

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

**TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2023
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Makai Milton, Historical Commission intern
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

- Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
- Jay Farrell
- Virginia Maksymowicz
- Marissa Howard, JKRP
- Alex Balloon
- John Hunter
- Hsing-Yuan Chen, SKY DESIGN
- Mirai Yasuyama, SKY DESIGN
- Naché Patoir
- Robert Gurmankin
- Shimi Zakin, Atrium Design Group
- Snežana Litvinović, Atrium Design Group
- Stephanie Pennypacker
- Linda Farrow

Blaise Tobia
Sophia Chihlas
Wen Lin
Peter McGuinness
Diane Pringle
Jerry Roller, JKRP
George Poulin
Jackie Tileston
John Calvitti
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Stephanie Boggs Magagna
Sarah Mitchell
Lucy Davis
Kirk McCarthy
Bridget Novielli
Michael Lopsonzski
Debra McCarty

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 3733 LANCASTER AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Henry Pemberton

Applicant: Wen Lin, Lui Consulting and Construction LLC

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Powelton Village Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/2022

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story rear addition on a contributing property in the Powelton Village Historic District. The addition will also include two roof decks, one at the front on the main block of the house and another at the rear of the addition. The building was constructed in 1875 and is three stories tall with a flat roof. The rear of the building is not visible from any public rights-of-way, but the front is largely visible along views down Lancaster Avenue as well as at the nearby intersection of 38th Street and Lancaster Avenue. The application proposes to demolish the rear wall of the property, including a rear bay window, and construct an addition at the rear of the building that will expand the footprint and extend one extra story above the historic building. The fourth story of the addition and proposed front roof deck will be visible from long views down Lancaster Avenue and from the intersection at 38th Street and Lancaster Avenue.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a four-story rear addition.
- Construct two roof decks.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JULY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed new addition does not meet Standard 9. It is too large and is not compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The front deck does not meet the Roofs Guidelines because it will be visible from the public rights-of-way at front of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:07

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Wen Lin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Lin stated that the property was previously used as a community center and has been vacant for several years. He explained that the renovation will return it to a mixed-use building which preserves the existing historic building while adding massing for expanded occupancy. He explained that the project will entail a partial demolition of the rear wall because it is in deteriorated condition and so they can expand the existing commercial space on the first floor into the new space provide by the addition.
- Ms. Stein asked about the context of the addition relative to the block. She mentioned that the application included no site plan to explain its length relative to its neighbors and whether the addition will be visible from slots between buildings along 38th Street. She added that it looks like the addition extends all the way to the back of the lot.
 - o Mr. Lin responded that the two adjacent lots are currently vacant and there will be a large apartment building constructed there in the near future with a length of about 130 feet. The length of his addition is smaller compared to this apartment building, and the apartment building will block visibility of the east side of this proposed addition.
 - o Ms. Stein clarified that the proposed length of this addition is 118 feet.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is difficult to judge the relative sizes of this project and the imminent construction next door without site plans both for this address and the design for the proposed adjacent building.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that more documentation is needed to make a final decision.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey added that this property is part of a historic district, and virtually all of the surrounding buildings are three stories high with a stepped down two-story rear wing. This project, at four stories in height, is much larger than its surroundings.

- Ms. Stein commented that, owing to the height of the proposed addition and the arrangement of the streets around the property, there will be long views that make the fourth story of this addition visible. She added that the Architectural Committee does consider taller additions at the rear of properties but looks for them to be inconspicuous or not visible from the public right-of-way. There is no documentation included in the application proving that this cannot be seen from surrounding long viewpoints. She added that there are additional questions regarding how much of the existing building will be demolished, noting that the Architectural Committee typically does not recommend approval of the removal of an entire rear wall of a historic building. She suggested that some of the masonry wall needs to be retained to accommodate the sheer force on the building. She suggested the applicant reconsider both the size and height of the proposed addition as well as the amount of demolition of the rear wall.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee typically does not recommend approval of roof decks on the main block of a historic building, and certainly not positioned in locations as visible as this deck is proposed. She agreed that the proposed addition is too large and overwhelms the historic building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented about the widening of the building at the rear. He asked how that will affect the neighbors.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the application lacks context for how the addition will be positioned relative to neighboring properties.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed and stated that the lack of context makes it difficult to understand exactly how this project fits within the historic district.
 - o Mr. Lin asked if he should revise the application to show the proposed apartment building on the neighboring lots. He stated that the apartment building will be approximately three times larger than his project.
 - o Mr. Till confirmed that the proposed apartment building on the adjacent lots was permitted prior to the creation of the Powelton Village Historic District, which is why it was not reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission.
 - o Ms. Gutterman added that even if there will be a large building next door, it does not change how the Architectural Committee reviews this project.
- Mr. Detwiler emphasized that he believed there will be visibility from 38th Street through gaps between buildings and from long views at the front due to the additional height. He added that the applicant should supplement the application with more documentation including a full site plan drawing and additional context showing the adjacent properties for review at the Historical Commission meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Diane Pringle, a neighbor, asked about trash storage. She added that there does not seem to be an alleyway included.
 - o Mr. Lin responded that trash will be stored in the rear yard and there will be private trash pickup at the property.
- Blaise Tobia, a near neighbor, agreed with Architectural Committee's comments and stated that this property is identical in dimensions to his own home and therefore he knows that the application misrepresents the height of the building. He stated that the correct height is 34 feet, 8 inches, not the 30 feet shown on the drawings. He asserted that if an 8-foot-tall mezzanine level is constructed, the addition will be taller than the 38-foot height limit for the CMX-2 zoning of the property.

- o Mr. Lin responded that he would check the building height with a survey before the Historical Commission meeting.
- Jackie Tileston, a resident on the block, opposed the application. She commented that the issues brought up related to height and visibility are important and opined that this addition will impact her light and air.
- George Poulin, a neighbor, spoke in opposition to the scale of the addition. He stated that the proposed building will more than triple the square footage of the existing building. He noted that there are no other comparably scaled buildings on the block. He added that the materials proposed for the addition are very basic and will negatively affect the character of the block.
- Debra McCarty, a neighbor, opposed the application. She claimed that the building was not vacant prior to this ownership, and it had tenants in its upper floors. She reiterated that the massing of the proposal is too large and out of context with the surrounding properties.
- Virginia Maksymowicz, a resident on the block, opposed the application. She voiced opposition regarding the scale and design of the addition. She stated that no other building on the block is more than three stories in height. She claimed the addition will be visible from three public rights-of-way: Lancaster Avenue, 38th Street, and from behind on Baring Street through the gaps between the twins. She stated it will negatively affect her own home, adding noise and parking issues with many new renters. She explained that she purchased her property in 1996 and since that time, this building has never been used as a community center and had residential tenants up until the recent sale of the property.
- Sarah Mitchell, a resident on Baring Street behind the property, opposed the application. She asserted that the addition would block light to her yard. She added that Baring Street contains twin homes and one can see down their side yards to the area behind them where this addition will be visible. She voiced concern about the structural stability of the rear of the building.
- David Brick, a resident on the block, opposed the application. He commented that the addition is out of character with the neighborhood and will remove a large amount of greenspace at the rear, which characterizes the block.
- Peter McGuinness, a resident of Baring Street directly behind the property, opposed the application. He commented in opposition to the setback at the rear and overall massing of the proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Visibility of the rear of the building is mostly obscured from the public right-of-way, but the front is largely visible along views down Lancaster Avenue as well as at the nearby intersection of 38th Street and Lancaster Avenue.
- The fourth story of the addition and a roof deck proposed for the front of the main block of the historic building will likely be visible from surrounding public rights-of-way.
- The application does not include a site plan or other drawings showing the proposed addition in context with the neighboring buildings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new addition does not meet Standard 9. It is too large and is not compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building and the Powelton Village Historic District.

- The proposed mezzanine level and front roof deck fail to satisfy the Roofs Guideline, owing to the conspicuousness of these elements from the public right-of-way at the front of the building.

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

ITEM: 3733 Lancaster 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	7				

ADDRESS: 27 AND 29 S 2ND ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate buildings, replace storefronts

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: JFK Hospitality, US LP

Applicant: Hsing-Yuan Chen, Sky Design Studio PC

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval to renovate the buildings at 27 and 29 S. 2nd Street to include two ground-floor retail spaces and 12 residential units on the upper floors. The four-story masonry buildings were constructed in 1840. The buildings are individually designated and are contributing resources to the Old City Historic District. The original storefronts were significantly altered between 1957 and 1972 with new window and door openings and wood clapboard. The applicant seeks approval to install new storefronts. Additional exterior changes include the removal of a fire escape, mechanical structure on roof, and first-floor metal shutters.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing storefronts and install new storefronts.
- Remove fire escape and install Juliet balconies.
- Demolish mechanical shed on roof.
- Remove existing first floor shutters.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JULY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - o To satisfy Standard 2, the applicant should remove the clapboard on the front façade to determine if any historic architectural details or materials are present underneath.
 - o Removal of later and non-historic alterations such as the fire escape and mechanical shed meets Standard 2. More information should be provided about the first-floor metal shutters, which may have historical significance.
- *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.*
 - o If historic details and materials survive underneath the existing storefronts, these elements should be incorporated into the new storefront design to meet Standard 6.
 - o If the new windows and doors proposed for installation are historically appropriate in configuration and detail, this project element will meet Standard 6.
- *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 storefronts must be compatible with the historic building and district. If no historic materials survive behind existing clapboard on the storefronts, the applicant should propose storefront replacements that are sensitive in massing, size, scale, and architectural features to the historic building and compatible with similar buildings in the historic district to meet Standard 9. The proposed storefronts do not meet Standard 9.
 - o The installation of the new Juliet balconies in place of the fire escape meets Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:33:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Hsing-Yuan Chen and Mirai Yasuyama represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein inquired if the owner and applicant are willing to make the storefronts more compatible with the Old City Historic District.
 - o Mr. Chen confirmed that they are willing to work with the staff to create a more historically appropriate design for the buildings' storefronts. He said that they are willing to incorporate the Architectural Committee's feedback into their application prior to submitting for a building permit application.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired if both buildings were owned by the current owner. He also asked about the internal connections between the buildings.

- o Mr. Chen replied that his client owns both buildings. He explained the existing internal connections between the buildings and confirmed the revised egress locations.
- Ms. Stein asked if a roof deck is in the project scope. She asked for confirmation that the mechanical units will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - o Mr. Chen stated that a roof deck will not be part of this project. He pointed to floorplan H-3 in the application that showed all exterior mechanical equipment will be mounted on the rear second-floor roof and not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned if the mechanical equipment would be visible from Black Horse Alley.
 - o Ms. Yasuyama confirmed that the equipment would not be visible.
- Ms. Gutterman asked where the exterior shutters are located.
 - o Ms. Mehley showed applicant photos of the exterior shutters proposed for removal. She also displayed historic photographs of the building from the 1950s that staff provided with their recommendation. Ms. Mehley said that the photographs appear to show storefronts in the 1950s which may have already been modified but that specific architectural elements such as the first-floor cornice could be incorporated into the architect's new design for the storefronts.
- Mr. Detwiler commented on a visible pilaster that may be from the original storefronts. He recommended that the applicant work with the staff on removal of the current front siding material to determine what other historic fabric or evidence of the original storefronts exist behind the siding. Mr. Detwiler said it will likely inform the appropriate appearance for the new storefronts.
- Mr. Detwiler turned his focus to the buildings' windows. He observed the application calls for window replacement, but the windows are shown as one-over-one double-hung windows on one building and two-over-two double-hung windows on the other. Mr. Detwiler encouraged the staff to do more research on the historic configuration of the buildings' windows and communicate this to the applicant. Mr. Cluver also noted the different window configurations shown on the applicant's drawings. Mr. Detwiler pointed to the fourth-floor windows on the side elevation. He asked the applicant to review these window drawings because the size appears different than in the photographs.
 - o Mr. Chen confirmed they are not changing the size of the fourth-floor windows.
- Mr. Detwiler commented on the proposed Juliet balconies. He said he is accepting of the installation given that these openings have already been converted to doors. He commented that the different transom heights look odd, and he recommended that the doors get taller rather than the transoms. He stated that the transoms should remain consistent in their proportions to one another.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that there are infilled window openings on the side elevation. He commented that if the applicant chose to do so, these areas could be reopened with new windows.
 - o Mr. Chen said they had studied this and decided not to reopen these locations.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated the Architectural Committee appreciated the applicant's willingness to work with the staff on the storefronts. He said that the Architectural Committee could not provide more input on these areas until exploratory work is done so that the applicant knows what exists under the existing siding material.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated the metal shutters should be preserved. He said they are quite interesting and asked the applicant about the material and observed they are

likely blast shutters. Architectural Committee members noted if these are older or original metal shutters they should remain.

- o Mr. Chen confirmed they are metal shutters. He and Ms. Yasuyama confirmed they could remain in place and pinned back.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Job Itzkowitz of the Old City District commented in support of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- More research and investigation must be completed to design historically appropriate storefronts for both buildings.
- The plan for window replacement is inconsistent as it is shown in the application. The staff should provide details on the historically appropriate windows to the applicant.
- The removal of the fire escape and replacement with Juliet balconies is acceptable, but design details for balcony railing and doors with transoms must be refined.
- The first-floor metal shutters should be incorporated into the final design. To accommodate the opening of windows, the shutters can be secured open in order to remain in place.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2 because the proposed storefront systems are not compatible with the historic buildings and district, the removal of shutters does not provide justification for removal, and the proposed window replacement is not historically accurate.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6 because more research and physical investigation must be completed to design historically compatible storefronts, and the historic window appearance must be determined.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 owing to incompatibility of the proposed storefronts with the historic buildings and district. If no historic materials survive behind the existing clapboard on the storefronts, the applicant should propose storefront replacements that are sensitive in massing, size, scale, and architectural features to the historic buildings and compatible with similar buildings in the historic district. The application fails to meet Standard 9 because the proportions and details of the Juliet balcony doors, transoms, and railings should be further studied and revised to be compatible with subject properties.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented with the following suggestions for approval:

- Revise the storefront designs based on historic photographs and removal of existing siding to provide information regarding the historic appearance.
- Revise the Juliet balcony railings to be more compatible with the historic buildings.
- Revise the height of the Juliet balcony doors and transom openings. All transoms should have similar proportions.
- Show the mechanical equipment on the roof plan.
- Retain the metal shutters along the alley in an open position.
- Revise the front façade window appearance based on historic photographs.

ITEM: 27 and 29 S 2nd St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 230-36 VINE ST

Proposal: Salvage mosaic, construct mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Groom Investments LLC

Applicant: Shimshon Zakin, Atrium Design Group

History: 1949

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to salvage a mosaic mural by Isaiah Zagar from the Painted Bride building, demolish the non-contributing building, construct a mixed-use building, and reinstall parts of the mosaic. The property is located on the south side of the 200-block of Vine Street and runs along N. Bodine Street, a narrow service alley, back to New Street. The building was constructed as a parking garage in 1949, converted for office and warehouse use in 1953, and converted to the Painted Bride Arts Center in the 1980s. The Zagar mosaic was installed in 1991.

The new building would be six stories and 65 feet in height. It would be H-shaped in plan, essentially two buildings connected by a circulation tower with open courtyards to the east and west. The building would be clad in metal panels with cement panels at the circulation tower. In style, the new building would be contemporary. Parts of the salvaged mosaic would be reinstalled at the first floor.

The area around the site in Old City has seen extensive new construction in the last 10 or 15 years. There are several new buildings in the immediate area and several others planned. The proposed building is compatible with those buildings in size, scale, and massing. Moreover, the architectural features of the proposed building are differentiated from but compatible with the context. Although contemporary in design, the proposed building would be compatible with the area because it would serve as a reminder of the Painted Bride, a contemporary arts organization that was fundamental to the revitalization of Old City as an arts community in the late twentieth century.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Salvage mosaic mural;

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JULY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Demolish non-contributing building;
- Construct mixed-use building; and,
- Reinstall parts of the mosaic.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed building is differentiated from yet compatible with the architecture of the historic district.
 - o The massing, size, and scale of the proposed building satisfy Standard 9.
 - o The architectural features of the building, which are drawn from the mosaic and the memory of the Painted Bride arts organization, reflect the importance of contemporary art to the neighborhood and satisfy Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:55:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Shimi Zakin and Snežana Litvinović represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver stated that he does not understand the explanation of the relationship of the proposed building to the historic context. He commented that it is positive that sections of the mosaic are being retained and incorporated into the new building. He continued that it is a very white building, with a lot of glass and projecting bays. He contended that it is not compatible with the historic district.
- Mr. D'Alessandro objected to the curtain wall aspect of the design. He stated that the buildings in the Old City Historic District are masonry with punched openings.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out that in this area, you do see industrial buildings but, although they have large windows, they are always punched openings and are not floor-to-ceiling windows. He noted that the examples that the application showed for context do not seem relevant and suggested that the lighter color buildings used for context are painted. He stated that the proposed design is not contextual enough.
 - o Mr. Zakin said they are proud to present the proposed design. He stated that it is important to remember that this specific area of the Old City Historic District is different than other areas of the district. He pointed to the aerial view in the application and the context visible in the image. Mr. Zakin contended that in the direct area around the property, there are many new buildings with contemporary facades and new materials. He stressed the proposed design is compatible in size and massing. He pointed to slides in the presentation that address the proposal's compatibility.
- Mr. McCoubrey said the aspects of the project that attempt to make it fit into the historic district are being obscured by materials and the treatment of windows.
 - o Mr. Zakin reminded the Architectural Committee of the building that their design is replacing. He pointed out that the Painted Bride building visibly stands out and that is why they selected the white brick building to echo the memory of what

they are replacing. Mr. Zakin pointed out the incorporation of Zagar's tiles into the base of the building.

- Ms. Stein thanked the applicant for the high quality of the application and excellent presentation. She stated that the scale and massing of the proposal fits in with the neighborhood and historic district, and the overall size of the project feels right for this site and block. However, there is concern about the articulation. She called out the amount of glass and the stark white color in a dark historic context. Ms. Stein remarked the one thing that has not been mentioned is the bay windows and the chaotic articulation of those across the façade. She stated that she can understand the grid but then there are bay windows that are different heights and volumes and scales, which goes against the grid logic that is being presented. Ms. Stein expressed concern about the open glass corners. She said if those corners were closed up this would make a positive difference. Ms. Stein summarized that overall, she is concerned about the amount of glass, white color, bay windows, and the openness of the corners. She said she finds these elements not sympathetic to the historic district.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed to the perspective rendering on page 23 of the application. He observed the planer nature of the adjacent and nearby facades. He remarked that the perspective rendering illustrated the bristling nature of the proposed facade, and this was a result of the façade's visual elements.
- Ms. Lukachik commented that she likes the building but does not like the color. She commented that she believes the Committee is reacting to the starkness of the white color against everything else. She remarked that she would not mind all of the windows if it was a different color building. She continued that if there was a way to eliminate the diagonal openings on the first floor and replace these with larger arched openings this would be similar to neighboring buildings. Ms. Lukachik pointed out this may be another way better integrate it into the context of the neighborhood.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Lukachik that the white color is the most jarring part of the proposed design and the next is the quality of the façade and nature of the windows. He observed the fragmented appearance of the salvaged mosaic at the building base. He asked if it would be better to have larger sections together. He said the diagonal elements on the base detract from the mosaics and noted the existing Painted Bride mosaic does not have diagonals.
 - o Mr. Zakin discussed where the mosaic will be placed. He noted there may be an opportunity to use some of additional Painted Bride mosaic in the courtyard.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that all of the Architectural Committee members are unanimous in their agreement that the proposed building massing is acceptable, but the overall façade treatment is not compatible with the historic district.
 - o Mr. Zakin asked the Committee if the colorful materials shown in the courtyard would work on the façade.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro replied that he wants this to be a red brick façade.
- Ms. Stein said she noticed the approach to massing along the Vine Street façade is very different from other areas of Old City. She pointed out that they are taking the second through sixth floor and putting that at the property line and the first floor is recessed from the property line. Ms. Stein wondered how this would relate to a neighboring property.
 - o Mr. Zakin corrected Ms. Stein and explained the base elevation is in line with the neighboring facades and the upper floor projects beyond the property line.
 - o Ms. Stein stressed this type of projection may not be the right relationship with the neighboring buildings and three-story properties.

- o Mr. Detwiler commented this is likely the reason the bays feel out of place.
- The Architectural Committee members expressed concern about the plan for the first floor and how it is represented in the perspective renderings.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out that, in the Old City Historic District, the heights of the floors change. He suggested something like this could be incorporated into the design. He noted this may help with concerns that the second-floor projection on Vine Street is too low to the sidewalk.
- o Mr. Zakin replied that in historic industrial buildings, the floor heights generally do not change. He added that they would look at and consider Mr. Detwiler's comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The white color of the façade stands in stark contrast to the red brick context of the historic district.
- The amount of glass on the façade appears out of place in an area populated with masonry buildings with punched openings.
- There are too many elements on the facade, especially the chaotic articulation of the bay windows.
- The massing, size, and scale are appropriate in the context within the streetscape and historic district.
- The relationship of the building's elevation to the property line along Vine Street requires more clarity in the application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9 in terms of massing, size, and scale of the proposed building.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 because the architectural features of the building, specifically color and articulation, are not contextual with the neighboring buildings and overall Old City Historic District.

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

ITEM: 230-26 Vine St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 4432, 4436-42, 4400R, AND 4436R MAIN ST

Proposal: Construct mixed-use residential and commercial buildings and bridge

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rock Venice, LLC

Applicant: Jerry Roller, JKRP Architects

History: Vacant lots and non-historic building

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish non-contributing buildings on four parcels and to construct a new large-scale development with frontage on Main Street as well as Venice Island. The new construction on Main Street would be two stories in height and clad in red brick with large-scale storefront windows. A dark metal and glass bridge would span the drive aisle to the island. On Venice Island, a five-story 189-unit residential development with ground-level parking is proposed. The buildings would be clad in vertical and horizontal corrugated metal with terra cotta colored metal accents above an elevated ground-floor set on pedestals. A pedestrian bridge would connect the buildings on Venice Island and Main Street at the second level. Historically, a large mill complex known as Ripka Mills occupied this stretch of Venice Island.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar version of the proposed development at its June 2023 meeting, but that application was withdrawn before the July Historical Commission meeting. Following that meeting, the applicants revised to address many of the concerns of the Architectural Committee, including setting the Venice Island building away from the Manayunk railroad bridge, changing the design from white brick to red brick on the Main Street elevation, scaling down the second-floor windows and providing additional detail to the connector bridge on the Main Street elevation, and enhancing the pedestrian experience of the drive aisle bridge over the canal.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct two-story building on Main Street
- Construct five-story buildings on Venice Island

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JULY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

- *Standard 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 construction would not destroy historic materials and the proposed buildings are differentiated from the old. Along Main Street, the height, massing, scale, and features are compatible with the district, as is the use of red brick. The district is characterized by terra-cotta-colored brick, natural stone, and light-colored stucco facades. The scale and massing of the Venice Island construction is consistent with that of the historic district. The application meets Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:29:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Jerry Roller and Marissa Howard represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Roller explained the changes made to the design following the previous Architectural Committee review. On the Venice Island building, they cut back the third and fourth floors as it approaches the bridge and relocated the stair tower away from the bridge. On the Main Street building, they changed the color to red brick, reduced the scale of the second-floor windows and set them in, slightly reduced the scale of the storefront windows, and added greater detail to the bridge so that it is not flat metal panels but rather evocative of beams with major and minor openings. On the vehicular bridge, they added planters in lieu of bollards and between the vehicular and pedestrian access, and added stamped concrete to the paving and a screen wall so the pedestrians are physically separated from the cars. He also noted that they added a sheet that gives a better representation of the brick details, including corbelling and sub-corbelling and soldier coursing over the windows.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the vehicular bridge would be entirely new.
 - o Mr. Roller responded affirmatively, explaining that the current one is 13 feet wide, and that they need a full 24-foot wide two-way vehicular plus pedestrian access in addition to the pedestrian bridge above.
- Mr. Cluver thanked the applicants for the revisions and refinements and opined that the design is moving in the direction. He noted that the applicants mentioned planters and a dividing fence guard, but that those are not shown in the plans, just the renderings. He asked that the applicants update the plans so that they show greater detail and correspond to the renderings.
 - o Mr. Roller responded that they could add a plan that will show all of that detail.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he appreciates the additional articulation of the Main Street bridge, and asked whether the windows extend to the floor.
 - o Mr. Roller responded that they are not at floor level but are not traditional sill height either. He commented that he thinks they are relatively scaled to industrial fenestration and balance the traditional and contemporary.

- o Ms. Howard clarified that the sill height is approximately eight inches above floor level.
- o Mr. Roller noted that the bridge structure is higher than it would normally be owing to the clearance requirement for emergency vehicles.
- o Mr. Roller explained that they wanted to keep the sill height consistent across the second-floor façade.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the Main Street building is more successful than the Venice Island design. He suggested that the vehicular bridge still needs more detail, so it does not read as a concrete overpass. As presented, he opined that does not present a pleasant experience for the driver or pedestrian. He suggested that the bridge be widened to incorporate a planter or other detail.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, opining that people would be inclined to walk on both sides of the bridge.
 - o Mr. Roller responded that it is not a high-volume bridge, and that there will be a fairly steep slope owing to the need to get from Point A to Point B. He explained that they have little leeway in terms of the bridge design.
 - o Mr. Detwiler opined that the applicants have control over the materiality of the bridge.
 - o Mr. Roller responded that there is no room for a planter or anything that would be living on the bridge. He explained that they have added stamped concrete to the span to make it look less like an on-ramp, but it is still a ramped vehicular structure. He noted that they cannot police peoples' actions and have tried to make the pedestrian side as inviting as possible. He noted that the trail continues on the other side out to the river.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that their rendering shows that there is no transition for pedestrians to cross the opening and that it creates a blind spot.
- Mr. Detwiler lamented the fact that once these parcels are developed, Venice Island will be filled with contemporary metal-clad buildings. He noted that the island historically had such a substantial masonry presence and wished that the materials of the proposed construction were higher quality, as they will become the backdrop for Main Street.
 - o Ms. Stein agreed.
- Ms. Stein noted that she appreciates the improvements that were made to the setbacks from the bridge but opined that the setback should be closer to 50 feet than 25 feet as proposed. She opined that the view on page 29 of the submission shows how the proposed design crowds the bridge and clips views, including from across the river.
 - o Mr. Roller responded that, looking at the historic images of the mill buildings that were on the site historically, they also came near the bridge.
 - o Ms. Stein agreed but noted the buildings closest to the bridge appear to have been two or three stories for about 80 feet. She opined that the proposed design crowds the bridge and that dropping down to two stories for about 50 feet or so would improve the viewshed.
 - o Mr. Roller responded that part of the issue they are encountering that was not a problem in the nineteenth century is the flood plain line. Historically, he noted, buildings came right down to the river, and were probably a story or so below where they are now. He opined that the proposed building is still probably shorter than the historic building. He noted that since they lose the whole ground floor and must have the building up on stilts, they do not feel that masonry is an appropriate cladding material. He argued that metal is the right material to sit up

- on stilts and look appropriately supported. He stated that they have pulled the building back to what is viable.
- o Ms. Stein commented that if they took out three units on levels three and four, that would give about a 50-foot setback. She acknowledged that she does not know what their proformas look like, but that six out of hundreds is not so significant.
 - o Mr. Roller noted that they started out with 220 units and have paired it down in various ways, including owing to river setbacks, and are now down to 181. He opined that continuing to reduce the number of units starts to impair the viability of the project. He explained that they pushed the developer to pull back from the bridge to what they feel is a reasonable setback and reflects the stepping from the bridge. He opined that historically the buildings were probably more crowded to the bridge because that is how industrial buildings were built.
 - Mr. Detwiler reiterated that the waterfront deserves better quality buildings than what are proposed. He opined that in the view on page 29 of the application, it shows that there is some detail to the buildings on the left, but that the darker metal portion is “chaotic.”
 - o Mr. Roller responded that they have taken care not to treat the waterfront façade lightly and to make it interesting with balconies and ins and outs and to try to create a good, contemporary façade. He opined that the scale and scope feel respectful.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned the significance of the orange bays facing the river.
 - o Mr. Roller responded that they project through the façade where the amenity spaces for the building are. He noted that they have used orange on other accents and as a touchstone to create brightness against the neutral colors of the rest of the building.
 - o Mr. Cluver noted that orange is an aggressive color that does not have any connection back to the district.
 - o Mr. Roller responded that they feel it is a good contrast color to add some brightness.
 - o Ms. Stein noted that the shade of orange makes a big difference. She noted that a deep terra cotta orange that evokes the color of brick is different than bright orange.
 - o Mr. Roller clarified that they are looking to use a terra cotta color throughout.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed that a terra cotta orange in a rich, earthy tone, and not bright orange, would be acceptable.
 - Mr. McCoubrey questioned the gap between the two buildings on Venice Island, and asked whether there is an opportunity to shift units there away from the bridge.
 - o Mr. Roller responded that they wished they could, but the gap is a city easement with a storm sewer below. He explained that they can pass over it and use it for parking but cannot build on it. He noted that it is a convoluted piece of property, and they are trying to use it in a way that is viable and respectful of the massing and jumble of industrial buildings that would have been there historically.
 - o Mr. Detwiler noted that if they could build over the 22-foot line in the gap that that would be helpful.
 - o Ms. Howard responded that she does not believe they can but will look into it.
 - Mr. McCoubrey lamented the loss of the historic industrial buildings on Venice Island but argued that they are gone, and a new generation of buildings have been built. He opined that the proposed buildings fit into that new generation and context, noting

that it would be hard to expect the design to be masonry with punched openings. He commented that he likes the way the design steps and moves with the river.

- o Mr. Detwiler responded that he did not intend for the design to recreate the historic masonry buildings with punched openings, but to have higher quality materials and less chaos. He reiterated that the dark portions of the façade are chaotic.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether the roof has public access.
 - o Mr. Roller responded that it is a vegetative roof for stormwater management with a deck amenity for use by the residents.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro questioned keeping plants alive on rooftop gardens.
 - o Mr. Roller reiterated that it is a vegetative roof for stormwater management, and that most of the vegetation will be low materials that are designed for looking at and dealing with stormwater. He also noted that there will be additional vegetation along the riverbank.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The overall design of both the Main Street and Venice Island new construction is appropriate for the district, but details of both need additional consideration.
- The use of red brick on the Main Street building is appropriate.
- Since the last review, the applicants have stepped the building down, but the setbacks could be increased to reduce the visual impact on the iconic views of the Manayunk bridge.
- Portions of the Venice Island design are out of keeping with the scale, rhythm, and materials of the historic district.
- The drive aisle remains too vehicle-centric.
- The color of the orange accents should be carefully considered. The use of rich terra cotta color accents is appropriate, but bright orange is not.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed construction would not destroy historic materials, but setbacks should be increased to reduce the visual impact on iconic views of the historic railroad bridge, and additional consideration should be given to the materials and features of the Venice Island construction, to protect the historic integrity of the property's environment. As proposed, the design fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- The overall scale and features of the Main Street building are appropriate for the context and the historic district and satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 4432, 4436-42, 4400R, and 4436R Main 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	7				

Mr. Cluver exited the meeting.

ADDRESS: 1601 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Restore main block, construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mt. Vernon Commons LLC

Applicant: Hsing-Yuan Chen, Sky Design Studio PC

History: 1859; Robert Purvis House; storefront, 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 1601 Mount Vernon Street is significant in the Spring Garden Historic District, owing to its association with Robert Purvis, a Black anti-slavery activist, writer, and lecturer who resided at the property from c. 1875 to 1898. Over the last few decades, the property has languished and has been subject to multiple violations, proposed but unimplemented projects, and court orders, culminating in an Act 165 conservatorship. The City demolished the rear ell to abate a dangerous condition in 2012. After years of deterioration and legal proceedings, the property is finally in new hands.

This application for final approval proposes restoring the front façade of the surviving main block to its appearance during the ownership of Robert Purvis. The work includes removing the later storefront and restoring the building's residential appearance. A new marble base, stoop, door surround, and lintels would be installed on the front façade. A new door, windows, and cornice would be fabricated in wood to match the historic features. On the side of the main block, new windows are proposed for each floor.

At the rear, the application proposes to construct a new three-story ell to replace the ell that was demolished a decade ago. The rear portion of the addition would have a roof deck and pilot house. A developer seeking to purchase the property in 2022 submitted an in-concept application proposing to rehabilitate the main block and to construct a rear addition with garage. The Historical Commission denied that application, owing to objections to the garage. The current application does not include a garage.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate main block; and
- Construct rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The only remaining portion of the building, the main block, had a storefront installed c. 1920. That intervention removed the original entryway and marble base. Two large openings for storefront windows were cut into the masonry on the front façade and side wall at the first story, and a new corner entrance was constructed. Decades of neglect have also led to the loss of the cornice and have caused the masonry to deteriorate.
 - o The application proposes to rehabilitate the main block by replicating the lost features in their original materials. A marble base, stoop, door surround, and lintels would be installed to reverse the storefront alteration. A wood cornice, door, and windows would also be installed. The work complies with Standard 6.
- *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 While the application does not propose to reconstruct the rear ell to its historic appearance, the proposed addition is compatible in massing, size, scale, and features, and complies with Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:12:05

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Hsing-Yuan Chen and Mirai Yasuyama, and property owner Naché Patoir represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the storefront was not being retained.
 - o Ms. Chantry stated that the significance of the house dates to the time it was a residence for Robert Purvis who was a significant abolitionist and lived in the house from approximately 1875 to 1898. Therefore, the storefront is non-historic and a restoration back to the period of significance would include removal of the storefront and a restoration of the first floor back to a residential appearance.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested setting the brick back on the first-floor connector between the original building and the new rear addition approximately six to eight inches because it is very difficult to match the brick color of both parts of the house.

- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the parapet was necessary and suggested a railing instead.
 - o Mr. Chen responded that the parapet could be replaced by a railing.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested wrapping the stone base around the back of the building for several feet.
- Ms. Gutterman offered that the side door was undersized and suggested its design be amended.
 - o Mr. Chen stated that he would reconsider the door's dimensions.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested changing the design of the side door to a paneled door with a transom and sidelights.
- Ms. Stein suggested increasing the height of the windows on the side elevation of the main block.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested that the windows on the side of the main block should be the same as those on the front façade.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the siding on the pilot house should be a dark color.
- Mr. Chen expressed agreement with all changes recommended by the Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Ms. Chantry noted that the Preservation Alliance submitted a letter of support.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 1601 Mount Vernon Street is significant in the Spring Garden Historic District, owing to its association with Robert Purvis, a Black anti-slavery activist, writer, and lecturer who resided at the property from c. 1875 to 1898.
- Until now the property has languished and has been subject to multiple violations, proposed but unimplemented projects, and court orders, culminating in an Act 165 conservatorship.
- The application proposes restoring the front façade of the surviving main block to its appearance and introducing a door and windows on the side.
- The project includes construction a new three-story ell with roof deck and pilot house to replace the ell that was demolished a decade ago.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposal to rehabilitate the main block by replicating the lost features on the primary façade satisfies Standard 6.
- The reconstruction of the rear ell is compatible in massing, size and scale, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, provided:

- The front entrance, windows, side door, and cornice details are provided to staff for review.
- A metal railing is used in lieu of a brick parapet on the rear addition.
- The stone base wraps the rear of the addition approximately 12 to 16 inches.
- The connector link at the first floor is set back a full brick course.
- Hardie siding in a darker color is used for the pilot house cladding.

ITEM: 1601 Mt Vernon St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 10 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Legalize Installation of Sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: RCI Inc.

Applicant: Mahir Atak, Golden Fox Sign LLC

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a sign installed without Historical Commission approval at 10 S. Front Street. The property is a four-story commercial loft building with storefront, which was individually designated in 1976 and which is classified as contributing to the Old City Historic District. In March 2023, a violation was issued for an unpermitted sign with illuminated letters, which had been installed without permits and approvals. The sign reads “LILLY’S FERRY” in 18-inch-tall channel letters joined by a raceway, and “BAR & GRILL” on a 10-inch-tall lit panel below. The sign elements are 10 feet and 7 feet long respectively. The upper sign is mounted with “z-hooks” and screws, and the lower sign is hung from the upper one.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Legalize sign installed without permits.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New addition, 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.*
- *Storefronts Guidelines: Using new, over-scaled, or internally lit signs unless there is a historic precedent for them or using other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features of the storefront and the building.*

- o The installed sign is large in scale compared to the existing spatial relationships of the storefront and the lower portion obscures character-defining transom windows. It also features internally lit components.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefronts Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:32:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman stated that the sign is inappropriate in design and scale and is not a design for which the Architectural Committee would have recommended approval, had the applicant sought approval prior to installation. She noted that the Architectural Committee is advisory to the Historical Commission, and therefore does not have the capacity to legalize work done without permits.
- Ms. Stein agreed, and further observed that the sign obscures distinctive features of the storefront.
- Ms. Lukachik noted that the anchoring is not ideal.
- Mr. Detwiler sought clarification about whether the Architectural Committee ever recommends approval of signs illuminated in this manner.
 - o Some Architectural Committee members responded that the Committee typically does not recommend approval of these types of lit signs.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Job Itzkowitz, representing the Old City District, commented that his organization received complaints about the sign. He also noted that there are several examples in the historic district of national stores which usually use lit signs finding alternatives, including the CVS and 7-Eleven both located near 3rd and Market Streets.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The sign was installed without permits and prerequisite Historical Commission review and approval.
- The sign obstructs the storefront at 10 S. Front Street, which is designated both individually and as a Contributing resource in the Old City Historic District.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The sign is large in scale compared to the existing spatial relationships of the storefront, and the lower portion of the sign obscures character-defining transom windows. It also features internally lit components. The sign as installed fails to satisfy Standard 9 and the Storefront Guidelines.

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

ITEM: 10 S Front St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1423, 1424, 1425, 1428, AND 1629 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Legalize door replacements

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael Lopsonzski

Applicant: Michael Lopsonzski, Off Campus Philly

History: 1880s

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Contributing, 1/29/1986

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize five non-historic front doors that were installed at 1423, 1424, 1425, 1428, and 1629 Diamond Street without approval from the Historical Commission. These five properties are contributing to the Diamond Street Historic District and were built in the 1880s. The current doors were installed after the historic doors were stolen within the past few years, which has been a reoccurring issue in this district. The current doors do not fill the doorway opening and are incompatible with this historic district in size and materiality.

The applicant has included a letter in his application describing his situation to the Historical Commission. The door violations are preventing him from renewing his rental license, and he believes replacing the doors with historic replicas will encourage further theft and danger for his tenants. He seeks legalization of the five doors he has replaced.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Legalize doors.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the*

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

- o The current replacement doors do not fill the doorway openings and are incompatible with these historic buildings in size, design, and materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9, but approval of a stock door with glazing in similar proportions to the historic doors, provided the doors are installed symmetrically in the openings and the doors, infill, and frames are painted brown, with the staff to review details.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:36:49

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Michael Lopsonzski represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked the applicant how the doors were stolen and what mitigation strategies were taken to combat this.
 - o Mr. Lopsonzski responded he had not found a solution to prevent people from stealing the doors and hypothesized the student tenants may leave the doors unsecured. He concluded that did not know how the doors were being stolen.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether the frames were intact.
 - o Mr. Lopsonzski confirmed the frames and the transoms remained.
- Mr. D'Alessandro guessed the pins were being removed from the outside and the hinges were then addressed from the inside.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that this was a growing problem and noted situations of theft happening after open houses in West Philadelphia and Germantown. He wondered if an iron gate would prevent this type of theft. He asked the applicant if he had insurance for situations like this.
 - o Mr. Lopsonzski noted he did have insurance, but student housing insurance required a \$25,000 deductible, owing to the inherent risks involved renting to young students.
- Mr. Detwiler stated he understood the need to put something in temporarily, but that a hollow core metal or fiberglass door was not a long-term solution. He asked fellow Architectural Committee members how they have handled these types of applications in the past.
 - o Ms. Gutterman answered that they have discussed installing a single door which appeared as a double door and captured the spirit of the historic door without having to replicate the historic door, having the correct width and height and with or without glass. She continued that it would be acceptable if there was a replacement door of hollow metal or fiberglass that resembled the historic door which could prevent theft.
- Ms. Stein suggested installing security hinges.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested installing a head and foot bolt on the inactive door of the pair of double doors as extra protection.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested a hollow metal frame and hollow metal door that fits the opening, with panels, a glazed head, and perhaps a small sidelight to fill in the space that exceeds four feet. He acknowledged it may still be expensive but would be a long-term solution.

- Ms. Stein added she would prefer the wood frames were kept if they were not damaged as in 10 or 20 years this could be a different neighborhood and a more appropriate door could be reinstalled.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that none of the original fabric should be removed.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that without knowing what the dimensions are the Architectural Committee cannot provide anything other than guidance. She added it was her opinion the door should fill the opening fully in terms of height and width and have safety hinges.
- Mr. Detwiler said he was open to a simplified door design, but the replacement door should fill the opening better and have some glass in it. He stated that he would prefer two doors with a window over one or two panels. He added that measures should be taken to protect the remaining historic doors. He stressed to the applicant to convey to his tenants that the doors must remain closed.
- Ms. Stein recommended that the doors are put on closers and the hardware is upgraded.
- Mr. Lopsonzski conveyed the financial burden of the situation and stated this was an expensive punishment. He explained that many of his doors were stolen.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested replacing one door at a time.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the Architectural Committee could not recommend approval of the legalization of the doors. She noted the applicant could present the current doors to the Historical Commission and they could vote to legalize or deny legalization.
- Mr. D'Alessandro again suggested a hollow metal door as a possible solution.
- Mr. Lopsonzski highlighted the need for him to renew his rental licenses in August, which he cannot do with open violations. Without renewing his licenses, he continued, he cannot legally collect rent. He noted he was seeking temporary relief from the violations.
 - Mr. McCoubrey opined that some type of agreement could be reached where the applicant agrees to replace the doors with more appropriate doors, but not necessarily all before August.
- Mr. Lopsonzski stated that the Department of Licenses and Inspections referred him to the Historical Commission, and he hoped they could reach a solution to how he could obtain his rental licenses for August.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that was not something the Architectural Committee could do, but at the Historical Commission meeting there may be suggestions.
 - Ms. Chantry reiterated that the Architectural Committee meeting was the first step in the Historical Commission review process where the Architectural Committee will make a recommendation to the Historical Commission, which is the entity that will make the final decision of approval or denial. She noted that meeting is scheduled for 11 August 2023.
- Mr. Lopsonzski stated he would be open to cooperating with the Historical Commission in getting the doors replaced one at a time over the next year and asked if he could get his rental license renewed in the meantime.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about a similar application for door legalization on Diamond Street that the Architectural Committee had reviewed recently.
 - Ms. Chantry explained that the Historical Commission denied the request for legalization of that particular door, at 1919 Diamond Street, which was a white stock door, installed off-center in the doorway. Ms. Chantry noted the applicant of 1919 Diamond Street provided subsidized housing and was looking to keep costs as low as possible. She pointed to the dimensions of the door which are not

standard. She said the issue is the staff have not been able to locate an inexpensive stock door with the approximate appearance and size of the historic door.

- o Mr. Detwiler suggested TruStile doors.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the doors will still need to be custom.
- Ms. Stein asked about the timing of the theft, and whether it had occurred all at once or over time and if the applicant was before the Architectural Committee owing to violations for door replacement without a building permit.
 - o Mr. Lopsonzski responded in the affirmative and that the Department of Licenses and Inspections said they could not remove any violations without him addressing the issue with the Historical Commission. He claimed the thefts happened over several years.
- Mr. Detwiler asserted that the Architectural Committee is bound by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but the Historical Commission could have more leeway than the Architectural Committee in reviewing the legalization request. He suggested the applicant contact his Councilperson.
 - o Mr. Lopsonzski responded that if it were not for the violations, he could install a door every three months. He postulated it would cost him near \$35,000 and was concerned about college students not having to pay rent in the five buildings in the meantime.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey reiterated that this is a matter to address with the Historical Commission.
 - o Ms. Gutterman suggested to the applicant to amend his application to include what he is willing to do to address the inappropriate replacement doors.
- Mr. Detwiler said an appropriate door would be semi-custom and with a company like TruStile, it is possible to choose a stock profile and adjust it to fit the opening, even using the existing frames.
 - o Mr. Lopsonzski responded that he would be willing to do that.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The replacement doors are not in keeping with the Diamond Street Historic District.
- A wood door would be preferred but a custom hollow metal or fiberglass door would be acceptable if it filled the entire opening and resembled the historic door.
- The dimensions of the doorways were not provided with the application materials.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 5 as the replacement doors do not preserve the distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques of the historic doors.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 as the replacement doors do not fill the doorway openings and are incompatible with the Diamond Street Historic District.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

ITEM: 1423, 1424, 1425, 1428, and 1629 Diamond St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:20:40

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:21 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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