center muntin. He concluded that he would prefer a casement.
 - Mr. Levy responded that he had wood windows at the rear that rotted and was drawn to Fibrex, because he did not want to invest in a product that would rot. He added that one vendor left the house exposed to multiple storms. He opined that

- it does not make sense to jeopardize the house in pursuit of preserving the window configuration.
- Mr. Cluver cautioned Mr. Levy not to conflate the product with the installer. He stated that it is certainly feasible to install the appropriate casement windows in this building.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that numerous qualified window companies exist in the city and can do the work properly. He added that his career has been spent working with those companies and that there are more historic window companies now than there ever have been.
 - Mr. Levy commented that the current windows have no soundproofing and that they impact the livability of the property. He added that he understands the Committee's concerns related to historic preservation, but argued that they should not exceed the basic needs residents have for livability. He contended that homeowners should not be discouraged from making an investment in their properties, adding that the neighborhood is in desperate need of improvement.
 - Mr. McCoubrey countered that the Committee is encouraging Mr. Levy to restore the façade to its wonderful 1913 characteristics and that the tile and windows are important.
 - Mr. Levy questioned whether the Committee was requesting three casement windows with the fourth left in an odd configuration.
 - Mr. Farnham noted that the photograph that the owner keeps referring to as evidence of the historic condition dates to 1968. One can safely assume that all four windows at the second and third stories were casements at the time of the 1913 renovation. The photograph, he continued, does not depict the precise conditions in 1913; it depicts the conditions 55 years later, after one of the casements was removed and replaced.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that the Committee is encouraging Mr. Levy to do the right thing. The product proposed, he continued, is not appropriate, but there are many other readily available products that are appropriate.
 - Mr. Terra suggested changing the muntin pattern to replicate the historic configuration on the proposed double-hung windows. He contended that the window would have a similar appearance, though the meeting rail would be more substantial.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked whether Mr. Terra could insert a wider vertical muntin in the center.
 - Mr. Terra stated that he would try, though he did not think he could make the center vertical muntin wider than the other muntins.
 - Mr. Cluver asked that the dimensions of the muntins be included for the staff to review.
 - Mr. Terra responded that the muntins are either 7/8-inches or 1 1/8-inches.
 - Ms. Stein stated that the Fibrex material is inappropriate.
 - Mr. Terra replied that he has received approval by the Historical Commission to use it elsewhere in the city. He noted that the product consists of 40 percent wood and lasts much longer than an all-wood window.
 - Mr. Detwiler argued that the detailing is different on composite windows and that the Fibrex windows approved by the Historical Commission were for a property in Girard Estate, which has different conditions.
 - Mr. Cluver agreed with Mr. Detwiler.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property was renovated in 1913 in the Arts & Crafts style that included the application of Mercer tiles on the front façade.
- The original window configuration was likely changed during the 1913 renovation to include four multi-pane casement windows at the second- and third-story windows.
- A 1968 photograph shows the historic configuration of the casement windows in three of the four openings.
- The application proposes to install Andersen Fibrex nine-over-nine double-hung sash windows.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The replacement windows should replicate the 1913 appearance of the multi-pane casements.
- A Fibrex window could potentially be approved, provided the details and profiles match the historic casement windows.
- The proposed Andersen windows would not replicate the historic configuration. The work does not comply with Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 2129 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 1611 W GIRARD AVE

Proposal: Construct additions; construct sidewalk access to basement; replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kibbutz 3 LLC

Applicant: David Whipple, Assimilation Design Lab LLC

History: 1864

Individual Designation: 5/28/1968

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 1611 W. Girard Avenue is a three-story Italianate building located midblock. The building includes a main block and three-story rear ell with two-story addition. Buildings historically stood behind the property and fronted Flora Street. However, those buildings have been demolished and vacant lots remain, which leaves the rear of 1611 W. Girard Avenue visible from Flora Street. This application proposes to construct several additions. On the main block, a fourth-story addition would be constructed the full width of the building and with no setback from the front facade. The addition would be clad in aluminum. At the rear, the west wall of the ell would be retained and enveloped in a four-story addition that would extend beyond the current rear wall of the ell. The rear addition would be clad in stucco. The application also proposes to create sidewalk access at the front façade and to replace the front façade windows. The staff requests clarification on the scope of work related to creating sidewalk access and whether an opening would be cut into the building to provide access to the interior.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct fourth-story addition with no setback over main block;
- Demolish rear wall of main block;
- Retain west wall of main block and construct additions totaling four stories at rear;
- Create sidewalk access at front façade; and
- Replace windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition is not compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportions, and massing of the historic property, and therefore the application fails to satisfy Standard 9.
 - Any replacement windows should match the historic configuration, including replicating the arched top of the first-story windows.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The addition would require significant demolition of the rear ell, leaving only the west wall. As proposed, the addition would destroy the essential form and integrity of the rear. The work does not comply with Standard 10.

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:49:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect David Whipple and owner Omri Shitrit represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Whipple explained that the sidewalk access would consist of a door in the sidewalk to provide meter and trash room access. He clarified that he would not cut into the existing elevation. He stated that 1531 W. Girard Avenue served as a design reference for the proposed addition at 1611 W. Girard Avenue. He noted that the mansard is not necessarily the style referenced, but it shows how the fourth-story addition on this type of structure aligns with the front elevation. He elaborated that the addition's metal cladding would match that of the property across the street. He commented that, at the rear, the adjacent property was approved for full demolition of the rear ell, adding that he is attempting to salvage the rear of this property.
- Mr. Cluver requested a roof plan and questioned whether there would be a roof deck, pilot house, or rooftop mechanical units.
 - Mr. Whipple responded that the floor plan and roof plan are essentially the same. Since the interior floor plans are similar, he clarified that he only included a single, standard floor plan. He added that there will be no roof deck or pilot house and that the mechanical units are shown in the middle of the plan.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the fourth-story addition with no setback is not appropriate. Adding a story that extends forward to the cornice line at the front facade, he continued, has not traditionally been approved.
 - Other Committee members noted that there are no additions or fourth stories on the buildings in this row, and that the row remains largely intact.
- Ms. Stein agreed that the fourth story would not be appropriate on the main block and questioned whether it would be appropriate at the rear ell. She noted that she would support a fourth story at the rear ell, provided it does not extend into the main block.
- Mr. Whipple asked whether there is a setback from the façade that would be acceptable.
 - Mr. Cluver answered that the building provides a natural transition to a fourth story with the change from the full width of the main block to the rear ell. He agreed with Ms. Stein that the rear ell would be the appropriate location for the addition.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned how much demolition is proposed at the ell, noting that the drawings are not clear. He asked whether the rear walls would be demolished.

- Mr. Whipple replied that the very rear wall would be demolished and a second wall set further in the ell's interior could be largely salvaged.
- Mr. Cluver clarified that the entire two-story rear wall would be demolished, and a new rear wall would be extended to four stories.
 - Mr. Whipple agreed, adding that the existing three-story rear wall would remain, though a doorway would be cut into it and that the interior rear wall of the main block would be demolished.
- Ms. Stein questioned whether the rear two-story portion of the ell was a later addition, observing that it does not have a cornice like the rest of the ell.
- Mr. Cluver requested that more documentation be included with the application, including full floor plans, existing and proposed drawings, and a demolition plan.
- Ms. Lukachik asked whether the applicant has discussed increasing the height of the building with the neighbor and the subsequent impact on those structures.
 - Mr. Whipple responded that the property to the west is vacant and the property to the east has been vacant since the rear ell was demolished several years ago. He added that the structural engineer will review issues related to increased loads.
 - Mr. Farnham stated that the rear ell of the adjacent property at 1613 W. Girard Avenue was demolished a few years ago, because it was deemed imminently dangerous by the Department of Licenses and Inspections, and the property owner was obligated to replicate the historic rear ell according to drawings approved at the time of demolition within one year. The property owner, he continued, has not done that, and the Historical Commission will look into enforcement efforts to compel the reconstruction of the rear ell.
- Mr. Shitrit asked whether the concern is only at the rear of the building.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that the concern is with the front mass and asked that it be removed. He asked to have a better understanding of how the overbuild at the rear ell would be constructed. He added that the Committee seems to be open to an overbuild but that there is concern about the lack of detail in the plans. He noted that the Committee does not understand how much demolition would be involved and stated that the plans should show that enough existing wall will remain to support the addition.
- Mr. Shitrit inquired whether he would need to reduce the visual impact of the front addition.
 - Mr. McCoubrey replied that the entire front addition needs to be removed from the main block.
- Mr. Shitrit questioned whether he could build the front addition in a matching material.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that the block remains intact and the buildings maintain a similar roofline, so an addition would be incompatible.
 - Ms. Stein noted that the property is individually designated and is not part of a historic district. An addition on the main block, she continued, would alter the character of the primary façade from Girard Avenue and would be highly visible.
- Mr. McCoubrey requested that the overbuild on the rear ell not be constructed against the rear wall of the main block. He asked that some separation be considered to allow the cornice to remain.
- Mr. Farnham clarified for the applicant that the Architectural Committee is advisory to the Historical Commission itself, which will make a final determination at its meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes to construct a fourth-story addition at the main block. No other buildings on this row extend four stories in height.
- The proposed rear addition would extend beyond the current rear wall and would be constructed four stories in height.
- The application lacks complete floor plans, a roof plan, existing conditions, and a demolition plan.
- The sidewalk access proposed at the front façade would not require cutting into the façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed fourth-story addition over the main block is incompatible in massing, size, scale, and materials and does not comply with Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.
- The proposed rear addition may be appropriate in massing, size, and scale; however, the current application lacks the proper documentation and is incomplete. Floor plans, a roof plan, clear existing and proposed drawings, and a demolition plan should be submitted for the Historical Commission's review.

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

ITEM: 1611 W GIRARD AVE					
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	6				1

ADDRESS: 539-41 N 22ND ST

Proposal: Construct addition with roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: JLM Investment Group, LLC

Applicant: Augusta O'Neill, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to convert a single, wide building back to its historic form of two residential row houses. The parcel at 539-41 N. 22nd Street was two separate properties with two separate row houses until the 1930s, when one owner purchased both buildings and consolidated them into one. Historic maps and deeds indicate the buildings were combined into a single building sometime between 1931 and 1942. Despite the merging of these properties, the original cornice and majority of front façade window and door openings remain in place. PermaStone was installed over the brick on the front facade in 1951. The application proposes to rehabilitate the front elevation to be more compatible with the historic district and the 1859 appearance.

The application also proposes to construct an addition on the existing rear extension with a roof deck and pilot house. Zoning records show this area has been altered over time and is a combination of brick and frame construction. It is presently clad in white vinyl siding. The present condition and materials under the vinyl siding is unknown. The rear addition and roof deck with pilot house will not be visible from the public right-of-way along N. 22nd Street but will be visible from Wilcox Street. Although accessible to the public, Wilcox Street is a rear service alley for properties along Green Street and Brandywine Street. Visually it is composed of garage doors, parking areas, and fencing. Character-defining features of this historic district are limited along this service alley, owing to past alterations to the rear of these homes.

A similar application was reviewed at the June 2021 Architectural Committee. This is a revised application based on comments of the Committee and additional information requested at the June meeting.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate front façade to nineteenth-century appearance.
- Divide building interior into two separate residences.
- Construct addition with roof deck and pilot house on each row house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Rehabilitation Standards of 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 alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The removal of the PermaStone material on the front façade is appropriate as it was added in 1951 and outside the period of significance for the historic district.
 - The original cornice and front façade window and door openings should be maintained.

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The applicant should remove some Permastone to reveal the condition of the original brick facade. The staff should define the final scope of work for the rehabilitation of the brick façade after reviewing the condition of the surviving brick, determining whether the existing brick can be restored or a replacement brick material will need to be applied.
- *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.*
 - To meet Standard 9, applicant should document the materials and window/door openings present under the vinyl siding. Existing historic materials and conditions should be compatible with new cladding system and window/door replacements.
- *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.*
 - Although the roofs of the rear ells will be altered, the application indicates the existing exterior side walls will be maintained in place. It is not clear if the original 1859 walls are extant under the current cladding material. In the future, the original roofline could be restored if a future owner chose to do this.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The proposed deck and pilot house on each residential property meets the Roofs Guideline as they are located on the rear of the property and not on the main block. They will not be visible from a primary public right-of-way, but will be visible from a service alley.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details including the front facade masonry work, window and exterior doors, and rear cladding material, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, 10, and Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:08:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Augusta O'Neill and architect Joe Lombardi represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. O'Neill said a revised application had been submitted based on the June comments of the Architectural Committee. She stated that mason William Proud visited the property after the last meeting to provide an assessment of the materials at the property. Ms. O'Neill provided additional details about the owner's timeline of purchase and the poor exterior and interior condition of the property as acquired from years of use as a business. She said that William Proud reported that the rear siding

- cannot be restored, and it will require a complete rebuilding. Ms. O'Neill continued that the mason removed some of the front façade Permastone and restored an area of the brick. She noted the photographs provided of the existing and cleaned brick samples and said owner intends to remove the Permastone and restore the brick on the entire front façade.
- Mr. Lombardi stated that they reviewed comments made by the Committee at the June meeting and responded to them in the revised application. He noted they lowered the height of the rear ells in response to their comments.
 - Mr. Cluver inquired about demolition plans.
 - Mr. Lombardi responded that the only area of the building that they are demolishing is the gable and shed roof. He noted that they will remove all siding and residing the entire rear section of the building. Mr. Lombardi said their intent is not to demolish any of the building but to repair and add on to it.
 - Mr. Cluver said he cannot tell what is being demolished and there are no plans showing this.
 - Ms. Lukachik asked which back wall is structurally compromised. She pointed to the wall mentioned in William Proud's letter, which was submitted with revised application.
 - Mr. Lombardi pointed to the existing conditions photographs of the rear section of the building and said they do not know the full extent at this time. He noted that their intent is to repair and reconstruct and commented that their plan is to not demolish if they do not need to.
 - Ms. Lukachik said she would like clarity on which wall is referenced in the mason's letter.
 - Mr. Lombardi pointed to the elevation drawing, A3.1, showing the areas intended for demolition, but did not indicate which wall.
 - Ms. Stein asked if a structural engineer has been to the site and participated in the proposal up to this point. She said that based on the photographs, it looks like a significant amount of the wood framing is rotted out at the corner of the building because the asphalt cladding has torn away.
 - Mr. Lombardi said that a structural engineer has not been engaged at this time. He noted that more portions of the rear building would need to be opened up and these details would be added when construction drawings are done.
 - Ms. Stein said that this type of information needs to be brought in front of the Committee and therefore they are asking. She pointed out that William Proud's letter indicates that a rear wall needs to come down and this needs to be evaluated by the Committee.
 - Mr. Lombardi said their intent is to have a structural engineer involved.
 - Ms. O'Neill said that they did not believe the rear section of the building where the original ells would be is historic.
 - Ms. Mehley responded by showing a 1910 historic map that showed the original ells and a 1947 zoning drawing showing a mix of construction materials at the rear area. She noted that historic material is there, but it has been added to over time. Ms. Mehley said that staff has indicated from the earliest reviews that the rear section should be carefully inspected.
 - Mr. Farnham said that the narrow portion at the rear of the rear ell does not appear historic and may be structurally compromised. He noted that he has been confused by the proposal to retain the narrow section but build out to the full width of the rear ell. He stated that the proposal does not make sense to him. Mr. Farnham continued that this would make the existing exterior walls of the narrow rear section into interior

walls and creates spaces that are only three or four feet wide. He said that this needs a clarification. Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission would not object to the complete demolition of the narrower portion at the back of the rear ell. He added that the applicant keeps saying they are keeping it, but it does not make sense to keep it and building a new wall a few feet out from it.

- Mr. Lombardi said they do intend to demolish those walls that are now exterior walls on the narrow section of the rear ell area.
- Mr. Cluver asked that floorplans be added to the application prior to the Commission meeting on 13 August 2021.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he agrees with Mr. Farnham that the rear most area of the rear wing is not historic and can be demolished.
- Mr. Cluver said that taking a step back from the specifics, the intent of the project is good. He noted that the removal of the Permastone and restoration of the brick is fantastic. Mr. Cluver noted that they will run into areas on the front façade that need to be patched but has confidence that the mason can handle these issues and is capable of finding matching brick. He said the big picture is fine, but he feels the applicant is tripping over their own application submission and this is where the Committee's hesitations are coming from.
 - Mr. Lombardi asked if the presentation is clear on what it is proposing other than the two walls that should have been shown for demolition.
 - Mr. Cluver responded there are other details missing that the staff will need to review.
 - Mr. Farnham stated that the staff can work through the issues that remain missing or unanswered related to this application. He noted that the Committee's opinion on the overall plan would be helpful.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said that what will be removed should be documented.
 - Others disagreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that if revised plans can be presented at the Commission meeting, they would go a long way to clarifying some of the ambiguities. He added that he is not sure if the cornice runs around the back of the main block and the way the addition attaches to the main block should be handled sensitively. He noted he appreciates the plan to bring the front façade back to its historic appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Permastone will be removed from the front façade and the original brick restored.
- The addition will be visible from Wilcox Street, but it is a service alley.
- Applicant must provide demolition floorplans and new construction floorplans.
- A structural engineer must be consulted on the condition of the rear wing and all structural conditions must be accounted for in the construction drawings.
- The overall intent of the project is acceptable, but the applicant must work with the staff on the details.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The non-historic Permastone will be removed and original brick restored. In addition, the original cornice and window/door opening shall be maintained to meet Standard 2.
- The applicant has removed sections of Permastone and reported on the condition of the original brick façade with the intent to restore it. The staff should approve the final scope of work for the rehabilitation of the brick to meet Standard 6.
- The applicant should document the materials and window and door openings present under the vinyl siding on the rear area. A structural engineer should be consulted for construction drawings and a full set of demolition and new construction drawings should be provided with the final application. Existing historic materials and conditions should be compatible with the new cladding system and window and door replacements to meet Standard 9.
- Although the roofs of the rear ells will be altered, the application indicates the existing historic exterior side walls will be maintained in place. It is not clear if the original 1859 walls are extant under the current cladding material. In the future, the original roofline could be restored, satisfying Standard 10.
- The proposed deck and pilot house on each residential property meets the Roofs Guideline as they are located on the rear of the property and not on the main block. They will not be visible from a primary public right-of-way, but will be visible from a service alley.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details including the front facade masonry work, window and exterior doors, and rear cladding material, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, 10, and Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 539-41 N 22nd ST					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 122 S 19TH ST AND 1902 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Susan J. Schwartz

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.

History: 122 S 19th St: 1951; Sophy Curson; Beryl Price, architect

1902 Sansom St: 1840

Individual Designation: 122 S 19th St: Pending

1902 Sansom St: None

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

122 S 19th St: Non-contributing

1902 Sansom St: Contributing

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

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application requests the Historical Commission's comments and advice on the construction of an addition over the one-story Sophy Curson Building at 122 S. 19th Street and the adjacent three-story building at 1902 Sansom Street. Both properties are owned by the same entity. Both properties located are in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The property at 122 S. 19th Street, the Sophy Curson Building, is classified as non-contributing, while the property at 1902 Sansom Street is classified as contributing. The Historical Commission is in the process of reviewing an individual nomination for the Sophy Curson Building at 122 S. 19th Street, but the review dates have not yet been scheduled. Therefore, the Historical Commission has not yet determined whether the Sophy Curson Building has historical or architectural significance that merits protection. For the sake of this review, the Historical Commission, Architectural Committee, and staff should assume that the building does merit individual designation.

The application is submitted as a massing proposal only and should be judged as such. No details such as cladding materials or design features or elements are proposed. The addition would be L-shaped in plan, seven stories in height on the one-story building, for a total of eight stories, with a setback at the fourth-floor level on 19th Street and at 1902 Sansom Street. The new building would be 88'-8" tall.

The one-story Sophy Curson Building is an anomaly in the area. Nearby buildings range from three and four stories to 565 feet in height, with several very tall buildings in the immediate area to the south, east, and west. The building that stood at 122 S. 19th Street that was demolished for the Sophy Curson Building was four stories in height, as the 1922 map below shows.

The application points to three precedents, including additions on two Mid Century Modern buildings, the National Building in Old City and the Big Brothers Big Sisters Building on N. 13th Street, and an addition on the Freeman's Auction House Building. All three projects were approved by the Historical Commission. Another precedent not noted in the application is the adjacent building at 1904 Sansom Street, where the Historical Commission approved the construction of a multi-floor addition on the four-story rowhouse when that building was connected to the larger Warwick Apartment Building to the west. The buildings at 1902 and 1904 Sansom Street were nearly identical in size.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The question is whether an addition of the massing and size as is proposed is compatible with the two buildings and the environment.
- *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.*
 - It appears that the addition could be removed at a later date. Thereby, the proposal satisfies Standard 10.

STAFF COMMENTS:

- An eight-story building would be compatible with the environment. The one-story Sophie Curson Building is an anomaly. All of the buildings around it are taller and many are much taller. The building that stood on the site prior to the Sophy Curson Building was four stories in height.
- An overbuild of the buildings at 122 S. 19th Street and 1902 Sansom Street could be compatible with the existing buildings if designed with sensitivity. The primary experience of the Sophy Curson Building is the intimate pedestrian experience from 19th Street. Owing to its nearly flat roof with large overhang and unadorned north façade, a large rooftop addition would not alter that experience, if sensitively designed. While the Historical Commission does not typically approve large overbuilds on three-story rowhouses like the one at 1902 Sansom Street, this context might allow for an exception, if the addition is set back from the front façade sufficiently and designed with sensitivity.
- The visual separation of the one-story Sophy Curson Building and the addition above should be further developed, perhaps with additional setbacks and other devices. For example, an open space along Sansom Street between the one-story building and the addition above could highlight the subtly sloped roof of the Sophy Curson Building and improve the visual separation between the two elements of the building. The drawings on pages A104 and A105 hint at such a massing, but the intention should be clarified.
- The addition should be set back from the front façade at 1902 Sansom Street a greater distance than currently proposed. A sufficient setback could give the impression that the addition is a taller building in the background. The addition approved for 1904 Sansom Street may provide some guidance.
- The projects at 228-38 N. 13th Street (Big Brothers/Big Sisters Building) and 109-31 N. 2nd Street (National Products Building) can provide guidance for constructing large, but compatible additions on a Mid Century Modern buildings. Owing to the characteristics of Mid Century Modern buildings, they often are more capable of accepting visible additions than styles of buildings with pitched roofs.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:31:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect James Campbell represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Campbell described the proposal is to construct an overbuild on both buildings. He explained that although the buildings are within a historic district, they are also in a zoning category that allows for midrise to high-rise development and are within a half a block from Rittenhouse Square. Mr. Campbell commented that this is an unusual proposal as they realize this does not fully reflect the National Park guidelines in terms of overbuilds but unfortunately to accomplish an overbuild in this location it has to cover a substantial amount of the existing site. He said they are asking for a review in concept and a philosophical discussion about how one might preserve and maintain the Mid Century Modern Sophy Curson building with its character-defining features and elements while achieving the value and site of the location.
- Mr. Cluver said he has been struggling with this application since he received it. He said the building has such an iconic feel and its “one-storiness” is what brings your attention to it, noting that its scale is part of its character. Mr. Cluver continued that the large overhang is part of it too. He noted that staff comment that the overhang can serve as a buffer is one worth considering but there are other elements of to consider as well. Mr. Cluver pointed to the application images on page A107, noting the sign on the adjacent party wall along N. 19th St, and said this sign is as striking as the business itself.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that there are two painted wall signs, one on N. 19th Street and one on Sansom Street.
 - Mr. Cluver clarified he was speaking of the one on N. 19th that always catches the eye.
- Mr. Cluver noted another photograph on A107 of the Sophy Curson building at night. He commented on the contrast of light and dark and the absence of light above it that is part of what makes it striking as well. Mr. Cluver said he is picturing if you have this overbuild it is now going to have residential units and it is really going to change the perception of that corner. He stated that all that being said, he understands that it is a one-story building in Center City and it is an anomaly, but he does have concerns with this type of massing. Mr. Cluver continued that pulling the overbuild halfway back the Sophy Curson building or something like that would be appropriate. He realizes though that this then creates all different types of layout problems for the overbuild.
- Ms. Stein said she is not opposed to an overbuild on the building or an overbuild of this scale and mass. She continued that what is important when you are dealing with a historic property is the care in designing the building above it and selecting the materials that are compatible with it. Ms. Stein said she sees the begins of elevations that do not seem to relate to the Sophy Curson building and do not respond to it. She commented that it would be better if some of the fenestration either was a counterpoint or related to it. Ms. Stein continued that she sees the vertical stripes and is not sure what she is seeing. She stated that she does not think that it should look like a regular commercial building. Ms. Stein said the overbuild looks like it wants to terminate at the end of the Sophy Curson building, but right now it amalgamates over the rear building on Sansom Street. She pointed out that this a contributing building in the district and is therefore not appropriate. Ms. Stein observed the proposed glass façade comes right up to the front of this building and then adds five floors to it. She said the angled façade shown on page A108 does not help the situation because it looks like it envelopes two buildings with an overbuild

and she thinks it needs a more strict approach that makes that look like two separate buildings or somehow relates to the two separate buildings in the overbuild. Ms. Stein added that she does not believe that the setback is currently enough based on page A108.

- Mr. Campbell replied that they need to make a connection between the two buildings and to do that they used a transition piece to set it back and then use a front setback on 1902 Sansom Street. He said the setback from the front of 1902 Sansom Street would be eight to 10 feet.
- Ms. Stein noted that one of the staff recommendations was to separate the historic buildings from the overbuild with a recess or an alcove. She said this was an excellent idea. Ms. Stein commented that the setback floor could be an amenity floor. She said the application just does not seem to respond to the historic buildings. Ms. Stein said she appreciates that they are keeping the building and the overall intent, but it seems like it needs to be pushed farther to create a better design.
- Mr. Detwiler said that sliver of air between the Sophy Curson and the overbuild over that sloped roof line is too small. He noted that the question he is struggling with is: How much breathing room does the Sophy Curson building need? Mr. Detwiler said he agreed with Mr. Cluver's comments that the nighttime views of the building, glowing in the dark with a void of dark over it, is part of its character. He contended that the historic building needs more breathing room. Mr. Detwiler wondered aloud if this means the floor gets reduced by 50 percent and set back, or does it lift up higher with an empty story between the Sophy Curson building and the overbuild. He said he agrees that the transition between 122 S. 19th Street and 1902 Sansom Street should be developed further. Mr. Detwiler stated that he agreed with the comments made by Mr. Cluver and Ms. Stein.
- Mr. Campbell said that what he is hearing is that the Committee wants to see a greater articulation between the Sophy Curson building and the overbuild. He continued that the Committee has also communicated that the connection between the Sophy Curson overbuild and 1902 Sansom Street overbuild needs more thought.
 - Ms. Stein added that there should also be care and attention to the materials and details. She inquired if the applicant has thought about what the materials of the building would be.
 - Mr. Campbell replied they have not studied the materials yet. He said his personal preference would be to have a brick similar to the Sophy Curson brick where the blue spaces are shown on the application drawings and have windows and fenestration that echoes the Sophy Curson windows. Mr. Campbell said he thought that would be quite nice. He said other than that they have not delved into any material choices for the building itself. Mr. Campbell commented that the Sophy Curson building is a Mid Century Modern building and should guide the design.
- Mr. Campbell asked the Committee what they would think if the overbuild was one floor taller to create that greater separation between the Sophy Curson building and the overbuild. He noted that they decided on an eight-story building based on precedents in the area.
 - Mr. Cluver replied that while it is nice that they were relating to the scale of other buildings in the area, in this case what happens between the first story and the second story is more important than what happens at the eighth story. He continued that, as with all comments on in-concept massing submissions like this, the answer lies in the ultimate design. Mr. Cluver added that, if there is a

potential trade off there, then he is willing to entertain it, but he needs to see what it looks like.

- Mr. McCoubrey said that the proposed design steps back along 19th Street to reflect that three-story scale, but then, as it turns the corner to connect again, is lost. He noted that perhaps they could think of the upper four floors as somewhat different than the other three. Mr. McCoubrey commented that this might help continue that three-story line.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the overbuild on the commercial space is almost easier than that over the small house at 1902 Sansom Street. He contended that this building needs more breathing room too. He said he agreed with other Committee members about the bigger reveal over the Sophy Curson building but he does not think it should be at the expense of making the building a whole story taller. He stated that he would like to see more recognition that the three-story building on Sansom Street is important and that the overbuild responds to that in a more definitive way.
 - Ms. Stein suggested stepping the overbuild down at 1902 Sansom Street so there were not as many floors. She said it would give it the sense of separation the Committee is talking about. She noted that right the roof is above that of the adjacent building, which is 77 feet, and if the overbuild just came down a floor it would be more successful. Ms. Stein observed that the application is proposing to add five floors over a three-story building, a lot for a contributing building.
- Mr. Cluver noted the mention in the staff recommendation of The National overbuild. He said there are lessons to be learned from it but there is a big difference between the two projects. Mr. Cluver pointed out that the defining features at The National were the tiles and sawtooth entrance roof which kept your eye down at that level so much that they overbuild was not impeding on the character of the historic building. He said the one-story nature of the Sophy Curson building is almost its defining feature as articulated by its roof treatment.
 - Mr. Detwiler pointed out that The National reads as such a plinth whereas the Sophy Curson building reads in contrast as long and slim with a razor line of a roof.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he thinks the materials will be what make this overbuild ultimately successful or not. He added that his opinion would be to stray from the brick and glass and make it more different.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jay Farrell opposed to the application as presented. He commented that the Sophy Curson building could tolerate a modest overbuild on its rear corner and then step up to a taller 1902 Sansom Street overbuild. Mr. Farrell said a materials palette that maintains the prominence of the existing historic structures would be critical.
- Architect Kathy Dowdell said she believes that Sophy Curson's 19th Street façade is very important as well as the façade along Sansom Street back to the big storefront window. She noted that once you get past this window with a little breathing room, it is her opinion that you could put a 20-story overbuild on the rear of the Sophy Curson building. She pointed out that, if there was a way to configure the building in this manner, you would still be still preserving the development rights. Ms. Dowdell said 1902 Sansom Street is contributing and it should be retained but noted that it is a much more common building type in Philadelphia. She said the 122 S. 19th Street building remains untouched and in its historic form, and it is important to preserve the sense of that building as the original owner commissioned it.

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia said that an overbuild is conceptually possible on these properties. He said he agreed with many of the comments and suggestions made by the Committee members. Mr. Grossi said this overbuild is ultimately about scale and relationship, and he said the current application shows that the existing building and the overbuild are not quite speaking to each other yet. He pointed out that the current application is more about what zoning would allow and that the Architectural Committee comments are intended to move this application toward a more compatible proposal. Mr. Grossi said he agreed with Ms. Dowdell's comments and Ms. Stein's proposal to create a one-story space above the Sophy Curson building to allow for breathing room.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The one-story form of 122 S. 19th Street is a key character-defining feature of the building.
- An overbuild of the buildings at 122 S. 19th Street and 1902 Sansom Street could be compatible with the existing buildings if designed with sensitivity and materials that maintain the primacy of the existing historic structures.
- There should be a greater articulation between the 122 S. 19th Street building and the overbuild. This articulation should highlight the historic form of the Sophy Curson building.
- The connection between the 122 S. 19th Street overbuild and 1902 Sansom Street overbuild should be additionally explored.
- As presented, the proposal does not meet Standard 9 as the massing and form are not compatible with the historic buildings.
- It appears that the addition could be removed at a later date. Thereby, the proposal satisfies Standard 10.

ADDRESS: 1600-18 ARCH ST, UNIT 1621

Proposal: Cut down window into door on terrace; install windows without muntins

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: SAS 1600 Arch Street LP

Applicant: Robert Henderson, Robert Henderson Architect

History: 1925; Insurance Company of North America Building; Stewardson & Page, architects

Individual Designation: 9/7/1978

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application focuses on the doors and a window along the east elevation of the 16th floor at 1600-18 Arch Street, Unit 1621. The applicant is proposing the alterations as part of a comprehensive interior renovation. The doors and window face on to exterior terraces and part of this change is required because the floor height will be raised in this unit. The existing doors and windows are not original to the construction of the building. The building was converted from office use to residential in 2000.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Cut down masonry to alter a window to a door opening on the south terrace of the east elevation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Remove existing doors on north and south terraces and replace with windows and one set of doors.
- Remove historic muntin patterns and replace with single lite configuration.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Rehabilitation Standards of 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 alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - While changing the doors to windows is acceptable, the historic muntin pattern should be maintained in the new windows, doors, and transoms to satisfy Standard 2.
- *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.*
 - Owing to a lack of visibility from the public right-of-way, the removal of the window and cut down of the limestone masonry to accommodate a new door on the south terrace meets Standard 9.
 - As the upper portion of the doors and transoms on the 16th floor's east elevation are visible from the public right-of-way, the historic muntin configuration should be maintained to satisfy Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:03:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Robert Henderson represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Henderson explained that the goal of the current owner is to make the 4000 sq foot residential unit more modern to appeal to a potential renter. He noted that removing the window and door muntins and replacing them single lites is part of the plan to rehabilitate Unit #1621 and attract a resident for this apartment. Mr. Henderson walked through the submitted drawing and photographs and provided the Committee with a detailed explanation of the proposed exterior changes.
- Ms. Stein asked about the decking on the terraces. She observed that there is an existing railing and inquired about updates to terrace decks.
 - Mr. Henderson replied that both decks will be refurbished, and they will not be doing any new decking. He noted that, because of this, the existing terrace railing will remain in place. Mr. Henderson explained that they do not want to touch any of the existing flashing around the deck area.
- Ms. Stein asked if the staff had any concerns about the proposed changes to the limestone area under the window.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that the staff did not object to the cutting down of limestone to create a door. She commented that the staff was not concerned about changes to the lower portion of the windows and doors because these

cannot be seen from the public right-of-way such as the nearby parks. Ms. Mehley added that the main concern is the upper portion of the windows and doors, specifically the removal of the muntin patterns.

- Mr. Henderson pointed to the photographs submitted with their application showing the 16th-floor door and window details from the Love Park. He said that, although the doors and window are only 20 years old, they need to be replaced owing to their poor condition. Mr. Henderson also mentioned that they require new doors and windows that perform better acoustically.
- Mr. Cluver said he does not agree with the contention that removing muntins makes it more contemporary or modern, as muntins are not solely the jurisdiction of historic buildings. He added that he does not think removing muntins will make a huge change in the perception of the building either. Mr. Cluver noted that the muntins provide scale.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he would go further and say the muntins are character-defining features as they are significantly visible. He commented that you can see this building from a great distance away.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. McCoubrey and said that your eye is always drawn to the top of this building and to the columns on the 16th floor. He added that it is important to maintain the current appearance with the muntins in place.
- Mr. McCoubrey contended that to change this for a current interior aesthetic at the expense of the articulation and the historic exterior of the building is inappropriate. He said that the existing muntin pattern should be retained. McCoubrey added that he has no objections to the cutting down of the windowsill to create a new door opening.
- Ms. Stein inquired the type of window to would be installed in place of the existing doors.
 - Mr. Henderson said that it would be a high-end Marvin wood window with aluminum cladding on the exterior. He noted they will provide better glazing and soundproofing than the existing ones in place.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The top of the doors and transoms on the east elevation of the 16th floor are visible from the public right-of-way, especially from nearby parks and plazas.
- The door and transom muntin patterns are character-defining features of the historic building's façade.
- The cutting down of the limestone below the window on the south terrace to create a new doorway is acceptable, as it is not visible from the public right-of-way.
- The application submitted indicates that there will be new decking and handrail in the exterior spaces. The applicant confirmed these changes are no longer in the scope of work.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The historic muntin pattern must be maintained in the new windows, doors, and transoms to satisfy Standard 2.

- The upper portion of the doors and transoms on the 16th floor's east elevation are visible from the public right-of-way; therefore the historic muntin configuration must be maintained to satisfy Standard 9.
- Owing to a lack of visibility from the public right-of-way, the removal of the window and cut down of the limestone masonry to accommodate a new door on the south terrace meets Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1600-18 ARCH ST, UNIT 1621					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1250 E PALMER ST

Proposal: Construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barbara Cunningham

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design

History: 1835; Joseph Paxson House & Store

Individual Designation: 11/10/2017

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct additions at the side and rear of this two-and-a-half-story individually designated building. An In-Concept application was reviewed at last month's meeting, where members of the Architectural Committee raised concerns that the design of the addition would partially demolish the rear roof of the house and would also obstruct views of the rear dormer. The Committee members recommended that the applicant find a design solution that would preserve the integrity of rear roof and would provide some distance between the designated house and the addition. The applicant has revised their plans to reflect these comments by creating more breathing room between the historic structure and the rear addition. The rear roof slope and dormer window remain intact in the revised plan. Because the subject property was designated with Criterion I, the archaeological criterion, the staff asks that the applicant confirm the extent of excavation necessary to build the additions as proposed. The staff also asks the applicant to confirm the materials proposed for the additions.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct additions at the side and rear of house.
- Replace existing bay windows at ground floor.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 8: Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*
 - The applicant should demonstrate that archaeological resources will be protected and preserved.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The design of the additions leaves the character-defining features of the historic house, such as the gabled roof and the dormer, intact.
 - The staff finds the use of Hardie Plank siding and asphalt dimensional shingles to be appropriate materials, but not the use of vinyl.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided archaeological resources are protected and preserved, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:22:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Janice Woodcock and property owner Barbara Cunningham represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cunningham told the Architectural Committee members that she hoped the revised plans would be satisfactory enough for their approval.
- Ms. Woodcock explained that the revised addition was designed to put more space between it and the historic house. She said that a change in cladding materials was also proposed to differentiate the addition from the historic house.
- Ms. Stein commented that the new massing allowed a better view of the roofline of the historic house which had been a recommendation of the Architectural Committee at the in-concept review the previous month. She asked Ms. Woodcock why the overhangs of the eaves appeared to be so pronounced and suggested that they all be pulled back to allow the eaves on the historic house to stand out. Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein.
 - Ms. Woodcock responded that she would be happy to investigate pulling the eaves back to allow them to be more deferential to the historic house.
- Mr. Cluver said that he had reservations about the proposed copper downspout on the addition because it was highly noticeable in the rendering. He stated that the use of vinyl siding at the addition was not something typically approved by the Historical Commission and he suggested that fiber cement siding be used instead. Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Woodcock what material was proposed for the windows.

- o Ms. Woodcock replied that the final material for the windows had not been selected.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that the windows at the first floor of the addition were larger than the windows at the historic house. He said that the pair of windows on the ground story of the addition was acceptable, but the relationship between the window on the addition closest to the existing house needed to be reworked.
 - o Ms. Woodcock asked if Mr. Detwiler would be open to the use of a window with a shape and he responded that he was.
- Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that the windows at the second story of the addition should be smaller in height than they were proposed on the revised plans.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he was not opposed to the copper downspout. Ms. Stein suggested that the downspout be pushed over to the other side of the elevation.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked what the material was in the rendering below the lowest piece of siding at the foundation.
 - o Ms. Woodcock replied that the material was exposed concrete.
- Mr. Detwiler and Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that the material should be brick or stone rather than exposed concrete.
- Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Detwiler thanked the applicants for their sensitive revisions to the plans.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The revised design for the addition protects the integrity of the historic structure.
- Architecturally significant details such as the rooflines and the overall massing and scale of the historic remain intact and visible alongside the addition.
- Fiber cement is a more appropriate and durable siding material for the addition than the proposed vinyl.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Should archaeological resources be encountered during the process, the applicant will take the necessary actions to protect them, pursuant to Standard 8.
- The design of the additions leaves the character-defining features of the historic house, such as the gabled roof and the dormer, intact, pursuant to Standard 9.
- Fiber cement siding and asphalt dimensional shingles are appropriate materials to use at the addition, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval provided that archaeological resources are protected and preserved; a fiber cement siding is used at the addition; the overhangs are reduced in scale; the downspout is relocated to the rear of the façade; alternatives to the windows at the ground floor where the addition meets the original structure are considered; and the exposed concrete at the ground level is clad with stucco or brick veneer and a water table feature, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

ITEM: 1250 E PALMER ST MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 223-25 MARKET ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: American Investment Assoc.

Applicant: Snežana Litvinovi, Atrium Design Group

History: 1960; second story and rear added, 2001

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

BACKGROUND:

The two-story, two-bay, brick-clad building at 223-25 Market Street is non-contributing structure in the Old City Historic District. This application proposes to construct a three-story addition on top of the existing structure. The building fronts Market Street and has a secondary façade that fronts Church Street to the north. An extremely narrow alley named W. Grishom Alley runs north – south between Market and Church Streets to the east of the subject property.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story addition on existing two-story building:
 - Construct roof deck with pilot houses/roof access;
 - New brick to match existing will be used at the first and second-stories; charcoal color standing seam zinc panels will be used at the new, upper floors;
 - Balconies are proposed for floors two through five at both the front and back facades.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed three-story addition would not adversely impact any significant architectural features because it is being proposed on top of a non-contributing

building. The overall massing and height appear compatible with the context of the overall block.

- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - Recommended: Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.
 - Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.
 - Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.
 - The massing, size and scale of the proposed addition appear compatible with the site's context.
 - The lack of cornice, the proposed arrangement of the window and door openings, and the use of standing seam zinc siding do not appear compatible with other buildings seen throughout the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Although the massing and height of the proposed addition seem appropriate to the site's context, the staff recommends denial owing to the details of the design, including the lack of an articulated cornice, the out-of-place rhythm of the fenestration, and the incompatible cladding and balcony materials proposed for the addition, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:43:09

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Snežana Litvinovic of Atrium Design Group represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Litinovic stated that they had attempted to add a cornice to the Market Street façade. However, they could not find a design that they felt suited the building. She said when they planned it out, the cornice ended up drawing too much attention to the upper floors of the building whereas they were trying to keep the focus on the base.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the parapet looked rather high and asked the applicant if a roof deck is proposed.
 - The applicant responded that there was a roof deck proposed and the parapet was raised to prevent the railing from being visible. Ms. Litinovic explained that the height had been added at the parapet almost in place of a cornice.
- Mr. Detwiler said that the parapet either needed to be reduced in height or a cornice needed to be added but that there was something off with the building's current design. He commented that height of the building could work here on Market Street; however, the block includes cornice lines where their building lacks such articulation.
 - Ms. Litinovic said she understood the comments and would reconsider how to finish the top of the building.
- Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Stein remarked that black is not an appropriate color for the building's cladding.

- o Ms. Litinovic responded that black metal cladding was so commonly proposed because it is one of the standard colors available without making a special order. She said that they also chose a black cladding because they thought that a light color would blend in too much with the adjacent buildings, especially to the east.
- Ms. Stein noted the proximity of Christ Church to the subject property, stating that it is one of the most iconic buildings in the city and therefore relevant to their discussion. Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein's comments and added that the colors of the neighborhood included, whites, off-whites, and brick.
 - o Ms. Litinovic responded that they would be happy to respond to these comments through revisions.
- Mr. D'Alessandro objected to how far out the balconies projected from the building. Ms. Stein and Mr. Detwiler remarked that if the balconies were designed more as Juliet balconies and only project out from the building façade about one foot they would find them more acceptable. Mr. D'Alessandro said he still objected to the balconies.
- Mr. Cluver said that they were challenged to try and make this out-of-place design somehow fit into its context.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed addition is to be constructed on top of a non-contributing structure.
- The proposed height and massing of the project appear to fit into the height and massing of its surrounds on this block of Market Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The addition would not adversely impact the non-contributing building and the overall massing and height appear compatible with the context of the overall block, pursuant to Standard 9.
- The design of the addition, including the fenestration, lack of cornice, balconies and black cladding appear completely out of context and do not satisfy Standard 9 or the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

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

ITEM: 223-25 MARKET 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 1524-38 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: TR Gretz LP

Applicant: Anthony Tsirantonakis, T + Associates Architects

History: 1885; Gretz Brewery; 1894-96; 1900; 1901; 1903; 1905; c. 1944

Individual Designation: 11/9/2018

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes the adaptive reuse of the former Gretz Brewery complex, which was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in November 2018. The Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for this same scope on 12 April 2019, and voted unanimously to approve the in-concept application. As required by the Commission's Rules and Regulations, the applicant has now submitted for final approval. This final approval application includes details, such as specification sheets for windows and doors, which were not part of the in-concept application.

At the time of designation, the Commission voted to consider "Building 12" at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Redner Street as non-contributing, so that it may be approved for demolition to allow for greater flexibility with the plans for redevelopment. Also at the time of designation, the developer briefly showed preliminary plans to the Commission for redevelopment of the site, to demonstrate that plans for reuse of the property had been in the works for some time prior to the proposed historic designation. Several members of the staff toured the complex with the developer and architect in late 2018 and can confirm that the buildings have suffered from years of deferred maintenance and exposure to the elements. Several buildings in the complex are lacking roofs.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing "Building 12" at corner of Germantown Avenue and Redner Street.
- Construct new mixed-use buildings on vacant lot created by demolition of "Building 12" and on existing vacant lot at corner of Germantown Avenue and W. Oxford Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Construct overbuilds and additions on existing historic buildings.
- Rehabilitate historic facades and iconic chimney with “Gretz beer” signage.
- Install new windows and doors throughout.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - The proposed project retains the historic facades and chimney, which are the highly visible portions of the complex that convey the historic materials and features.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The proposed project retains the historic street-facing facades. The interior of the complex, which is not visible from the street, is not a distinctive feature, and is in disrepair, and therefore does not require repair nor replacement in kind.
- *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 shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed project includes overbuilds with setbacks on historic facades, in an attempt to minimize the massing on the historic structures. Overall, the new construction portions of the complex may not strictly satisfy preservation standards, but should be considered owing to the poor condition of the complex, in addition to the plans having been developed prior to notice of proposed historic designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, 9, and 10 and the Historical Commission’s 12 April 2019 in-concept approval.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:01:12

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Anthony Tsirantonakis represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver questioned the use of the red beveled corner, opining that it was like wallpaper on the corner.
 - Mr. Tsirantonakis responded that it is cast terra cotta with a corrugated face, and is recalled in a few places, most notably at the top and bottom of the corner, and at the other corner on Redner and Germantown, and inside and around in window frames of new building. He noted that they also tried to add a different

- contemporary modern rainscreen material that had the color and corrugated detail to add a texture with some characteristics.
- Mr. Cluver opined that it feels pinched in by white on either side. He suggested treating the entire corner the same by continuing to wrap the material to the left and right for additional bays.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned the mesh at corner.
 - Mr. Tsirantonakis responded that it is a miscellaneous steel and mesh material to recall the original mansard. He noted that they recreated the profile of the corner mansard but using a modern material.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that he appreciates the nod to the history, but is not sure it is working that way for him.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed. He suggested retaining the cornice line and eliminating the mansard above. He opined that the design is too complex, and suggested simplifying the design of the new construction. He noted that there is a wonderful variety of historic facades, but all the different new materials and window types and ins and outs of the new construction distracts from the historic buildings. He noted that one's eye is drawn to it because there is so much going on. He noted that the terra cotta is a nice material and suggested that it be extended over the entire corner building. He opined that the massing and size of the new construction and overbuilds are acceptable.
 - Other Committee members agreed, opining that the design needs to be more understated.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that several details on the window sheet, A-401, are overlapping and incorrect, making it difficult to tell what is being proposed.
 - Mr. Tsirantonakis responded that those are CAD errors.
 - Ms. Stein questioned the intent for the windows and whether there would be any changes to the masonry openings.
 - Mr. Tsirantonakis responded that the intention is not to remove the masonry arches. He explained that the intent of Window Z is to extend a window so it is closer to the floor level of the existing window. The top part of the window would not be altered.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro disputed the use of square top windows in the upper sashes and heads of arched windows, opining that they should be arched, with no infill panels.
 - Mr. Tsirantonakis responded that they had reached an agreement for the proposed windows during the in-concept stage with Historical Commission staff members Randy Baron and Kim Chantry that the use of squared off windows would be acceptable in certain locations.
 - Ms. Stein questioned whether these squared windows are proposed only on certain floors, noting that the renderings make it appear as though the arched tops are being retained, while the details show squared windows.
 - Mr. Tsirantonakis noted that most of the arched windows are located along Lawrence Street, as shown in A2002.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that two different approaches are shown to large arched openings on A404. He suggested that the applicants pick one approach.
 - Mr. Tsirantonakis responded that the design is dictated by use, and they had to determine how to handle large arched windows and operability.
 - Committee members responded that there are more compatible options than what is proposed for S11 and S17. They noted that arched casements or fixed

arched windows with hoppers below are preferable to square top casements in those openings.

- Ms. Stein opined that there may be additional flexibility for courtyard windows as opposed to street-facing facades.
- Mr. Tsirantonakis noted that there are many square top windows in arched openings currently, although he does not know whether they are original. The property has a long history of industrial use.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that part of the exercise of the Architectural Committee review is for the staff to learn what is important to the Committee so they can execute those considerations.
- Mr. Farnham noted that the proposed design is similar to what was approved by the Historical Commission in-concept a few years ago, at which time they allowed for deviations from the historic appearance owing to the buildings' condition. There was a belief that the standards could be lowered to save an important group of buildings that might otherwise be lost. The Commission was promoting the adaptive reuse of the buildings.
- Ms. DiPasquale presented the in-concept rendering from 2019. Mr. Farnham explained that the primary differences were the colors and that the mesh mansard was not presented in the original application.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that he remembered opining that the original in-concept design was too busy, and that the new design is busier.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with comments about the busyness of the new construction and how it competes with the new buildings. He noted that under the Number 5, the windows have popped up instead of having a single horizontal line, grabbing attention. He opined that they should simplify the materials, suggesting that they do not need the orange; the new construction could all be white or grey.
 - Mr. Tsirantonakis responded that they went through Civic Design Review (CDR) and the initial Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviews, so most of these discussions have happened previously. He noted that the direction from CDR was different than the Historical Commission, and this was the best attempt at merging the differing opinions into something that could work.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that there should be greater unity in color
 - Mr. Tsirantonakis responded that the orange striping is a material color.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia noted that the Alliance nominated the property in 2018 and is supportive of the project from a massing concept, but agreed with the Committee members that the design of the new additions is too articulated and busy, and competes with the varied and ornamental historic buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed in-fill and overbuild construction is appropriate in massing and scale.
- The design of the proposed construction is overly busy, distracting and detracting from the historic buildings, and should be simplified in color and details.
- Window details are rendered incorrectly and should be corrected prior to the Historical Commission meeting.

- The need for operability in the arched openings is understandable, but details should be revisited, particularly of the large arched openings with a squared center casement and flanking quarter-round windows. The central casements should be arch-topped.
- Greater flexibility can be exercised with the windows on less visible elevations.
- The proposed mesh and miscellaneous steel mansard is not successful and contributes to the busyness of the proposed construction.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed additions are compatible with the historic property in scale and massing, and, with modifications, could be appropriate in details, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the suggestion that the new construction is simplified and the mesh mansard is removed, with the staff to review details, especially the windows in the historic buildings, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1524-38 Germantown Ave 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 Guterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 36-42 S 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct mixed-use building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Second and Trotter LLC

Applicant: David Gest, Ballard Spahr LLP

History: Parking lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct an approximately 85-foot-tall building on a vacant lot at the corner of S. 2nd Street and Trotter's Alley between Chestnut and Market Streets in the Old City Historic District. Historically the parcel was occupied by three four-story buildings, all of which were demolished prior to the designation of the Old City Historic District. Since the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

property was vacant at the time the district was designated, the Historical Commission's jurisdiction is limited to review and comment only.

The proposed construction is located on a block composed of mixed-use buildings ranging from one to six stories, with the majority being four stories in height. The building to the north across Trotters Alley is the tallest on the block, at approximately 77 feet. The majority of the buildings on the block are of red brick construction, although some are clad in lighter stone and cast iron. The proposed building, which is identified as seven stories with an additional mezzanine level, is approximately 85 feet in height, and would be clad in white brick on the 2nd Street elevation, with the side elevations in dark grey cement board siding.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct building on vacant lot

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed new construction is differentiated from but generally compatible with the materials, proportions and features of the historic district, but is out of scale in terms of height with the surrounding context. The application partially complies with this standard.

STAFF COMMENTS: The proposed construction is compatible in general materials, rhythm and fenestration with the historic district, but is out of scale in terms of height with the surrounding structures, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff also suggests that the masonry be carried onto the north elevation above the ground floor for at least one bay.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:41:14

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carey Jackson Yonce, attorneys Matt McClure and Devon Beverly, and developer Mike Tester represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented revised renderings that the applicants submitted during the meeting.
- Mr. McClure explained they have already received a zoning permit for the construction.
- Mr. Yonce noted that the building is actually 89 feet in height, not more than 100 as originally reported.
- Mr. Yonce explained that they took design cues from the light clad stone building to the north and the cast iron building across the street
- Mr. Yonce noted that they have revised the plans to have subtle brick reveals, taking context clues from building to the north. The revised design he noted has also changed the cornice to brick as opposed to metal to give it a more uniform feel.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that it is hard to tell the projection of the cornice.

- Mr. Yonce replied that it will have a slight curve to it to give a more modern less traditional top.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether is one mullion is thicker than others in the center bay of windows.
 - Mr. Yonce responded affirmatively, noting that there is a wall at that location, but that they are attempting to compromise to maintain symmetry of overall façade. He explained that it would be clad in metal to match the windows.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested an ABA rhythm to the center bay of windows to create better symmetry.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that that was a good idea and that they could make both verticals the same thickness.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro noted that a wall does not need to impact the window so greatly and could be achieved with a knife edge from wall to window.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that it is a demising partition, so it needs to be rated and therefore thicker, but that he is open to making more the mullions more symmetrical.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he likes the introduction of a cornice at the base and the change to inset panels from striations. He questioned the articulation between the top two floors, noting that the top floor is a little too tall, and suggested that the applicants introduce a base-middle-top articulation that gives it more rhythm and feel.
 - Mr. Yonce agreed, noting that it could be similar to the second floor at the seventh floor
 - Mr. Cluver responded that it should be similar but not identical.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested that it would be important to have that classical appearance.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned why the brick only returns one or two feet on the north elevation.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that it only returns for a few feet at the upper floors, but brick runs approximately three quarters of the first floor of the Trotter's façade.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that the brick return the first whole bay at the upper floors to avoid looking like wallpaper rather than a masonry façade. He suggested a return on the south elevation as well.
 - Mr. Cluver agreed, and also suggested that the windows combine with the spandrel on the seventh floor.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that there is such rhythm to the windows on the Trotters Alley façade, but that they lose the pattern on the seventh floor. He opined that he is bothered by the appearance that it looks like it is just responding to interior.
- Ms. Stein expressed opposition to the use of black cement board siding. She suggested that a Hardiboard panel, metal, or stucco system would be more appropriate, but that the wood siding scale does not feel appropriate for such a large building. She also suggested that an eight-story façade should not be black, and that there should be less contrast with the 2nd Street façade.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that the alley is going to be oppressive.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the side elevations should utilize a panelized system, with a greater masonry return.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether there would be retail on first floor.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that that is the plan, and is why the residential entrance is located down Trotter's Alley.

- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the base be articulated more strongly. He noted that the revised design has more of a distinction than the initial proposal, but more would be better.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that there is a distinct one-story cornice line along the whole block.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the typical ceiling height on the upper floors.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that they are just at nine feet.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed concern about the lower building to the south. He noted that it would be nice if the windows could be lowered slightly to align better.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that he imagines the ceiling heights of the adjacent building are quite low.
- Ms. Stein asked whether they have considered signage locations, noting that the design does not leave much room for signage.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that the intent is that signage would be thin signs located on piers mounted within the recessed areas.
 - Mr. McCoubrey opined that the windows should be wider at the ground level, with three rather than four divisions, noting that more glazing would provide better space for commercial activities.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENTS: The Architectural Committee did not formally adopt comments.

ADDRESS: 1921 GREEN ST

Proposal: Construct multi-family building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1921 Green Street, LLC

Applicant: Amanda Anderson, CANNO design

History: 1959; infill of original storefront opening, 1975

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish the non-contributing, one-story, mid-twentieth century building at the northeast corner of 20th and Green Streets in the Spring Garden Historic District and to construct a four-story building in its place. The new construction would be clad in red brick with a cast stone base and feature large double-hung windows and a metal cornice. The height of the proposed building approximates that of the adjacent historic building at 1919 Green Street, and is located in a context of primarily three and four-story residential masonry buildings.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Amanda Anderson and Carey Jackson Yonce represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented revised renderings that applicants submitted during the meeting.
- Ms. Anderson explained that they took design cues from the brick and stone of the neighborhood, with cast stone details at base and articulation under the sills.
- Mr. Detwiler thanked the applicants for showing the adjacent buildings in the renderings.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the cornice return further onto the north elevation.
 - Ms. Anderson noted that they extended the cornice return 18 inches after receiving initial feedback from the staff.
 - Mr. Detwiler and Mr. Cluver opined that it should have a longer return.
 - Ms. Stein suggested that the stone beltcourses should also turn onto the north elevation.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that the other facades are so nicely articulated, it would be great to see the north elevation treated with more detail.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether all the floor-to-ceiling heights are the same.
 - Ms. Anderson responded affirmatively, noting that they are approximately 9.5 feet in height.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that they typically expect to see taller first floor.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that the location of the beltcourse also makes the first floor look lower, and suggested that it be placed higher.
 - Ms. Anderson responded that they did not want to make it look commercial.
 - Mr. McCoubrey replied that raising the beltcourse is not going to do that.
- Mr. Cluver questioned any proposed exterior lighting.
 - Ms. Anderson responded that they are proposing uplighting and lights adjacent to the door.
 - Committee members noted that any lighting should be carefully considered and should not be located above the first floor in a residential neighborhood.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned the termination of the cornice on the east corner of the Green Street elevation, where it comes up against the mansard of the adjacent building.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that, since it crosses the property line, the cornice will end at end of building.

- Mr. Cluver suggested that the profile of the cornice turn back on itself, rather than a knife slice at the edge.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that that would also help make the adjacent dormer more visible.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the pairing of windows at the upper floors but not the first on the north elevation.
 - Ms. Anderson responded that they were reacting to the fence, but noted that they could look into centering the windows or aligning better.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the fence looks like raw wood but it should be painted.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the symmetry of the windows at the third and fourth floor is a little skewed.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that it is acceptable since the string course at the base separates the floor levels.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether they are proposing brick or metal between the triple windows on the north elevation.
 - Ms. Anderson responded that they are proposing metal.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the east elevation material.
 - Ms. Anderson responded that they are proposing vinyl siding.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that a Hardie panel system would be preferable.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the mechanical equipment should not be visible.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed building aligns with the adjacent building.
- Brick and stone are appropriate building materials for the district.
- The beltcourse between the first and second floors should be raised so that the first floor appears taller, which is more in keeping with the character of the historic context.
- Details of the north elevation warrant additional consideration, including extending the cornice and better aligning the windows.
- Exterior lighting should be limited to the first floor only.
- The fence should be painted wood rather than raw wood.
- The cornice on the Green Street elevation at the east party line should turn back on itself.
- The east elevation should be clad in a Hardie panel system rather than vinyl siding.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- With some minor revisions, the proposed construction is differentiated from but compatible with the massing, scale, size, materials, and details of the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following provisions:

- the beltcourse at the first floor is raised to make first floor appear taller;
- the cornice wrap the north elevation;

- the window placement on the north elevation is examined to make it more symmetrical;
- the east elevation change from vinyl siding to a Hardie panel system;
- the cornice return on itself at the east party line;
- and that the fence be painted wood.

ITEM: 1921 Green St MOTION: 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	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 05:20:20

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:31 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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