

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

**TUESDAY, 26 OCTOBER 2021
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair	X		
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP		X	Arrived 9:39 a.m.
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

Michael Brahler
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas
Jay Farrell
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Justin Krik, Esq.
Russell Fulton
Rick Sudall
Karly Fajardo
Sara-Ann Logan
Susan Wetherill
Dany El Kai
Jim Nolen
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Zhanna Fast

Henry Sullivan
Georges Ballouz
Plato Marinakos Jr.
Irena Wight
AJ Reilly
Chad Happ
Christina Carter, John Milner
Fon Wang
Avery Mathews
Shae Nicole Morong
Ben Sabagh
Niki Green
William Kerr
Andrew Goltzman

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1317 PINE ST

Proposal: Remove rear roof slope and dormer, construct rear roof with modified dormer
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Amy S. Clark and Chadwick Happ
Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
History: 1835
Individual Designation: 3/28/1961
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish the rear roof slope and rear dormer of this c. 1835 rowhouse and replace it with a new rear roof with modified dormer to provide increased headroom at the fourth-floor stair, bedroom, and proposed bathroom. The existing condensers will be relocated to the rear roof. No work is proposed for the front façade. The rear of the property is visible from where Panama Street intersects with Butler Avenue at the rear, which is a dead-end street. The rear dormer is partially visible from within the parking lot at 13th and Pine Streets.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear roof slope and rear dormer.
- Construct rear roof with modified dormer.
- Relocate condensers to rear roof.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - o Removal of the historic rear dormer and rear roof alters features that characterize the historic property.

- *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.*
 - o The proposed alteration would destroy historic materials and features that characterize the property.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect James Campbell and owner Chad Happ represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked about the existing interior stair leading to the fourth floor.
 - o Mr. Campbell responded that it is original and led to the attic, which is space that the owner would like to make more usable.
- Ms. Gutterman commented about the loss of historic fabric and asked if Mr. Campbell had considered bumping up at the stair but not the bathroom.
 - o Mr. Campbell responded that it was considered, but the existing roof framing runs from party wall to party wall and the existing dormer intersects those joists, so it would be an extensive amount of work for a limited benefit, and would also not allow for additional space above the bathroom.
- Ms. Stein asked if the dormer could be widened to encapsulate the stair rather than modifying the entire rear roof.
 - o Mr. Campbell responded that this would still require restructuring a substantial portion of the roof, therefore it seemed more reasonable to lift the entire roof and build a slightly wider dormer.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the interior stairs could be altered rather than altering the exterior of the building.
 - o Mr. Campbell responded that it was considered, but that restructuring the stair would require restructuring a substantial portion of the fourth floor.
 - o Ms. Lukachik suggested that the landing could be dropped and the dormer widened so that the entire rear roof does not need to be removed.
 - o Mr. Campbell responded that the framing does not allow the stair to be moved forward.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro commented that this proposal is trying to do too much on the fourth floor.
- Mr. Happ explained that this was marketed as a fourth-floor bedroom but is not functional as such, owing to the head height, lighting, and lack of bathroom.
 - o Ms. Stein suggested moving the bathroom over and fitting it into the middle.
 - o Mr. Happ explained that the plumbing runs along the rear wall so that would be difficult.
- Ms. Stein suggested a removal of this section of the stair, and the installation of a circular or ship ladder stair as a potential solution.
 - o Mr. Happ responded that this would present safety concerns.

- Mr. McCoubrey summarized that the Architectural Committee typically considers dormers and roof slopes to be character-defining features of a historic building, and as such, they should be maintained to the extent possible. He noted that the widening of dormers has been approved in the past, but this proposal changes the entire rear roof. He suggested that the applicant looks for solutions that have less impact on the exterior.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the proposed skylights are inappropriate.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that the proposed mechanical equipment is inappropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rear roof and dormer are partially visible from the rear and side across a parking lot and are likely original to the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The removal of the historic rear dormer and rear roof alters features that characterize the historic property, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 2.
- The proposed alteration would destroy historic materials and features that characterize the property, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1317 Pine St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 201 W JOHNSON ST

Proposal: Construct five-story residential building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Preservation Group, LP

Applicant: Niki Green, VBC Studio

History: 1895; Nugent Home for Baptists

Individual Designation: 10/8/2004

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to construct a five-story detached apartment building between the historically designated Presser Home for Retired Musicians and Nugent Home for Retired Baptists. At its 8 October 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed the revised application and voted to remand it back to the Architectural Committee for review of the revisions. The Historical Commission approved the location and footprint of the new building in-concept in 2007, and then approved the new building as part of a final review which included the rehabilitation of the Nugent Home for Baptists in 2011. This is Phase 3 of the larger development project, with Phases 1 and 2 being the restoration and reuse of the historic buildings. The revised application incorporates feedback from last month's review by the Architectural Committee, specifically as it relates to the top floor and material colors. The new building will not connect to either historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct residential building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed new construction is compatible with the surrounding context in terms of massing, size, scale, and architectural features, satisfying Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:27:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney William Kerr, architect Sara-Ann Logan, and developer Rick Sudall represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Logan summarized the changes between Iteration 1, Iteration 2, and the current proposal, which were based on earlier feedback from the Architectural Committee. She explained that the mansard has been incorporated on the entire top floor, all vertical stucco elements have been removed and replaced with a stepped brick design, the portico at the front entry remains, and all angled roof elements on the top

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 OCTOBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- floor have been matched with the roof colors, just as the Architectural Committee recommended. She stated that they have incorporated all of the changes that the Architectural Committee requested.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the change in brick tone is still not right and that the removal of the white vertical elements now makes it appear too solid of a mass.
 - o Ms. Logan observed that the Architectural Committee recommended that she remove the white vertical elements, which she did.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that he remains concerned about the carriage house and its deteriorated condition, and how it is not included in this application.
 - o Mr. Kerr responded that the carriage house is not part of this project. It will be rehabilitated in Phase 4 of the overall project. The current application does not propose any work to the carriage house.
 - o Mr. Sudall stated that the carriage house has been stabilized.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that the drawings lack the detailing necessary for review as a final approval.
 - o Ms. Logan responded that she could not fully detail the mansard in time but that she can provide those additional details for review by the Historical Commission. She explained how every other floor has a different brick pattern to break up the massing.
 - Mr. Farnham provided background on the larger project. He reminded the Architectural Committee that the Historical Commission approved the location and footprint of the new building in-concept in 2007, and then approved the new building as part of a final review which included the rehabilitation of the Nugent Home for Baptists in 2011. He stated that the historic buildings at the site would have been lost without this owner stepping in, and that this new building was always part of the larger plan to make the finances work for the substantial rehabilitation of the historic buildings. The owner is relying on the earlier approvals by the Historical Commission to make the overall development of the site feasible.
 - Ms. Lukachik stated that she is not opposed to the revised design. She stated that it is plain enough to allow the historic buildings to be the focus. It would not have an adverse effect on the historic buildings and site.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the design has improved significantly and agreed that the footprint and massing are established. He agreed that additional details should be provided for review by the Historical Commission. He suggested a red rather than purple tone to the brick. He commented that the relationship between the mansard and dormers needs further study.
 - Mr. Kerr explained that they are seeking approval of any zoning aspects so that they can go before the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that he approves of the aspects of the proposed building that require zoning approval but would like to see more development of the details.
 - The Committee members commented on the color selection and roof line.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro referred to the color as "depressing."
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested that the massing be further broken up and the blackness and flatness of the roof be modified. He stated that the roof should not be any darker than the roof of the historic buildings, and that the main brick does not need to be all the same color.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the center of the building could have the masonry step up or have a more central bay better articulated.

- o Ms. Stein suggested a more neutral brick color with a lighter colored roof.
- Ms. Logan stated that additional renderings of color schemes, in addition to further detail development, can be provided for review by the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented that he is concerned about the carriage house, and the color choice for the new building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission approved the location and footprint of the new building in concept in 2007, and then as part of a final review which included the extensive rehabilitation of the Nugent Home for Baptists in 2011.
- The proposed building is completely detached from both historic buildings.
- The existing carriage house on the site is not part of the scope of this application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new construction is compatible with the surrounding context in terms of massing, size, and scale, but requires further development of details including materials colors to fully satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9, by a vote of 5 to 1 with 1 abstention.

ITEM: 201 W Johnson St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver			X		
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik		X			
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5	1	1		

ADDRESS: 1148-62 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Construct building; renovate historic building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Wells Fargo Bank NA

Applicant: Michael Brahler, Oombra Architects, LLC

History: 1877; Kensington National Bank; Frank Furness, architect

Individual Designation: 8/7/1980

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a five-story, mixed use building south and west of the existing Frank Furness-designed Kensington National Bank. The application also proposes to renovate the designated structure, including removing the drive-through teller canopy and an addition housing the ATM. Overall improvements to the façade of the designated structure include removing conduit, brackets, etc. and cleaning, patching, and pointing the masonry. The replacement of the signage is also proposed.

The new building would be L-shaped and would be constructed on the rear of the designated site as well as two adjacent, undesignated parcels known as 14 and 16 W. Girard Avenue. The proposed structure is compatible with the designated building in height, scale, and massing. The design and siting of the new building complement the historic structure by allowing it to remain the focal point of the block.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct building;
- Remove non-historic drive-through teller canopy and ATM addition;
- Rehabilitate 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.*
 - o The alterations that are proposed to the designated structure involve the removal of non-historic additions; no historic fabric is proposed for demolition.
 - o The new building is compatible to the designated structure in material, size, scale and proportion, and massing.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The new building does not propose to connect to the designated structure, and therefore complies with Standard 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:08:00

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 OCTOBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Michael Brahler and AJ Riley of Oombra Architects represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked the applicants about the rusticated base on the addition housing the ATM and whether that base dated from the 1980s.
 - o The applicant responded that they were not sure but thought the base dated to the time of the construction of the ATM.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the existing signage and canopy were to remain.
 - o The applicant confirmed that they were to remain.
- Ms. Stein commented that she was very much in support of the new building but she expressed concern about the work proposed to the designated structure. She said that the application lacked details that the Architectural Committee was used to seeing and did not address accessibility.
- Mr. Cluver remarked that the level of detail that Ms. Stein was referring to was the kind of detail the staff would normally review prior to final approval. He added that he did not think that the design of the new building was doing any harm to the context of the designated structure.
 - o The applicant asked whether the review of the details of the work to the designated building could be conducted by the staff.
- Mr. McCoubrey responded that the staff would review the final details of the various scopes of work and would refer anything they could not approve back to the Architectural Committee. He agreed with his colleagues that the scale, massing, and materials of the new building were sympathetic to the designated building. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the color of the brick of the new building would be similar to the designated building.
 - o The applicant confirmed that the intent was to use a similar colored brick on the new building, but that the brick would include some slight variation of tone so that it would better match the designated building.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he liked the project very much and added that the design of the new building was very deferential to the Furness-designed bank building. Mr. Detwiler noted that the designated building has a massive cap and exaggerated cornice line, while the new building has an extremely small dimension between the top of the fifth-story window to the roof line. He added that the applicant should consider distinguishing the brick of the new building with pattern and tonal variation.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant if the application contained two different versions of the proposed parapet height.
 - o The applicant responded that Ms. Stein was correct, and that one of the renderings in the packet reflected an earlier design, and that the accurate rendering showed the parapet as higher.
 - o Ms. Stein and Mr. Detwiler agreed that the higher parapet design looked much better than the out-of-date rendering.
- Mr. Detwiler asked the applicant if the rooftop overbuilds could be reduced in height.
 - o The applicant responded that the elevator overrun had been designed to the absolute minimum possible.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the owner would be open to the idea of restoring some of the cornice elements on the designated structure.

- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that some kind of detailing of the brick at the roofline, for example corbeling, may help with the design of the new building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke from the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia commented that the roofline of the new building was very unadorned and he wondered if the design would be more successful with some detail to mark the parapet.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The work proposed to the designated building was appropriate and in keeping with the original design.
- The design of the new building was sensitive to the individually designated building and the context.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The alterations that are proposed to the designated building satisfy Standard 9.
- The design of the new building is compatible with the designated structure in material, size, scale and proportion, and massing, therefore satisfying Standard 9.
- The new building does not connect to the designated building, therefore satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 1148-62 FRANKFORD AVE					
MOTION: Approval, 9 & 10					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1816 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Steve and Doreen Merkt

Applicant: Christina Carter, John Milner Architects, Inc.

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roofdeck and pilot house on the main block of the rowhouse at 1816 Delancey Place. An application for a similar but larger deck was approved for this property in 2014. That approval directed the staff to review a mock-up for the visibility of the deck from the street. That deck was not constructed. Owing to the property's height and position mid-block on a relatively narrow street, the application postulates that the deck will not be visible from the public right-of-way. Existing rooftop condensing units, which are located near the front edge of the roof, are not visible.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct roof deck

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The proposed deck and associated construction on the flat roof will not damage or obscure character-defining features of the property. Owing to the property's height and mid-block location and the narrowness of the street, the deck is likely to be inconspicuous if not invisible from the public right-of-way. The staff can determine visibility through review of an on-site mock-up.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a mock-up determines that the deck and associated rooftop structures will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:32:11

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Detwiler recused owing to his firm's involvement with the project.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Christina Carter represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Carter explained that, owing to the severity of the roof pitch, they have attempted to keep the deck structure as close to the existing roof by stepping it down and breaking it up into sections. She noted that they have also kept the pilot house to the minimum required height.

- Ms. Stein commented that the deck seems appropriate, but that she wants to ensure that the staff reviews a mock-up to determine that the deck is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
 - o Ms. Carter responded affirmatively, noting that the owners are in the process of interviewing contractors, and once they have one on board, will construct a mock-up of the front railing, with a pole to represent the pilot house, so that the staff can verify the visibility from the street.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern with amount of construction on the roof of the main block and the precedent that it would set. She questioned whether the applicants had considered moving the deck to the rear ell.
 - o Ms. Carter responded that they considered putting a portion of the deck on the rear ell, but determined it was not preferable in terms of how the spaces communicate and work together, owing to the offset of the ell and the fixed location of the pilot house. She explained that, owing to the stair location on the fourth floor, it would create two pods that do not work together, so the preference was for the connected square spaces. She indicated that she understood the tendency to put roof decks on rear ells, but noted that there are similar decks on the main blocks of other houses on the block that have been approved, including that at 1807 Delancey Place. An approval of this deck would not set a precedent. Many others already exist.
 - o Ms. Stein questioned the set back of the deck at 1807 Delancey.
 - o Ms. Carter responded that, based on a mock-up, they set the deck back seven feet, but noted that it is closer to cross street and more visible from a distance.
- Mr. Cluver opined that one unusual thing about this particular block is that decks on the rear ell would actually be more visible. He suggested that, if the intent is to minimize the visual impact, a deck on the main block is more in keeping with the intent. Given particulars of this block and the fact that the goal is to minimize visibility from Delancey, any deck that was visible would not be following this precedent.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed, opining that a rear deck would be more visible from Panama Street because the flanking structures are lower.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the amount of glass on the pilot house and whether there is a lighting plan. He expressed concern that too much glazing and light would bring attention to the project. He asked if the amount of glazing could be reduced on the pilot house.
 - o Ms. Carter responded that they are proposing a tape light around the rail. She stated that Mr. D'Alessandro must be confused about the pilot house design. Only the east wall of the pilot house is glazed; the other three sides are solid.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro noted that he does not want a lantern effect and that he is opposed to lighting on the railing.
 - o The other Committee members indicated that the glazing and lighting is appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 1816 Delancey Place is located mid-block on a relatively narrow street, and therefore rooftop features that are set back from the front cornice are not visible from the street.

- A deck on the rear ell would actually be more conspicuous than one on the main block, provided the main block deck is set back from the front façade.
- The staff should review the potential visibility through review of an on-site mock-up.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Provided a mock-up determines that the deck and associated rooftop structures will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, the project meets the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mock-up determines that the deck and associated rooftop structures, including the trellis, are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 1816 DELANCEY PL MOTION: Approval 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6			1	

ADDRESS: 5911 OVERBROOK AVE

Proposal: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval or Review and Comment

Owner: Zhanna Fast

Applicant: Paul Kreamer, ALFA Engineering Inc.

History: 1898; Schermerhorn & Reinbold; house demolished in 2005

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Contributing, 11/8/2019

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a three-story residential building at 5911 Overbrook Avenue in the Overbrook Farms Historic District. Historically, three-story masonry house and detached garage stood on the property. The house was demolished in 2005, prior to the establishment of the historic district. The garage still stands, but is in ruins. The garage was built between 1918 and 1927, according to insurance atlases.

The historic preservation ordinance limits the Historical Commission's jurisdiction to review-and-comment only on "undeveloped sites" in historic districts. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction over this site is unclear because, while the house was demolished, the garage still stands, albeit in a ruined state. Only the Historical Commission itself can decide whether 5911 Overbrook Avenue is an "undeveloped site" and therefore subject to review-and-comment

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 OCTOBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

jurisdiction only, or is developed and subject to plenary jurisdiction. The Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations defines an undeveloped site as:

a property within an historic district which is not individually designated, to which the inventory in the historic district nomination attributes no historical, cultural, or archaeological value, and upon which no building or structure stood at the time of the designation of the historic district. Non-historic foundations and other below-grade constructions; surface parking lots; non-historic parking kiosks and other kiosks, storage sheds, and other impermanent constructions without foundations; and non-historic walls, fences, and gates shall not be construed as buildings or structures for the purposes of this definition.

To determine the level of jurisdiction over this review, the Historical Commission must decide whether the ruined garage qualifies as a building or structure standing on the site at the time of the designation of the historic district in 2019. The Architectural Committee should formulate a recommendation that the Historical Commission can utilize with both the review-and-comment and plenary jurisdiction scenarios.

The proposed construction is located on a block composed of residential buildings ranging from one to three stories, with the majority being three stories in height. Most of the buildings on the block are masonry construction showcasing a mix of stone, brick, and stucco on the exterior. The proposed three-story building is approximately 35 feet in height and would be clad in a combination of grey brick and vinyl siding with black vinyl slider windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct residential building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff finds that the proposed construction is not compatible in general materials, rhythm and fenestration with the historic district. The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 9, if the Historical Commission concludes that it has plenary jurisdiction.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:45:03

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Dany El Kai, engineer Georges Ballouz, and owner Zhanna Fast represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein inquired about a site plan. She noted one was not included with the application package she received. Ms. Stein said she has no idea where the house

would be located on the site and whether there would be a garage or other structure elsewhere on the property.

- o Ms. Mehley replied that the applicant did submit a site plan, but it was not included in the application materials sent to the Committee members. She made the site plan visible to those in the meeting.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to address the comments about the selected materials not being compatible with the neighborhood. She noted that the plans indicate vinyl siding with black vinyl windows as part of the material selection. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that they are not really materials that you see in this neighborhood. She asked if they considered any other materials for the project. Ms. Gutterman explained that vinyl siding is not an appropriate material for a historic district and is not a material that exists in this neighborhood.
- Mr. Ballouz said they would need to consult with the owner, but it could be stucco or stone. He noted that he is not sure what the owner would like but he understands it must be something that satisfies preservation standards. Mr. El Kai said they would need to consult with the owner on a change in materials.
- Ms. Fast stated that the photographs provided show other houses in the neighborhood with vinyl windows. She added that the only difference is that they the ones in the neighborhood are white vinyl, but she is willing to change the proposed color of her windows if necessary.
 - o The Committee members noted that many of the buildings depicted in the applicants' photographs are not in the historic district or are non-contributing to the historic district.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the architectural elements of the building such as the massing and scale, how it presents to the street, and how it fits in with the historic district. She noted that she cannot tell from the site plan if the proposed building is in alignment with the adjacent properties. Ms. Stein continued that, when you look at the adjoining properties, you also see architectural elements on those homes like porches and bays and other elements that reflect the character in this neighborhood. She pointed out that none of those elements really exist on the proposed new house. Ms. Stein cited as an example that historically the neighborhood houses had garages at the back of the property and the proposed building has a garage at the front, which is not compatible. She said it is important that the new house responds to the context. Ms. Stein continued that it does not need to look historic, it can look unique, but it should include elements of the historic neighborhood to be a success. She noted that it does need to line up with the historic setbacks and this is one element that is important to this block.
- Ms. Fast pointed out that garages were placed on the side of the house with a shaped roof on the front and a porch on the front elevation.
- Ms. Stein said that the roof shape is another important element. She noted that nothing else in this neighborhood has gable ends that are facing the street. She pointed to the roof shapes of the adjacent houses and said the proposed new roof will be so different that it is not compatible both from a massing point of view and an architectural point of view. Ms. Stein stressed that some reconsideration needs to be given to the new design to put it more into the context of the historic district.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein's comments on the proposed roof. He noted that although the garage door faces the side of the house, the garage is located at the front of the house. He added that there is a kind of mishmash of masses, roof lines, angles, windows at different levels, and all these different things; none is cohesive and none relates to the context of the neighborhood. Mr. Detwiler commented on the rear roof deck and said he is not aware of roof decks in the neighborhood.

- Mr. McCoubrey said the proposed design reminds him of theater a little bit. He continued that it is like a stage front has been created with all these elements and then you have a box behind it. Mr. McCoubrey said that the proposed design looks like a house that is symmetrical with two garages, but its main front is really like a side, and then it has all kinds of random gables to try to give it some character. He added that the proposed design misses the fundamental forms, shapes, and architectural elements that characterize the historic neighborhood.
- Ms. Fast requested that the photographs she submitted of neighboring houses be shown to the Committee members.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey commented on the photographs shown, stating that he does not see elements that helped him understand the proposed form.
 - o Mr. Detwiler noted that some of the buildings shown in the photographs are non-contributing to the historic district, and others are outside the district.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey requested to see the two houses that the new building is going in between.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented on the photographs shown and said that, even if you look at that newer construction photograph, the windows are in line on each floor. Mr. Detwiler noted that all the windows on the second floor line up at the top and all those windows on the first floor line up. He added that the gable roof goes all the way back the whole depth of the house.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that it also has an overall roof form.
- Ms. Fast and Mr. El Kai acknowledged the comments regarding alignment and extension of the roof and noted changes could be made based on the feedback.
- Ms. Stein said the overall comments on the design from the Committee members are more than just subtle changes, and that it needs to go back to the drawing board for some major revisions to the design. She continued that the changes would need to bring it into alignment with the character defining features of the buildings in and around the property. Ms. Stein stressed that some of the characteristics of the nearby modern ranch homes cannot be applied to a three-story home and the applicant should look to the left and right of the property to take cues from the massive scale and proportion of those buildings. She added that she personally does not agree with the garage at the front of the property, and it should be moved to the back. Ms. Stein pointed out that historic buildings in this neighborhood typically have some element of a porch and those porches help distinguish and define the front of a house and indicate where the entrance is. Ms. Stein concluded that the applicants cannot simply make changes to certain elements of the design but really need to reconsider the whole design and try to bring it in alignment with the context.
- Mr. Cluver said that, if you think about the context of this site and the fact that the main house was destroyed by fire prior designation, the garage is the historic element on the site. He noted that it is at the back of the site, which is typical for the neighborhood.
 - o Ms. Stein questioned if a reconstruction was in order.
 - o Mr. Cluver said that it should be considered.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that a key component of the design should be how it addresses the street. He observed that the current proposed plan shows that the main entrance is tucked completely behind the garage and the front has no protection of anything over the door.
 - o Ms. Fast disagreed and replied that there is a roof and porch at the main entry. She pointed to the left elevation. Ms. Fast and Mr. El Kai explained the porch and entry configuration.

- o Ms. Stein said it does not appear in the floor plans, so the Committee has no way of evaluating the drawings. She continued that the porch and entryway area do not show up consistently between plans and elevations.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed design does not incorporate character-defining features of the Overbrook Historic District.
- The buildings adjacent and closest to the property should be referenced for materials, form, and details. Non-contributing buildings to the historic district and buildings outside the historic district should not be referenced as examples.
- Garages are historically located at the rear of the property in Overbrook Farms. The front garage shown in the proposed design should be moved to the rear of the building or property.
- Roof forms are typically carried across the top of the buildings in this historic district. The change in roof line from multiple gables at the front to a flat roof at the rear shown in the proposed design is incompatible with the district. Flat roofs and roof decks are not in character with the historic district.
- Material choices for the exterior area are a key factor for compatibility with the historic district.
- Although the building that historically stood on the site was destroyed by a fire, the surviving garage is the historic element on the property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new construction is not compatible with the materials, massing, and features of the historic district. The proposed new design does not meet Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 5911 Overbrook Avenue MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 150 S INDEPENDENCE W ML

Proposal: Construction rooftop addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Andrew Goltzman

Applicant: Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio

History: 1923; Public Ledger Building; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rooftop addition with a roof deck and penthouse on the Public Ledger Building, which is located across S. 6th Street from Independence Hall. The addition would be clad in a sandstone veneer with frosted white spandrel glass between the windows on the east and south elevations.

The addition is similar to the two-story addition recently constructed at the Curtis Building at 170 S. Independence West Mall, to the south of the Public Ledger Building. The Historical Commission approved the addition at its 12 December 2014 meeting. Like the Curtis Building addition, the Public Ledger addition would have a 10-foot setback on the S. Independence Mall elevation. However, the addition at the Curtis building includes an additional setback at the second story. The massing, size, and scale of the proposed addition would be comparable to the Curtis Building addition on the S. Independence Mall side. The addition proposed at the Public Ledger Building would be L-shaped and would extend along the south elevation, though this portion would not be visible from a public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct two-story rooftop addition with mechanical penthouse.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed rooftop addition would incorporate appropriate materials and would be compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The application satisfies Standard 9.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o Owing to the location of the Public Ledger Building along Independence Mall and its visibility from Market Street, the proposed addition would be visible; however, the staff contends that the addition would be inconspicuous and would not damage or obscure character-defining historic features. The comparable addition at 170 S. Independence West Mall is similarly visible but inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The work complies with the Roofs Guideline.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 OCTOBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:13:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Plato Marinakos and Avery Mathews and owner's representative Andrew Goltzman represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Marinakos stated that he was concerned about the visibility of the addition but contended that the addition would minimally impact the views from Independence Mall.
 - o Ms. Gutterman questioned the view of the mechanical penthouse from Walnut Street. She expressed concern that the overbuild would not be inconspicuous from the corner of 6th and Sansom Streets. She further noted that the plans show a roof deck, which would require a railing that she suggested would be conspicuous.
 - o Mr. Marinakos responded that he could provide images from that view and explained that he designed the railing to match the façade materials with a change to clear glass.
 - o Ms. Gutterman argued that a glass railing is inappropriate.
 - o Mr. Marinakos disagreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested locating the deck between the penthouses, so that the portion of roof deck along 6th Street is eliminated.
- Ms. Stein contended that the proposal is for a three-story visible addition, owing to the long views. She argued that the neighboring building does not have the penthouses, which are quite large. She asked what will be contained within the penthouses, adding that they seem oversized.
 - o Mr. Marinakos responded that they are for mechanical equipment and that he would try to reduce them.
 - o Mr. Mathews added that the dimensions of the penthouses are taken from the dimensions of the previous mechanical room.
 - o Ms. Stein noted that the mechanical systems will be altered from commercial systems to residential systems, so more or less space may be needed, and she asked that that information be included.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the rendering showing the proposed addition on the Public Ledger Building uses an older photograph that predates the construction of the Curtis Building addition. He asked that the rendering be updated to include the adjacent addition. He added that not only is the Curtis addition two stories with a setback, but the mass is also set back on either side and is symmetrical to the building. He contended that its presence is much less than what he believes the presence of this proposed addition would be from the street.
 - o Mr. Marinakos explained that the roofline of the buildings differs, and the Public Ledger Building has a flat façade, unlike the Curtis Building which has large projections at both ends.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed with Ms. Stein that the proposed addition would have a much stronger presence than the adjacent addition.
- Ms. Stein suggested that a one-story addition would be more appropriate because the visibility would be much less. She argued that the second story and penthouses will make this addition highly visible.

- o Mr. Marinakos responded that he would look into lowering the overall height of the addition.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the rhythm of the façade and asked why there is irregularity in the window openings, suggesting that they be equal size to retain the rhythm. He then added that it seems that the parapet is not tall enough.
- Mr. McCoubrey raised concerns over the color of the spandrel panels and asked that they be gray or a tone closer to the windows.
- Ms. Stein questioned whether Mr. Marinakos considered making the 6th Street massing symmetrical with the façade, so that the mass aligns with the courtyard, then include a separate mass along Sansom Street. She added that the building has a symmetrical presence and that the addition seems not to relate to the building below.
 - o Mr. Marinakos answered that the building consists of four condominiums and that the owner of the portion of the building where the addition is located does not own the portion of the building further north. He contended that it would be difficult to make the entire addition symmetrical but stated that he could consider adding more symmetry to the design.
- Mr. Goltzman commented that the condominium under consideration has been almost fully rented and has brought nearly 200 families to the neighborhood. He added that his team has worked with the staff on other sensitive alterations and that he wants to maintain the historic character of the building. He then explained that the size of the mechanical penthouses is driven by the HVAC systems required.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the design of the addition is very simple and does not relate to the main mass of the Public Ledger Building. He further noted there is no relationship in the window articulation and no articulation, such as a cornice, at the top of the addition between the spandrel panels and roof deck.
 - o Mr. Marinakos agreed to revise the design, including adding a cornice and adjusting the penthouses. He further noted that he could revise the spandrel panels to create a more vertical appearance.
 - o Mr. Cluver stated that he believes there are too many revisions to recommend approval. Ms. Stein agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The recently constructed two-story addition at the adjacent Curtis Building has a setback second story, is centered within the 6th Street elevation, and has significant setbacks from the north and south elevations. The proposed addition at the Public Ledger Building is asymmetrical, contains no setbacks at the upper story, and extends to the southeast corner of the building.
- The renderings included in the application are limited and use an outdated photograph that does not show the recently constructed Curtis Building addition.
- Not enough information has been provided to determine the size of the mechanical penthouses.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- More renderings are needed to determine the proposed addition's visibility. Additional renderings should be included from Walnut Street, further down Independence Mall,

and from 6th and Sansom. The existing rendering from Independence Mall should be updated to include a current photograph showing the Curtis Building addition.

- More information is needed to determine the minimum size required for the mechanical penthouses. The property has changed from commercial use to residential, and the mechanical equipment will be replaced to reflect the change. The proposed design assumes that no change to the size of the existing mechanical equipment is required.
- The addition's design should be revised to include more regular rhythm in the fenestration, additional articulation at the cornice line, and darker spandrel panels that emphasize the building's verticality.
- The narrow portion of the roof deck that extends along the 6th Street side should be eliminated.
- As proposed, the addition would not be compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The work does not comply with Standard 9.
- The proposed addition includes two large stories and two large mechanical penthouses and is likely to be highly conspicuous from Walnut Street, 6th and Sansom Streets, and Independence Mall. The work does not comply with the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 150 S Independence W MI MOTION: Denial 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2141 ST JAMES ST

Proposal: Legalize demolition of stone site wall; construct stairs and fencing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ben Sabagh

Applicant: Ben Sabagh

History: 1923; English Village; Spencer Roberts, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Significant 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 2141 St. James Street is significant in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District as a prominent corner building of the 1920s English Village development. The building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 OCTOBER 2021

21

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

fronts St. James Street; its west elevation extends along 22nd Street, and its rear is highly visible from both S. 22nd Street and Chancellor Street, the latter of which dead ends behind the English Village properties.

At its 9 December 2016 meeting, the Historical Commission approved an application to construct a rear addition “with a revised, sloped and lowered roofline” to replace a non-historic vestibule. The application originally included a rear deck, which was removed from the scope by the applicant prior to the Historical Commission meeting. No work was proposed to the rear stone site wall.

Following the Historical Commission approval, the property owner obtained an EZ Permit from the Department of Licenses and Inspections without the required review and approval by the Historical Commission for an expanded scope which included removal of the historic masonry site wall at the rear of the property, which was not part of the scope approved by the Historical Commission during its 2016 review. Acknowledging its error in issuing the permit without Historical Commission approval, the Department of Licenses and Inspections revoked the permit and issued a violation for the demolition of the wall on 7 March 2019. The rear exterior of the property remains unchanged since the date the violation was issued; the stone wall has not been reconstructed, the addition has not been built, and thus a raised rear door lacks steps down to grade.

The Streets Department is currently installing an ADA ramp in the sidewalk at the southeast corner of 22nd and Chancellor Streets, which includes the area where the wall was removed.

This application proposes to legalize the demolition of the stone site wall and to construct two wrought iron staircases and to enclose the rear courtyard area with metal fencing and a gate.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize removal of historic stone site wall;
- Construct two wrought iron staircases to basement and first-story; and
- Enclose rear courtyard with metal fencing and gate.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The demolition of the stone site wall destroyed historic materials that characterize the property and the English Village development. The work does not comply with Standard 9, and the site wall should be reconstructed to its original appearance.
 - o The proposed wrought iron staircases and fencing along Chancellor Street are compatible with the property and would not impact its historic integrity. The work satisfies Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the legalization of the demolition of the stone site wall; approval of the wrought iron staircases and fencing along Chancellor Street but not along 22nd Street, where the stone wall was located, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Justin Krik and owner Ben Sabagh represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Krik explained that the wall was removed with an EZ permit, which was later revoked by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. His client's contractor backed into the wall with a large piece of equipment and damaged it to the point that it needed to be removed. An engineer reviewed the damage, he continued, and determined that the wall could collapse onto the wooden structure behind it. Mr. Krik stated that he has been working with Leonard Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, to determine whether his client had vested rights and whether the permit was issued in error. He stated that his client has explored reconstructing the wall but that he would like to continue the railings that are found along the front of the building.
- Ms. Stein argued that it is possible to rebuild the stone wall in kind and asked Mr. Krik to explain why the wall has not been rebuilt.
 - o Mr. Krik reiterated that it was removed in response to an engineer's concern over safety. He stated that for the past year and a half he has been waiting for a decision on the violation and his client felt that there were other options to explore. He contended that the wall was originally intended to remain in place, as represented in the plans approved by the Historical Commission. Once removed, he continued, his client preferred the open space. He then added his client is appealing the violation for removing the wall under the revoked permit and has filed this application to legalize the removal as a means of correcting the violation. He concluded that the wall was not rebuilt because once it was removed it looked "cleaner and better for the space."
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether the owner has photographs showing the extent of the damage.
 - o Mr. Krik answered that he was not representing his client at the time but would try to get photographs.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the entire wall needed to be removed. She then questioned whether a portion of the wall, even with the curb cut, could be reinstalled. The installation of railings along 22nd Street, she continued, is inappropriate and not in keeping with the character-defining features of English Village.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that a photograph was submitted by a neighbor as part of the public comment that shows the portion of the wall that was damaged. He observed that most of the wall remained. He opined that this application requires the Architectural Committee to determine whether the wall needs to be rebuilt. He stated that he is of the opinion that it does.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that this wall and its counterpart form the entrance to English Village.
- The Committee opined whether the recently completed ADA ramp would interfere with the owner's ability to rebuild the wall. It concluded that it appears it would not.
- Ms. Stein expressed concern over the wrought iron stair, clarifying that it is not detailed the way a wrought iron stair and railing would be detailed in English Village. She questioned whether the stairs were historically masonry or wrought iron.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that he is not bothered by the use of wrought iron, since it is more temporary in nature. He also clarified that it should remain behind the wall.

- o Ms. Stein agreed that wrought iron would be acceptable if the wall is rebuilt.
- Mr. Krik asked whether the Committee would accept the proposed wrought iron steps as proposed if he consults with his client and finds an acceptable solution to rebuilding the wall.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the design needs to be further considered and then it should be determined how visible the stair would be behind the wall.
- Ms. Stein inquired whether there would be a change to the other stair that goes down, questioning whether it is an existing hatch.
 - o Mr. Krik answered that there would be no change and that it is a hatch.
- Ms. Gutterman asked to discuss the proposed gates and questioned whether any other properties in English Village have similar gates. She also requested clarification on where the gate is relative to the property line, observing that the plans and elevations show it in two different locations.
 - o Mr. Krik explained that the wrought iron fencing is proposed to enclose the rear space, and that a gate would be installed along Chancellor Street. He noted that the property at the opposite end of English Village has a large gate. He then elaborated that the masonry wall extended beyond the property line into the public right-of-way and the proposed fencing and gate will remain within the property line. He clarified that the plans are inconsistent, but he believes the intention is to align the gate and fence with the rear wall of the building. He also commented that he would not instruct his client to rebuild the wall beyond his property line.
 - o Ms. Gutterman stated that there are enough inconsistencies in the plans that need to be clarified.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that when rebuilding the wall, there are other aspects of the proposal that need to be rethought.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia asked that the Historical Commission require the rebuilding of the masonry wall.
- Irena Wight of the Center City Residents' Association stated that her organization does not support the legalization of the wall's removal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The historic masonry wall along 22nd Street was demolished under an EZ permit issued in error by the Department of Licenses and Inspections, following some damage incurred by a contractor.
- The masonry wall was a character-defining feature of the property and of English Village, and a similar wall extends from the property opposite 2141 St. James Street.
- An application to replace the rear vestibule and steps was approved by the Historical Commission in 2016, though it was never completed. This application proposes to construct open stairs to the rear door and to enclose the rear space with wrought iron fencing.
- The plans present inconsistencies in the location of the proposed fencing. The plans show the fencing extending beyond the rear wall of the building, while the elevations show it aligning with the rear wall.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The design of the wrought iron stair and railings is dependent upon the reconstruction of the masonry wall. Plans for the reconstructed masonry wall, stair, and railings should be submitted concurrently.
- The inconsistencies in the plans showing the location of the proposed fencing should be corrected.
- The historic masonry wall should be reconstructed in kind, since it is a character-defining feature of English Village. The work does not comply with Standard 9.
- The wrought iron fencing proposed to replace the demolished masonry wall is an inappropriate replacement and does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 2141 St. James St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:09:30

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:32 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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