

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

**TUESDAY, 28 JULY 2020
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		
Suzanne Pentz		X	
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- David Jacovini
- Jim Conners, SGRA
- Jacob Adelman, Philadelphia Inquirer
- Ashley May
- Mary McGettigan
- Steve Perzan
- Michael Silverman
- Bernice Koplin
- Dennis Waterman
- Adam Branovan
- Marissa Raybuck
- Mary Purcell

Bob Everett
Bridgette Byrnes, Plato Studio
K. Leslie
Mark Raymond
Peter Conn
J.M. Duffin
Michael Mattioni, Mattioni Ltd.
David S. Mirabal
Allan Nadav
Jacob Cooper
Cindy Taylor
Plato Marinakos Jr, Plato Studio
John Scott
Devon Beverly
Lisa Whitney
Humberto Fernandini
Slav ytsimura@gmail.com
Dana Fedeli
Kathleen Beaver
Moshay LaRen
Justin Spivey
Job King
Rich Freeh
John Wisniewski
John Hallock
Kevin McMahon
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
P.J. Hayes
Zola Filippi
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Chris McBrien
David S. Traub
E. Ravin
Hal Schirmer
Donald Haskin
Alice Levy
Jenna Horrow
Matt McClure
Rhoda Haber
Paul Chrystie
Trang Do
Nadia Schafer
Jonathan Doran
Venise Whitaker
Brenden Krewer
Margaret Manzer
Rick Miller, RKM Architects
Oscar Beisert
Mark Coggin
Randy Baron
Andrew Fearon

Jeanne Curtis
Jay Farrell
Paul Boni
Lorna Katz
Jeanne Sigler
Rich Villa
Stephanie Stahl, CBS3
Suzanna Barucco
Timothy Kerner
John Mattioni
Peter Angelides
Susan Davis
Sue Patterson
Ashley Schwab
William Roberts
Marie Scarpulla
Katie Park
Kate McGlinchey, Old City District
Brian Wengenroth
Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
Patrick Cusick
Mason Carter
Jo Holz
Job Itzkowitz
Anthony Cerone
Kathy Dowdell
Alex Balloon
Christopher Romano
Ian Litwin
Scott Scuderi
Susan Wetherill
Jason Greenspon
Howard Haas
Tori Dickson
Roger Perry
BJ Halda
Beth Walker
J Bown
Kevin Brett
Deena Gothelf
Terrie Lewine
Aron Martinez
Jan Vacca
Ted Agoos
Lisa Yoworsky
Stephanie Boggs, Klehr Harrison
Michelle Shuman
William Pasquarello
David Simons
Norm Lieberman
Bruce Holberg

Ellen Ravin
Carolyn Bechta-Devine

ADDRESS: 1707 PORTER ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition, alter side openings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Carley Pascetta and William Pasquarello

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC

History: 1906; James H. and John T. Windrim, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition and alter side openings at 1707 Porter Street. The addition would be visible from Roseberry Street, a service alley at the rear that marks the northern boundary of the district, and from S. 17th Street at the side. The addition would maintain an open porch at the first floor, and be clad in fiber-cement siding. The rear chimney is proposed for removal as part of this project. Many of the openings on the side were previously altered or infilled. A proposal for a similar two-story rear addition on this same block was approved by the Commission in 2003, and a one-story rear addition on this block was approved by the Commission in 2014.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct two-story rear addition and alter side openings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition will only be visible from the far side, and rear along a service alley, and will not destroy the features and spatial relationships that characterize the property, owing to its location and context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the chimney above the roof is retained, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Tim Kerner represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Kerner asked if the Committee agreed with the staff's recommendation regarding retention of the chimney above the roof.
 - The Committee members expressed agreement with the staff's recommendation regarding the chimney, and noted that a photograph of the rear of the block shows a continuous row of chimneys.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if work is proposed for the front or side of the building.
 - Mr. Kerner responded that there is no work except for paint and maintenance proposed for the front façade, and that additional windows are proposed to be cut into the side. He stated that the new windows will be clad wood windows, and will transition to casements in the new addition to differentiate it and also to be more modern than the existing house.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the addition is perfectly aligned with the side of the house, or if there is a slight change in plane.
 - Mr. Kerner responded that the exterior face of the siding would align with the exterior face of the brick, as shown in the plan.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that the addition be slightly offset from alignment with the existing façade, to let the corner read as the original mass. He suggested a four-inch offset.
 - Mr. Kerner asked about the reverse scenario, where the new addition would be forward of the existing building, which would still create a break.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that he was not in favor of that solution, because it would take away from the chimney reading as an independent corner.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested a reveal as an option, rather than a setback, or some other way to articulate new versus old.
- Mr. Kerner stated that the new mechanical units would be high efficiency so the chimney would not need to be used. He stated that it would vent out the side towards the rear of the existing building, in an area behind the last basement window.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed addition will only be visible from the far side, and rear along a service alley.
- The existing chimney is a character-defining feature of the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work will not destroy the features and spatial relationships that characterize the property, owing to its location and context, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the chimney above the roof is retained, an offset, articulation, or reveal is added between the addition and the existing brick, and that the vent for the new mechanical system is located towards the rear of the existing building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1707 Porter St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1232 WAVERLY ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Hallock

Applicant: Susan Davis

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 11/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a rear addition at 1232 Waverly Street. The existing one-story rear addition would remain, and an additional two stories would be constructed on top of it, rising to the height of the existing main block of the house, and extending to the depth of the neighboring rear additions. The existing one-story addition was constructed in 1958. Small decks projecting six feet are proposed for the new second and third floors. The only visibility of the rear of this property from the public right-of-way is via a very oblique angle from a short, fenced section of S. Iseminger Street. Existing two-story rear additions at the neighboring properties further obscure visibility from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. It will not be visible within the context of the front of the building. It will be differentiated from the old by way of

materials, and will be compatible with the historic property in terms of materials, features, size, scale, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:15:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Susan Davis and property owner John Hallock represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver commented that the inclusion of a third-floor deck projecting six feet is starting to impose on other properties. He suggested that the third-floor deck be omitted.
 - Ms. Davis asked about an option for a smaller third-floor deck.
 - Mr. Cluver opined that it should either be omitted, or project out the same distance as the second-floor deck in order to relate the two masses.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that he would approve the third-floor deck projecting six feet, if the railing is a black metal railing with vertical pickets. Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the material of the proposed deck railings.
 - Ms. Davis responded that they are shown as wood in the drawings, but the owner would prefer to use something lighter in visibility.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that the Commission often approves a black metal vertical picket railing system. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, and commented that the railing system should not be cable.
 - Mr. Detwiler observed that the change in railing material will be helpful if the third-floor deck remains part of the application.
- Ms. Davis explained the limited visibility of the rear of the property, and noted that the rowhouses immediately to the west are taller than the subject building.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that the taller buildings are setback further than the subject building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed windows and mechanical equipment.
 - Ms. Davis responded that there will be no new mechanical equipment, and the windows are proposed to be painted wood. She commented that the owner would prefer windows and doors that are more open than what is shown in the drawings, and asked if one-over-one double-hung windows and glazed doors with no muntins would be permissible.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the omission of muntins for the new windows and doors is preferred. Mr. McCoubrey agreed.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked that Ms. Davis provide a detail drawing of how the new addition attaches to the existing structure, for the staff to review and also as part of the construction drawings.
- Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Detwiler stated that they both accepted the third-floor deck as proposed, with the discussed change in railing design.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The only visibility of the rear of this property from the public right-of-way is via a very oblique angle from a short, fenced section of S. Iseminger Street. The addition will not be visible within the context of the front of the building.
- The property is not located in a historic district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. It will be differentiated from the old by way of materials, and will be compatible with the historic property in terms of materials, features, size, scale, and massing, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the third floor deck is eliminated, the railing for the second-floor deck is a black metal vertical picket design, and the windows and doors have no muntins, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1232 Waverly St					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
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				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4	2			1

ADDRESS: 520 KAUFFMAN ST

Proposal: Construct three-story addition with pilot house at 522 Kauffman Street

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Ashley H. Schwab and Chloe Ann Deon

Applicant: Stephanie Boggs, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes to consolidate the lots at 520 and 522 Kauffman Street and construct a three-story addition on the vacant lot at 522 Kauffman Street. The property at 520 Kauffman Street is designated as historic. The building that stood at 522 Kauffman Street was demolished by order of the City in 1976. The property at 522 Kauffman Street is not designated as historic even though it is currently listed as designated on the Historical Commission's website. That listing is a clerical error that will be corrected. The Historical

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Commission has jurisdiction over the addition, which will stand entirely on 522 Kauffman, even though that property is not designated because the addition will connect to a designated building. That said, the addition only connects to a party wall that was not exposed historically.

The proposed addition, with pilot house and roof deck, would be set back 11.5 feet from the front of the lot. The façade would be clad in brick, and would feature a masonry fence wall with gate at the sidewalk. No work is proposed for the building at 520 Kauffman Street; however, the door and windows were recently replaced without the appropriate permit and the Historical Commission's approval; the staff will request that the Department of Licenses & Inspections inspect and issue a violation for that unpermitted work.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct three-story addition at side of historic building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. Its setback on the lot allows it to be deferential to the historic building at 520 Kauffman Street. It is differentiated from the old but compatible with the historic property in terms of materials, features, size, scale, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:28:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Stephanie Boggs, architect Richard Miller, and property owner Ashley Schwab represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Chantry explained that the applicant submitted a secondary component of this application, which asks the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission to provide feedback on the existing windows and front door at 520 Kauffman Street, which were recently replaced without the appropriate permit and the Historical Commission's approval. She stated that the Commission cannot legalize during an in-concept application, so this will be feedback only as to whether the windows and door satisfy Standard 6. The applicant would need to submit an application for final review in order to get an official ruling on the legalization.
 - Ms. Boggs explained that there was a condition of the owner's closing that the previous door be replaced, so there was a builder-grade standard slab door installed prior to that. Once they had closed, they pulled a building permit under a

- mistaken understanding with the contractor at the time that the window and door replacement was permitted. She welcomed comments on the windows and door.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the windows that were installed without the appropriate permit.
 - Mr. Miller responded that the windows are Pella fiberglass windows with a muntin sandwiched between the glass.
 - Mr. McCoubrey observed that the window sills were panned with metal.
 - Ms. Schwab confirmed that they were panned with metal.
 - Mr. Cluver asked about the condition of the sills and asked if they are in poor condition.
 - Ms. Schwab responded that they took the advice of their contractor, who said there were cracks around the windows that needed to be fixed, and this was the best way to do it. She stated that they also took his advice in terms of necessary permits. She stated that they are open to comments and suggestions for how to move forward.
 - The Committee suggested that the panning should be removed and the sills should be repaired.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked if the historic window frames remain.
 - Ms. Schwab confirmed that the historic frames remain, and that the Pella windows were installed into those existing frames.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that the sash are detracting and should be removed, and new sash with simulated divided lites should be installed into the existing historic frame.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if the windows introduced a subframe which built down the opening, but observed that the window proportions do not look off in the photographs.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, and noted that the muntins between the glass are the most offensive aspect of the windows.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked about the door and transom replacement, and observed that the transom grew in height owing to the replacement. He noted that the new door frame is missing the wider rail that existed previously between the door and transom.
 - Ms. Schwab responded that the previous door frame was removed, and a new piece of glass was installed for the transom.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that the door is out of character. He suggested that the applicant look to the door at 518 Kauffman Street, which has the historically accurate door, frame, and transom. He suggested that a six-panel door would be appropriate, but that there may be other options for the door paneling.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he could not approve new work without knowing what was there prior.
 - Mr. Detwiler referenced the photographs shown in the presentation, which clearly show what was there prior to the recent replacement of the window and door.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed, stating that they could have replaced just the sash without altering the frame, and stated that there was no information as to why the windows and doors were replaced.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the staff look at the condition of the frames.
 - Ms. Chantry noted that the close-up photographs of the windows in the presentation were taken by her, and she confirmed that the historic frames and brickmould remain, the sills were panned, and the sash were replaced with a fiberglass window.

- Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee that this application is in-concept and as such, the Committee is only providing advice to the applicant regarding the windows and door. These elements cannot be legalized with this application, as that would require an application for final approval.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the addition and pilot house compared to the adjacent buildings. She expressed concern about the height of the pilot house, the presence of the pergola, and visibility from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Miller responded that the new parapet should not be higher than the adjacent houses, which is approximately 36 feet, and the pilot house is approximately 42 feet at the highest point. He noted the setback on the lot, the narrowness of the street, the lack of visibility of the property from the rear, and that the building sits mid-block.
 - Mr. Cluver asked about the slope of the roof on either side, and if that allows for the height difference to align the parapet. He suggested that the pilot house be reduced in height to eight feet. Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Miller responded that any new units would be in the rear yard, and there is the one vent through the roof as shown.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the proposed casements on the front of the addition are appropriate.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked that a line of sight drawing be provided for review by the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron commented that the brick color of the addition is important, Pella windows always have a subframe, the existing subframe system should be removed and new sash kits should be installed, the transom should be three-pane, and the transom bar should be made thicker.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- It provided feedback on the new windows and door of 520 Kauffman Street but will provide no official action for this in-concept application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. Its setback on the lot allows it to be deferential to the historic building at 520 Kauffman Street. It is differentiated from the old but compatible with the historic property in terms of materials, features, size, scale, and massing, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept of the proposed addition, provided the height of the pilot house and pergola is reduced to eight feet, the height of the wall does not rise above the height of the adjacent building cornices, and a line of sight drawing is provided for review by the Commission, with the staff to review details including brick color, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 520 Kauffman St MOTION: Approval in-concept of addition, with conditions MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1703 W DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Install vinyl windows on front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Denise Jones

Applicant: Denise Jones

History: 1890

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to replace a total of four non-historic windows at the second and third stories of the front façade of this contributing structure. The property owner is seeking approval to use Simonton 6500 vinyl replacement windows. The proposed configuration is 1/1 to match existing. This application is for complete replacement of the sash and frames.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove windows at the second and third stories of the front facade.
- Replace existing windows (sash and frame) with vinyl 1/1 windows.

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.*
 - Vinyl windows will match the historic wood windows sufficiently enough to meet this standard. An aluminum-clad window with the correct details could be an acceptable alternative to wood in this case.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:51:55

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked if the existing windows were the original wood windows with a storm window and panning over the original frames.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that the property owner had explained that the existing windows are not the original. However, staff pointed out that they were the appropriate material and configuration for the house, while the proposed vinyl windows were not.
- Mr. Cluver asked for confirmation that the owner was not applying to replace the ground-floor windows at this time.
 - Ms. Schmitt confirmed that the application was for the second- and third-stories.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he believed that the replacement of the second- and third-story windows should set the precedent for the eventual replacement of the first-story windows. Mr. Cluver remarked that he was not opposed to the replacement of these existing windows. However, the question of the frames merited further discussion.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether all of the existing windows and sills had been panned with metal. He noted that once the applicant applied to replace the windows, the Historical Commission needed to look at the non-historic condition of the existing frames.
 - Ms. Schmitt confirmed that this was the case.
- Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that the installation of new windows might require the removal of the existing panning. He added that details were lacking in the application.
- Mr. Cluver said that he assumed that the application was before them because it was a request for vinyl windows. He stated that his other main concern was with the color of replacement windows, which must be a dark brown to match what is existing. Mr. Cluver opined that there were many details that needed to be provided that the staff could handle, and though the concept of replacing these windows was acceptable to him, the use of vinyl should be denied.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether they could propose that the owner consider using a metal or wood-clad replacement material instead of vinyl.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that this recommendation had been made by the staff already. However, the owner requested to move forward with this application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The replacement of the existing windows could be considered since they are not original to the property.
- The details of the second- and third-story windows should be approved with the eventual replacement of the ground-story windows in mind.
- The existing panning was not original and the installation of new window frames may require its removal.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed vinyl windows were not a sufficient enough match to the original wood windows and therefore do not satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 1703 Diamond St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 5900 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Construct five-story, mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Scuderi RE 5900-02 Germantown Ave LLC

Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: 2/25/1964

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a new mixed-use building on the vacant lots at 5900-02 Germantown Avenue. The property at 5900 Germantown Avenue was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1964. There is no documentation that indicates that 5902 Germantown Avenue was ever designated. Both lots are currently vacant, and the staff is still seeking information that clarifies how the structures came to be demolished. A letter dated 16 January 1992 from the staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to the then-owner explains that, owing to the dangerous conditions of the building at that time, administrative approval would be granted for the demolition and reconstruction of the building's façade. No additional information was located in the Historical Commission's files.

Aerial images from 1996 show that 5900 was vacant but there was a structure at the 5902 parcel at that time.

As of the writing of this overview, the staff is not able to confirm whether the designated building at 5900 Germantown Avenue was demolished legally or not.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct five-story building with pilot house and roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

If the demolition of the designated structure was not undertaken legally, Section 14-1007(3) of the historic preservation ordinance requires the restoration of the building:

any person who alters or demolishes a building ... in violation of the provisions of this Chapter 14-1000 or in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a building permit issued by the Historical Commission shall be required to restore the building ... involved to its appearance prior to the violation.

The Historical Commission must require the property owner to reconstruct the building if it was illegally demolished.

If the building at 5900 Germantown Avenue was demolished legally, then the Historical Commission has no basis with which to review an application for a vacant lot that is not in a historic district. The property was designated before the Historical Commission was granted the authority to protect archaeological resources. Therefore, there is no basis for determining whether the proposed building satisfies preservation standards. If the building was demolished legally, the Historical Commission should approve the application without review and initiate the rescission of the designation of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff offers no recommendation until additional research is undertaken.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:59:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Logan Dry and developer Scott Scuderi represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked the applicant about the status of the lot when they acquired the property.
 - The property owner, Mr. Scuderi, explained that he purchased the property as a vacant lot. He said that because it was vacant, his understanding was that the review jurisdiction of the Historical Commission would be review and comment. Mr. Scuderi explained that he was unaware of the questions surrounding the demolition of the designated building, but wanted to present his application before the Architectural Committee to begin a dialogue about his proposal.
- Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Farnham if it was still worthwhile for the Architectural Committee to have a discussion about the design of the project while the questions surrounding the Historical Commission's purview were investigated.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that he believed it was worthwhile to review the design currently before them. He reminded the Architectural Committee members that the ordinance required a designated building that was demolished illegally to be reconstructed. Mr. Farnham explained that another possibility in this case, was if that the building was legally demolished, and the vacant lot in question is not located within a historic district, then it is difficult to decide what is and is not compatible since nothing adjacent to it is designated.

- Mr. Dry explained that they were very interested in getting some initial feedback about the design of their project. He said that they would be happy to postpone going before the Historical Commission should additional time be needed to understand the circumstances surrounding the demolition of the designated building however they were seeking feedback on their current design.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that what he felt was missing from the application was more information about the context of the subject property. He said that the materials did not provide enough views of the neighboring structures. Mr. McCoubrey said that his initial impression was that the proposal looked quite tall in comparison to the adjacent buildings.
 - Mr. Dry responded that his firm was also designing a new five-story building at the site of the three adjacent properties at 5904-5908 Germantown Avenue. Mr. Dry noted that while the properties next door to 5900 Germantown Avenue were not designated, his firm was attempting to design the two projects. He also pointed out that there was a mix of building heights up and down this stretch of Germantown Avenue.
- Mr. Cluver said that he had several general comments that he wanted to share with the applicant. He observed that the fifth-story was very tall in proportion to the other stories. He suggested that the cornice be lowered and the roof deck be pulled back instead of using the tall parapet to screen the deck. Mr. Cluver observed that the bay windows extend vertically beyond the above piece of trim which looks unusual. He commented that the overhangs of the cornice of the bays seems excessive. Mr. Cluver also pointed out that it was unusual to see two windows above one bay and three windows above the other bay at the fifth floor of the Germantown Avenue-facing façade. He requested clarification about the materials proposed for the fifth-story and for the base of the Germantown Avenue and Rittenhouse Street facades. Mr. Cluver said he was not sure why casement windows are proposed at the secondary facades while double-hung are proposed for the primary facades, suggesting that consistency across the facades might be important.
- Mr. Detwiler remarked that this corner is very significant, and sits along Germantown Avenue, which is a National Historic Landmark, which makes it important both locally and nationally. He observed that the history of this site is a wonderful, eighteenth-century building, which was nothing near the size or scale of the building being proposed by the applicant. Mr. Detwiler observed that while the design of the building was somewhat traditional, it could be located in any business district in the country. He acknowledged that it was a strong action to require that a structure be rebuilt if it was torn down illegally, and that he would support such an action if this proves to be what happened here. Mr. Detwiler noted that Rittenhouse Street is a very small narrow street with very low buildings. While there are taller commercial structures along Germantown Avenue, they are not what is significant about it. He opined that a new structure at this site must look to the original building's scale, especially at the street-level. Mr. Detwiler said that he thought that this new proposed building was very far off from where the design needed to be.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said that he agreed with these comments and added that the application was missing streetscape drawings of the surrounding buildings. He noted that as a corner property, any development would have a significant impact on several area views.
- Ms. Stein remarked that she agreed that the proposal would result in the over-development of an important, corner site, adding that this project would help to set the standard for development along Germantown Avenue. She said that although the

site was not currently located in a historic district, perhaps one would be established there in the future, noting that the site's context was important. Ms. Stein said that she found the proposal just too large to fit into its context.

- Mr. McCoubrey said that he agreed with Ms. Stein that the massing was simply too large for this site. Mr. McCoubrey said he wondered whether even four-stories would be appropriate or if something smaller would be more contextual. He added that the proportion of the fifth-story made it look like an addition to the building.
- The Committee members asked the applicant about the status of the lot when he acquired the property.
 - Mr. Scuderi repeated that their intention with moving forward today was really to create a dialogue with the Architectural Committee about their initial comments on the design. He said they would continue to investigate the circumstances of the demolition with the goal of re-applying to go before the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission with more information.
- Mr. Scuderi confirmed that he was withdrawing this application with the intention of reapplying for the next Architectural Committee and Historical Commission meetings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society asked whether the staff believed that there was an end date to the 1992 approval to demolish and reconstruct the front façade. He commented that based on his research, he believed that this building was demolished in 2008. Mr. Beisert commented that the proposed design did not speak to the demolished designated building. He noted that the form of the designated structure was important and should be considered in the design of any new structure on the lot.

ADDRESS: 1106 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Legalize removal of glass and metal panels and repair brick facade

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Joseph Nadau

Applicant: Shae Morong, Plato Studio

History: 1933; Dr. Scholl's Comfort Shoes; Markham Ashberry, architect

Individual Designation: 4/30/1986

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 1106 Chestnut Street was individually designated in 1986 for its unique Art Deco façade that featured polished glass and pressed metal panels above its commercial storefront. In April 2014, the Department of Licenses and Inspections inspected the building, deemed the front façade unsafe, and issued a violation to the property owner. The violation notice specified that only the unsafe and loose panels of the façade were to be removed and that Historical Commission approval would be necessary prior to replacement. To correct the violation, the owner removed the all panels from the façade prior to June 2014 without seeking approval from the Historical Commission. In 2016 and 2017 the staff of the Historical Commission approved two permit applications. The scope of work on both applications included the removal of the glass and metal cladding, repointing and repair of the brick façade, and the installation of new and salvaged glass and metal panels. The staff placed a condition on the application that work would be completed within 12 months. In its present condition, the brick

wall and wood parapet remain exposed, and the metal straps that once held the glass and metal panels remain in place. The proposed work would result in the long-term exposure of the brick back-up wall, the removal of the original metal fasteners, and the rebuilding of the wood parapet in brick. The character-defining glass and metal panels would not be reinstalled.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize removal of metal and glass façade panels;
- Restore exposed brick wall;
- Reconstruct wood parapet in brick; and,
- Modify storefront for new entrance.

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.*
 - This application has been submitted in response to a long-standing violation related to the removal of character-defining polished glass and pressed metal panels that once adorned the building's Art Deco façade. The application proposed to legalize the removal of those features and to retain only the support brick that now comprises the front façade. The still-extant metal fasteners that once held the panels would be removed, and the wood parapet would be reconstructed in brick. The proposed work would leave the façade highly altered and would eliminate the features that contributed to the building's architectural significance and for which it was designated. The work does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:23:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Plato Marinakos and owner Allan Nadav represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Nadav stated that the 2014 violation was issued in response to one large section of glass that was falling from the façade onto the sidewalk. He explained that he contacted the Department of Licenses & Inspections, which then came to the site to inspect the building. He added that when the mason arrived to remove the unsafe panels, it was found that all panels were loose and appeared to pose a danger and that there was no way to guarantee other panels would not fall. Mr. Nadav claimed that the mason and inspector verbally agreed that all panels needed to be removed but that that agreement was not recorded in the violation notice. Consequently, he continued, all panels were removed in response to the threat posed. The initial application to restore the glass and metal façade, he contended, was found incomplete due to the lack of a structural engineer's report. He stated that in response, he had several engineers inspect the building and that all engineers

concluded that the brick wall could not support the load from the glass panels. A new curtain wall system, he remarked, would need to be installed. He opined that one option presented by an engineer was to install reinforced columns behind the brick façade that would support the glass panels.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that Mr. Nadav keeps referencing engineers' reports that were not submitted as part of the application and that the Architectural Committee has not had the opportunity to review them. He added that Mr. Nadav's summaries are not sufficient.
- Mr. Marinakos explained that his office worked on the façade restoration in 2014 with former staff member Randal Baron, in which he proposed to reinstall salvaged glass panels and install a number of new panels. He noted that what was unknown at that time was that the brick backup wall could not support the original glass. He asked whether he can submit the engineering reports to show that the original glass and metal panels cannot be supported without a drastic intervention.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that he understands the argument that the wall cannot support the load, but he contended that the Architectural Committee has insufficient information to make a judgment.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that the application as it is being presented by the applicant is incomplete and that the Committee cannot reach a decision, since the applicant is discussing engineers' reports that were not submitted for review prior to the meeting. Addressing claims of cost related to the reinstallation of the panels, Ms. Gutterman argued that the applicant would need to submit a financial hardship application. She commented that the Architectural Committee is tasked with determining whether the historic glass and metal panels can be reinstalled.
 - Mr. Nadav agreed to submit the additional information, commenting that it will address why the building cannot withstand the load. He added that no engineer was willing to sign off on the original approved plans to restore the façade.
 - Ms. Gutterman countered that Mr. Nadav is stating that the engineers' reports suggest that the building cannot support the load of the glass panels, but that the Architectural Committee must be provided with that information in order to reach its own conclusion. She noted that the wall supported the panels in the past until some panels became loose. She questioned why a wall that once supported the glass panels can no longer carry the load.
- Mr. Nadav made several financial hardship claims, noting that the original plan to reinstall the glass panels costs much less than reconstructing the façade or installing an extensive support system on which to hold the panels.
 - Mr. McCoubrey interjected that Mr. Nadav's financial hardship claims are not relevant to their current discussion.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the current condition of the wall.
 - Mr. Nadav responded that the engineers confirmed that the wall can support itself but that it could not support thousands of added pounds from the glass panels and wind load. He explained that the building was originally constructed in the nineteenth century and the Art Deco façade was applied in the early twentieth century.
 - Mr. Detwiler argued that the period of significance dates explicitly to the Art Deco period when the glass façade was installed and questioned whether an alternative solution exists. He suggested that the current solutions proffered by Mr. Nadav, to reconstruct the wall entirely or to install structural columns behind the wall, could potentially be overdesigned, noting that the glass panels existed on the façade for 90 years.

- Mr. Nadav interjected that the panels fell down and almost killed someone.
- Mr. McCoubrey countered that it was not a failure of the masonry but was instead a failure of the glazing system.
- Mr. Detwiler noted the long-term ownership of the current owner, adding that it is up to the owner to maintain a property, including the façade. He contended that if there was failure of the façade, there are probably other signs of failure within the building.
- Mr. Cluver expressed concern over the proposed design, regardless of whether the engineers' reports show that the reinstallation of the panels is infeasible. He stated that the proposed storefront alteration is problematic in the way the door creates a corridor through the building. He asked whether the residential portion of the building could be accessed through an entrance vestibule or central corridor. He stated that an additional concern relates to the rebuilding of the wood parapet with a thin brick veneer. He questioned whether the proposed system could match the historic building and argued that it would not be durable.
- Mr. Farnham stated that procedurally if the applicant will submit a new or supplemented application for the next Architectural Committee meeting that demonstrates that the reconstruction of the glass façade is either technically or financially infeasible the appropriate action would be to withdraw the current application and to resubmit with the engineers' reports and building estimates for the Committee's review in August and the Commission's review in September. He clarified that it is not possible to continue the matter and that the application would need to be withdrawn and resubmitted.
- Mr. Nadav withdrew the application.

ADDRESS: 1607 ST PAUL ST

Proposal: Legalize work to façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Attika Van

Applicant: Damont Lewis, Lewis Living LLC

History: 1885

Individual Designation: 9/26/1967

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 1607 St. Paul Street is one of 16 properties on St. Paul Street and 24 properties on adjacent Rowan Street individually designated as historic in 1967. The two blocks feature two-story red brick Queen Anne rowhouses with projecting bays and porches, cedar shake siding and roofing, and brownstone trim. Nearly all the original Queen Anne windows have been replaced, and a number of buildings now have painted brick facades. Other work to many of the buildings has been undertaken illegally over the course of several decades.

On 27 January 2020, the staff of the Historical Commission requested that the Department of Licenses and Inspections issue a violation to the property for illegal work to the front façade, and a violation was subsequently issued. Prior to the violation, the front façade had a painted brownstone base, lintels, and sills, vinyl windows, a non-original door, and replacement cedar shingles. No permit applications had been approved by the Historical Commission for any past work. Between July 2019 and January 2020, the owner renovated the property. Work to the

front façade included painting the masonry façade, capping the cornice, installing asphalt shingles at the bay roof, replacing the cedar shingles with vinyl siding, installing a steel six-panel door, and replacing the original hairpin porch railing with a metal picket railing.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize roofing;
- Legalize painting of masonry façade;
- Legalize door;
- Legalize removal of hairpin porch railing;
- Legalize vinyl siding; and,
- Legalize cornice capping.

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.*
 - This application proposes to legalize the painting of historic masonry, the covering of the historic cornice, the removal of the original hairpin porch railing, the installation of a steel door, and the cladding of the bay in asphalt shingles and vinyl siding. The work is inappropriate to the historic character of the building and does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:45:45

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the original roofing consisted of slate shingles, noting that it later became cedar shakes.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that so many of the character-defining features have now been lost and questioned whether they could all be returned to their original condition.
- Mr. McCoubrey contended that the shingles were a character-defining feature, and argued that the roofing, panning of the cornice, and painting of the masonry pose the most significant problems.
- Ms. Gutterman added that a further issue is the replacement of the large first-story windows with two double-hung windows.
 - Ms. Keller clarified that the windows had been replaced without permits in the past but were not part of the current violation, since the work had been done years prior.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee would be obligated to recommend denial, though the Historical Commission could reach a different conclusion.

- Mr. Cluver discussed the elements that have been changed and the potential for their restoration. He noted that many of the original elements had already been lost, but contended that those replacement elements attempted to match the character of the original design. He stated that it would be appropriate for the Committee to request that the building be restored in a manner that is sympathetic to its historic character.
- The Committee discussed materials for the shingles at the bay roof.
- Ms. Gutterman asked when the hairpin railing was removed.
 - Ms. Keller answered that it was removed as part of the renovation that resulted in the current violation.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that the replacement of that element is not costly and is important to restore, noting that a salvaged railing could likely easily be located.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that the masonry, including the brick and brownstone lintels, had been painted red and green prior to the repainting during the renovation.
- Mr. McCoubrey argued that the most significant elements to address include returning the shingles on the bay, restoring the pediment, removing the paint from the masonry, and returning the hairpin porch railing.
 - Mr. Detwiler opined whether the original pediment detailing was under plywood prior to the building's renovation and questioned whether it remains. He observed that the undulations of the façade remain intact.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that the decorative brackets remain at the second story of the bay.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the steel door is included in the violation.
 - Ms. Keller responded that it is.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The owner renovated the property between July 2019 and January 2020 without permits.
- At the request of the Historical Commission staff, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for alterations to the front façade. Work included replacing the bay roof with asphalt shingles, installing vinyl siding on the bay and pediment, capping the cornice, installing a steel six-panel door, painting the masonry, and replacing the hairpin porch railing.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The work undertaken by the owner resulted in the removal of character-defining features and is not appropriate to the historic building. The work does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1607 St. Paul St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 527-37 W GIRARD AVE

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Franklin Berger

Applicant: Franklin Berger

History: 1887; N. 6th Street Farmers' Market House & Hall

Individual Designation: Under consideration

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Located at the northeast corner of W. Girard Avenue and N. 6th Street, the former North Sixth Street Farmers' Market is composed of several interconnecting masses constructed between 1886 and 1887, including a prominent headhouse fronting on Girard Avenue (identified in the application as Building A); a two-story hall to the north along N. 6th Street (Building B); and two one-story market sheds with monitor roofs, Building C, which runs along N. 6th Street and connects Buildings A and B; and Building D, which occupies the interior northeast quadrant of the lot and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The property is currently under consideration for designation, and has been recommended for inclusion on the Philadelphia Register by the Committee on Historic Designation.

At the time the owners received notice of the nomination, they were under contract to sell the property to a developer who intended to clear the site. The prospective buyer subsequently backed out, and the owners now seek to better understand the impacts of designation and the potential of future reuse and redevelopment of the property.

This in-concept application seeks guidance on several potential future redevelopment schemes.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Scenario 1 calls for the adaptive reuse of all buildings, with the possibility of alterations to the shed roof of Building D.
- Scenario 2 calls for the removal of Building D and the construction of a 6, 8, or 10-story addition in its footprint.

- Scenario 3 calls for the removal of Building D and the partial demolition of Buildings B and C, and the construction of a 6, 8, or 10-story addition.
- Scenario 4 calls for the removal of Building D, and the partial demolition of Buildings A, B, and C, and the construction of a 6, 8, or 10-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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.*
 - Scenarios 1 and 2 may satisfy Standard 9, as the alterations would be made to historic fabric that is not visible from the public right-of-way. An addition higher than the existing buildings may be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, as it would read as a separate building.
 - Scenarios 3 and 4 propose to remove considerable historic fabric and do not protect the history integrity of the property or its environment.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - Scenarios 1 and 2 satisfy Standard 10, as they leave the essential form and integrity of the historic property intact, provided any new addition are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
 - Scenarios 3 and 4 remove more than half of the existing structures and alter the understanding of the property and, if removed in the future, do not leave the essential form and integrity of the property intact.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept of Scenarios 1 or 2, provided any alteration/addition to Building D is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The staff suggests that, while there are no non-historic components of the property and the shed roofed portions of the property are integral to its history and significance as a farmers' market, given Building D's lack of visibility from the public right-of-way and deep setbacks from both Girard Avenue and 6th Street, flexibility could be exercised in terms of significant alterations or additions to this portion of the property.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:56:16

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ted Agoos and property owners Franklin Berger and Deena Gothelf represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Berger explained that he is trying to get a better understanding of what can be done with the property in the future, either by himself or a future owner.
- Mr. Agoos clarified that these are not specific designs, but are massing concepts intended to get a better understanding of the level of development that would be looked upon favorably in the future.

- Ms. Stein asked whether the property is landlocked; whether the property is 100% built out, or whether there are ways to access the rear of the property for egress or future construction.
 - Mr. Agoos responded that the buildings cover 100% of the site, and all egress is through the existing buildings to W. Girard or N. 6th Street.
- Mr. Cluver agreed with the staff recommendation, noting that scenarios 1 or 2 could be considered acceptable as a concept. He noted that with scenario 2, building C and to a lesser extent building B both have roofs that would slope towards the new addition, so he would accept some modifications to those roofs to achieve positive drainage, but would not go so far as scenario 3 in terms of modifications.
- Mr. Cluver noted that in terms of potential heights for an addition, what strikes him is that it is a neighborhood of three and four stories, so even an addition of six stories is going to stand out, but the fact that it is set back from the street to the extent that it is makes it more palatable. Eight or ten stories starts to give the addition too great of prominence, he opined.
 - Mr. Agoos noted that what is shown in scenario 2 is essentially covering 100% of building D, but if it were an actual future development, there is the potential for holding it back, creating additional setbacks, green space, etcetera, that might have an impact on a building taller than six stories.
 - Mr. Cluver explained that given the long sightlines, even additional setbacks might not have too much of a lessening impact.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, and questioned the visual impact of the massing looking west from further east on Girard Avenue. He agreed that scenarios 1 and 2 seem better than 3 or 4, and noted that this would be the tallest building other than church spires along this stretch of Girard Avenue.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the historic use of building D.
 - Mr. Berger responded that it has been used as many things. He explained that originally it was a farmer's market, but when the market failed, it was used as a nickelodeon, and then a bowling alley, and later a pool hall.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked if the interior is just a wide open space. Mr. Berger responded affirmatively.
 - Mr. Agoos noted that the photographs in the application with the green flooring show the interior of building D.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that that speaks to the usability of a wide, open space.
- Mr. McCoubrey explained that the roof monitor of building C is one of the character-defining features of the property. He acknowledged that the roofing on the other side of the monitor may need to be altered to accommodate future development on building D, but encouraged the retention of the monitor and the reopening of its fenestration.
- Mr. Agoos agreed that that would be an objective, but noted that unfortunately the structure of the monitor is in poor condition and the integrity of the remaining windows is compromised.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the gabled roof of building B is also character-defining, and encouraged any additions to be set back from the ridgeline.
- Mr. Agoos agreed, noting that scenarios 1 and 2 do not alter the roof of building B.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the existing roofing does not appear to be in good condition, and that the owner should be careful or the property could be cited for demolition by neglect.
- Mr. Berger responded that it appears to be haphazard but is generally watertight.

- Mr. Farnham responded that the property is under consideration for designation, but is not yet designated, so a demolition by neglect argument is probably not appropriate at this time.
- Mr. Agoos noted that there is no standing water in the building and the structure overall is in stable condition.
- Mr. Berger asked whether Building D could be removed from the nomination.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that that is a matter that the owner could take up with the Historical Commission when it considers the nomination, but it would be beyond the purview of the Architectural Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society, the nominator of the property, applauded the property owner for exploring redevelopment scenarios that involve the preservation of this important market house building. He agreed with the staff recommendation and supported scenarios 1 and 2, asking the Architectural Committee to be cautiously lenient on plans for redevelopment. He noted that while context of redevelopment is important, almost nothing around the property is designated, and had the nomination not been filed, the development would not have included anything of the historic building. He applauded the retention of the distinctive building C, which has the potential to be a stunning commercial space. He opined that, even with an overbuild, this project has the potential to be one of the most distinctive in the whole area.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing historic buildings cover 100% of the property.
- Neighboring properties are generally three to four stories in height.
- Buildings A, B, and C are the portions of the property that are visible from the public right-of-way, while Building D is not visible from the public right-of-way.
- The rooftop monitor of Building C and the gable roof of Building B are particularly character-defining features.
- Scenarios 1 or 2 provided any alteration/addition to Building D is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The staff suggests that, while there are no non-historic components of the property and the shed roofed portions of the property are integral to its history and significance as a farmers' market, given Building D's lack of visibility from the public right-of-way and deep setbacks from both Girard Avenue and 6th Street, flexibility could be exercised in terms of significant alterations or additions to this portion of the property.
- Depending on its height, an addition higher than the existing buildings on the footprint of Building D may be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, as it would read as a separate building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The Historical Commission should exercise flexibility in approving alterations to Building D.
- The rooftop monitor of Building C should be retained and restored.
- Scenarios 1 and 2 may satisfy Standard 9, as the alterations would be made to historic fabric that is not visible from the public right-of-way. A new addition on Building D should be restricted to four to six stories in height so as not to overwhelm

- the existing buildings and to read as a separate building and therefore be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- An addition of eight or more stories in height would overwhelm the existing buildings and context and would not satisfy Standard 9.
 - Scenarios 1 and 2 satisfy Standard 10, as they leave the essential form and integrity of the historic property intact, provided any new addition is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of Scenarios 1 and 2, provided the addition on Building D is restricted to four to six stories in height, depending on the design, and that the rooftop monitor of Building C is restored, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 527-37 W. Girard Ave MOTION: Approval in concept with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver 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				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1730 WHARTON ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate church; install vinyl-clad windows and ramp railing; remove chimneys
 Review Requested: Final approval
 Owner: 1730 Wharton LLC
 Applicant: Rich Villa
 History: 1888; Eighteenth Street Methodist Episcopal Church
 Individual Designation: 9/14/1988
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

Located at the southeast corner of Wharton Street and S. 18th Street, the former 18th Street Methodist Episcopal Church, constructed about 1888, historically featured wood windows with marbled blue glass. Between fall 2018 and summer 2019, many of the historic windows appear to have been removed without Historical Commission review or approval. The original frames and some of the original marbled blue glass windows remain. The current owners, who purchased the property in 2019, intend to convert the property into residential use. This application proposes to install vinyl windows in most of the window openings, as well as in the louvered belltower openings. Most of the proposed windows feature a two-over-two configuration with a vertical muntin, when historically the building featured a combination of four-over-four (1st floor front), one-over-one (1st floor gable), two-over-two with horizontal muntin (2nd

floor front; 1st floor side), and six-over-six windows (1st and 2nd floor side). To accommodate the insertion of an additional interior floor level, the upper floor windows on the side elevation, which historically were single double-hung, six-over-six windows, are proposed to be composed of two sets of hung windows. To create usable space in the belltowers, the application proposes to install windows in place of the existing louvers. The application also proposes to install a solid metal ramp railing that extends to the ground, replace the front doors, and to demolish two historic, corbelled, rear chimneys to the roofline. The application also proposes rehabilitation work including masonry repairs, which can be reviewed and approved at the staff level.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate building for residential use and insert interior floor level
- Remove remaining historic windows and bell-tower louvers
- Install vinyl windows in most openings, including stacked double-hung windows in side elevations
- Remove corbelled chimneys
- Install solid metal ramp railing with laser cut building name
- Replace entrance doors

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.*
 - The proposed windows do not replicate, nor approximate, the historic windows in design, texture, or material, therefore failing to satisfy Standard 6. The staff notes that there are a number of incorrect window details in terms of proposed muntin configuration. Based on the floor plans, some of the windows also appear to sit proud of the façade, rather than be set in an appropriate depth within the masonry opening.
 - The corbelled chimneys should be repaired rather than removed in order to satisfy Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed solid metal ramp railing is differentiated from, but not compatible with the historic property, and is visually obtrusive, further blocking views of the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, but approval of an application with a metal picket railing at the ramp and wood or aluminum-clad wood windows at the side elevations and in the bell tower openings, including the installation of stacked double-hung windows in double-height side elevation openings, provided the muntin pattern matches that of the historic windows, and provided the marbled blue glass windows are retained, restored, or replicated in the front façade openings in all but the bell-tower openings, with the staff to review details.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:11:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rich Villa and developer Kal Leslie represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked whether the staff feels the chimneys should be removed or restored.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff feels the chimneys are character-defining features and should be restored rather than demolished.
- Mr. Villa addressed the staff overview and recommendation. He explained that his client purchased the property recently and is looking to rehabilitate the property. He agreed to use metal-clad windows or wood windows in place of vinyl windows with the correct muntin patterns.
- Mr. Villa noted that the west chimney is in very poor condition, and the mason would like to remove the top 10 feet and rebuild the corbelled top 10 feet lower in lieu of repointing it at its current height.
 - Ms. Stein opined that the chimneys are character-defining features, and questioned how much of the chimneys would need to be removed to make them stable.
 - Mr. Villa responded that he is not sure of the exact dimensions, but that the top of the chimneys are in poor condition and that they are proposing to demolish them to the spring point above the roof and to rebuild the corbelled tops in those locations.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein, noting that the chimneys are not terribly complicated, and could easily be rebuilt. He suggested that they remain at their current height.
 - Mr. Leslie opined that the existing height of the chimneys is a safety concern, because the integrity of the existing chimneys is poor. He noted that the height also requires additional maintenance over the years.
 - Ms. Stein explained that the property is individually designated and it is important to maintain features that are distinctive on the exterior of the building, which includes the chimneys and bell towers. She applauded the applicants for their intention to rehabilitate and reuse the building, and noted that the Committee is suggesting some concessions in terms of the replacement of some of the blue marbled glass windows, but that chimneys are important, and can be made safe, even when they are tall.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that, if the chimneys are not functional, they could be filled solid, which would add to their structural integrity. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.
- Mr. Villa noted that the bell tower is a faux bell tower, and that he is looking to replace the louvers with double-hung windows with a muntin pattern that is acceptable to the Commission and to use those spaces as additional residential space.
 - Mr. Detwiler opined that the louvers in the bell tower openings on the front elevation at least should be maintained or replicated, explaining that whether or not they were actually historically bell towers, they were made to look like them, and that is an important feature of the building. He suggested that he would accept windows on the side elevations, but not the front.
 - Mr. Villa responded that he could put windows inside of the openings, behind the louvers.

- Mr. Cluver disagreed with Mr. Detwiler, opining that the louvers should be maintained on the fronts and sides of the bell towers because they are visible together.
- Ms. Stein noted that she would accept the installation of windows in place of louvers as part of the adaptive reuse, but suggested that all of the openings in the bell towers be treated the same way.
- Mr. Villa explained that his client did not remove the marbled blue glass windows, the previous owner did, but some of the removed windows are in storage. He agreed to take an inventory of the remaining and stored windows and to restore or replace in kind as many as possible. He noted that the first floor windows as well as a round window on Wharton Street are still in place and could be restored, as are some windows on the 18th Street side at the bottom of the bell tower. He noted that there are a few others that may remain but are in poor condition. Mr. Villa explained that the marbled windows are located in communal spaces, so their retention or replacement in kind would not hamper the residential use.
- Mr. Villa explained that there is an existing set of commercial front doors that they would like to replace in kind.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned the appearance of the new doors, which are presented as a storefront system.
 - Mr. Villa responded that the existing doors are storefront doors, and they are proposing to replace in kind.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested that a pair of wood door with a proper stile and rail with glass panels would be more appropriate.
- Mr. Villa agreed to install a new picket railing for the ramp instead of the proposed opaque metal railing.
- Mr. Villa noted that the rest of the work involves cleaning the masonry and repointing.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the insertion of a new floor level and its relationship with the windows. He noted that the new third floor level hits at the middle of the windows openings, but that the elevation drawings do not show how the sound and fire separation will be addressed on the interior and how that will impact the window itself.
 - Mr. Villa responded that his intention is to install a thin mullion bar between two hung windows, and to hang the floor beyond the mullion using a K pocket. He noted that he could try to match the overall pattern of the historic windows.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that the elevation drawings do not show any mullion bar and the configuration appears a bit odd and does not reflect the reality of what Mr. Villa described. He noted that the staff should pay close attention to that detail.
 - Mr. Cluver also suggested looking at the relationship between the proportions of the upper and lower sash.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the location of any proposed mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Villa responded that there is a side yard on the east side of the building where some mechanical units will be located, in addition to mounting some on the east side of the roof, where they will not be overly visible.
 - Committee members expressed concern over the installation of dunnage and units on the sloped roof, noting that they may be visible from the street.
 - Mr. Villa responded that he will try to put as many units on the ground in the alley, and limit the number installed on the roof, and locate them as far back as possible to limit their visibility.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron offered suggestions for the rehabilitation. He agreed with the staff recommendation, and added that the window openings are both curved and pointed, and have a rope molding, all of which may be difficult to achieve with metal windows. He also noted that the front door jambs have a panel pattern that matches the panels of the historic doors, and suggested that new panels in glass match the three part pattern. He noted that the basement windows probably had muntins. He suggested that the paint on brownstone should be removed with paint remover and that the heavy carbon on the brick be cleaned with a restoration cleaner rather than power washing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The tall corbelled chimneys are character-defining features can be rebuilt to their current height and configuration safely.
- The proposed windows do not match the configuration or materials of the historic windows.
- The drawings do not adequately address how the new floor will be installed in relationship to the windows.
- The historic marbled glass windows are a character-defining feature that should be retained or restored where possible, especially on the front elevation.
- The bell tower louvers are a character-defining feature of the building and should be retained or replicated, with new windows installed behind.
- The existing doors in the western opening of the front elevation are commercial storefront doors, but if they are to be replaced, should be done so with wood doors and glass panels to replicate the historic jambs and doors in the eastern opening.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed windows do not replicate, nor approximate, the historic windows in design, texture, or material, therefore failing to satisfy Standard 6.
- In order to satisfy Standard 6, the marbled blue glass windows should be retained or restored where possible, and wood or aluminum-clad windows should be used in other openings, with muntin patterns replicating those of the historic windows.
- The corbelled chimneys should be repaired rather than removed in order to satisfy Standard 6.
- The proposed solid metal ramp railing is differentiated from, but not compatible with the historic property, and is visually obtrusive, further blocking views of the historic building, therefore failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- Exterior mechanical equipment should be inconspicuous and should be installed on the ground rather than the roof, where possible, in order to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline, but approval provided the following, with the staff to review details:

- wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are used at the side elevations, including the installation of stacked double-hung windows in the double-height openings, provided the muntin patterns matches those of the historic windows, and the mullion between the windows at the new floor level is as minimal as possible;
- the marbled blue glass windows are retained, restored, or replicated in the front façade openings and communal spaces;
- the original chimneys are restored and kept to present height;

- any exterior condensing or other HVAC units are installed in inconspicuous locations with preference for the ground;
- louvers at corner towers retained, with understanding that glass or operable windows may be installed behind them;
- new doors in the western entrance of the front façade are made of wood, with glass panels to replicate the panel pattern on the jambs.
- a metal picket railing is used at the ramp.

ITEM: 1730 Wharton St					
MOTION: Denial as proposed, but approval with revisions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 737 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct six-story building with mezzanine and decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sarah Investment LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects

History: 1955

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a six-story, mixed-use building with a mezzanine and roof decks on the site of a now-demolished, non-contributing building in the Society Hill Historic District. The staff of the Historical Commission approved the demolition of the non-contributing building in October 2019.

The north side of the block, where this site is situated, has an important history as Sansom Row by Benjamin Latrobe, which marks the beginning of rowhouse development in Philadelphia in 1799. Before that time, builders only constructed houses individually or in very small groups. Twelve of the original houses still survive in the row, even if some have been modified. The row now consists entirely of three- and four-story historic buildings clad in red brick, brownstone, stucco, and other masonry.

At its 8 May 2020 meeting, the Historical Commission denied a similar application to construct a six-story building with a mezzanine and roof decks, stating that the size of the party walls overwhelmed the adjacent buildings and the setbacks were too minimal. The current application

maintains the size and materials of the party walls and minimally increases the dimensions of the setbacks by two feet. The current design includes a five-foot setback at the fifth story and an additional three-foot setback at the sixth story. The mezzanine would be set back a total of 19-feet from the front façade, with roof decks at the front and rear. The façade materials are similar to the application the Historical Commission reviewed at its May 2020 meeting. The building would feature red brick at its upper stories and cast stone to imitate limestone at the storefront. Aluminum double-hung windows are proposed at the upper stories.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six-story, mixed-use building with commercial ground floor and set-back seventh-floor mezzanine.

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.*
 - The size, scale, proportions, and massing of the proposed building are incompatible with the surrounding context and the historic district. The proposed new construction does not satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's 8 May 2020 denial of a similar application.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:39:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Reuter stated it was brought to his attention earlier that morning that the applicant had submitted a video presentation in support or related to the application. He noted that he assumed the video is just a walkthrough. Mr. Reuter continued that the video is narrated by Bob Thomas, the Chair of the Historical Commission, who is obviously going to recuse himself from the matter. He stated that as this was just brought to his attention, he does not know if there is a rule explicitly a rule against being involved in a presentation if you are recusing, but would strongly urge against doing this. Mr. Reuter asked if it was possible for Mr. Rosenberg to mute the narration and ask him to do the narration of the walkthrough. He asked the applicant if by the time of the Commission meeting if the video could have a different narration presented to the full Commission. Mr. Reuter said at this point he is not willing to say it is forbidden under the ethics provision of the code but again he has not had the time to research on that. He stated that he suspects it will be strongly recommended against the Chair of the Historical Commission providing the narration for the video. He asked Mr. Rosenberg to let him know if this can be done.

- The Committee members said the video had been provided to them in advance of the meeting and had all watched it, therefore there was no need for them to watch it again at the public meeting.
- Mr. Rosenberg responded that they will change the narration, and have it resubmitted to avoid any potential issues that were raised by Mr. Reuter and that is something that can be done in the next couple days.
- Mr. Rosenberg thanked the Committee for watching the video and noted it is essential to their overall approach in submitting the revised application. He noted that he believes the video is also available online to the general public. Mr. Rosenberg said the main point of the video and the application image HC-01 is to make the point that notwithstanding there are some beautiful historic buildings east of the project site on the block and hopefully will remain there for a very long time and there are many historic buildings in this immediate vicinity. He said they are aware the Sansom Street historic district nomination is pending, and Washington Square West is around the corner and full of historic buildings but this neighborhood over time has evolved well beyond those. Mr. Rosenberg indicated that application image HC-01 illustrates the point showing nearby buildings such as the Curtis Building and the St. James at taller heights and said as the city has evolved this area has become a major commercial center. He added that the historical buildings that remain hopefully shall be preserved for posterity and the continuation of making this a rich collection of many architectural styles and periods will continue. Mr. Rosenberg said they feel the modest 2-story building height above their adjacent neighbors is suitable and appropriate for respecting the historic buildings immediately to the east and at the same time acknowledge change that has taken place throughout this wonderful part of the city.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that he has seen many aspects of this presentation already and would like Mr. Rosenberg to focus on what is different between what the Committee saw before and what they are seeing now.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that they had changed the color of the brick. He stated that the brick color originally proposed was more of an orange brick and the new red brick is more consistent with the neighboring building. He said the second change is the massing has been updated to increase the setback for the penthouse to almost 19 feet and the elevator penthouse has been eliminated which was another 10 feet above the mezzanine. Mr. Rosenberg noted that those of the major revisions that have taken place since the last submission.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he appreciates that the cornice now much more strongly relates to the row. He continued that the overbuild massing is still very close to the front façade and still very prominent from the corner. Mr. Cluver said the cement board panels on feel like a mismatch and added that they are a higher, visible element that do not have historic character. He agreed that the changes are a step in the right direction from the original submission, but he still does not think the revised submission addresses the overall concerns previously raised about the height of it.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that he agreed that strengthening the cornice line along Walnut Street ties the proposed building together with the historic buildings to the immediate east. He noted that when you couple image HC-04 with the video it becomes completely clear what the visibility shown in HC-04 is its worst possible condition and heading west, north, or south it is completely out of eyesight.
 - Mr. Cluver replied that it might be at its worst possible condition, but it is at its worst possible viewpoint.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated the view from the opposite way is also very important because the neighboring building on the opposite side, directly to the east, is only a three-story building. He noted that the Committee asked Mr. Rosenberg to provide this view the last time they reviewed this application.
 - Mr. Rosenberg replied that this view is captured in the video submitted. He continued that they felt it was pretty clear that the amount of building seen from the east looking west was minor. Mr. Rosenberg stated the fact is even though we think it is a taller building we just do not think it adversely effects the character of the neighborhood which is surrounded by larger buildings.
- Mr. Detwiler said it is not necessarily the overbuild itself, rather it is the visibility of the overbuild. He pointed out that HC-05 in the application shows the site line you are within and he continued that if you look at where the cornice line is relative to that it is pretty close. Mr. Detwiler commented that if the overbuild were shifted back a bit it would not be terrible to the integrity of the building to have a little more of a setback.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that they will take that under consideration and it is a valid point. He contended that in comparison to the buildings in the immediate vicinity, such as the Curtis Building and St. James, those minor adjustments will have a negligible impact.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that they are really looking at the design in the context of the neighboring buildings and a very important row. He continued that the fact there is a multistory building across the street does not change the relationship with this building to its immediate neighbors and the visibility from the street corners.
- Ms. Stein said she agreed completely. She pointed out that this is an infill building among a very significant building row. Ms. Stein noted that they are proposing to insert a seven-story building between three- and four-story structures and it is really oversized for this site and row. She added that it doesn't matter if there is a skyscraper across the street, the context is this row of buildings. Ms. Stein contended this is an infill building not an object building so the context is what makes it important.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that he disagreed because the context is the three-dimensional world we are living in. He added that we don't have blinders on when we are walking down the street, we are not just looking at the 12 historic houses, we are looking at everything three-dimensionally and that is the context. Mr. Rosenberg stated that to limit the height of the building because of one minor aspect of the context seems to him like the tail wagging the dog.
- Mr. Cluver said the fact that Mr. Rosenberg thinks the context of the historic row is a minor component is telling. Mr. Cluver stated that he believes it is the major component.
 - Mr. Rosenberg replied that the proposed building is relatively big compared to the buildings next door, but it is relatively tiny compared to the intersection where it is located.
 - Mr. Cluver said that context degrades the further you get from the source so the immediate context, such as the buildings on either side, is the most important portion of the context and the buildings next to those come after that. He noted that what is happening across the street is part of the context but in terms of priority and order of impact, its order of magnitude is different.
 - Mr. Rosenberg replied that he would challenge that in view of the controversy over the building of the St. James. He continued that this was an enormous undertaking and controversial. Mr. Rosenberg said he would venture that residents of the neighborhood would completely disagree. He stated that he

- thinks the St. James has more of an impact on the entire vicinity than a couple of extra stories. He asked the Committee to view their application in a global sense.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he thinks the overbuild has to be set back significantly from the street and reduced in height to not have such an adverse impact on the entire block.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that he wanted to remind everyone that the overbuild is on a new building and the entire building will be new construction.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated the staff has appropriately summed up the issues and provided a history of the importance of the row in the staff recommendation. He continued that this is a row of three and four-story buildings with a proposal for a six-story building and does not meet Standard 9.
 - Mr. Detwiler said if he remembers correctly, the building that was historically on the site was a match to the building standing immediately east of the site.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that it was not a match to the one to the east but to the building two doors down to the east. He pointed out that the massing of the four-story portion of the proposed building is comparable to what was historically there.
 - Mr. Rosenberg replied that he would agree with that noting that the fifth and sixth stories are set back from the four-story section.
 - Mr. Cluver said the discussions of this application have focused on the height, but he wants to be clear that the material proposed for the visible party walls is not an appropriate fit.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated he agrees strongly with this.
 - Mr. Rosenberg replied that he is open to other materials on the party walls and will discuss with staff and come up with alternative approaches.
 - Mr. Cluver pointed out that no elevations were included in their application. He said there were no discussions about the front façade and storefront and there should be more discussion about this.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that he will provide this.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated they should move on to public comment.
 - Mr. Farnham noted that Randal Baron, a former staff member of the Historical Commission, had raised his hand requesting to speak for public comment. He noted that Mr. Baron had participated in the review of this project when he was a staff member. Mr. Farnham observed that, while Mr. Baron may not be technically barred from participating in the review, he had grave concerns that his participation would give the appearance of an ethical conflict. He asked Mr. Reuter to comment on the legal implications of the possible participation.
 - Mr. Reuter stated that he is not an ethics counsel, there is a Board of Ethics that handles these things. He said his understanding that where there are conflicts of interest in post-city employment this typically applies to having dealings with city contracts and other issues. Mr. Reuter stated that in terms of a very quick review of the issue there does not appear to be any prohibition on former city employees commenting on matters with which they have had some involvement. He added that obviously if you are an attorney, there is a whole other set of rules that applies but for non-attorneys he is not seeing any specific prohibition. He concluded that they will have to see what Mr. Baron has to say and make a determination if there is a specific problem. Mr. Reuter said Mr. Baron can provide public comment.
 - Mr. Baron stated that he has gone to the Board of Ethics to ask this specific question. He explained that he cannot comment on behalf of an owner on projects that he worked on in the past as city employee nor is he allowed to work with an owner on projects that he worked on in the past as city employee. Mr.

Baron said he was told by the lawyers that he is allowed as a private person to speak to the Historical Commission about something he has worked on in the past. He wanted to confirm to those present that he did speak to the ethics counsel and received a written determination from them.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association, spoke in opposition to the project. He stated that he wanted to add to the discussion about the St. James building. Mr. Boni noted that the St. James tower was approved by the Historical Commission as a compromise expressly because of the higher preservation purpose of saving the PSFS building on the corner (located directly east of the St. James). He continued that it was very much a package deal and that there was a much higher preservation purpose so much so that the approval issued by the Historical Commission stated that this was not to be used as a precedent. Mr. Boni noted that he thought it was completely improper for anyone else in the neighborhood to point to the St. James as a precedent. He added that the SHCA submitted a letter to the staff about the project and they stand by the other points made in the letter.
- Randal Baron stated that he wished to address the earlier discussion point about what was historically on this site. He noted that a photograph was submitted by the applicant with their first application that showed what historically stood on the site. He confirmed that the staff does have this information available in the older application file. Mr. Baron said that the building did in fact look like the building directly to the right of the site, 735 Walnut Street. He added that some buildings further east in the row were originally similar three-story buildings but at some point had a fourth floor added on. Mr. Baron explained that the front facades of the altered buildings have Flemish bond brickwork on first three levels and the upper fourth story has running bond. He concluded that originally the full row looked similar to 735 Walnut Street but many of the buildings had been changed over time. He said that the most recent building at 737 Walnut Street was a one-story building that was recently demolished.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The revised application included the following changes:
 - Façade brick color is now red.
 - The elevator penthouse has been removed.
 - The penthouse setback has been increased to 19 feet.
 - The cornice is more prominent to better relate to the historic character of row.
- The overbuild above fourth floor remains highly visible.
- The concrete panel proposed for the party walls is not appropriate to the historic character of the block.
- The requested rendering, showing a view of the proposed building looking west down Walnut Street, was not provided with the revised application.
- The proposed building is an infill building in a historic row.
- The key context for the proposed building is the adjacent buildings and the historic building row.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The floors above the cornice line should set back significantly from the street and reduced in height to not have such an adverse impact on the entire block.

- A new material for the visible party walls should be proposed. The material should be compatible with the historic row.
- Application should be revised to include a rendering of the proposed building looking west down Walnut Street.
- Application should be revised to include elevation drawings, including a detailed elevation of the proposed front façade with storefront.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's 8 May 2020 denial of a similar application.

ITEM: 737 Walnut St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 232-36 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Demolition non-contributing building; construct 15-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marie F. Cerone

Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 2000; Martin Jay Rosenblum, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application for final approval proposes to construct a 15-story tower at the southeast corner of Walnut Street and S. 3rd Street. The existing single-family residence on the property was constructed in 1999 and is non-contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. The application proposes full demolition of the three-story brick residence and garage and construction of a 15-story, 184' tall building. The proposed building will house a hotel and a first-floor commercial space.

Although the existing building is non-contributing to the historic district, the lot is considered contributing for archaeological potential.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish existing building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Construct 15-story, 184' tower.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 8: Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*
 - The applicant should engage an archaeologist to assess property for archaeological potential in order to satisfy Standard 8. An initial assessment has not been submitted with application.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The massing, size, scale, proportions, and height of the proposed tower are not compatible with the historic district. The Historical Commission rejected a tower for the adjacent site to the east recently, asserting that a tall building was not appropriate for the context, especially the Merchants Exchange building and other nearby, historically significant buildings and collections of buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 8 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:12:03

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehler presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rich Villa and property owner Anthony Cerone represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver said he does not feel the proposed design is an appropriate fit and noted at issue is the height but also the design too. He continued that the height is its own issue, but the design almost has a Louis Sullivan and reminded him of the Bayard Building in New York City along with a couple other buildings in Center City, although none in Society Hill. He concluded that the height and design make it an inappropriate fit with the historic district.
 - Mr. Villa asked if he meant the inappropriateness is within the top of the building.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that in general there are specific elements about the design such as the size of the cornice, the relationship of the top of the windows to the cornice, and the lack of articulation at the base, middle, and top which would be typical of a midsize building such as this. He added that it just does not feel like it is part of the Society Hill Historic District.
 - Mr. Villa pointed out that the building is along the upper limit of the Society Hill Historic District. He continued that as you go down the street there are different articulations in the buildings. Mr. Villa said that the top of the windows are open for interpretation; its design is to represent a curtain being pulled open which is an homage to Charles Willson Peale's famous painting of him revealing his museum.

- Mr. McCoubrey said that the proposed building is in a block that is largely a three-story brick block and is significantly higher than its neighbors. He noted that the height is the overwhelming issue he has with the design. Mr. McCoubrey added that he is concerned about the impact on the Merchants' Exchange Building which would shade it fairly significantly. He continued that the Merchants' Exchange Building is a civic, somewhat public building, that is white within a red brick context and it calls into question the palette proposed for the new building. Mr. McCoubrey stressed that his main concern is the proposed height in a mostly three-story part of the city. He recognizes that Society Hill Towers are there, but it is different as they are surrounded by lawn and green space and in a very different urban environment than this site. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he knows a 65-foot height limit is being considered for this area of the city and thinks it would include this site. He noted that City Council was supposed to be acting on this but does not believe it has happened yet. This 65-foot limit suggests a maximum height that could be considered although in this specific context even a 65-foot height could be questioned.
- Mr. Detwiler said he agreed with Mr. McCoubrey in that the 65-foot height limit was on his mind as well. He added that for him the major factor is the Merchants' Exchange Building and the impact of putting it in shadow for much of the day. Mr. Detwiler contended that in such a context, that includes the Merchants' Exchange Building and Independence National Historical Park, it needs a little breathing room and the proposed design does not provide it.
 - Mr. Villa pointed out that the proposed building does provide a 29-foot setback from Walnut Street as a little bit of breathing room.
 - Mr. Detwiler said he recognized the design's setback but contended that its height will put the Merchants' Exchange Building in a significant amount of shadow and that has a significant impact on his point of view.
 - Mr. Villa responded that the Merchants' Exchange Building would not be in shadow all day.
- Ms. Stein pointed out that it is the fact that the height dominates the view. She said what architects and preservationists love about the Merchants' Exchange Building is its very delicate detailing and the light well at the top. Ms. Stein stated that the proposed building would dominate over those features down Walnut Street and puts the Merchants' Exchange Building in its shadow. She continued that the overbearing height is taking away from the Merchants' Exchange Building and that is one of the things the Committee is trying to protect.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated he agrees with the staff recommendation.
- Mr. Cerone stated that he owns the property, constructed the current building, and lives there. He said that he is very sensitive to the property, cityscape, and in what he has designed with Mr. Villa. Mr. Cerone continued that he understands the Merchants' Exchange Building and that they first designed the building in red brick but changed it to the material used on the Merchants' Exchange Building. He explained that he was born, raised, educated in Philadelphia and loves the city. Mr. Cerone said that if the Committee wants them to move the building up to the property line and bring it down a couple stories, he would be open to that. He stated that the City of Philadelphia is in a position right now which is unprecedented and added that if one were to take a forensic audit, he would find that Philadelphia is bankrupt. Mr. Cerone continued that the city needs development and jobs to bring back the image that was destroyed two months ago. He noted that it is all nice and well that those who have to say "oh no" to this project and that he believes this project is one that the city needs. Mr. Cerone said he believes the design is sensitive to it and noted

again he would be open to moving the building perimeter to Walnut Street and reducing the height a couple of stories. He addressed comments that a hotel will add traffic congestion and crowding to this intersection, noting it already has this.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mr. Farnham said that representatives of Society Hill Civic Association, Society Hill Towers, and Bingham Court submitted written public comments to the staff, and these had been distributed to the Committee members prior to the meeting. The National Park Service submitted a letter in opposition to the proposal. This letter and additional email comments were posted to the Historical Commission's web site.
- Alex Balloon, Old City resident and preservation advocate, said that he was concerned about some of the opposition to the proposed building and arguments regarding height concerns. He added the taller heights of nearby building should be considered in the context of Standard 9, also noting that historically, taller buildings stood in the area, but were demolished years ago. Mr. Balloon agreed with the staff recommendation and the National Park Service letter regarding Standard 8
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, opposed the proposal. He said his organization agreed with the staff recommendation of Standards 8 and 9, noting the context of the proposed building to Independence National Historical Park and the Society Hill Historic District.
- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia, said that he liked the design but noted that the building's height could be lower. He added that it should not be detached from the building next door and should be built out to Walnut Street, without a setback, and this could justify lowering the height. Mr. Beisert stated his opinion that earlier planning decisions were a disaster to this neighborhood and that the proposed building has the potential to rebuild a sense of importance that as lost on so many nearby parcels where buildings were demolished in the past. He disagreed with the argument for three-story and low-scale buildings only in this area.
- Bonnie Halda, resident of Society Hill and historical architect, opposed the proposal. She stated that the Merchants' Exchange Building is a National Historical Landmark, and as such, it is among only 2,500 National Historical Landmarks in the nation. Ms. Halda said the Merchants' Exchange Building is significant to Philadelphia but also part of the nation's history.
- Jeanne Sigler, resident of Society Hill Towers, opposed the proposal. She said the building is out of scale with the neighborhood. Ms. Sigler pointed out that Walnut Street and 3rd Street is already a busy corner and the increased traffic would have a negative effect on the neighborhood. She added that the increased traffic around the clock would impact the pedestrian, tourist, and historical experience of the area.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed tower would stand on a block composed of primarily three-story brick buildings.
- The building's height would dominate over the view along Walnut Street.
- The site's context includes the Merchants' Exchange Building and Independence National Historical Park.
- The proposed height and mass would negatively impact the nearby Merchants' Exchange Building, potentially casting an extensive shadow over the National Historic Landmark building.

- Elements of the design are incompatible with the Society Hill Historic District.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application as submitted does not meet Standards 8 and 9.
- The denial for Standard 9 is based on the design's size, scale, proportions, height, and design elements.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 8 and 9.

ITEM: 232-36 Walnut 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				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1600-06 E BERKS ST

Proposal: Demolish building owing to necessity in the public interest

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1600 Berks LLC

Applicant: Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr

History: 1885-90, St. Laurentius Church, Edwin Forest Durang, architect

Individual Designation: 7/10/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the St. Laurentius church building at 1600-06 E. Berks Street. Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance stipulates that:

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

This application contends that the Historical Commission should approve the demolition as necessary in the public interest to abate a dangerous condition that poses a threat to public safety. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building Unsafe in April 2015. The Historical Commission designated it in July 2015 over the objections of the owner, the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, who claimed that the building was in very poor condition and repairing it would be a hardship. A current owner purchased the church in January 2020.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

In June 2020, the owner submitted an engineer's report to the Historical Commission and Department of Licenses & Inspections that indicates that the two towers are failing and pose a public safety hazard. In response to the report, the L&I Commissioner requested that the property owner provide a second engineer's report from an independent, qualified structural engineer. The second report was submitted in early July. It concurs with the findings of the first report and also provides a detailed history of the many recent engineering analyses of the building. After the second report confirmed the findings of the first, the L&I Commissioner requested that the Historical Commission consider the application on an expedited basis at its July 10 monthly meeting, without referral to the Architectural Committee, owing to a need to address the public safety concerns immediately. On July 9, the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections sent a letter to the Historical Commission explaining his request. The letter indicates that the danger posed by the building must be abated as soon as possible, especially before students return to the adjacent school and freeze/thaw cycles begin.

The Historical Commission considered the application at its July 10 meeting and after a lengthy presentation by the applicant, considerable debate by the Commissioners, and extensive public comment, the Commission voted to refer the application to the Architectural Committee for a recommendation.

Owing to the public safety hazard posed by the towers and the Historical Commission's decision to delay a decision to its meeting on August 14, the L&I Commissioner retained an independent engineer to evaluate the building. The Commissioner and the engineer inspected the building on July 24 and the Commissioner issued a letter with the engineer's report to the Historical Commission on July 27.

The Commissioner's letter contends that the Historical Commission should approve the demolition of both towers and that the demolition should be undertaken from the rear, through the sanctuary. He also states that structural bracing or scaffolding of the towers is not a practical alternative to removing the towers. He concludes that the focus should be on saving portions of the building for incorporation into a new building. While discussing his latest letter with the Historical Commission's staff, the Commissioner indicated that the north or front façade along Berks Street and the east or side façade along Memphis Street might be able to be saved and incorporated into a new building, but the rest of the church will need to be demolished to get to the towers from the south or rear along Wilt Street. The Commissioner states in his letter that owing to the tight dimensions of the site, adjacent buildings and narrow streets, the safest and most practical method to demolish the two towers is to stage the demolition from the south side. This approach however necessitates substantial demolition of the former sanctuary.

The Department of Licenses & Inspections is the City agency with the expertise and authority to determine when buildings poses threats to public safety. The Department has determined that this church building poses a hazard to public safety and that the hazard must be abated quickly with the demolition of the towers. The Historical Commission should accept the Department's determination on its face. The task before the Historical Commission and Architectural Committee is to determine whether there are reasonable alternatives when demolishing that might save some of the building while protecting public health, safety, and welfare. The Historical Commission and Architectural Committee should accept the Commissioner's assertion that the Historical Commission should approve the demolition of both towers and that the demolition should be undertaken from the rear, through the sanctuary.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:50:28

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Matt McClure, engineers Janis Vacca and Mark Coggin, and economic consultant Peter Angelides represented the application.
- Attorney Michael Mattioni represented parties who have an agreement with the property owner to remove artifacts from the building.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McClure introduced his team. He stated that he is presenting an application to demolish the church, which is necessitated by a need to protect public safety, not a development project. He reserved his right to submit a financial hardship application at a later date.
- Mr. McClure stated that the church cannot be considered devoid of its context. He explained that the streets around the church on three sides are very narrow and a school is located 10 feet to the west of the church. The steeples are 135 feet tall, much wider than the 30 and 50-foot wide streets. The school supports the application.
- Mr. McClure stated that the structural problems with the towers have been well known for at least seven years. The problems were discussed at the time the church was nominated, but the Historical Commission tried to limit the conversation to the historical and architectural merits, and not the condition. He asserted that the Historical Commission should have considered the condition of the towers. He noted that the nominator claimed at the designation review that the towers have structural issues that are being addressed, but the building is otherwise in good condition. He opined that that statement was false at the time and potentially reckless. Several engineer's reports have highlighted the problems. Mr. McClure stated that efforts to redevelop the church were thwarted through litigation. Designating alone does not fix structural issues. The poor condition of the building has been "an inconvenient truth."
- Mr. McClure stated that his client purchased the church in January 2020 with the intent of rehabilitating the church. His client paid \$350,000 for the plans to redevelop the church. However, that is not possible. Several structural engineers have concluded that there is a very real potential for a complete structural failure. The towers pose an imminent risk of collapse. The potential for structural failure has been confirmed by David Perri, the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections, in a letter, and by the Urban Engineers report, which Mr. Perri commissioned. Time is of the essence. Demolition should start now. There is no feasible way to repair the towers. Demolition needs to begin immediately to abate the dangerous condition. Owing to the need to demolish the towers in a short time frame, the only way to do so is to demolish the entire church. He explained that the safest way to remove the towers is to do so from the south, to ensure that the towers do not collapse into the street.
- Mr. McClure summarized the testimony to come from his witnesses. He stated that his team immediately made the City aware of the structural problems at this building. He asserted that, even if he had all the time he needed to respond to the conditions and the church was set in an open area, providing a large collapse zone, there would still be no financially feasible way to repair the towers. He stated that this is not a financial hardship application but observed that the Architectural Committee can consider financial information when deciding necessity in the public interest cases.

He stated that he reserved the right to submit a financial hardship application in the future.

- Mr. McClure stated that he and his team as well as the owner are all new to this matter, which has been ongoing for many years. They bring new eyes and new intentions. He stated that three structural engineers with no involvement in a new construction project have all concluded in the last three months that the towers must be demolished from the south.
- Mr. McClure read from Commissioner Perri's letter of 27 July 2020: "We witnessed damage to the towers' exterior brownstone façade and more significantly, cracking and related horizontal displacement (previously measured at up to 2-in.) of the interior mica schist stone cores. As a result of structural cracking, portions of the exterior walls of the towers are leaning outward and are partially freestanding." He again stated that the school is 10 feet from the church. He again quoted the Commissioner, who wrote that "the installation of long-term structural bracing and/or the erection of structural scaffolding to gain additional time is not a practical alternative given the dire condition of the tower." Quoting the Commissioner again, Mr. McClure read that "the safest and most practical method to demolish the two towers is to stage the demolition from the south side. This approach however will necessitate substantial demolition of the former sanctuary." Mr. McClure then referred to the structural engineer's report attached to the letter. Quoting from the report, he read that "it is Urban Engineer's opinion that demolition or deconstruction commence from the south in order to dictate the direction of an intended or unintended collapse and mitigate risk exposure as quickly as possible."
- Mr. McClure stated that the interior of the church is "breathtaking." The owner is working with the Archdiocese, Holy Name Parish, and Our Lady of Czestochowa in Doylestown to have the St. Jude Liturgical Art Society remove artifacts including the paintings and stained glass. The artifacts will be removed in August and relocated to Our Lady of Czestochowa.
- Mr. McClure commented on the engineer's report prepared for the Preservation Alliance by Justin Spivey. He stated that it is unlike a typical engineer's report. It parses its language very carefully. He questioned the report's analyses of his engineer's reports and stated that his engineer's reports were not prepared as part of an application but instead to advise his client and the City of the structural problems. He stated that the reports were not revised by any attorney, but are solely the engineer's assessments of the structural problems. The reports were written to alert the owner and City to the conditions, not in support of any applications.
- Mr. McClure stated that Mr. Spivey appeared as an advocate for the designation of the property at the meeting at which the Historical Commission designated it. Mr. McClure stated that Mr. Spivey did not focus his testimony on the condition of the building, but instead on whether the building satisfied the Criteria for Designation. He has a long history of advocating for this property that is unrelated to reviewing its structural condition. Mr. McClure claimed that Mr. Spivey contacted Commissioner Perri regarding this building. He noted that when Commissioner Perri and his engineer inspected the building they did so with knowledge of Mr. Spivey's position and rejected that position when drawing their conclusions.
- Mr. McClure stated that several members of the public engaged in ad hominem attacks of his team and made unsubstantiated claims of bait-and-switch tactics and lying on the part of his team. He stated that his engineers are professionals and are saying what they are saying because they believe it. He stated that we now live in a society where facts do not seem to matter and anything may be said. He asked the

Committee to focus on the facts. He concluded that the engineers' investigations have been exceedingly thorough.

- Ms. Vacca stated that she has been a structural engineer for more than 40 years. She stated that there is a 100% chance of collapse of portions of the towers within 10 years and an 80% chance in three years. She stated that she has experience with demolitions. She stated that she was approached by the owner of the property in June 2020 to evaluate the building. She stated that as many as seven other engineers have inspected this church in recent years. The owner provided her with 10 to 15 earlier engineer's reports on the building. She explained to the owner that he did not need another façade inventory. Instead, she inspected the interior of the church. She stated that the towers have significant cracking that is frightening. She explained the structural system of the towers which is masonry below and timber above. She stated that significant cracking has occurred inside the towers where the timber spires sit on the masonry, where the masonry carries the load of the timber spires. She stated that the façade is a five-inch thick brownstone façade with occasional header courses that extend back into the schist masonry backup. The schist is the masonry that holds up the building. Earlier reports indicate that the headers that tie the façade material to the backup have sheared off. She explained that they removed plaster at the cracks in the interior to inspect the structural stone behind it. She stated that the 35-inch thick masonry walls behind the plaster, the 30 inches of structural wall and five inches of veneer, have cracked through. There are turrets at the corners of the towers that tie the corners together. She stated that there are cracks in the walls at turrets and the walls have pushed out two inches. The western wall is 10 feet away from the school. The trough cracks are not thermal cracks; they are structural failures of the backup masonry. The cracks result from the load of the 50,000 timber spire and the masonry weight above the watertable of 500,000 pounds. She stated that the towers are in essence four independent walls with no structural integrity at the corners. The tower walls are freestanding walls. . She stated that they used a boroscope to inspect the mortar. She stated that the mortar had deteriorated and is basically dust. The walls have pushed out to the north and east. She stated that the repairs that had sought to anchor the façade back to the structural stone had not been successful. She stated that there have been no repairs to the structural stone. Ms. Vacca stated that the only repairs undertaken at the church related to the façade, not to the structural integrity of the towers. She noted that the repairs to the façade were not entirely successful because there is little to attach to behind the façade. She stated that the existing scaffolding provides no structural stability. She stated that the towers will fall in a "non-ductile" manner. Once it goes, it will just go. She stated that the surrounding school and houses are 10 to 50 feet away. The towers are 135 feet tall with about 75 feet of masonry. Ms. Vacca stated that she has 10 years of experience designing demolitions. She stated that this will be a hand demolition. She stated that partial demolition of the towers would require significant structural steel to support the end of the church nave. The towers cannot be repaired in place; they must be demolished to the watertable. She stated that the towers must be demolished from the south so that they fall to the south if anything goes wrong. She stated that significant structural steel would be required to brace the front façade if it were to be saved during the demolition of the towers. She stated that it would take six months to survey, design, and install the structural steel. Installing the steel would extend into the next freeze/thaw cycle, when the mortar will be further degraded. A failure on one of these towers will be "cataclysmic." When one fails, a significant amount of weight will come down. Ms. Vacca stated that Mr. Spivey's report wrongly indicates that the timber spire sits at

the watertable level, but it does not; it sits on the masonry at the lower bell level. The timbers only sit on the north and south walls of the towers; the east and west walls gain no stability from the timbers. The outward movement of the towers begins where the timbers sit on the towers and continues down from there. Ms. Vacca stated that the cracks in the towers are through cracks; she stated that she is adamant that these towers need to be demolished to ensure public safety. Ms. Vacca stated that there is no way to completely evaluate the structure of this building without inspecting the backup masonry from the interior. She agreed that three independent structural engineers all came to the same conclusions about the danger and need to demolish. Mr. McClure read the definition of imminently dangerous from the Philadelphia Property Maintenance Code and asked Ms. Vacca if this building satisfies the definition of imminently dangerous. She stated that it does satisfy the definition. Ms. Vacca agreed with Mr. McClure that his statements regarding the reason for her retention to inspect the building were accurate. Ms. Vacca stated that his portrayal was accurate. Ms. Vacca stated that the recent repairs, mesh, strapping, scaffolding, and other measures undertaken at this building will do nothing to prevent a structural collapse. On Mr. McClure's question, Ms. Vacca stated that she took Commissioner Perri and the engineer from Urban through the interiors of the towers.

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked Ms. Vacca about the space shown in the photograph on page 19 of Ms. Vacca's report. He asked about its dimension. Ms. Vacca responded that the gap is about eight inches wide and is filled with mortar dust. He asked about the width of that portion of the wall. Ms. Vacca stated that it is about three feet wide. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that it would not be possible to work in that area. There is no room for a person to work.
- Mr. Coggin, a structural engineer, provided his credentials. He stated that he has 35 years of experience. He stated that he was retained to assess Ms. Vacca's report. He stated that he has reviewed all of the other engineer's reports prepared on this building. He stated that the building was deteriorating long before the first report in 2013. He summarized the reports. He noted the water infiltration into the masonry and the effects of freeze/thaw cycles. The brownstone façade has delaminated. He stated that improper repairs have been undertaken to the masonry at the building. He stated that earlier reports called for demolishing the towers and the entire building. One report noted that the church would only have a 20-year life after stabilization. Earlier reports noted deteriorated masonry, mortar lost, cracks, displacement, bowing, and other problems with the towers. The brownstone was laid up incorrectly allowing water infiltration and deterioration. The turrets at the corners are not appropriately design, allowing cracks. The corners are cracked. The towers have larger than typical openings and show signs of stress cracking. An earlier report noted that a failure would be catastrophic. The monitoring in 2016 and 2017 noted increasing deterioration. During this time period, a laser scan was done. Soon after the scan, a large collapse of façade materials occurred, despite the fact that no movement was detected. The bedding stone had sheared, allowing the façade stone to fall down onto the sidewalk. He stated that the July 2019 repairs were minimal and only attempted to pin some of the façade stone to the backup stone. The repairs did not address the structural problems with the towers. The Callahan monitoring concluded that the towers needed to be repaired or demolished quickly. Mr. Coggin stated that he discovered cracks at the heads of lancet windows while undertaking his inspection. The cracks indicated outward movement at the northwest tower. He stated that the mortar at the structural schist is deteriorated and has no bond to the

- stones. There is significant cracking at the lower bell level. The remainder of the tower has been inaccessible, owing to bird guano and carcasses. Mr. Coggin explained that he donned a hazmat suit and respirator and climbed further up the tower than any other engineer has gone. He stated that he found very similar conditions. He stated that the diagonal masonry at the turrets is cracked and does not connect the facades. The facades of the tower are cantilevered out and are not tied back to the timber structure of the spires. Mr. Coggin concluded that the towers are not stable. He noted that Mr. Spivey had claimed that the recent pointing had not cracked, indicating a lack of movement. Mr. Coggin stated that Mr. Spivey is incorrect. There is cracking in the recently installed mortar. Mr. Coggin explained that he used hi-power binoculars and a spotter scope to inspect the exterior facades. Mr. Coggin stated that the major cracking occurs between the head of the middle window and the sill of the highest window, where the timber structure bears on the masonry. He stated that Mr. Spivey is mistaken about the location where the timber rests on the masonry; he incorrectly states that it is at the watertable level. Mr. Coggin stated that the building is imminently dangerous and a large failure could occur. The failure will be sudden and unpredictable. Mr. Coggin disagreed with Mr. Spivey and stated that monitoring is not useful. He stated that it will collapse unexpectedly without prior movement. The towers are unstable and need to be taken down. Mr. Coggin rejected Mr. Spivey's claim that scaffolding could be used to support the towers. The streets are too narrow for the scaffolding. Other designs would take six months for design, not including fabrication and erection. Mr. Coggin discussed the projects that Mr. Spivey presented at the Historical Commission. He noted that the St. Ann's project was very different in that the tower was demolished, not saved, and the closest buildings were 100 feet away. The St. Ann's project is not a good comparison. Mr. Coggin stated that he also reviewed the Mt. Moriah project, which involved supporting a much smaller, shorter building. It too was not a good comparison. Mr. Coggin stated that Mr. Spivey misrepresented the uncertainty about the timeline that Mr. Coggin indicated in his report. Mr. Coggin stated that he does not know when the towers might collapse, but they could collapse at any time.
- Mr. McClure asked Mr. Coggin how long it took to design the structure that was installed to hold up the Rittenhouse Club façade during the 10 Rittenhouse project. Mr. Coggin stated that it took seven or eight months for the design and the cost for the framing was \$1 million. The building in that case was only four stories. He observed that erecting a structure at St. Laurentius would be much more difficult and complex. The bracing would not be a permanent fix. You could not install the bracing before the next freeze/thaw cycle. The project would be difficult and risky. Mr. McClure asked Mr. Coggin what it would take to preserve any of the walls during the demolition. He responded that it would be difficult and expensive. It would take six to eight months to design and another six months to erect it. It would delay demolition of the towers. The towers present an imminent danger to the public. Mr. McClure asked Mr. Coggin if this building satisfied the definition of imminently dangerous in the Philadelphia Code. Mr. Coggin stated that it does. It is imminently dangerous. Mr. McClure asked Mr. Coggin if his characterization of Mr. Coggin's hiring and writing of his report that he offered at the start of the review was accurate. Mr. Coggin stated that it was.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked the applicants about the timeline for a demolition.
 - Ms. Vacca stated that it would take one month to design a strategy to demolish the church. The demolition would take one year.

- Mr. McCoubrey noted that Ms. Vacca's report details one crack and asked if the other corners of the towers are failing.
 - Ms. Vacca stated that the towers are in similar condition with similar displacements of the walls. Each of the corner turrets has a crack. She stated that she removed plaster on the west tower in one location but did not find a through crack. She stated that there are many through cracks at the towers.
 - Mr. Coggin stated that he discovered that the diagonal masonry at the turrets was not bonded to the outside walls at the west tower.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked how the engineers would prevent the building from collapsing to the north onto Berks Street if they came in through the south side of the building.
 - Ms. Vacca stated that she would consult with a demolition contractor, but she believes that the demolition contractor would need to strap or girdle the towers so that they would fall to the south if they fell. She stated that the building would be braced to guarantee the fall direction. She stated that the demolition contractor must ensure that the towers do not fall to the north.
- Ms. Gutterman asked why it would take six months to design a strategy to stabilize the towers. She also asked why the towers cannot be demolished to the bottoms of the louvers, saving some of the towers and the end wall of the church.
 - Ms. Vacca stated that towers must be demolished to at least the watertable, probably farther because the cracking extends below the watertable. If one were to demolish to the bottoms of the louvers only, the towers would still be unstable and susceptible to collapse.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if the spire is the problem.
 - Ms. Vacca explained that the spire, the copper-clad timber section, attaches to the tower between the louvered opening and the window below. The tower must be demolished to that point to remove the spire. However, the tower suffers from through cracks to a point below the watertable and must be demolished to or below the watertable because it is unstable.
 - Mr. Coggin agreed. He stated that the towers cannot be stabilized in place. The backup masonry is in very poor condition and the cladding and turrets cannot be tied back to it.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked why they can stabilize the towers by girdling for demolition but they cannot stabilize them permanently.
 - Ms. Vacca responded that the girdling for demolition would be done to direct the towers south if they collapsed. The towers cannot be girdled to stabilize them permanently. Ms. Vacca concluded that permanent stabilization and temporary stabilization for demolition are two "entirely different animals."
 - Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Coggin why he claimed it would require six months to design a permanent basing system.
 - Mr. Coggin replied that it might take four months under perfect conditions, with all of the necessary information at hand, but six months is a more reasonable number. He stated that it would be a very complicated design.
- Mr. Detwiler asked why years have passed with knowledge about the condition of the building and nothing has been done. He stated that the engineering could have already been done.
 - Mr. McClure responded that his client just acquired the building. The property was owned by the Archdiocese until January.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that his client purchased it knowing of its condition.

- Mr. McClure stated that the purchase may not have been a wise decision, but the owner is addressing the matter now. He noted that the Historical Commission designated the building knowing of its very poor condition.
- Mr. Detwiler responded that the owner is responsible for maintaining the building.
- Mr. McClure stated that his client began addressing the problem as soon as he purchased the building. He had engineers inspect the building and then provided their reports to the City as soon as they were available.
- Ms. Vacca observed that the condition of the building first came under scrutiny during a review that was done to satisfy the façade ordinance. That review appropriately addressed the “skin” of the building. After that, the reports and repairs focused on the skin, ignoring the real problem, the underlying structural masonry, which holds up the skin and is unstable. Ms. Vacca stated that she was the first engineer to inspect the backup masonry and really understand that structural failure of the towers.
- Mr. Detwiler asked why the building was never repaired.
 - Mr. Coggin explained that the former owner was not willing to spend the money to repair the building.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked why the current owner did not address the problem immediately.
 - Mr. McClure stated that the owner did and this review is the result of that effort. He also noted that there was a development project that might have saved the building, but it was stuck in litigation for three years from 2016 to 2019 as some community members tried to stop the project. The earlier project was delayed by some neighbors. Mr. McClure stated that the current owner began investigating the building’s problems as soon as he purchased the building. No bank would ever lend millions of dollars in these conditions to try to stabilize this building. He stated that the current owner bought the building for \$50,000 because the designation of a building that cannot be saved drove the price down to nothing. The building is in imminent danger of collapse. The people who would be impacted by a collapse want it demolished.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that the owner should provide a plan to retain most of the building or reconstruct it. He stated that such a plan should have been presented.
 - Mr. McClure stated that the towers must be demolished because they present an imminent danger of collapse. Art work and stained glass windows will be salvaged, but the towers must be demolished.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the towers may be able to be partially demolished and reconstructed. He stated that the Committee has not been presented with real demolition plans. He stated that it may be able to be demolished from the north, street side, not the south, sanctuary side.
 - Mr. McClure stated that he has presented significant testimony on those questions from engineers and also has the City’s opinion. He offered to present more testimony. He added that he could submit a strong financial hardship application, but that would do nothing but add delay in addressing the dangerous conditions. He stated that it is obvious given this property’s history that there is no reasonable adaptive reuse of this building given its condition. The towers must be demolished from the south as confirmed by the Department of Licenses & Inspections and its independent engineer. He stated that his client is willing to discuss trying to save parts of the building, but that will have to happen during the demolition planning.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the engineers should have addressed the conditions of both towers, not just one.
- Ms. Vacca responded that there are many through cracks in both of the towers. She stated that most, if not all, of the through cracks visible on the exterior of both towers are through cracks. She stated that she has never before seen severe cracks like this in a masonry building.
- Mr. Coggin agreed. He pointed to photographs in Ms. Vacca's report showing cracks in both towers. He noted that Commissioner Perri and his engineer observed this cracking. All of the engineers understand that this is structural cracking.
- Ms. Vacca added that the walls are displaced out of plane at the cracks. The towers are moving out to the north.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the movement was the result of the traffic in the street.
- Ms. Vacca stated that the traffic has nothing to do with it. The movement results from the degradation of the mortar in the backup masonry.
- Mr. Coggin noted that earlier reports have commented on the structural instability of the towers. Mr. Coggin stated that two laser surveys indicated no movement between them, yet stone continued to fall.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the face stone and backup masonry are two different systems with different problems.
- Ms. Vacca stated that the façade brownstone cannot be anchored back to the structural masonry because the structural masonry is in such poor condition. The Façade stone should be removed, but removing it may cause a collapse of the backup stone.
- Mr. Coggin stated that the veneer stone is allowing water to infiltrate the walls and freeze/thaw cycles are pushing the veneer stone off. However, the water has also damaged the backup stone, deteriorating its mortar. The backup stone is not bonded to the mortar.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that it is not possible to reattach the veneer to the backup stone because the backup stone has failed. Moreover, using a hammer drill might cause a collapse. Mr. D'Alessandro, the preservation contractor on the Architectural Committee, stated that he would not put someone in a tower to work on it. It is too dangerous. He stated that a contractor working on the tower may trigger a collapse. He stated that you could not inject grout into the backup masonry. Any pressure would cause the wall "to blow up on you." Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the backup masonry cannot be repaired. He agreed with Ms. Vacca that there is no way to repair the towers in place. The towers would need to be demolished and reconstructed. He stated that it is not possible to repair them. Any pressure from grout injection would cause the towers to collapse. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that simply drilling a hole in the masonry could cause a tower to collapse. He stated that it would not be safe to work on these towers. He listed several reasons why it would not be safe to work in these towers. Mr. D'Alessandro concluded that the towers must be demolished. They might be able to be rebuilt, but they must be demolished first.
- Mr. Angelides, an economic consultant, stated that he analyzed the project as though there were no time constraints. He determined whether it would make economic sense to stabilize and repair the building if there were no need to act immediately and if the towers could be accessed from the north, not through the building from the south. He observed that it would not make economic sense to stabilize the building, remove the towers, and reuse the building. He stated that this is not a full hardship analysis, but instead a limited, hardship-like analysis. The

demolition of the towers from the north would cost at least \$2 million, maybe much more. Stabilizing the remainder of the building would cost more than \$1 million. Then the building would need to be rehabilitated for the new use like 25 apartments. It would cost \$3 million just to stabilize the building, before any rehabilitation. The apartments that would result would be compromised, owing to the constraints of the building. The units would be less attractive than comparably sized new units, and therefore produce less income. There is no space for onsite parking. Rehabilitating an old building for a new use is already expensive. The reuse of this building is not economically feasible. “The juice is not worth the squeeze.” To rebuild the towers would make the financial hole that much deeper. Old estimates to rebuild the towers are \$2 million. It would cost more today. Any requirement to rebuild the towers would make a financially infeasible project even more infeasible. Tax credits and other assistance would not offset the costs. Residential is the only feasible reuse at this site. Additional costs for supporting additional walls for reuse would merely add to the sunk costs. No bank would ever finance a project like the reuse of this church, given the investments needed to stabilize and the inferior apartments that would result. No one would take on this project. Mr. Angelides concluded that he is very confident that this building cannot be feasibly reused. He acknowledged that he had not completed a full hardship analysis, but noted that the conclusion of such an analysis is very clear. The up-front costs to partially demolish and stabilize are too great.

- Ms. Gutterman noted the 1730 Wharton Street application reviewed earlier today shows that churches can be reused.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed.
 - Matt McClure asked Mr. Angelides to judge the feasibility of reuse of the church assuming that the apartments would attract the highest possible rents, to which Mr. Angelides responded that the project would be financially infeasible even with the best possible rents. The enormous expense of stabilizing the building renders any subsequent project in the building financially infeasible. Two dozen units cannot offset the high costs to stabilize. He added that his analysis ignores the real-world constraints.
- Ms. Stein asked why the applicants did not provide options, like disassembly of the towers from the north.
 - Mr. McClure stated that the condition of the building is driving the application. He asserted that an application like this would never have been heard by the Historical Commission in years past. The Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections would have ordered the demolition of the building without consulting the Commission. The Commissioner is giving the Historical Commission an opportunity to hear the application and offer advice, but the situation is dire and the condition needs to be addressed immediately. The situation dictated that the application would be limited.
 - Ms. Stein stated that she does not understand why the Architectural Committee is hearing the matter since there is only one option presented.
 - Mr. McClure stated that he is before the Committee today on the direction of the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The situation does not allow for the development of options. The dangerous condition must be addressed immediately.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the building is not classified as Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

- Mr. McClure suggested that the City may be reluctant to classify it as Imminently Dangerous because then the City may become responsible for demolishing it.
- Mr. Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, stated that the City would not necessarily unilaterally initiate a demolition if the building were classified as Imminently Dangerous. He stated that an Unsafe building can also pose a hazard. He concluded that the Commissioner's letter speaks for itself.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the towers should be demolished to the watertable.
 - Mr. McClure noted that the engineers and Commissioners have all agreed that demolition needs to proceed from the south. He asserted that the Historical Commission should not impose a condition that cannot be met, such as requiring demolition from the north, street side. He stated that the demolition planning must start now and demolition must be undertaken from the south. During the demolition planning, saving some portions of the building can be considered.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization retained Justin Spivey, an engineer. Mr. Steinke objected to Mr. McClure's comments about Mr. Spivey's direct contact with Commissioner Perri. Mr. Steinke summarized Mr. Spivey's testimony before the Historical Commission on this matter and noted that he said that the building is in good condition with "reserve strength." Mr. Steinke noted Mr. Spivey's July 17 letter to the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Spivey stated that he believes that there are alternatives to complete demolition. He stated that he has not changed the opinions expressed in his July 17 letter despite reading Commissioner Perri's letter and the accompanying Urban Engineers report. He acknowledged that he was incorrect about how the timber spires tie into the towers and appreciated the correction, but noted that that fact does not change his opinion. He asserted that his July 17 letter is an engineer's report. He also claimed that he did not lobby Commissioner Perri. He also claimed that he did not lobby for the designation of the building. He acknowledged that he has not been in the interior of the church. He said that the towers are still standing and have found a stable load path. He suggested that a stabilizing structural system should be erected before winter. Such a system is technically feasible and could be "done" faster than any demolition plan. Mr. Spivey discussed a photograph of the interior of the church and asked how salvage could be safely removed if the condition is as bad as the applicant claims. He suggested erecting stabilizing scaffolding as quickly as possible. Mr. Spivey discussed a church that he worked on in West Philadelphia, saving it despite its Imminently Dangerous condition. He discussed a photograph of a hospital in New York City and stated that it was stabilized. He stated that an engineer from the firm that undertook the hospital project concurred with his assessment that the towers at St. Laurentius could be stabilized with scaffolding. He discussed a photograph of the Mt. Moriah Cemetery gatehouse. He said that precast concrete structures can be used to brace a structure. He discussed a building in New York with a structural system constructed outside the building. Scaffolding can be obtained and erected quickly and can provide temporary lateral bracing. The towers could be braced, partially deconstructed, and rebuilt. He discussed St. Ann's in Waterbury, Connecticut. He stated that it is possible to dismantle masonry towers and return a building to occupancy. He asserted that the towers could be dismantled and capped, or rebuilt in masonry or alternative materials. He stated that the towers can be dismantling without demolishing the entire church. Structural scaffolding should be erected. Demolishing the church is not the quickest or most responsible

option. Structural scaffolding should be erected. Mr. Spivey stated that the towers are not moving; they are not in a state of imminent collapse. He stated that the new pointing repairs done in 2019 have not cracked. The structure can remain standing if structural scaffolding is installed before winter. He stated that he agrees with the Urban Engineers report, which indicates that the towers can be stabilized.

- Mr. Steinke attempted to offer more testimony, but Mr. D'Alessandro noted that he already had a chance to speak and that his testimony was repetitive.
- Jeanne Curtis, an interior designer, stated that she has been involved in research and academic study of the church. She discussed her research at length. She suggested that all alternatives be considered. She offered her research.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stopped Ms. Curtis, stating that she has exceeded her three-minute time limit by quite a bit.
- Mr. Farnham asked the members of the public to limit their comments to the matters at hand: the structural condition of the building, whether it must be demolished or can be repaired, whether sections of the building can be retained, whether salvage is feasible, whether it must be demolished from the south, whether reuse is feasible, and whether demolition is necessary in the public interest. He stated that the historical, architectural, and cultural significance of the building are givens; the Historical Commission has already made that decision. Earlier project, the zoning of the site, how it was purchased, dust, noise, and safety during any demolition are all irrelevant.
- Attorney Hal Schirmer asked if the Committee was provided with his photographs. He stated that he was involved in the designation and the appeal of the zoning. He noted that the Archdiocese deconstructed and reconstructed towers at St. John the Evangelist. It cost \$1.2 million. He suggested installing cellphone antennas on the reconstructed towers at St. Laurentius. He noted that the towers on the Church of the Assumption are dangerous and have not fallen. He asserted that they will never fall down.
 - Mr. McCoubrey told Mr. Schirmer that his time was up. Mr. Schirmer kept talking, discussing agreements made by the Archdiocese and Holy Name Parish in 2016. He asked why the owner or buyer did not repair the property. He discussed the zoning appeal and the later rezoning. Mr. McCoubrey stated that Mr. Schirmer's testimony was not on point. Mr. Schirmer kept talking. Eventually, the Zoom meeting manager muted him.
- Mason Carter claimed that structural and hardship issues have been confused. He suggesting looking at buildings in Europe, where they are building structural frames to support buildings. He stated that only demolition has been considered.
- Oscar Beisert said that reviewing this application at the Historical Commission first was a "flawed and reckless action." He suggested an overbuild. He asked why the owner has not tried to sell the building. He asked about other options. He asserted that the regulation of this building is not a taking.
- Dana Fedeli opposed the demolition of the church. She stated that the building is not Imminently Dangerous. She suggested stabilization. The letter from Commissioner Perri and his engineer should be disregarded because they provide no new information. The owner wants to demolish for the open lot. The owner has failed to repair the building. The owner wants profit. She referred to Mr. McClure's "history of toxic conduct." She stated that Mr. McClure is a bully.
 - Mr. McCoubrey told Ms. Fedeli that her time was up. Ms. Fedeli tried to scream over Mr. McCoubrey. Ms. Fedeli kept talking, despite additional time and warnings from the chair.

- Attorney Michael Mattioni stated that he represents the Holy Name of Jesus Parish and the St. Laurentius School. He stated that his clients support the recommendations of Commissioner Perri and his engineer. His clients are concerned about public safety and the ability of the school to operate safely. He asked for prompt action to abate the safety hazard. He stated that he is involved in the project to relocate the windows and murals from the church for preservation. He stated that the salvage effort will begin about August 10. The school is scheduled to open in September and wants assurances that public safety will be protected.
- Mary McGettigan of West Philadelphians for Planning & Preservation asked if this is a case of demolition by neglect. She stated that there has been intentional neglect. She stated that the former and current owners are guilty of demolition by neglect and should be forced to repair the building. She noted that the Historical Commission ordered the demolition of 107 Chestnut Street last month, but no work has been done. There is no emergency. Mr. McClure is histrionic. A demolition permit in this case would not be in the public's interest.
- John Scott, a long-term resident of Fishtown, stated that the building is not Imminently Dangerous, and therefore there is no emergency. He noted that the owner has not braced the building, closed the streets, or taken any other actions to protect public safety. He quoted from the Urban Engineers report on bracing. He suggested that the Committee consider the differences between bracing for demolition and bracing for repair.
- Kevin Brett stated that this is a case of demolition by neglect. He discussed a transfer tax document and an engineer's report and questioned whether the current owner had knowledge of the engineer's report. He suggested that the City pursue this case like it pursued the Edward Corner case. He stated that this is "appalling" and a "charade."
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the public comment period is closed.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McClure stated that his client has taken many steps evidencing his original intent to reuse the building.
- Ms. Vacca disputed Mr. Spivey's testimony. She stated that situation at St. Ann's was very different from that at St. Laurentius. Ms. Vacca stated that the structural scaffolding that Mr. Spivey recommends will not stop a catastrophic collapse at St. Laurentius. Typical scaffolding like that recommended by Mr. Spivey cannot support the towers. Structural steel with large bracing might support the towers, but not the scaffolding that Mr. Spivey described. Ms. Vacca stated that there is a potential for collapse that cannot be addressed by scaffolding. She stated that everyone agrees that the towers are in extremely poor structural condition and must be demolished. No one is saying that they can be repaired in place. She stated that stabilization cannot be achieved with scaffolding.
- Mr. Coggin disputed Mr. Spivey's claim that there are no new cracks where repairs were undertaken. He disagreed. Mr. Coggin stated that no movement in the towers does not indicate that a collapse will not occur. The building is imminently dangerous. No one knows when stone will fail from the towers. He stated that the only way to safely demolish the tower is to demolish from the south. He also noted that \$500,000 was spent trying to repair the St. Ann's tower before it was demolished. Mr. Coggin stated that St. Ann's was in better condition than St. Laurentius, based on photographs he reviewed. Mr. Coggin observed that the Renwick Hospital that Mr. Spivey referenced was his company's project. He noted

- that they collapsed some of the building inward before beginning the repairs. It is also a very different type of structure and the project ran out of money. Finally, Mr. Coggin stated that the Spring Street, New York project referenced by Mr. Spivey was very different from St. Laurentius. It is in no way analogous to the current situation.
- Mr. McClure stated that his client bought the property in January and immediately started working with engineers. All three engineers and the Department of Licenses & Inspections are providing the same advice.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the building should be immediately stabilized and then a discussion about its future initiated.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that it is clear that the towers are dangerous and cannot be stabilized. The towers must be demolished to the watertable. He stated that he is not yet convinced that the demolition needs to start from the south. He again stated that the towers must be demolished to the watertable.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that he is not convinced that anything but the towers needs to be demolished. He is not convinced that the remainder of the church needs to be demolished.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. Detwiler regarding the need to demolish the towers, but not the sanctuary.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the demolition of the towers could happen in phases, demolishing first to the bell tower platform level.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the towers should be demolished without additional demolition and then the situation should be reevaluated.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro rejected Mr. Detwiler's idea to lift the spires with a crane.
 - Mr. McCoubrey again suggested stabilization first.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that the applicant should have presented options to the Architectural Committee.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested a motion that denied complete demolition with further studies to determine how the towers can be stabilized, dismantled, repaired, and reconstructed to maintain the important structure.
 - Mr. Farnham stated that the Committee should not place conditions on a denial, but should recommend approval, approval with conditions, denial, or tabling.
 - Mr. Reuter stated that a recommendation for denial could include suggestions for the applicant.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that the Committee is advisory only.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that she would amend her motion and recommend denial of the demolition of the full church in order to be able to demolish or dismantle the towers.

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

ITEM: 1600-06 E. Berks St
MOTION: Denial
MOVED BY: Gutterman
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 07:32:40

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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