

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

**TUESDAY, 22 JUNE 2021
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair	X		
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP		X	
Rudy D'Alessandro		X	Arrived 9:26
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
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Sally Nista
Scott Ritchie
Gussie O'Neill, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Mike Kitsios
Matt Semola
Jay Farrell
Sherman Aronson
Allan Nadav
Oleg Sokolov, Esq., RS Law Group
Megan Strenski
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Howard B Haas
Charles Kerr, Cadre Design
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Randal Baron

Paul Toner, Esq.
Judy Robinson
Roger Perry
Gabriel Gottlieb
David Ade
Gui Tepedino
Russell Fulton
Brian Nadav
Plato Marinakos
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Joseph Lombardi
John Athanasiadis
Bridgette Byrnes
Alan Delfiner

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 59 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct addition and light wells; replace windows and storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PHL 59N2ST LLC

Applicant: Oleg Sokolov, RS Law Group

History: 1885

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to add an additional story to this four-story building located in the Old City Historic District. The new fifth story would have a roof deck with access via stair and elevator pilot houses, and span the full length of the existing building, which runs from N. 2nd Street through to N. Mascher Street at the rear. The application also proposes to insert two light wells into the building, and install a new storefront system at the front façade and new windows in the front and rear facades. The staff can work with the applicant on the appropriate storefront and window details.

The application mentions evidence of an original fifth story, but the staff has found nothing to support that suggestion, and notes that the rear elevation on N. Mascher Street has five floors of fenestration so that may have contributed to confusion surrounding a fifth floor on the building historically.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct fifth floor addition.
- Insert two light wells.
- Install new storefront at front façade.
- Install new windows at front and rear facades.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JUNE 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition is not compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportions, and massing of the historic property and therefore the application fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The proposed addition is highly visible from the public right-of-way and therefore the application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Charles Kerr and attorney Oleg Sokolov represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Sokolov explained that they met with a former staff member of the Commission several years ago to discuss possible development options, and their understanding from those discussions was that this proposal would satisfy the requirements. He stated that this property is unique in that it is adjacent to a building that is only two stories in height, so that any rooftop addition will be visible from any angle other than directly in front of 59 N. 2nd Street, owing to the adjacent property's height. He stated that they are trying to provide dwelling units that are appropriate for the neighborhood in size and quality and that also meet code requirements for a second means of egress. He stated that the light wells are necessary owing to the existing building having no windows on the north side, and that the light wells and second means of egress resulted in a loss of square footage for dwelling units, necessitating the fifth-floor addition.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the addition extends to the front façade and will be highly visible from the street, and therefore does not satisfy the Standards used by the Committee when reviewing rooftop additions.
 - Ms. Stein agreed that the addition will be very tall and highly visible from the street. She suggested setting it back 15 or 20 feet so that the historic cornice reads without an incompatible addition directly behind it. She noted that the property is both individually designated as historic and is contributing to the Old City Historic District. She stated that she is not opposed to a fifth-floor addition, as long as it is designed to be minimally visible from the street.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that the parapet for the roof deck could be changed to be a transparent railing, which would help to reduce the massing.
 - Mr. Kerr stated that they are not opposed to changing the material of the deck railing.
- Mr. Sokolov asked if the primary concern is the visibility from across the street, or directly beneath the building.

- Mr. McCoubrey responded that the concern is visibility from across the street.
- Mr. Detwiler added that the concern is also visibility from down the street.
- Mr. Kerr stated that the rendering may be a little misleading, but the sightline drawing was generated to show visibility from across the street. He explained that they sloped the face of the fifth floor addition as well as set back the deck rail, so that it would not be visible from across the street. He reiterated that they arrived at this design from discussions with a former member of the Historical Commission's staff.
- Ms. Stein commented that a sloped roof on the addition will look awkward from the side, and that it should instead be sufficiently set back from the front facade.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the Committee typically does not recommend approval of decks at the fronts of buildings. She suggested pulling the addition back and eliminating the deck at the front, which would result in a more inconspicuous addition.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the sightline drawing is incomplete, because it does not show the existing façade, cornice, or windows. He stated that it needs to show the configuration of the existing façade and where and how the new addition relates to it.
- Mr. Sokolov asked if it is preferable to have the new addition look more compatible with the historic materials, or to instead have it look more modern.
- Mr. McCoubrey responded that it is not a question of material or design at this time, but a question of the massing. He stated that the addition can be a different material and should not try to mimic the historic fabric.
- Mr. Sokolov asked if the Committee could provide a recommended number of feet to set back the addition.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the architect needs to study how much setback is required in order to make the addition less conspicuous.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Committee understands that this is adjacent to a low building which could become a taller building in the future.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested drawing an imaginary cornice line on the adjacent building at four stories and determining visibility.
- Mr. Sokolov asked about the potential for the adjacent low building to become a five-story building.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that any proposal to increase the height of the adjacent building would likely result in the Commission approving only a four-story building with a set-back fifth floor.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the pilot houses should be the minimum height required by code.
- Mr. Sokolov asked about the rear façade.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that the addition should be inconspicuous from N. Mascher Street at the rear.
- Mr. Kerr asked about the procedure going forward.
 - Ms. Stein responded that the applicant could withdraw the application at this time, or could proceed to the Historical Commission with revised drawings based on comments received by the Committee.
 - Mr. Sokolov confirmed that his client would like to move forward with the application and submit revisions for review by the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The staff can work with the applicant on the appropriate storefront and window details.
- This building is adjacent to a two-story building and therefore any rooftop addition has greater visibility from the public right-of-way, but the primary concern for visibility is from across the street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition is not compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportions, and massing of the historic property and therefore the application fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed addition is highly visible from the public right-of-way and therefore the application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 59 N 2nd ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4				3

ADDRESS: 400-36 S 3RD ST, AKA 301-17 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct parish hall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. Peter's Church

Applicant: David Ade, SMP Architects

History: 1758; St. Peter's Church and Yard

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The property in question, 400-36 S. 3rd Street, is a large parcel that occupies much of the block bounded by Pine, S. 3rd, Lombard, and S. 4th Streets. St. Peter's Church stands at the northeast corner of the site. St. Peter's Cemetery occupies much of the northern half of the site. The southeast corner of the site, a surface parking lot, is being subdivided from 400-36 S. 3rd

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JUNE 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Street as 301-17 Lombard Street. St. Peter's Church proposes to build a parish hall on the site. The overall property, 400-36 S. 3rd Street, was individually designated in 1957 and was included in the Society Hill Historic District as a Significant resource in 1999. Although part of the larger tax parcel at 400-36 S. 3rd Street at the time of designation, the surface parking lot at 301-17 Lombard Street is separately classified as Contributing for its archaeological potential, but not for any aboveground resources.

The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a design for the parish hall in 2019, with the requirement that the property owner conduct an archaeological investigation. Since that time, the archaeological investigation has been completed and a new architect has taken over and revised the design of the parish hall. The underground parking has been eliminated from the project. The exterior materials and design details of the parish hall design have changed slightly, but the overall siting and massing of the building are very similar to the project approved in 2019.

In May 2021, the Architectural Committee reviewed a new parish design. Following that review, the applicants withdrew the application, and have since submitted updated materials, including additional context photos. Revisions to the design include replacing the previously-proposed striated brick with a darker, rough brick; setting back the two-story portion of the building four inches from the Lombard Street elevation; and adding pedestrian scale windows with wood screening below the ribbon windows to the west of the Lombard Street entrance.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a parish hall

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.*
 - The archaeological investigation has been completed and the final report submitted with the 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 revised design is similar to that approved in 2019. The proposed building would be differentiated from the old and would be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:26:27

RECUSALS:

- Ms. Gutterman recused, owing to her firm's involvement in a different architectural project at this property.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect David Ade represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the site had not been considered archaeologically significant if the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission still would have reviewed the project.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded affirmatively, noting that the parking lot is still part of the larger tax parcel. Had the parking lot been a separate tax parcel at the time the district was designated, and not had archaeological potential, the Commission's jurisdiction would have been limited to Review and Comment.
- Mr. Ade outlined the changes made since the previous Architectural Committee review, including the substitution of the striated brick with a flat but textured brick, which is rendered as the darker brick in the renderings. He explained that they included photographs of contemporary buildings in Society Hill; included photographs of the existing church building; and revised the east side of the transformer enclosure from cedar to brick. He noted that the majority of the changes were made to the Lombard Street façade to strengthen the presence of the entrance and enhance the pedestrian scale. He explained that they connected the upper windows to the entry and canopy, widened the right pilaster to the stair, and lowered the former ribbon windows and clad them with the same wood picket screening they have elsewhere. He further explained that they set back the two-story great hall portion to focus the hierarchy on the entrance portion. He also highlighted that there are street trees to illustrate that there are significant pedestrian trees. Finally, he explained, they updated notes and added clarification to the drawings.
- Ms. Stein commented that the changes are modest, but have helped the Lombard Street façade. She noted that she is disappointed about the lack of change on the north side that faces the church, noting that they had talked previously about the open corners and extensive amount of glass as incompatible with the neighborhood. She noted that the Committee had already agreed that the massing was fine, and that the lowering of the event hall helps even more. She stated that she feels the material changes are acceptable.
 - Mr. Ade responded that they reviewed the previous discussion extensively and discussed it with the owner. From those discussions, a few things became apparent, one being their desire for transparency into the building to allow the mission to be more visible to the community. The corner windows emerged as a desire to direct views to the west where there is a solid party wall of the school, the intent is to look inside out at an angle and at the steeple and the open churchyard beyond. Those two drivers were important to the owner and the wider parish and were part of the original design process.
 - Ms. Stein responded that the Architectural Committee is charged with considering the public view, noting that it is not inspiring to look in and see ACT ceilings.
 - Mr. Ade replied that they have articulated the ceilings, which are more than simply ACT ceilings, with reveals and indirect lighting so the perimeter glows.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Ms. Stein, opining that the glazed areas will have a lantern-like effect in the evening, and over-lit for the location. He opined that additional brickwork would reduce the glowing at night.

- Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that there is a lot of glass. The proportion of glazing to solid brick is inappropriate. He commented that they have not talked about the glass wall on 3rd Street, but did talk about it in previous iteration in 2019. He noted that there was a concern that that was too much glass at the time, but that they came to accept it. He opined that adding the glazed corners on the north side are too much. He suggested that there are ways to allow slices of views from the inside out and vice versa but with less glass. He agreed that there have been improvements along Lombard Street but objected to the north elevation. He opined that the neighborhood buildings have much more solid than glass.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that an obvious consideration would be to continue the masonry in place of the spandrel metal. He noted that he likes the fact that the curtain wall exists on the large gathering hall and gives it importance and presence. He suggested that converting the spandrel zones on the north to brick will make it seem more like punched opening vocabulary than vertical strips of masonry, without changing the size of the actual windows.
- Mr. Ade replied that he understands the concern about the amount of glass, noting that they have reduced it significantly from the 2019 design.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned the mechanical penthouse
 - Mr. Ade responded that it will be clad in metal paneling with horizontal striations
 - Mr. Detwiler asked the height of the penthouse.
 - Mr. Ade responded that it will be eight feet tall, the height being driven by height of mechanical equipment, with a sliding metal door that will appear as a fixed panel.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed massing and materials are compatible with the historic district.
- Improvements have been made since the previous review to the Lombard Street elevation in terms of the brick, the set back of the two-story portion of the building, and the addition of windows.
- The north elevation features too much glazing, and the addition of a brick parapet in place of the metal spandrels would help reduce the appearance of the glazing.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is compatible in massing, size, and general materials with the property and its environment, but improvements could be made to the fenestration and details of the north façade in order to fully satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee failed to offer a recommendation. Ms. Stein moved to recommend approval of the application, with the suggestion to replace the metal spandrels with brick at the north elevation. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 2 to 2. Mr. Detwiler and Mr. D'Alessandro dissented.

ITEM: 400-36 S 3RD ST, AKA 301-17 LOMBARD ST					
MOTION: Approval, with a suggestion					
MOVED BY: Stein					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro		X			
Justin Detwiler		X			
Nan Gutterman				X	
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	2	2		1	2

ADDRESS: 527-37 W GIRARD AVE

Proposal: Construct addition; rehabilitate building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 527 W Girard, LLC

Applicant: Judy Robinson, Continuum Architecture

History: 1886; N. 6th Street Farmers' Market House & Hall

Individual Designation: 8/14/2020

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.

In August 2020, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for the property and concluded that the Historical Commission should exercise flexibility in approving alterations to Building D and that a new addition on Building D should be restricted to approximately six stories in height so as not to overwhelm the existing building.

This application proposes to remove Building D and to construct a four-story building with a roof deck. The new building would be largely independent from the remaining historic buildings, with attachments limited to pilot houses at the northeast corners of Buildings A and B. The addition would be clad in dark grey corrugated metal siding with black composite windows and feature a series of wrap-around walkways.

The application also proposes to rehabilitate the existing historic buildings A, B, and C. Since no clear historic photographs have been located of the property, and only a few historic windows remain on the buildings, the application proposes simple one-over-one aluminum-clad and conventional storefront windows for most of the openings. The contents feels that the proposed

window and doors are mostly acceptable, but encourages the use of clerestory-type windows in the monitor of Building C, and the use of glazed transoms in lieu of Azek panels in all locations. At a minimum, the staff recommends that glazed transoms with a vertical mullion be installed in the arched transoms to approximate the general historic appearance. The application also proposes to repaint the façade.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove Building D
- Construct four-story building
- Rehabilitate existing buildings
- Alter openings
- Install new windows and doors
- Repaint facade

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - While the configuration of many of the windows and doors on this property are not known, existing transoms on both floors indicate that there were split, arched fanlight transoms in the large arched openings. The staff recommends that these be replicated or approximated in the remaining openings.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed removal does not destroy materials that characterize the property, and the new construction is largely free-standing from the remaining historic buildings. The new building is limited to four stories, and while taller than the existing buildings, does not overwhelm the historic buildings.
- *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.*
 - If removed in the future, the proposed building would leave the form and integrity of the historic buildings intact.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the removal of Building D and construction of a four-story building, and approval of the rehabilitation of Buildings A, B, and C, provided the window and door configuration matches or more closely approximates the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Historical Commission's August 2020 in-concept approval.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:47:47

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Judy Robinson and attorney Paul Toner represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Robinson noted that they are amenable to both aspects of the staff recommendation, and are willing to include clerestory windows in the monitor of building C and to use glass transoms in place of the Azek panels as proposed.
- Ms. Stein thanked the development team for making a clever adaptive reuse of this unique property. She opined that, if the extra massing in the rear makes it a financially viable project, the addition is fine with her. She stated that the additional massing is appropriate because it is set back so far. She noted that resolving the window issues will make it a great project.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether the stair tower would be open or glazed.
 - Ms. Robinson responded that originally she thought of the stair towers as more of a mass, but they felt heavy, so now the idea is that there will be portions of the stair tower that are open. She noted the intent is to feel like an open exterior stair, so when one is inside courtyard it is a series of walkways and open areas.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein's previous comments, but noted that the stair towers have a mass and presence that makes them look like a structure and not a gossamer open stair. He suggested reducing the mass at top.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that he likes the stair, but suggested lowering the top and adding transparency, perhaps through perforation.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the dark color of the proposed addition.
 - Ms. Robinson responded that they wanted to differentiate the new addition from the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler commended the project, noting that the windows were the main problem for him.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the desire to repaint, suggesting that further investigation be done to understand the potential impact of paint removal.
 - Ms. Robinson responded that they considered paint removal, but there is a lot of damaged brick as well as infill on the building, so they felt that repainting was the cleaner solution.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the applicants could work with the staff to determine the appropriate coating material.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randy Baron noted his appreciation for the project and support of the staff recommendation. He noted that there are some existing historic windows in the building, shown in the renderings as the fancy fanlights and Queen Anne windows. He suggested that the fanlight windows be replicated in the arched openings facing Girard Avenue as well. He noted that the paneled doors were probably used throughout and questioned whether it would be possible to create a glazed form of those doors in other openings. He opined that the applicant should be encouraged to remove the paint because it traps moisture and its lovely brickwork would be exposed. He also noted that removing the paint would reveal the ghost signs.
 - Others noted that the ghost signs were actually in the interior, not on the exterior, as documented in a recent *Hidden City* article.

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia seconded staff recommendation of approval, opining that it is a clever approach to add density but retain integrity. He agreed the windows could be improved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed removal of Building D is acceptable.
- The proposed massing of the new addition is appropriate and does not overwhelm the historic building.
- The top of the stair towers should be lightened.
- Glazed transoms should be used in place of Azek panels.
- Clerestory windows should be used on the roof monitor of Building C.
- Paint removal would be preferred, but repainting with a vapor-permeable coating is acceptable.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The configuration of many of the windows and doors on the property are unknown, but existing transoms on both floors indicate that there were split, arched, fanlight transoms in the large openings, which should be replicated or approximated in the remaining openings in order to satisfy Standard 6.
- The proposed removal of Building D does not destroy materials that characterize the property, and the new construction is largely compatible in terms of the massing, size, scale, and features to protect the integrity of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.
- If removed in the future, the proposed addition would leave the form and integrity of the historic buildings intact, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the top of the stair towers is lightened, and the window and door configuration matches or more closely approximates the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Historical Commission's August 2020 in-concept approval.

ITEM:					
MOTION: Approval, with conditions, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, 10					
MOVED BY: Stein					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 539-41 N 22ND ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate front façade; construct addition with roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: JLM Investment Group, LLC

Applicant: Augusta O'Neill, Klehr Harrison

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

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

The application also proposes to construct an addition on the existing rear extension with a roof deck and pilot house. Zoning records show that the rear section of the building has been altered over time and is a combination of brick and frame construction. It is presently clad in white vinyl siding. The present condition and materials under the vinyl siding are unknown. The rear of the property is not visible from N. 22nd Street, but is obliquely visible from a service alley.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate front façade to nineteenth-century appearance.
- Construct additions with roof decks and pilot houses at the rear.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The removal of the PermaStone material on the front façade complies with the Standard because it was added in 1951, outside the period of significance for the historic district.
 - The original cornice and front façade window and door openings should be maintained.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The applicant should remove some PermaStone to reveal the condition of the original brick facade. The staff should define the final scope of work for the rehabilitation of the brick façade after reviewing the condition of the surviving

brick, determining whether the existing brick can be restored or a replacement brick material will need to be applied.

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - To meet Standard 9, applicant should document the materials and window/door openings present under the vinyl siding and retain and restore historic features. The addition should be compatible in massing, size, scale, and features.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - Although the roofs of the rear ells will be altered, the application indicates the existing exterior side walls will be maintained in place. It is not clear if the original 1859 walls are extant under the current cladding material. In the future, the original roofline could be restored if a future owner chose to do this.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The proposed deck and pilot house on each residential property meets the Roofs Guideline as they are located on the rear of the property and not on the main block. They would not be visible from N. 22nd Street, but would be obliquely visible from a service alley.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:05:05

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the existing rear extension includes the original ells.
 - Ms. Schmitt pointed to the historic maps and existing condition photographs provided.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that if the original ells would be masonry, based on the historic maps.
- Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Stein inquired about the existing configuration of the rear ells, specifically about the window opening and interior floorplan.
 - Mr. Lombardi replied explained that there is a step difference in height between the main block and the rear ells. He plans to make the third floor of the addition level with the main-block third floor.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the blue portion shown on page A3.0 of the architectural drawings on the proposed rear elevation.
 - Mr. Lombardi said that everything shown in blue represents new construction. He explained that to expand one area of the ell, a corner will be filled in.

- Ms. Stein noted that, if that is a brick façade behind what is shown in blue, then they will be adding a lot of steel because of all the new openings proposed.
- Mr. Lombardi explained that this portion of the rear ell is wood frame, not brick construction. He noted that their plan is to square off the rear addition, then overlay the brick portion with new stucco and stucco the wood frame along with the addition so that everything matches in terms of material.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if they are really going to keep the two-story wood frame portion or will they be removing it.
- Mr. Lombardi said they will be keeping it but modifying it.
- The Committee members questioned retaining the small, rear, wood-framed projection and building around it. They suggested that removing and reconstructing that section would be a more practical approach.
- Ms. Stein asked the staff about the removal of the PermaStone. She noted that, if the underlying brick is restored, there will be areas needing replacement and it may be hard to match the historic brick.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that they will not know the condition of the underlying brick until some of the material is removed. It may be a brick restoration or may require full replacement.
 - Mr. Lombardi said they are anticipating they will need new brick on the façade but will restore it if they can.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said that the application does not seem to provide enough detail at this point and that the Committee cannot have a complete discussion because the required information is not available.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the ceiling height of the new third floor at the rear.
 - Mr. Lombardi replied that it is about seven and a half feet. He noted that they have not yet undertaken a full design of the interior. Mr. Lombardi said that they could potentially step that section down.
 - Mr. Detwiler said he recommends the third floor be dropped down a little bit at the transition between the main block and new third-floor addition. He said that the change would differentiate between the historic main block and new rear third floor.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the visibility of the rear addition from the Wilcox Street. She stated she believes the addition and roof deck will be visible from the street. Ms. Gutterman said she is concerned about the proposed massing on the back of the house in relation to its neighbors. She added that this will be a story and a deck higher than anything around it.
 - Mr. Lombardi responded that a small portion of the addition would be visible.
 - Ms. Gutterman disagreed with this. She pointed out that the neighboring rear ell is only two stories with a deck.
 - The staff pointed out that Wilcox Street is a service alley lined with garages and non-historic structures. The upper portions of the rear of this building will be obliquely visible from the service alley.
- Ms. Schmitt noted that she could display additional photographs of the rear area of the building sent to her by Ms. O'Neill, the attorney, during the meeting discussion. The Committee members reviewed additional photographs of the rear area of the building with sections of the vinyl siding removed.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that the relationship between the wood-frame section and brick section is ambiguous.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if any investigation had been completed of the brick under the PermaStone.

- Ms. O'Neill responded that the owner had a mason visit the property and they looked at the existing brick and recommended replacement. She said that they are willing to work with staff on selecting a historically compatible brick.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired if the Permastone had been mechanically fastened to the brick and this is the reason for the damage to the brick.
- Ms. O'Neill said she understood this to be the situation with this brick.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that there is a lot of ambiguity and missing elements with this proposal, but noted that he did not object to the third-story rear addition. He added that he recommends the addition step down from the historic main block, allowing the main block to visually be the primary structure. Mr. McCoubrey noted they need clarification on the changes to the rear wing and the visibility from Wilcox Street.
- Ms. Gutterman said the Historical Commission needs to understand what they are proposing for the new brick on the front façade.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Clarification is needed regarding the visibility of the rear of the building from Wilcox Street.
- More extensive investigation is needed to document the existing conditions of the front façade brick under the Permastone and the rear ells under the vinyl siding.
- The application should be revised to include existing conditions drawings with demolition plans.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Conceptually, the project appears to meet the Standards, but the documentation of the existing conditions should be augmented before the Historical Commission's review.
- To retain the historic character of the property and meet the Standards, the applicant must provide a more detailed assessment and documentation regarding:
 - The condition of the brick under the Permastone
 - The historic materials and conditions of the rear ells including door and window openings under the existing siding
- To meet Standard 9 and better differentiate the addition from the historic main block, the roofline of the addition should be lower than the roofline of the main block.
- To meet the Roofs Guideline, the additions, decks, and pilot houses should be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. Additional documentation of the visibility of the rear ells from the service alley should be provided.

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

ITEM: 539-41 N 22nd 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	5				2

ADDRESS: 1250 E PALMER ST

Proposal: Construct additions

Review Requested: Review In-Concept

Owner: Barbara Cunningham

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design

History: Joseph Paxson Frame Store & Dwelling

Individual Designation: 11/10/2017

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to add additions at the side and rear of this two-and-a-half-story individually designated building. The one-story addition at the side of the house would include a roof deck. The additions would be clad in Hardie Plank Lap Siding and the proposed roofing is grey architectural shingles.

SCOPE OF WORK:

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

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 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.*
 - Although the addition that is proposed at the rear leaves the dormer intact, the house's original roofline would be destroyed in order to accommodate the new construction. The staff considers the shape of the roof to be a character-defining feature of the house and therefore contends that the rear addition as proposed does not satisfy Standard 9.
 - The staff finds the use of Hardie Plank siding and asphalt dimensional shingles to be appropriate materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:31:45

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman stated that she agreed with the staff that the proposed changes would have a negative impact on this small, corner property that is individually designated. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Ms. Gutterman.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether a second-story addition at the rear was even possible in this case if it meant changing the configuration of the original roof.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that she found the proposed overbuild to be unfortunate, but she was not sure whether a viable second-story could be designed to stay underneath the rear eave.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that perhaps the new openings at the second-story would have to be very low dormers.
- Mr. D'Alessandro observed that the single dormer at the rear roof was a unique and character-defining feature.
- Ms. Gutterman wondered if it was possible to extend the ground-story addition rather than build a second-story addition. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested they could apply for a variance.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he had been studying the renderings to try and see how an appropriate addition could be designed. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, commenting that the design would likely have to start down below the rear eave and then rise up in order to accommodate a viable ceiling height within the addition.
- Ms. Stein suggested that the design of the addition could remain below the gutter line by stepping down.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he was bothered by how the overbuild was designed to come right out to the edge of the street. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that a set-back was needed. Mr. Detwiler acknowledged that this was a difficult design challenge.
- Ms. Stein said that a section drawing would help the submission substantially to show floor levels and ceiling heights.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rear dormer and rear eave were character-defining features of the building.
- A section drawing would help the submission by showing the floor levels and the ceiling heights.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed overbuild would adversely impact the building by destroying character-defining features of the building, including the view of the rear dormer and the rear eave, and therefore failed to comply with Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1250 E PALMER ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Detweiler					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 1106 CHESTNUT ST

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

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Nadav

Applicant: Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio

History: Front façade for John Davis Co., Furrier, George W. Neff, architect, 1939

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 all the 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 removal of the wood parapet. The character-defining glass and metal panels would not be reinstalled.

A similar application was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its 28 July 2020 meeting. However, following the discussion, the property owner withdrew the application, and no

recommendation was made. During the discussion, the Committee requested that the owner submit engineers' reports detailing the condition of the brick backup wall. This application provides those reports, as well as an estimate for a new veneer wall system that would replicate the appearance of the glass and metal panels; however, such a system is not being proposed as part of this application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

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

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - 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 proposes 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, as would the wood parapet. 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: 01:39:05

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Nadav explained that glass started falling off one day in 2014, and an inspector from the Department of Licenses and Inspections came to the site and asked him to remove all of the glass. Mr. Nadav stated that a canopy was installed on the sidewalk and all the glass panels were removed, owing to the imminent danger posed to pedestrians. He contended that he did not act out of his own volition in removing all the panels. He argued that they were removed owing to the safety concern, since panels were falling onto Chestnut Street. He commented that he was ready to move forward with plans to restore the glass panels after receiving Historical Commission approval from the staff. After having a number of contractors assess the project, he continued, none would commit to the work without first having an engineer evaluate the structural condition of the facade. He suggested that the glass began falling,

- because it pulled at the wall. Mr. Nadav elaborated that he engaged a number of engineers and contractors, but none was willing to move forward with reinstalling the glass panels. He remarked that the only solution he has been offered is to demolish the brick wall and build a new structural wall, which would also require inspecting the structural condition of the storefront system, including the beam between the first and second stories. He claimed the work to restore the façade would cost between \$1 and \$3 million. He noted that his family has owned the business in the building for 35 years but that he does not have the funds to pay the fine and restore the façade to its original condition.
- Mr. McCoubrey responded that there is a financial hardship provision, but that the Architectural Committee will today only be considering the application as proposed, which is to legalize the removal of the glass and metal panels.
 - Mr. Nadav explained that at the last review, the Architectural Committee suggested that gates be installed at the interior as a way to keep the vestibule open and eliminate the need to install a second entrance in the storefront. He added that in light of the 2020 riots, the store did not get ransacked because there was still a solid metal gate on the exterior. He claimed that if he had installed an interior gate and left the glass windows exposed as the Architectural Committee suggested, the store would have been ransacked.
 - Ms. Gutterman countered that the 2020 riots were an exception and not a rule.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked why the windows need to be enlarged and questioned whether the brick is being replaced rather than restored.
 - Mr. Nadav answered that the brick will not be replaced and that he is proposing to remove infill brick surrounding the middle windows. He noted that when the glass panels were installed, the windows were infilled and made narrower.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification on the proposed scope of work.
 - Ms. Byrnes explained that the scope of work includes removing the metal tracking that once held the glass façade, cleaning and repointing the brick, removing the infill brick around the center windows to restore them to their original size, removing the wood cornice, installing a second door at the storefront to allow access to upper levels, and shortening the security gate that extends across the storefront.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the existing brick is stable, noting that the proposed work may add to the façade's issues. He added that he feels the structural reports are being ignored.
 - Mr. Nadav stated that Bill Proud pulled down the façade when the panels were failing and had the company and its engineer assess the brick backup wall. The company, he continued, confirmed that the wall would not be able to handle the load of the glass panels but that the wall itself is not in any danger, though it does need to be repointed and repaired in certain locations.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked to clarify where the windows would be enlarged and whether it would affect the wall's stability.
 - Mr. Nadav reiterated that the windows were originally larger and that they would be reopened to their original sizes. He added that he will have an engineer assess the wall to determine whether any additional structural elements would be necessary.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the fundamental issue is that the building that was designated is not the building that exists now. The building that was designated, he noted, was highly decorative with the glass curtain wall system applied over the brick backup wall. He elaborated that the building was designated specifically for that

glass and metal Art Deco façade. This proposal, he continued, would eliminate that decorative system and return the building to brick, noting that the arguments for doing so are economical. He explained that the Architectural Committee does not consider economic issues and instead considers how the building is being preserved and restored. He agreed with the staff's recommendation, reiterating that the building in its current condition is not what was designated.

- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the state of the metal panels and whether they exist on site.
 - Mr. Nadav answered that the metal panels are currently being stored in a warehouse and that the glass panels are not in any condition to be reused, because they are cracked and brittle.
 - Mr. Detwiler questioned whether a reflective, lightweight material could be substituted for glass. He suggested Plexiglas.
 - Mr. Nadav responded that he considered a metal panel system much lighter than Plexiglas, but that the engineers recommended against attaching anything to the wall.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether any consideration was given to a different structural system in which the load is not carried on the masonry. He proposed potentially needling through the wall to the back or applying a system to the front to carry the load.
 - Mr. Nadav replied that he has had an engineer conceive a plan in which steel columns from the basement would be installed approximately ten feet back. Cantilevered beams, he explained, would extend off the columns, would puncture the wall, and would carry the load of the curtain wall system. He stated that the proposal was cost prohibitive, but was the only plan to carry the load.
- Ms. Stein inquired whether the second- and third-story brick could be removed and replaced with a steel frame that rests on the storefront beam. She questioned whether the glass façade would be more financially realistic if the structure could be simplified.
 - Mr. Nadav answered that Ms. Stein's suggestion was proposed to the engineers and the engineers had concerns over the existing beam. He explained that the beam would need to be exposed, and then a load calculation would need to be run on the beam and the load to the footings. He contended that it would be likely that the footings and beam would need to be replaced. He cautioned that once the structural components are removed for replacement, it is likely that the entire façade, including the storefront, would need to be replaced.
 - Ms. Stein contended that Mr. Nadav's scenario is possible, but argued that glass and steel are much lighter than three wythes of brick bearing down on that storefront beam. She stated that the existing brick is delaminating and questioned whether, even with a financial hardship case, the brick could be salvaged. She concluded that it would be a major repair job that would not look good after completion due to the extent of damage caused by the glass façade.
- Mr. Detwiler argued that in addition to removing the weight of the brick, a lighter-weight system could be installed in lieu of the glass and metal system. He stated that he finds it hard to believe that removing the weight of the brick and installing a light-weight veneer system would not solve the problem.
 - Mr. Nadav countered that he has argued those points with engineers for years and will no longer contest it since they are professionals and have liability. He reiterated that he cannot afford to demolish and rebuild the façade.

- Ms. Stein remarked that there is no verification of Mr. Nadav's claims and suggested that the applicant submit a financial hardship application with the costs for these proposals.
- Mr. Detwiler added that a preservation engineer should be retained.
- Mr. Nadav commented that the structural engineers reviewed these proposals and the reports could be rewritten to address them.
- Mr. McCoubrey replied that no report that was submitted as part of the application assessed the possibility of dismantling the brick façade and reconstructing it with a light-weight material. He noted that all reports are predicated on retaining the existing brick backup wall.
- Mr. Nadav commented that he believed such a proposal was included in Trevor Henry's report where he mentions the potential issues if the façade were to be dismantled.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the storefront modification and asked whether there were any historic photographs of the storefront dating to when the glass and metal panels were added.
 - Ms. Keller responded that she believed all historic photos from the Historical Commission files were included in the application.
 - Ms. Gutterman observed that the storefront system appeared to be frameless.
 - Mr. Nadav explained that in order to develop the space above the store, there would need to be a means of egress. The only way to accomplish that, he continued, is to use the second stair, which is currently closed off. He added that the western storefront window would be reduced to allow for the installation of a glass egress door that would match the glass storefront. No changes would occur on the eastern side of the storefront, he noted.
- The Committee agreed that the proposed alterations would radically alter the appearance of the building, adding that they are charged with protecting the Art Deco façade.
 - Mr. Nadav argued that it was not possible for him to maintain the façade, because the glass panels were glued onto the brick with mastic, and thin channels held the edges of the panels. The mastic, he added, would be removed during the brick cleaning and pointing process.
 - Mr. McCoubrey argued that the Historical Commission is not interested in the brick façade but is instead interested in the Art Deco glass and metal façade.
- Ms. Stein asked whether the property was designated while Mr. Nadav's family has owned it.
 - Mr. Nadav replied that the property was designated in 1986 and was purchased by his family in 1988, adding that his father did not understand the gravity of maintaining a designated property when he purchased it.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the Historical Commission would have jurisdiction over the brick façade, if in the future the brick façade is retained and the glass and metal façade is not restored.
 - Mr. Farnham answered that the Historical Commission would maintain jurisdiction over the property and would review all building permits, whether they relate to the brick façade or another part of the building, until it decided that it would no longer regulate this property by rescinding the designation. He then stated that the real question, as noted previously by Mr. McCoubrey, is whether it is financially feasible to reconstruct the Art Deco façade. He stated that it is a question for the Committee on Financial Hardship and would require an

application to that body. The application, he continued, would need to demonstrate that there is no reasonable or feasible way to reconstruct the façade. He stated that, if the Historical Commission ultimately decides it is not feasible to reconstruct the façade, then the next step would be to rescind the designation, because the designation was predicated on that unique and important Art Deco façade. The building in its current condition without the façade, he continued, does not merit designation. Mr. Farnham then agreed with the Committee that it cannot abandon that façade in today's review and is bound to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and seek the restoration of that façade. If restoration is truly not possible, he reiterated, the Committee on Financial Hardship would need to determine that through a separate application.

- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the hardship process would require the submission of all the engineers' reports for different scenarios of restoration.
- Mr. McCoubrey added that cost estimates are a requirement and that the process is a rigorous procedure.
- Mr. Farnham commented that the staff could work with the property owner and his consultants to produce the application. He agreed that the application would need to prove that reconstructing that Art Deco façade would be more costly than the return on that investment would be able to support.
- Mr. Detwiler remarked that if the financial hardship process proves successful, he has concerns over the fate of the metal panels, noting that their survival is very important.
 - Mr. Nadav responded that he has discussed the future of the materials and if the metal panels do not get reinstalled, he would be happy to donate some of them to the Historical Commission rather than allowing them to languish in a warehouse.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the staff's recommendation and comments of the Committee, adding that it is a complicated situation that requires creative engineering and design solutions. He commented that the Alliance would support any effort to replicate the façade system even with alternative materials.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property was designated in 1986 for its significant Art Deco glass and metal panel façade.
- The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the unsafe condition of the building's front façade in 2014. At the time, some glass panels had fallen from the façade, and the violation requested that only loose panels were to be removed. The owner subsequently removed all glass and metal panels.
- The Historical Commission staff approved applications to restore the glass and metal Art Deco façade in 2016 and 2017, but the work was never undertaken.
- The owner contacted several engineers to assess the possibility of reinstalling the glass and metal panel system, and two reports were included in the application. One report concluded that the brick backup wall cannot support the load of the panels. The other report recommended replacing the spacers and anchors per the new glass façade manufacture.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The Committee is tasked with ensuring the preservation of the Art Deco glass and metal panel façade for which the building was designated.
- The removal of the glass and metal panels and long-term exposure of the brick backup wall resulted in the loss of the building's character-defining façade. The work did not comply with Standard 9. The façade should be reinstalled if financially feasible.
- While the owner may have a hardship claim, owing to the cost of restoring the glass and metal panel system, a financial hardship application would need to be submitted and reviewed through the financial hardship process.

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

ITEM: 1106 CHESTNUT ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:17:22

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:18 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.