

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

**TUESDAY, 28 MAY 2024
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 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	Arrived 9:15 a.m.
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		Acting chair
Allison Lukachik		X	
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

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

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner III
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design
Alina Herzberg
Andrew Biggin
Anthony Mascieri
Bill Strehse
Dennis Carlisle
G.C. Seibert, Bancroft Green
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Ian Toner, Toner Architects
Jake Blumgart
Jay Farrell
Jenn Patrino, TierView Development

Jim Cassidy, C2 Architecture
John Scorsone
Justino Navarro, Spring Garden Civic Association
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Lisa Ernst
Mary Costello, Esq., Philadelphia Law Department
Michael Ramos
Nancy Pontone
Noah Ostroff
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Patricia Freeland, Spring Garden Civic Association
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Robert Gurmankin, Franklin Bridge North Neighbors
Rustin Ohler, Harmon Deutsch Ohler Architects
Sam Katovitch, Toner Architects
Sara Pochedly, Toner Architects
S. Black
Scott Seibert, Bancroft Green
Steve Black
Tim Lux, Tierview Development

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 242 CHRISTIAN ST

Proposal: Legalize door and basement entrance
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Olymphina Hankinson
Applicant: Jason Ferreira, Superior Consulting Agency
History: 1820
Individual Designation: 5/31/1966
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize work performed without a building permit or Historical Commission's review and approval. The work includes the addition of an excavated front basement entrance with railing, steps and a door, and the build-down and installation of front entry door. In 2022 and 2023, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued several violations and a stop work order for unpermitted basement excavation and enlarging of openings at the rear. In April 2024, a consultant working for the property owner submitted this application seeking to legalize the unpermitted work. The front façade of 242 Christian Street has been without original or historically appropriate windows and doors since at least 1956, prior to historic designation, based on a photograph from that year.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize basement entrance and front door replacement.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MAY 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

- o The construction of the basement entry removed historic material and altered historic features and spaces. The replacement of the front door with a smaller door in a built-down opening altered historic features and spaces. The work does not satisfy Standard 2.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The replacement of the front door with a smaller door in a built-down opening does not satisfy Standard 6. The new door does not replicate the historically appropriate door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the legalization of the basement entry and replacement front door, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6. Approval of the basement entry if the basement door is replaced with a door that references the historic basement window and the basement window is replaced with a historically appropriate window, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. The staff can approve a historically appropriate front door, if such a door is proposed.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:00

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the appearance of a historic basement window for this property, and what the staff was recommending for the new basement door.
 - o Ms. Chantry responded that it is difficult to see what is behind the basement window grille in the historic photograph, but the recommendation is to remove the non-historic vinyl slider and replace with a more appropriate window, and then mimic that window appearance at the top of the basement door.
- Ms. Stein noted that there is a ponding issue at the bottom of the basement steps, and the parging of the wall leading down to the basement entry appears to be unfinished.
 - o Ms. Chantry noted that a Stop Work Order was issued, which it may account for some incomplete work.
- Mr. Detwiler joined the meeting and was provided with a summary of the discussion he missed. He asked if the historic fanlight above the front entry door remained.
 - o Ms. Chantry confirmed that the historic fanlight remains.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The front façade of 242 Christian Street has been without original or historically appropriate windows and doors since at least 1956, prior to historic designation.

- The historic fanlight remains over the front entry door.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The construction of the basement entry removed historic material and altered historic features and spaces. The replacement of the front door with a smaller door in a built-down opening altered historic features and spaces. The work does not satisfy Standard 2. The applicant should address the water ponding issues at the basement entry and the unfinished parging of the wall adjacent to the basement stair.
- The replacement of the front door with a smaller door in a built-down opening does not satisfy Standard 6. The new door does not replicate the historically appropriate door. The applicant should work with Commission staff on replacement of the door with an appropriate door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

ITEM: 242 Christian St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					X
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	3				4

ADDRESS: 2040 CHRISTIAN ST

Proposal: Convert church to residential building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2040 Christian Street LLC/Tierview Development, Inc.

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1870; Church of the Holy Apostles, Shiloh Baptist Church;
 2030-38 Christian Street: 1903; Richard Newton Memorial Building; Duhring, Okie & Ziegler

2040 Christian Street: 1870; Church of the Holy Apostles, Shiloh Baptist Church;
 Frazer, Furness & Hewitt; tower added, 1901, G.W. & W.D. Hewitt

Individual Designation: 11/6/1980

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert the former Church of the Holy Apostles, later Shiloh Baptist Church, and associated buildings to multi-unit residential use. Of the five buildings on the site, four are designated as historic, having been constructed and altered

between 1868 and 1903. Fronting onto Montrose Street at the rear, the Phillips Brooks Memorial Building, to be known as the Boy Scout Building, is not designated as historic.

The proposed exterior scope includes masonry repair and replacement, construction of an ADA ramp, insertion of skylights and dormers, and replacement of windows. New clear glazed aluminum windows are proposed in all locations where apartment units are located, including the church and Richard Newton Memorial Building. The main entryway of the complex adjacent to the Richard Newton Memorial Building is proposed to retain its existing leaded glass, as is the existing rose window at the narthex of the church.

At its 10 November 2023 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for a nearly identical scope of work and voted to approve the application in-concept, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, and the Accessibility Guideline Recommendation. The only design change to this application for final approval is the addition of a door in the non-historic one-story addition on the Richard Newton Memorial Building. This application has also been supplemented with window color samples.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert church complex buildings to residential use.
- Replace windows.
- Insert skylights and dormers.
- Replace asphalt shingles with Slateline asphalt shingles.
- Repair and replace masonry.
- Construct ADA ramp.
- Demolish non-historic one-story addition at rear of church.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property 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 scope retains and preserves the overall historic character of the church complex.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The exterior scope proposed to convert the buildings to residential use is minimal. The stained glass is being retained where possible. The stained glass which is to be removed shall be framed and backlit in display installations within the corridors of the building.
- *Accessibility Guideline | Recommended: Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.*
 - o The proposed ADA ramp allows for retention of and access through historic entrance doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and the Accessibility Guideline recommendation.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:20:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sam Katovitch represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Katovitch explained the two changes since the in-concept application, the color samples for the windows, and a new trash room door in a non-historic addition.
 - o Ms. Gutterman recommended retaking the photograph of color swatches without the plastic sleeves prior to review by the Historical Commission.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that the colors are appropriate.
- Mr. Detwiler thanked the applicant for submitting an in-concept application previously and for submitting a full and complete application now for final approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- At its 10 November 2023 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for a nearly identical scope of work and voted to approve the application in-concept, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, and the Accessibility Guideline Recommendation. The only design change to this application for final approval is the addition of a door in the non-historic one-story addition on the Richard Newton Memorial Building. This application has also been supplemented with window color samples.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed scope retains and preserves the overall historic character of the church complex, satisfying Standard 2.
- The exterior scope proposed to convert the buildings to residential use is minimal. The stained glass is being retained where possible. The stained glass that being removed will be framed and backlit in display installations within the corridors of the building. This scope satisfies Standard 9.
- The proposed ADA ramp allows for retention of and access through historic entrance doors, satisfying the Accessibility Guideline recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and the Accessibility Guideline recommendation.

ITEM: 2040 Christian St MOTION: Approval 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	3				4

ADDRESS: 627 N 16TH ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 627 N 16TH LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects, Sam Katovitch, Anthony Mascieri

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition on an Italianate twin at a contributing property in the Spring Garden Historic District. It also proposes to cut out a portion of the sidewalk in front of the building and expand an existing window opening for a new basement egress well. The building was constructed in 1875 and is three stories tall with a pitched roof, prominent cornice, and marble water table. The addition will be located at the rear of the building and extend to the north property line while leaving a narrow space on its south side. The application proposes to demolish the three-story rear wall of the building along with a one-story rear shed addition and construct a new addition at the rear of the building that will expand the extend approximately 17 feet beyond the existing rear wall and sit slightly higher than the current rear ell of the historic building. It will be clad in brick on the walls that are visible from nearby Wallace St and fiber cement panels on the walls that face the neighbor to the north and shared alleyway to the west. The rear of the building is visible both obliquely from the front on 16th Street looking down the side of the building and prominently from the side and rear along neighboring Wallace Street and the addition will be visible from both streets.

The applicants submitted an earlier application for an addition that was significantly larger, extended to both north and south property lines, and featured a much larger blank wall presented to the Wallace Street point of view, that was denied by the Historical Commission at its 12 April 2024 meeting. Since their first proposal, they have reduced the size of the addition by more than half, pulled it away from the south property line, proposed using brick cladding in place of fiber cement panels for portions of the addition, and added windows to the south wall based on previous comments from the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a three-story rear addition.
- Add a basement egress well.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o With the revisions, the size, scale and proportion, and massing of the proposed addition satisfy Standard 9. Philadelphia has a long tradition of enlarging rowhouses and twins by extending the rear ells. Pushing the addition to the north, away from the south property line, allows for windows in the south façade of the addition, improving its appearance from the public right-of-way.
 - o The proposed fiber cement panels on the north and east walls of the addition do not meet Standard 9. The material is not compatible with the historic materials or features of the building. The cladding should be replaced with an alternate material like lap siding that is more appropriate for a rear addition on a historic building.
 - o The proposed basement egress well will satisfy Standard 9 if the window is designed to include a horizontal mullion at the position of the former sill so that the upper piece of glass replicates the size and proportion of historic basement window.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the cladding material is changed to a lap siding instead of panels for the north and east walls of the addition and the front egress window is designed to appear like the historic basement window above grade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:40:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ian Toner represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Toner confirmed that the applicants are willing to change the proposed panel siding to a lap siding design and design the new basement egress window to match the appearance of the existing above-grade windows.
- Ms. Stein complemented the changes to the application from its first presentation and highlighted the move from fiberglass panels to brick cladding and pulling the addition away from the south property line to allow for windows. She added that she agrees with the staff recommendations to change the remaining panel siding to a lap design and to keep the new basement egress window in line with the existing.
- Ms. Gutterman pondered an appropriate design for the basement egress window. She pointed out that, currently, the front basements windows have a three-light design.
 - o Mr. Till confirmed that the three-light appearance is historically accurate.
 - o Mr. Detwiler added that they should try to keep the existing glass size and then just extend the design down below the level of the street.

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the placement of the proposed rooftop condenser. She wanted to ensure it would not be oversized or visible from the street level at the front of the building.
 - o Mr. Toner confirmed that they will make sure the rooftop equipment is not visible. He added that other units will be placed on the ground level at the rear in an area not visible to surrounding streets.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to confirm that they were not proposing to build a roof deck.
 - o Mr. Toner confirmed that there is no proposed deck as part of the application.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the slope of the roof and how that would affect the placement of the condensers.
 - o Mr. Toner replied that the slope was considered and that the further back the units are placed, the less visible they will be.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the positioning of the proposed addition and why it aligns with the north edge of the property line instead of the south where the party wall exists between the property and its twin neighbor.
 - o Mr. Toner responded that there are two reasons why the design is positioned like this. The first is that the Architectural Committee previously asked whether windows could be added to the south wall and in order to do that, they had to pull the addition away from the south property line. The second reason is that, as they understand it, the zoning classification for the property would require a 12-foot side setback if the addition did not touch the north property line, which would leave too little usable space for an addition.
 - o Mr. Detwiler asked for clarification on the zoning issue.
 - o Mr. Toner further explained that the building is currently considered a semidetached structure and would require a side yard of at least 12 feet, but if they design the addition to touch the north property line, then the building would be considered attached, which would not require that same side setback.
 - o Mr. Detwiler questioned that interpretation of the zoning code and he and Ms. Stein added that additions to buildings in the city are commonly aligned along the shared party wall when configured as a twin such as this one.
 - o The Committee members questioned whether the zoning codes were being properly interpreted in this case.
 - o Mr. Detwiler continued to say that he appreciates the addition of brick to the rear and south facades and appreciates the roofline of the proposed addition aligns with that of the existing ell, though he wished the addition could be pushed back from the north property line.
- Mr. Detwiler asked for more information about the interpretation of the zoning code as it relates to the positioning of the addition against the north property line and suggested the applicants should contact the office in charge of zoning for clarification and request a written response to confirm their interpretation.
 - o Mr. Toner responded that they made their judgment based on previous projects they have worked on that required the same thing for similar properties. He added that they will attempt to get a written response but worried that they may not have enough time to do so before the next Historical Commission meeting.
 - o Mr. Detwiler reiterated his desire to get clarification since this interpretation could affect future applications as well.
 - o Mr. Toner replied that this building is somewhat unique in that it is fully detached at its front whereas most similar homes in the city are at least somewhat attached.

- The Committee members discussed voting to recommend denial with the understanding that the applicant would confirm the zoning requirements for their review at the Historical Commission meeting and that the Architectural Committee is focused on architectural matters and do not have the jurisdiction to interpret the zoning.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lisa Ernst, the co-owner of the property to the north at 629 N. 16th Street, opposed the application. She supported the reduced footprint of the addition but criticized the placement against the north property line and the interpretation of the zoning code.
- Andrew Biggin, the co-owner of the property to the north at 629 N. 16th Street, opposed the application.
- Justino Navarro, Spring Garden Civic Association and Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, opposed the application. He was concerned about the continued visibility of the addition from both Wallace Street and North Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed addition has been scaled down to an appropriate size compared to the previous applications.
- The proposed addition will be visible both from nearby public rights-of-way on N. 16th Street and Wallace Street.
- The positioning of the addition along the north property line is out of character with the rear ells of the houses on the block and should be pulled away from it. The positioning is potentially related to zoning requirements.
- The proposed use of panel siding on the north and west side of the addition should be replaced with a more appropriate design such as lap siding.
- The proposed basement egress well window on the front of the property should be designed so that it matches the appearance of the existing window as closely as possible.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The positioning of the addition along the north property line is not in keeping with the character of the other buildings on the block, but it allows windows along the south side of the addition. The applicant should confirm the interpretation of the zoning code related to positioning the addition along the property lines and the need for setbacks and provide that information to the Historical Commission.
- The application will satisfy Standard 9 if the proposed panel siding is changed to a more appropriate lap siding and the proposed basement egress well window is designed to match the historic windows.

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

ITEM: 627 N 16th St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					X
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein		X			
Total	2	1			4

ADDRESS: 613 S HANCOCK ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Mark and Sally Forester

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1765; John Fullerton House

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to demolish a highly altered rear ell and construct a rear addition that encloses a portion of the rear of the main block at 613 S. Hancock Street. No work is proposed to the front façade. The addition features a side-gable roof with skylights and facades clad in cementitious panels with one-over-one windows. The ridge of the rear addition is taller than the main block but will not be visible from S. Hancock Street.

The rear ell of 613 S. Hancock Street faces the 600 block of S. Howard Street, a short, dead-end alley used primarily for parking. Three non-historic buildings with first-floor garages stand on the east side of S. Howard Street, across from the rear of 613 S. Hancock Street. The rears of the buildings facing the west side of S. Howard Street have been significantly altered. There is a history of building demolition on the 600 block of S. Howard Street that has diminished its historic significance. The 1917 Sanborn map shows a now demolished five-story building that would have obscured the view of the rear of 613 S. Hancock Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear ell
- Construct three-story rear addition

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*

- o No work is proposed to the historic front façade. The rear of 600 S. Hancock Street, including the ell, is highly altered.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The scale of the proposed addition is large, but it does not diminish the designated properties facing S. Hancock Street and there is no historic fabric on S. Howard Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:09:52

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the in-concept application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sam Katovitch represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant wanted to comment.
 - o Mr. Katovitch reiterated that the addition will not be visible from S. Hancock Street.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired if the staff had additional comments regarding the cementitious cladding or aluminum windows on the addition.
 - o Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff stated that the staff does not object to these design elements, owing to the lack of historic context on S. Howard Street.
- Ms. Gutterman responded that everything has character to preserve.
- Ms. Gutterman pondered the height of the skylights and HVAC condensers.
 - o Mr. Katovitch responded that the skylights will have a low profile, approximately 6 inches tall and that the condensers will not be visible from S. Hancock Street.
- Ms. Stein and Mr. Detwiler expressed concern that the roof configuration, specifically where the slope of the addition's roof meets the slope of the historic building's roof, will collect water and potentially damage the historic building.
 - o Mr. Katovitch noted that a cricket, upgraded downspout and emergency scupper will be installed to protect the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed a preference for a shed roof instead of a gable roof on the addition.
 - o Mr. Katovitch replied that the client prefers the gable roof, which allows for the installation of a pneumatic elevator. The gable provides room for the machine cabinet beneath the gable's ridge. Further, he stated that the roof height is dictated by the project program. He wondered if a shed addition with a roof height equivalent to the proposed gable roof would be acceptable.
- Ms. Stein observed that installation of a shed roofed addition will cause the construction of a parapet wall and that water from the historic building's rear roof slope could still cause water damage to the historic building. She expressed support for a shed roof even if that requires the elevator's mechanical equipment to extend above its height.
 - o Mr. Katovitch stated that he would work with the client to respond to the Committee's concerns.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposal is in-concept.
- The massing of the proposal is acceptable and will not be visible from S. Hancock Street.
- The side-facing gable roof of the addition slopes down and meets the side facing gable of the historic building. The configuration of the two roofs is problematic because stormwater could harm the historic building's rear wall.
- The proposed addition is clad in cementitious panels with metal windows.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 because the shape of the roof of the addition could cause drainage issues, resulting in damage to the historic building.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 because the addition's cementitious cladding and metal windows are incompatible with the historic context.

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

ITEM: 613 S Hancock St					
MOTION: Denial					
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	3				4

ADDRESS: 208-12 VINE ST

Proposal: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Stortz

Applicant: Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design

History: Existing structures approved for demolition, 2023

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a six-story building with roof deck. The Historical Commission previously approved the demolition of the former John Stortz and Son complex of buildings, pending the approval of plans for a new building. The proposed building would include 35 residential units and a seven-car garage accessed from New Street. The exterior of the building would be clad in a mix of brick, vertical metal siding, and fiber cement siding, with metal bands and cornices. Windows would be metal-clad wood.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a six-story building with roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The massing of the proposed building is compatible in scale with the immediate surroundings, which is comprised of primarily newly constructed apartment buildings.
 - o The use of brick along Vine Street responds to the immediate surroundings as well as the historic district as a whole.
 - o Using more brick on the secondary elevations, particularly along New Street, would make this building fit better into the surrounding district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the cladding materials are refined, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:23:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Agata Reister and developer Noah Ostroff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked for clarification about the staff's recommendation regarding the cladding material.
 - o Mr. Maust answered that the staff felt that the balance between brick and other materials, especially on the New Street elevation, could be improved.
 - o Ms. Reister spoke about her design team's decision to have brick turn the corner onto the side elevation and limit the fiber cement siding to elevations with lower visibility.

- Ms. Stein asked for clarification about the vertical metal siding.
 - o Ms. Reister answered that it is a corrugated metal siding with a factory finish. She pointed to several nearby buildings which used similar cladding to that proposed.
- Ms. Stein asked for the color of the fiber cement panel.
 - o Ms. Reister suggested that it would be a dark grey.
- Ms. Stein and Ms. Gutterman asked for more information about the materials and colors proposed.
- Ms. Stein asked for more context renderings or elevations to show the proposed massing compared to the neighboring structures.
 - o Ms. Reister noted that there is a height limit in the neighborhood and this building will be the same height as the neighboring building.
 - o Mr. Detwiler noted that context renderings or elevations would be helpful to evaluate the proposed window locations and ceiling heights.
- Ms. Reister noted a willingness to provide material samples to the Historical Commission in advance of the next meeting.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the applicant could submit more materials but stated that she felt the application was insufficient for the Committee's approval.
- Ms. Reister asked if the application could be considered as "in-concept" rather than asking for final approval.
 - o Mr. Farnham noted that the application could be downgraded from a final approval review to an in-concept review at the request of the applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia echoed the Committee's requests for more detail in the application.
- Robert Gurmankin of Franklin Bridge North Neighbors asked whether the historic Stortz sign could be reused on the new building.
 - o Mr. Ostroff answered that the Stortz family, the current property owner, intended to remove and retain the sign, given its association with the family.
- Jay Farrell echoed Mr. Gurmankin's interest in the historic sign being integrated into the new building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- More information, particularly about the specific materials proposed, including the vertical metal siding and the color of the cement board siding, is needed.
- Elevations showing the neighboring buildings would allow a better evaluation of the proportions of the building as well as the location of windows.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not provide sufficient information to evaluate the extent to which the proposal satisfies the Standards.

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

ITEM: 208-12 Vine St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					X
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	3				4

ADDRESS: 7600 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Construct new buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cresheim Green Associates

Applicant: Scott Seibert, Cresheim Green Associates

History: 1916, St. Martin's Coal Company Office; 1966 rear addition

Individual Designation: 8/13/2021

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for the construction of eight single-family attached houses and a parking structure at 7600 Germantown Avenue. The proposed development will stand behind the former St. Martin's Coal Company Office. Although the full parcel was designated in 2021, the nomination focused on the 1916 Colonial Revival style building directly fronting Germantown Avenue. No part of the historic building will be demolished or moved as part of the new construction.

The eight three-story buildings will have contemporary fenestration and be clad in yellow-brown brick and neutral tone stucco. The gable roofs will be green roofs. Windows and doors will be aluminum. In between the historic building at the front of the property and the new houses, a metal frame parking structure is proposed with rooftop solar panels. The parking structure will be set back approximately 10 feet from the historic building's 1966 addition. As part of the overall redevelopment of the site, the historic building will be repurposed for a new use. The rehabilitation of the historic building is not part of this application.

Historically, the narrow lot behind the office building has served industrial uses. Images and maps from the early twentieth century show coal bins and related company structures along the length of the property. This property is adjacent to a former rail line that allowed coal to be delivered directly to St. Martin's Coal Company.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct seven-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed new construction does not alter or connect with the historic building. Historically, the site was populated by various industrial type structures. Therefore, the addition of a parking structure and new residential homes does not have a negative impact on the historic character of the 1916 building. The massing, size, scale, and materials are compatible with the overall site. In general, the proposed application meets Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed new construction could be removed from the historic site in the future, leaving all surrounding contributing structures intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:52:02

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Developers Scott Seibert and G.C. Seibert and architect Jim Cassidy represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein observed that the buildings proposed are quite tall with gable roofs and this would be a change from the former lower industrial buildings originally on the site. She added the new construction would be a drastic change to the community and the context of the surrounding historic buildings. Ms. Stein said she cannot tell from the site plan provided what kind of buffer is between the proposed building and the adjacent historic church property.
 - o Mr. Cassidy responded that the adjacent New Covenant campus sits higher than their property. He also noted that there is an eight-foot wall along much of the property line. Mr. Cassidy stated that, owing to the grade change between the sites, his development would sit one story lower than the New Covenant buildings at the adjacent site. He pointed out that there is a former rail line on the opposite side of their property that is elevated above their property. He asserted that his development would be minimally visible from the adjacent properties and public right-of-way, owing to the grade changes and other features. Owing to the long, thin shape of the property and the surrounding terrain, the new buildings will not be conspicuous from the street.
- Mr. Detwiler said he feels the buildings are too tall and he would like to see the buildings drop in height a little and have more of a dormer effect on the third floor. He commented that these buildings are in essence three stories plus a gable. He

- remarked that many of the vernacular buildings in this area are two stories plus a gable.
- o Mr. Cassidy replied that the eave is important. He said it currently is showing about eight or nine feet and that they could reduce this to six to seven feet.
 - o Mr. Detwiler pointed to a rendering that showed the front of the property and the visual relationship between the historic building and the new building closest to Germantown Avenue. He noted that the new construction looks very tall compared to the front historic building. Mr. Detwiler said the historic building is beloved in the neighborhood and the scale between old and new is too dramatic. He concluded that he would like to see the new construction drop half a story to reduce the contrast.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated he does not like the parking structure with the solar panels. He said its proximity to the historic building feels too close. Mr. Detwiler inquired if the parking was for the new homes.
 - o Mr. Scott Seibert replied that it would likely be parking for the historic building. He pointed out that although the parking structure is approximately 10 feet from the 1966 addition to the historic building, it is actually almost 40 feet from the original historic building.
 - o Mr. Detwiler said he would prefer not to see the parking structure. He noted that because their application includes no information about rehabilitation of the historic building, the proposal for the parking structure seems premature. Mr. Detwiler added that the inclusion of the solar panels feels heavy and large.
 - Ms. Stein addressed the building materials. She commented that she is not sure why they chose a yellow tone brick and that it is awkward to have stucco below the brick. She said normally the masonry comes all the way down to the ground and visually supports the façade. Ms. Stein continued that the brick is treated like wallpaper and the brick appears as a hovering box and not standing on its own. She said the relationship between the brick and the stucco base feels awkward. Ms. Stein said she is not sure why the applicant chose these materials.
 - o Mr. Cassidy said they have chosen similar materials for other projects. He said the brick is a veneer and is not pretending to be a load-bearing masonry wall. Mr. Cassidy said it is not a historical aesthetic, but their team felt it worked well for this project.
 - o Mr. Stein inquired about the color palette of yellow brick and mauve toned stucco.
 - o Mr. Cassidy said the idea was to use a brick that has a lot of texture to it.
 - o Mr. Scott Seibert stated the material selections were partially inspired by residential developments in England where the brick used had a lot of texture to it and different color tones. He said they are hoping to find and source a similar brick available in the United States and noted their goal was to select materials that broke up the massing rather than constructed something that appeared as one monolithic mass.
 - Ms. Stein asked the applicant to talk about the proposed green roofs. She said she had never seen green roofs used on this type of pitched roof and wondered if they had an example of this in their application.
 - o Mr. Cassidy replied they do not have an example of this included but that they have been working with consultant Studio Sustena on the proposed roofs. He explained they have done green roofs on pitched roofs before, and their team is relying on Studio Sustena for guidance on this. Mr. Cassidy explained that the

- Philadelphia Water Department (PWD) has specific guidelines for stormwater on the site and the selection of green roofs was related to PWD's requirements.
- o Mr. Scott Seibert explained that 7600 Germantown Avenue is a challenging site. He said they have been working extensively with PWD owing to a sizable interceptor running through the site that cuts across the property and then runs under the nearby train line and meets up at Cresheim Road. He continued that this has made any development on the property difficult, and noted they are working with Studio Sustena because of the consultant's civil engineering experience. Mr. Seibert said the only way they could develop the property was to make the project almost completely pervious because it would allow them to tie into some existing connections on their side of train tracks along Germantown Avenue. He added that as a result, their development must be 95% pervious including the roofs. Mr. Seibert stated that PWD only recently signed off on the project with the specific roof pitch shown while requiring that they add in tie-offs and permanent ladders so that roof maintenance will happen. He said that if this project comes to fruition, it would be a real model for urban infill sites that are more challenging to develop. He concluded that those familiar with the site recognize that it has been a brownfield for decades and that prior to that it was a coal site.
 - Ms. Gutterman inquired if the applicant is asking for in-concept approval rather than final approval. She commented that final approval applications generally include more information.
 - o Mr. Scott Seibert said this is his first time working with the Historical Commission and if they need to provide more details about the project, their team can provide it. He noted that they thought the application submitted included all of the required information for final approval. He explained they still need variances from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Mr. Seibert said it was the Streets Department and Planning Department that recently advised their team to contact the Historical Commission to start the project review. He said he was not aware more materials were required for final review but is amenable to providing whatever the Committee needs to feel comfortable about the project.
 - Mr. Detwiler said that overall, this is a "cool" project and is a great use of this really challenging site and applauds the applicant for all they have done to get to this point. He said that his main concern is the scale and especially the three buildings closest to the road. Mr. Detwiler said if this group of three buildings could drop by approximately half a story, that would resolve his main design concern. He noted that the reduction in height would be helpful for the visual relationship between the historic building and new construction.
 - o Mr. Cassidy pointed out that the historic building at the front of the property is quite small, but they can definitely revisit the scale change between the historic and new buildings nearest to Germantown Avenue.
 - o Ms. Gutterman said this may be resolved by making the roofs less steep.
 - o Mr. Detwiler said he is not telling the applicant to remove a full story. He pointed out that pulling the gable down and perhaps creating two-story buildings with dormered third floors would better relate to the vernacular buildings around the site. Mr. Detwiler said this would help resolve the difference in scale between the old and new on the site.
 - o Ms. Stein said that the relationship between the front, historic building and the first new buildings is really important. She suggested trees and landscaping in

between the historic building and new construction. Ms. Stein also agreed with Committee comments regarding reducing the slope of the roof.

- The Committee members expressed concerns about the request for final approval and indicated that more information is needed.
 - o Mr. Scott Seibert inquired about the timing of completing the in concept and final approval applications. He explained that he wishes to address the Committee's concerns but noted that any additional changes may require additional approval by PWD. He also pointed out that this site originally had coal sheds and other buildings on it, so their proposal would, in fact, restore the relationship of the historic building at the front of the property to the structures behind it.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society stated that he supports the proposal for new housing on the site but finds the parking structure to be inappropriate and unnecessary.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The overall application should be supplemented with more detailed drawings and elevations. The application appears as more of an in-concept application rather than final approval.
- Rehabilitation of the historic building is not part of this application.
- The relationship between the historic building and new construction is key to the success of the site's development. The height and scale differences between the historic building at the front of the property and the three new buildings closest to Germantown Avenue should be reconsidered. The new buildings should be lowered in height. The applicant should also revisit the steep pitch of the gable roof and potentially lower it.
- The parking structure with rooftop solar panels may be visible from the street and too close to the historic building. Since the structure would likely serve the future use of the historic building, including it with the new construction application may be premature.
- Adding trees and other landscaping between the historic building and new construction would serve as a welcome buffer.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- More information is needed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Historical Commission consider this an in-concept application, not an application for final approval. The Architectural Committee suggested that the applicant reconsider the height of the new buildings relative to the historic building, reconsider the parking structure with solar panels, and provide more detailed drawings of the elevations, materials, and window sizes.

ITEM: 7600 Germantown Ave MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					X
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					
Amy Stein	X				X
Total	3				4

ADDRESS: 341 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Construct three-story addition on three-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Scorsone

Applicant: Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: 2002

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

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 341 N. Front Street is a three-story, two-bay, brick, vernacular house constructed ca. 2002 and is classified as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. The upper bays at the N. Front Street façade appear to be clad in vinyl siding. The ground-story of the rear or Water Street façade is also brick and has a garage, with the upper floors clad in vinyl siding. A deck and railing are visible on the roof of the second story.

This application proposes to construct a three-story addition on top of the existing building. The third story of the N. Front façade is proposed to be reconstructed and clad in a gray brick veneer to match existing. Aluminum composite panels are proposed to clad the upper floors. At the rear or Water Street façade, the floors of the addition are proposed to be clad in the same aluminum composite panels. Covered balconies are proposed at the top floors of both the N. Front and Water Street facades. Glass guardrails are proposed throughout. Aluminum-clad wood windows are also proposed throughout both facades.

A similar application was reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission in 2022. The Historical Commission approved the application in May 2022 and the approved scheme is shown in the current application. This review focuses on the revisions to the approved version, specifically to the cladding materials and windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story addition on a three-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o Because this structure is not historic fabric on this structure, no historic material will be destroyed, satisfying Standard 9.
 - o The proposal changes the red brick to dark gray brick and aluminum panels on the front and rear facades. The window placement and configuration have also been updated. The revisions as proposed are not compatible in terms of scale, fenestration, and materials with the district as a whole. For these reasons, the proposal does not satisfy Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o There is no historic fabric to protect, therefore the proposal satisfies Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:26:42

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rustin Ohler and owner John Scorsone represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Ohler stated there is no change to scale or massing from the original application to the revised application. The changes focus on the exterior materials and the fenestration on the third floor and mezzanine only. He provided the Committee with more specific details about the revised materials and windows.
- Ms. Stein asked why the changes were proposed and if the design approved in 2022 had been constructed.
 - o Mr. Ohler replied that the approved plan had not been executed as the owners had a change of heart. He said they had concerns about the approved design and put the project on hold for 18 months. Mr. Ohler noted that they have come back to the design during the last several months. He explained that the revised design includes changes the owners want before moving ahead with the construction. Mr. Ohler explained that the windows in the bathroom were a key concern and that they prefer the revised material palette much more than the one approved by the Historical Commission in 2022.
- Ms. Gutterman said that she understands that the surrounding neighborhood buildings are primarily brick but wanted to know if there are dark brick buildings in the same area as this residence.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that there are no similar neighboring buildings on Front Street but there is darker brick present on newer construction on nearby streets in the historic district. He noted that buildings behind the property on Water Street have a cast stone base and black brick cladding, similar to their proposed design.

- Ms. Stein asked the staff to clarify the scope of the review.
 - o Ms. Mehley responded that the Committee should focus its review on the changes proposed to the exterior materials and windows. She noted that the approval for the application from 2022 is still valid, and it is only the changes to the approved design that should be considered by the Committee.
 - o Mr. Farnham confirmed the approval is still valid and cannot be revoked at this point, but the Committee can decide if the changes proposed are compatible with the historic district.
- Mr. Detwiler said he is bothered by the materials more on the front than the back of the building. He pointed to the approved design and opined that it picks up on the traditional Philadelphia rowhouse with brick on the lower portion and gray at the roofline in a contemporary way. He said the new is unapologetically different and reads as a five-story building.
 - o Mr. Ohler asked if Mr. Detwiler's concerns were the cast stone base or the change in brick color from red to gray because the scale and massing had not changed.
- Ms. Gutterman said she is concerned about the height of the cast stone base and that it is too tall. She added that it would be more appropriate if it was 30 inches in height. Mr. Detwiler noted that a historic cast stone water table would end below the window.
 - o Mr. Scorsone pointed out that similar exterior cladding was on a residence one block away on N. 3rd Street and that the cast stone exceeds the height of the front doors. He contended that the materials, such as the black and gray brick, are already present on surrounding buildings in the neighborhood.
 - o Ms. Gutterman stated that if, they want to use the cast stone, it should clad the entire first floor and extend above the head of the window as opposed to the proposed design, in which the cast stone ends at the windowsill and then transitions to brick at the jambs and head of the window.
 - o Mr. Scorsone asked for clarification. He asked if Ms. Gutterman was asking for the cast stone to be raised or lower from its current endpoint.
 - o Ms. Gutterman said that it either needs to be a lower cast-stone base or full-height cast-stone cladding on the first floor.
- Ms. Gutterman indicated she does not agree with the use of dark gray brick.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the changes to the windows on the third floor.
 - o Mr. Scorsone said those had to be changed because there is a bathroom in the interior where those windows are located, and full-height windows do not work in a bathroom and shower area. He explained the tall center window remains, but it will be opaque for privacy. Mr. Scorsone stated there is presently a bathroom in this location and it needs to stay there.
 - o Mr. Ohler asked if they should omit the tall center window.
 - o Ms. Gutterman said that they could omit it if it is going to be opaque.
- The Committee commented on changes to the entrance area and third floor that were appropriate in the original approved scheme but not with the revisions.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society observed that the design is a perplexing mix of materials and sizes. He commented that, if the metal panels were eliminated from the design and replaced with gray brick, the design would be improved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The design approved by the Historical Commission in 2022 reads as a contemporary interpretation of a Philadelphia rowhouse, but the revised design is incompatible with the historic neighborhood.
- The revised window sizes and locations on the front façade are not compatible with the historic district.
- The cast stone on the front façade should be limited to the area below the first-floor window like a watertable or extended to cover the entire first floor but should not end awkwardly part way up the first-floor window.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 as the design is not compatible in terms of scale, fenestration, and materials with the historic district.
- The application satisfies Standard 10 as there is no historic fabric to protect.

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

ITEM: 341 N Front St MOTION: Denial 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	3				4

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:52:14

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:56 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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