

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

**TUESDAY, 23 JANUARY 2024
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

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

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

- Jake Blumgart
- Tuomi Forrest, Historic Germantown
- Stephanie Magagna, Esq., Klehr Harrison
- Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture
- Hal Schirmer, Esq.
- David Traub, Save Our Sites
- Ed Barnhart
- Christopher Van de Velde, Awbury Arboretum Association
- Matt Masterpasqua
- Justin Bright
- Albert Starominsky
- Michael Tucker
- Pamela Bracey

Wen Lin
Jay Farrell
Karen Singer
John Davies
Chagai Bader, Nadlan Properties
Mitchell Starominsky
Gina Michaels
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects
Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association
Jim Dragoni
Sydelle Zove
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Eli Kantrovitz
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Michael Ramos
Max Polichuk
Sara Stevenson, Awbury Arboretum
Kevin J. O'Neill, KJO Architecture
Zhen H. Jin, Esq., Law Office of Zhen H. Jin, LLC

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1200-08 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dimitry Starominsky

Applicant: Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: 1954; Order Sons of Italy in America, Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, aka Programs Employing People

Individual Designation: pending

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story addition with a roof deck on an existing three-story building at a property that is currently under consideration for individual designation. The nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission on 27 July 2023 and the notice of the consideration of the designation was sent to the property owner on 15 September 2023. The building was constructed in 1954 and is primarily two stories tall with a flat roof. A small third story occupies a portion of the building's footprint near the rear. The building has a prominent facade with large windows on Broad Street and features an open courtyard with a low wall on Federal Street. It has secondary facades on Carlise Street and where it abuts the neighboring property.

The application proposed to demolish the small third story and construct a two-story addition on top of the existing building to convert it into apartments. The courtyard that opens to Federal Street will be enclosed resulting in a four-story building with a roof deck. The footprint of the addition almost matches that of the historic building and builds up from the existing, distinctive flat roof. The addition will be clad with aluminum panels and feature an assortment of regularly spaced windows. The addition will be prominently visible on top of and around the historic fabric of the existing building.

The building is being nominated under Criteria A, C, D, E, and J. It was constructed as the headquarters for the Order Sons of Italy, Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, an organization of great importance to the Italian American community. It is described as a notable example of the Modern architectural style, and it was designed by the significant architecture firm of Carroll, Grisdale & Van Alen.

The Historical Commission sent notice of the nomination to the property owners on 15 September 2023. Prior to the issuance, the owners submitted a zoning application for this project on 18 July 2023, but that application was denied on 17 August 2023. An appeal was submitted by the owners on 24 August 2023, which is still pending. Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, the so-called "transition rule," allows the Commission, its committees, and staff to consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation, including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish existing partial third story of existing building.
- Construct a two-story addition with roof deck.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JANUARY 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Infill open courtyard of building facing Federal Street.

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 The proposed addition does not meet Standard 2. It is too large and occupies too much space on top of and interferes with the spatial relationships of the long, low, flat roof of the historic building, a distinctive characteristic of its architecture.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed new addition does not meet Standard 9. It is too large and is not compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:15

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Stephanie Magagna, Michael Tucker from People Employing People, and Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Stephanie Magagna provided an overview of the project and explained that revisions have been made to the design based on the comments from the previous Architectural Committee meeting in December 2023. She reminded the Committee that the project predates the Historical Commission's notice to the property owner that it would consider designating the property. The Historical Commission's transition rule should apply. She highlighted the fact that this project provides an opportunity to redevelop the building while allowing the nonprofit People Employing People to remain in place. The designation of the building should not prevent the nonprofit from undertaking this project, which is essential to the survival of the organization.
- Michael Tucker thanked the Committee for its consideration and explained that People Employing People is a nonprofit service organization has been on this site for 30 years and would be able to remain for at least 50 more if this project is able to proceed. He stated that the organization does not have the finances to maintain the building on its own without the redevelopment.
- Rustin Ohler summarized the proposed addition project and explained the revisions made to the design since the previous meeting. He explained that they are proposing to repair and restore the historical elements of the original building including windows, doors, and the limestone façade details, add two new stories on top of the existing two stories, and enclose the currently open courtyard facing Federal Street. Since the previous design, they have modified the windows to increase the overall glazed area, simplified the material palette by reducing the addition to one type of

aluminum, simplified the design, and increased the recess into the courtyard area slightly.

- Mr. Cluver commented that the new window design does relate better to the original building than the previous one. However, he explained that he does not think the proposed addition complies with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. He added that the Historical Commission is allowed to consider other aspects of the project beyond those standards, especially in a case like this, when the nomination process began after the project was conceived. He went on to say that he thinks that the color of the addition is very important in this case and needs to both minimize its presence and relate to the original building. He was not sure if the proposed aluminum panels satisfy this balance. He asked the applicant to explain their intent with the color choice.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that they were trying to relate to the aluminum storefront on the original building. They wanted something light, and they did not want to match the original limestone color.
 - o Mr. Cluver emphasized that the large amount of aluminum on the addition appears to throw off the balance with the warmth of the original limestone and the colors need to be chosen very carefully. He added that the overbuild appears very heavy and bulky especially compared to the lightness of the glass and masonry piers of the original. He asked if the applicant considered wrapping the entire overbuild in glass.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that the existing building cannot support a steel and glass structure.
- Ms. Stein commented that she was not present at the previous meeting but wanted to know if the applicant considered leaving the addition off the Broad Street wing of the building and building up higher on the back portion of it instead.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that they did investigate that option but the zoning for the site does not allow that extra height and they would need a variance to build higher. Even with the current design, they will need to get approval from the neighborhood RCO for the additional height on Carlisle Street. He added that the current design makes the project to be financially viable. A taller addition would not be viable financially or from a zoning perspective.
- Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Detwiler commented on infilling the courtyard. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the courtyard is an important element of the original building. The courtyard portion of the design should be more transparent. He stated that the top two stories should be a continuous band instead of dropping down in the open area. A glass and spandrel system should be considered. It would likely not be any heavier than the currently proposed metal panels. A simple, glassy grid would help the juxtaposition between the new elements and the old.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he understands that keeping the nonprofit People Employing People in this building is an advantage of this project, but that is a financial and public interest element of the project; the Committee needs to focus on design. The Historical Commission can determine whether the transition rule applies to this project and can take the timing of the nomination and the work of the nonprofit into account. He noted that, if some of the suggested design changes are made, the overall project will be improved.
- Mr. Cluver further commented on the courtyard. He suggested treating the whole four-story infill area as its own element. He suggested focusing on glass and steel in that area instead of continuing the design of the rest of the addition. This would reinforce the U shape of the original building.

- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the inside wings of the original building were likely fabricated with a curtain wall and column system and suggested that the drawings could better show how the addition intersects with that. He added that moving the infill portion in the courtyard back a bit more from the ends of the wings may allow the original building to be better expressed.
- Mr. Detwiler explained that he usually would advocate for more depth and shadow lines on an addition but, in this case, given the purity of the original design, a more minimal approach would be better. He added that the little steps and gradations in the current design are distracting. The window divisions could also be simplified. He concluded that, overall, a cleaner design would be better.
- Mr. Cluver suggested the applicant take inspiration from the storefront windows on the inside of the wings to help reinforce the original architecture in the courtyard area infill.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the addition causes the building to lose its distinctive roof overhang. He added that the front elevation gets lost with the bulk of the addition on top of it.
 - o Other committee members and the applicant pointed out that the overhang does remain even with the addition on top of it and that the addition aligns with the walls of the original building.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro responded that, even though a small amount of the roof remains visible, the effect of the overhang is lost. He suggested pulling the addition back.
 - o Ms. Stein added that reducing the addition to one story may help with this effect as well.
 - o Other committee members agreed that the overbuild was too large and boxy and interferes too much with the overall effect of the original building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance commented that the Alliance was unaware of the building plans when it submitted the nomination proposing to designate the property. She acknowledged the extenuating circumstances. She praised the plan to keep People Employing People in place in the building and asked for additional flexibility for this project. She added that she hopes that, with some revisions, the project can be approved.
- David Traub of Save our Sites commented that this project is a true overbuild and has the appearance of one building set on top of another. He stated that he would like to see a true addition that organically interacts with the original building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes to demolish the small existing third story and construct a new two-story addition on top of the existing building to convert it into use as apartments. The existing courtyard that is open to Federal Street will be enclosed, resulting in a four-story building with a roof deck.
- The redevelopment project would allow People Employing People, a nonprofit service provider for people with disabilities, to leverage the value of its property to support its mission and to continue to reside in the building that it otherwise would not be able to maintain.
- The building is currently under consideration for individual designation. The nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission on 27 July 2023 and the

notice of the consideration of the designation was sent to the property owner on 15 September 2023. The project to redevelop the building was well underway before the nominating process was initiated. The transition rule, which allows the Historical Commission to give special consideration to projects underway before a nominating process is initiated, may be invoked in this case.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2. The proposed addition interferes with the spatial relationships of the long, low, flat roof of the existing building, which is a character defining feature of the building.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9. The proposed addition is too large and is not compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the existing building.

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

ITEM: 1200-08 S BROAD ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 26-34 CHURCH LN

Proposal: Construct five-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chagai Bader, Nadlan Properties

Applicant: Kevin O'Neill, KJO Architecture LLC

History: vacant lot with archaeological potential

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Germantown Urban Village Historic District, Contributing, pending

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a five-story mixed use building on a vacant lot at 26-34 Church Lane. The property is currently under consideration for historic designation as part of the Germantown Urban Village Historic District, which is scheduled for review by the Committee on Historic Designation on 9 January 2024 and the Historical Commission on 9 February 2024. The proposed building will contain commercial space on the ground floor and 33 dwelling units spread over the floors above, with a roof deck. The façade fronting Church Lane will be clad in a light-colored brick and feature a large grid of regularly spaced, narrow, rectangular windows.

The Historical Commission sent notice to all property owners in the proposed Germantown Urban Village Historic District, which includes this property, on 16 November 2023. Prior to the issuance of the district notice, the property owner had applied for a zoning permit in eCLIPSE, L&I's online permitting system, for the construction of this building. The zoning permit was issued on 28 November 2023. Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, the so-called "transition rule," allows the Commission, its committees, and staff to consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation, including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.

The Germantown Urban Village Historic District is proposed for designation under Criteria A, C, G, I, and J. It argues for the importance of Market Square and its immediate surroundings to the history and development of Germantown. It contains a great variety of architectural types and styles including eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Georgian and Federal residential buildings, mid to late nineteenth-century rowhouses, late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Colonial Revival residential and commercial buildings, a Victorian church, and a late nineteenth-century mill building since converted to residences. In addition, the district nomination specifies that this property is contributing solely under Criterion I for archaeological potential, thus the Historical Commission should review future building permit applications for the impact on potential below-grade historic resources.

Before approximately 1841, no buildings stood on the property, which was a part of a pair of larger lots owned by Caspar Wistar and Paul Kripner. Between 1841 and 1871, four stone twin houses were constructed on the lots that now make up the subject property. In 1916, those houses were demolished, and a two-story brick building with no basement was constructed in their place and used as a garage and offices. This building was demolished sometime in the 1990s and the lot has sat vacant since. The proposed nomination contends that the property at 26-34 Church Lane is significant under Criterion I for its potential to yield archaeological information important to history, specifically for its potential to yield information related to the Battle of Germantown in 1777 and the development of Germantown's cross streets in the nineteenth century.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JANUARY 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a five-story mixed use building at 26-34 Church Ln.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 8: Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.*
 - o The proposed new construction will meet Standard 8 provided appropriate archaeological mitigation measures are undertaken.
- *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 materials and design meet Standard 9. It will be differentiated from the surrounding buildings and use compatible materials and features. The proposed massing, scale, and proportions do not meet Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to the size, scale, and massing of the building relative to its context, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:39:25

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Kevin O'Neill and developers Eli Kantrovitz and Chagai Bader represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. O'Neill presented the project to the Committee. He explained that they are looking to construct a five-story mixed use building on a currently vacant lot which will include 33 dwellings and a ground floor commercial space. He added that the project is by-right; a zoning permit has already been issued. The lot has been vacant since the 1990s. He highlighted design elements such as the brick façade that will face Church Lane, the rectangular windows, and the ground floor storefront and outdoor elements.
- Ms. Stein commented on the size of the proposed building. It will be two stories taller than anything around it and does not fit in well with the context of the neighborhood. She asked the applicant to respond to the claim that the proposed building is unlike its context.
 - o Mr. O'Neill responded that there are a lot of different sizes and scales to the buildings in the neighborhood if you look at the few blocks surrounding this one. There are also similarly sized new projects that have recently been constructed or proposed in the area. He highlighted the CMX 2.5 zoning designation for the lot and how the current building is allowed in that zoning classification.
- Mr. Detwiler echoed Ms. Stein's comments about the size of the other buildings on the block. He emphasized that this building is not on Germantown Avenue and will overwhelm the block of Church Lane. In addition, it is very visible from Market Square, which is the heart of the historic district. He also highlighted the materials

- proposed and noted that only the Church Lane façade is brick. From the direction of Germantown Avenue and Market Square, that brick will not be very visible. He asked the applicant about the materials on the other elevations.
- o Mr. O'Neill responded that only the Church Lane façade is currently clad with brick, but that brick does wrap around the corner at the east end facing away from Germantown Avenue. He is open to coming up with ideas to unify the other facades including potentially using more brick but would need to consult with the rest of the development team before committing.
 - o Mr. Detwiler replied that the west façade facing toward Germantown Avenue is more important than the other side.
 - Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the design does not correspond to the context in the district but noted that the applicants were likely not aware of the potential designation when preparing this design. He agreed with other comments that the view from Market Square is important to consider and that the size of the building is significant. He also pointed out the spacing of the windows and other design elements that make this building look more like those in a suburban office park than in historic Germantown. He suggested they look at some of the varied buildings that are in this district such as the mill buildings to develop a more contextual design. He re-emphasized the issue with the massing of the proposal and pointed out that the four houses that were on the lot occupied a much smaller area than this proposal does, which is relevant in light of the fact that the lot is highlighted for its archaeological potential.
 - Mr. Kantrovitz explained that the project complies with the current zoning; they are not seeking any zoning variances. They are aware of the historic nature of Germantown but do not believe this lot has any historical value, owing to its previous zoning classification as industrial by the City. That classification was only changed by the City to encourage development in the 1990s. He added that the archaeological potential stands in opposition to how the city has treated this land up until recently and at no point previously has anyone tried to examine archaeological remains in this spot. He continued to say that the development team wants to work with the Historical Commission, and they are happy to look into the design changes that have been suggested at this meeting to help the building better blend in with its surroundings. He highlighted that this has been basically an abandoned lot for quite some time, and no one ever raised any historical concerns until now. He stated that they are trying to construct housing in this spot, but if they are not able to make something work here, they will simply move on from the project and work elsewhere instead.
 - Ms. Stein asked if the applicants would be willing to reduce the height of the proposal and to redesign the façade to better blend with the district.
 - o Mr. Kantrovitz responded that in order for the project to remain financially viable, it would be very difficult to reduce the number of stories.
 - Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that by-right zoning does not necessarily always align with the requirements of the Historical Commission. By-right zoning and historically appropriate design are often at odds.
 - o Mr. Kantrovitz responded that he does understand the historic preservation requirements but noted that a handful of similar-sized building projects have been constructed in the area within a mile or two of this one and they were not subject to review by the Historical Commission. He reiterated that they are happy to work with the Historical Commission on design elements such as color and materials.

- o Mr. Detwiler replied that he appreciated the applicants' willingness to work on the design and with the Historical Commission and the community. He added that designated or not, many people believe that a new building should relate to its surrounding context. The street is very narrow, and the proposed building is very large.
- o Mr. Kantrovitz stated that community concerns are important to them, and they will consider them. He reiterated that they did not seek a zoning allowance for more units than they currently propose and added that they normally do not use brick or the types of windows currently proposed in most of their buildings, so they already have tried to take into account the historic nature of the neighborhood.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the stretch of Germantown Avenue here is also a designated as a National Historic Landmark District, so it is even more important to take into account the historic context with any new construction in the area.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Neighbor Jim Dragoni opposed the project. He stated that he lives on the same block and pointed out the historic nature of Germantown. He specified that the size and design of the proposed building are completely out of character with the block.
- Neighbor Gina Michaels opposed the project. She stated she owns a building on the end of this block of Church Lane and lives around the corner. She was opposed to the design and highlighted the archaeological potential and historic nature of the site.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society opposed the project. He added that this is an opportunity to build something that adds to the historic character of the area as opposed to detracting from it, as the current design does.
- Tuomi Forrest of Historic Germantown and the Germantown Historical Society opposed the project. The Historical Society is located almost across the street from this property and is opposed to the proposed size, massing, design, and materials. In addition, he reiterated that the view of this building from Market Square is very important.
- Allison Weiss of SoLo Germantown Civic Association opposed the project. She agreed with previous comments and hoped that a more appropriate building could be built. She asserted that, even though other less compatible buildings have been built recently in Germantown, that does not mean it should be encouraged.
- Karen Singer opposed the project. She reported that she has a studio in a building down the street and agrees with the Architectural Committee's comments. She also pointed out that the site slopes, but the slope has not been taken into account with this project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes to construct a five-story mixed use building on a vacant lot in the Germantown Urban Village Historic District.
- The lot is considered contributing to the historic district based primarily on its potential to contain archaeological resources.
- The Germantown Urban Village Historic District is currently under consideration for designation. The nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission on 3 October 2023 and the notice of consideration of the designation was sent to the property owners on 16 November 2023. A zoning permit was issued for this project on 28 September 2023. The transition rule, which allows the Historical Commission

to give special consideration to projects underway before a nominating process is initiated, may be invoked in this case.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9. The proposed new design, massing, scale, and proportions are out of character with the historic district.

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

ITEM: 26-34 CHURCH LN					
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	7				

ADDRESS: 5925-31 DEVON PL

Proposal: Demolish barn

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Awbury Arboretum Association

Applicant: Christopher Van de Velde, Awbury Arboretum Association

History: 1849; John Smith Haines Stable

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Awbury Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolishing a structure on the property at 5925-31 Devon Place. The Haines Stable, designed by Thomas U. Walter and constructed in 1849, is identified as the primary structure on the property and is considered a significant and rare component of the Awbury Arboretum's original nineteenth century landscape. The structure in question, a circa 1875 wood-frame barn, also called a shed, is identified as an auxiliary structure on the inventory form for the property but is not depicted in a photograph in the inventory.

The non-profit Awbury Arboretum Association acquired the property in 2019, after the barn had been significantly damaged in a storm earlier that year. The Arboretum has obtained an estimate of \$63,000 to stabilize the barn and has concluded that the cost is infeasible, as the barn also does not serve any programmatic or functional needs of the organization.

The Historical Commission must determine whether the barn is significant enough to be considered a contributing resource in the historic district. The inventory is inconclusive in that regard and the barn or shed is not mentioned in the district's statement of significance. If the barn is determined to be a contributing resource, the Historical Commission cannot approve its demolition without finding that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the barn cannot be used for any purpose which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish barn.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The City of Philadelphia's historic preservation includes the following provision:

- *14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition. No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.*
 - o The Awbury Historic District statement of significance and inventory do not definitively indicate whether the barn in question contributes to the character of the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff defers to the Historical Commission on the question of the significance of the barn.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:13:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Chris Van de Velde and Mark Sellers of the Awbury Arboretum Association represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Van de Velde explained that the Awbury Arboretum Association purchased the property because it includes nearly an acre of land at the rear of the Association's Cope House with the Haines stable, which was a stable for the original estate but was not included in the Arboretum when it was created in 1916. He explained that they spent around \$300,000 for the acquisition of the property and another \$300,000 renovating the Haines stable. He noted that both the stable and barn had been overgrown and in poor condition when they purchased them. The barn was damaged by a falling tree. He explained that they put an additional \$4,000 into stabilizing the barn until they could figure out what to do with it. He argued that the Association manages its scant resources very carefully, and cannot find a justification to spend an additional \$63,000 on the barn.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether any character-defining features were identified at the barn during its designation or whether there are any detail photographs showing features of the barn.
 - o Mr. Van de Velde responded that the barn has no significant features.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the inventory mentions two buildings on the site, a stable and shed. He noted that presumably the barn is the shed. He also noted that the description is focused on the stable and barely mentions the barn.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro commented that it does not look like the barn has any significant framing features.
 - o Mr. Van de Velde explained that they looked at disassembling the barn but concluded that no one would want the siding because it is covered in generations of lead-based paint, and there are few other salvageable elements.
- Mr. Van de Velde noted that there are two components of the district, its rural history prior to the founding of the Awbury Arboretum in 1916 and its post-Arboretum history that altered much of the property and sought to create a public garden and landscape with significant viewsheds. He noted that many buildings were demolished at that time, including several other barns, during the creation of the park-like landscape. He opined that if this property had been acquired at that time, the barn would likely have been taken down because it impedes viewsheds from the Haines field and Ardleigh.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that the Architectural Committee cannot recommend approval of demolition and questioned whether the application should be reviewed by the Committee on Financial Hardship.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Historical Commission, not the Committee, should make that decision. He noted that the inventory mentions the barn and maps indicate it was clearly there in the nineteenth century.
- Mr. Detwiler remarked that the barn has similar characteristics to agricultural structures in Chester County. He noted that it appears on nineteenth-century maps. He identified characteristics of the barn including horizontal members mortised and pegged into vertical members and beaded vertical siding, opining that, while simple, it is not without some detail and some historic integrity. He noted that there are extremely few historic frame structures in Germantown of an era when it had a significant agrarian sector.

- Ms. Lukachik noted that the photographs show the worst portions of the barn and opined that it is difficult to tell whether the condition is representative of the entire barn. She noted that the estimate seems to be to fix it up and make it usable, but that there could be an intermediate step if it is decided that the barn should be retained. She opined that there may be a less expensive way to make the structure structurally safe that is not the full value of the estimate but might buy some time to fundraise.
 - o Mr. Van de Velde noted that they got a few estimates to stabilize the barn and to create dry storage, but that it would not create any capacity to be used for programmatic or rental purposes. He explained that the Association does not have \$60,000 to spend on the barn, when they are struggling to maintain the major structures within the Arboretum including the shell of the Cope House.
- Mr. Van de Velde asked whether the application needs to go to the Committee on Financial Hardship.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Historical Commission will make that determination.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the building appears to be fairly easily demountable and rebuildable and could be relocated.
 - o Mr. Van de Velde responded that they looked into relocating the barn but could not identify a new location or justify the cost.
 - o Mr. Sellers commented that moving the barn is theoretically interesting but not practical because it is surrounded by trees and is in an arboretum, and removing trees for its move would be a significant loss in the district.
- Mr. Sellers noted that the Arboretum demolished several agricultural structures in service of the landscape when the area was converted to a park in 1916. He opined that, had the barn been part of the original land grant, the founders of the Arboretum would have demolished it in the service of the viewscape from the Francis Cope House looking out towards Ardleigh, because the barn blocks a really attractive and long view into specimen tree area on the Haines field. He asked that the Committee recommend approval of the demolition.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that removals that happened in other eras and for other purposes do not necessarily meet today's historic preservation standards.
- Mr. Cluver commented that other accessory buildings in the district are listed separately and have statements of significance and inventory forms of their own in the district inventory. He opined that it seems like no one thought this barn was significant at the time the district was created, and that it is an accessory building to an accessory building. He noted that he does not see how this barn contributes much of anything to the district designation.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the cost estimate provided actually seems optimistic since they do not know the real condition of the building. He opined that it could easily cost more than \$63,000 to restore it.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, noting that contractors will find concealed conditions and change orders by the hundreds.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that it would be helpful to know other conditions than the roof damage.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the rehabilitation of the building would be a change order nightmare unless its condition is fully documented. He reiterated that he does not see anything significant about the framing.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that it would be helpful to see overall interior and exterior views. He noted that timber framing is a key component of structures like this one.

- o Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the Historical Commission could request full measured drawings and details so the barn is documented prior to demolition.
- o Mr. Cluver suggested that the Architectural Committee keep a sense of perspective in terms of requiring the Association to expend resources on this structure versus others in its portfolio.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether there are any other similar structures that remain in the Arboretum.
 - o Mr. Sellers responded affirmatively, noting that there is a cow shed associated with the carriage house associated with the Henry Cope House, which is a similar agricultural board and batten structure that has its own separate inventory form.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey replied that it is helpful to know that there are other structures in the district that can represent the pre-Arboretum history.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The barn at 5925-31 Devon Place appears on nineteenth-century maps.
- The structure has some character-defining features, including beaded board and batten siding and mortise and pegged joinery.
- The structure is identified as an auxiliary structure to an auxiliary structure in the Awbury historic district inventory.
- Other similar structures in the historic district have their own inventory forms.
- The Association has received an estimate of \$63,000 to preserve the building, but the full condition of the building has not been assessed and change orders during construction may result in additional costs.
- The Association has limited resources and appropriately focuses on the significant structures in its portfolio.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The Architectural Committee must recommend denial of the demolition of the barn unless and until the Historical Commission determines that it is not a contributing resource in the historic district.

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

ITEM: 5925-31 DEVON PL 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: 342 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Front & Vine LLC

Applicant: Matt Masterpasqua, Mass architecture studio

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition and decks on top of this double-width, two-story property in the Old City Historic District. The addition would be set back 20 to 23 feet from the Front Street side, and nine to 15 feet from the rear elevation facing I-95. Decks would be located on the existing roof, set back 10 feet 6 inches at its nearest point to Front Street, and on top of the addition. The deck on top of the addition would be accessed by a sloped pilot house on the north side of the building. The addition would be clad in black board and batten siding.

The application also shows rehabilitation work to the existing façade, including replacement windows, which can be approved at the staff level. The staff notes that the rendering appears to show standing seam metal details on the cornice and storefront cornice that are not identified on the elevation drawings and are not compatible with the historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rooftop additions and decks.

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 new addition does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property and will be differentiated from the old but compatible with the massing, scale, size of the historic property, satisfying 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 The mass of the proposed rooftop addition and decks are set back substantially from the main elevation and will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. The color of the addition should be reconsidered to be lighter and less noticeable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the color of the proposed addition is reconsidered and no standing seam metal is applied to the existing cornices, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:45:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Matt Masterpasqua represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Masterpasqua explained that they have located the pilot house on the north side of the addition to utilize an existing staircase and maintain a private residential entrance. He noted that they want to provide commercial space on the first floor. He noted that they have tried to set the addition back so there is limited visibility from the front.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant to address the staff's comments about the color of the addition and standing-seam roofs on the cornices.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that they are amenable to those changes. He noted that they were not aware standing seam was prohibited and are happy to paint or match the color of the addition to whatever is recommended.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned the location of the overbuild, noting that it will be visible obliquely since there is a one-story building next door and somewhat visible from across the street. He asked if there is a possibility of pushing the addition to the back of the building. He also asked if the floor to ceiling height can be lowered.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that they cannot set the addition back much further owing to a requirement for a 9-foot rear yard from back corner, taken from the shortest point.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey asked if that was a requirement at the third floor.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua replied that anything above a non-compliant structure has to comply with the setback requirements.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua noted that they could remove the pilot house and use an exterior stair instead, which would reduce the visibility.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua explained that they have tried to keep eight to nine-foot ceilings, but do not know what the structural members are going to be yet. He noted that the current R-49 detailing has gotten much thicker at the roof to provide insulation and venting.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that one foot of additional roof height makes a big difference.

- Mr. Detwiler asked if there are any historic photographs of the property to show the historic storefronts.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that he has not found any photographs and the designation is relatively recent.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale confirmed that she has not found any historic photographs and that the storefronts appear to have been office space for a lumber yard and wagon works behind and adjacent to the building.
- Mr. Detwiler asked how the commercial space would be accessed, since it is shown being accessed only by a roll-up garage door. He noted that this is a major component of the building and that having carriage or garage doors that are more contextual and doors with glazing would be preferable to a blank garage door as shown.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that his client is not yet sure how the commercial space will be utilized, and it may instead be used for tenant parking.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned whether there are any photographs or elevation drawings of the west, rear elevation.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that they are not coming all the way to the rear.
 - o Ms. Stein noted that there is no rear yard and that the building extends to the property line.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua explained that the rear property line is angled and the existing building extends to property line. He stated that he could not access the rear in the survey but could see there were doors in rear wall.
 - o Ms. Gutterman noted that the rear is not visible from the public right-of-way. It backs up to the I-95 embankment.
- Ms. Stein noted that the massing is acceptable but suggested that the Front Street elevation of the addition should have windows where the stair is currently located. She opined that this would add value to both the interior and exterior to have a more regular façade, which will be somewhat visible from the street.
 - o Other Committee members agreed.
- Mr. Cluver asked where mechanical equipment would be located.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that it would be on the third-floor rear along the property line.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed addition would be partially visible from Front Street, owing to the adjacent one-story building.
- The addition cannot be pushed to the rear of the building, owing to rear-yard setback requirements.
- The rear of the building is not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Reducing the height of the addition and replacing the pilot house with an exterior stair would reduce the visibility of the proposed addition from the street.
- If altered, the storefront and garage doors should be contextual and compatible with the character of the building and district, including through the use of glazing in the garage door.
- Standing-seam metal should not be added to the cornices.

- The black color will make the addition overly conspicuous from the public right-of-way and should be reconsidered.
- Windows should be added to the east elevation of the addition to provide greater continuity along the façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property and will be differentiated from the old but compatible with the massing, scale, size of the historic property, satisfying Standard 9.
- With minor modifications, the proposed addition would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the third floor is reduced by a foot in height, windows are added to the east elevation of the addition, no standing seam metal is added to the cornices, consideration is given to moving the staircase to the exterior and eliminating the pilot house, and that the applicants work with the staff on the design of the commercial storefronts and color of the addition, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 342 N FRONT ST MOTION: Approval with provisions MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 151 N 3RD ST

Proposal: Construct six-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 151 N 3RD ST LP

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects, LLC

History: 1849

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a six-story multi-family apartment building at the rear of 151 N. 3rd Street, facing Quarry Street. The site is in the Old City Historic District. The property as currently configured includes a mid nineteenth-century, five-story building classified as contributing along N. 3rd Street and vacant land at the rear along Quarry Street. The Old City Historic District inventory calls out the vacant land at the rear 219-25 Quarry Street and describes it as a non-contributing parking lot. In the nineteenth century, the site for the proposed building was occupied by a collection of buildings. The buildings were demolished for a parking lot around 1938. A non-historic, one-story rear structure extending off the rear of the building at 151 N. 3rd Street, onto the site for the proposed building, was recently demolished with the Historical Commission's approval. Owing to the fact that a structure extended onto the site for the proposed building, the site was not undeveloped, and therefore the Historical Commission has full jurisdiction, not review-and-comment jurisdiction, over this application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The overall design of the building relates to the Old City Historic District through its materials, massing, and proportions.
 - o The extensive use of brick responds to the immediate surroundings as well as the historic district as a whole.
 - o Buildings in the immediate surrounding are largely three or four stories in height, but five- and six-story buildings can be found nearby within the historic district.
 - o Elements of the front elevation could use some refining to fit the context of the historic district. The bay seems overly large and heavy. Historically, bays were clad in a lighter material, not masonry. The first-floor openings and open, arched entranceway should be revised.
- *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 As the subject portion of the lot is currently vacant, there would be no adverse impact on the surrounding buildings or on the historic district if this property were to be removed in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the front façade details are refined to be more compatible with the Old City Historic District, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:04:15

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gabriel Deck and attorney Michael Phillips represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Phillips sought to clarify the level of jurisdiction exercised by the Historical Commission on the site. He contended that, because the footprint of the proposed building does not overlap the recently demolished, non-historic rear building, the Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction only over the development.
 - o Mr. Farnham stated that the staff overview of the project provided by Mr. Maust at the start of the review regarding jurisdiction was based on the belief that the footprint of the proposed building did indeed extend onto the developed site. He noted that the staff would investigate the matter before the February meeting of the Historical Commission.
- Ms. Stein suggested that the bay could be pushed back by 12 to 18 inches or be clad in a lighter material more typically found on a bay.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that Quarry Street is very narrow and that this building, especially the bay, would loom over the street and the neighboring buildings.
- Ms. Stein noted that the floor-to-floor heights of the proposed building seem greater than those of the surrounding buildings. She further noted that perhaps pulling the cornice down to the fifth floor and setting the sixth floor back a little would improve the overall design of the building.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that reducing the cornice in size may also help.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification about the metal panel portion to the left which seems very nearly in plane with the brick.
 - o Mr. Deck responded that the different finish is intended to set apart a portion where the windows in the stairwell will not line up with those in the rest of the elevation and generally preserve the symmetry of the rest of the front façade.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey suggested that keeping the whole façade masonry would simplify it and make it fit into the surrounding context of Quarry Street better.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the top floor windows slightly break the symmetry established on floors two to five and urged the applicant to simplify the building.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the rounded corners of most of the windows stretch an arch rather than being a true arch and lack precedent in the historic district.
 - o Mr. Deck explained that the design team was hoping to draw on the historic styles in the district but express them in a more contemporary way.
- Mr. Detwiler argued that the spandrel panels and vertical banding could be simplified by being made of brick.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed to the list of suggestions offered by the Architectural Committee to improve the project and noted that a slightly revised application could likely be approved by the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, of the Keeping Society, commended the architects for proposing a building which speaks to the details of the historic context.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The scale of the proposed building is large for the context. Adjusting the floor-to-floor heights, stepping the building back at the top story, and shrinking the cornice are ways to reduce the scale.
- The details of the proposed building could be refined, particularly the area around the stair tower.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed design generally relates to the surrounding Old City Historic District, but the details should be refined to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed building would be constructed on a surface parking lot and would not impact the historic building on the property that fronts on N. 3rd Street, thereby satisfying Standard 10.

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

ITEM: 151 N 3rd 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	7				

ADDRESS: 3651-53 LANCASTER AVE

Proposal: Construct two-story rooftop addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: JDY LLC

Applicant: Wen Lin, Liu Consulting & Construction LLC

History: 1940

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Powelton Village Historic District, Non-contributing, 11/10/2022

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for the construction of a two-story addition over a reconfigured one-story commercial building, at 3651-53 Lancaster Avenue in the Powelton Village Historic District. The existing one-story building is non-contributing to the district. The primary façade's original brick storefront has stucco covering and altered openings. The massing of the proposal is appropriate for the 3600 block of Lancaster Avenue. However, details such as the use of cementitious clapboards on upper stories, configuration of the door leading to upper stories and upper-story window proportions should be revised to increase compatibility with the historic context.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct two-story, four-unit addition above reconfigured storefront.

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 new construction does not destroy historic materials. The use of cementitious siding, inappropriate 2nd and 3rd story window proportions and undersized door to the residential units are too differentiated from the historic context. With appropriate revisions the proposed application meets Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The existing one-story building is non-contributing; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the suggested revisions to the cladding, entry door, and windows are implemented, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 2:35:40

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey sought confirmation that the applicant will extend brick to the height of the cornice on the south or primary and west or secondary façades.
 - Mr. Lin confirmed his willingness to extend the brick as suggested.
- Mr. Cluver asked why no windows were proposed on the west façade.
 - o Mr. Linn stated that the windows shown on the first story are extant. No new windows are allowed in the building because the building is located on the property line.
- Ms. Stein suggested venting systems should be routed through the roof.
 - o Mr. Lin confirmed venting would be through the roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey intoned that the windows are not tall enough. He proposed reducing the floor to ceiling height from 11 feet to 10 feet.
- Mr. Cluver related that the height of the windows should minimally be 5 feet 6 inches tall.
 - o Mr. Lin agreed to amend the dimensions of the windows.
- Mr. Cluver opined that a belt course should mark the transition between the storefront and upper stories.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the design of the storefront required greater study and that the design of the entrance door to the upper floors should be revised.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that a cornice or projections over the doors can provide weather protection.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building at 3651-53 Lancaster Avenue is a single-story non-contributing building in the Powelton Village Historic District.
- The proposal entails alteration of the storefront on the first story and construction of a two-story rooftop addition.
- The proposed addition is clad in cementitious clapboards with one-over-one double-hung windows on the Lancaster Avenue façade and no new windows on the west façade, that is visible from Lancaster Avenue.
- The upper-story apartments are accessed through an entranceway with a paneled door at the east end of the primary façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The cladding of the upper stories with cementitious panels is inappropriate and should be brick instead.
- The upper-story windows are not tall enough.
- The Lancaster Avenue door to the upper stories lacks architectural details such as a transom.
- A cornice or band course is needed to separate the storefront from the upper stories.

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

ITEM: 3651-53 LANCASTER AVE 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	7				

ADDRESS: 1916 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Helen and John Davies

Applicant: Ed Barnhart, Always by Design

History: 1911

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck, solarium, and elevator at 1916 Pine Street. The property is contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. Upon completion, the project will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear roof and sections of brick on rear wall and ell.
- Construct roof deck, solarium, and elevator.

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 application proposes demolishing sections of the main block's rear wall and rear ell walls at three levels. This is being done to accommodate the new elevator. This demolition does not meet Standard 9
 - o The front area of the roof addition will be built over the rear gable roof of the main block, which will not be demolished; therefore, this element of the project meets Standard 9.
 - o The proposed features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing of the roof addition meet Standard 9.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The main block's original gable roof will be maintained; therefore, this element of the project meets Standard 10.
 - o Sections of the rear main block wall and rear ell wall are proposed for demolition on three levels; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 10.
- *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 roof addition and deck could meet the Roofs Guideline if the roof deck and railing were pulled back behind the bay window and roof line.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:46:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ed Barnhart represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Barnhart explained that the existing house has five separate floor levels that they are trying to make accessible by elevator. He said they looked at placing an elevator within the house but could not determine a way to accomplish it without significant demolition within the residence. Mr. Barnhart said the location selected and shown in the plans for the elevator is the best option for avoiding interior demolition. He noted they are working with an elevator manufacturer to create a smaller elevator cab than normal because of the space limitations. He explained that, because of these limitations, they are proposing to demolish the interior corner at the intersection of the rear wall and rear ell of the property. Mr. Barnhart noted that they could move the elevator away from Pine Street and further back on the ell by approximately one foot. He said this would allow the rear wall of the main block to remain intact but alter other aspects of the elevator project.
- Mr. Cluver said the location of the elevator makes sense to him. He commented that this area of the building seems to be one of the least conspicuous locations to remove historic materials.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired if they were just removing existing openings to insert the elevator openings.
 - o Mr. Barnhart stated this was not the case. He explained they are proposing to remove all brick at the inside corner to insert the elevator and to allow more space for the shaft.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the proposed overbuild. She stated that the overbuild on the main roof and its impact to the historic fabric concerned her more than the elevator.
 - o Mr. Barnhart responded that the owners are seeking to provide natural light into the house throughout the year. He pointed out that the house is located in a densely built-up environment and also surrounded by trees. Mr. Barnhart said, as a result, the interior of the house is dark, and the solarium addition was intended

to allow more sunlight into the house. He said they explored other options for this but those would have involved extensive demolition and it seemed preferable to build on top of the third level instead. Mr. Barnhart noted that they are building on top of the rear gable roof and intend to keep the historic gable roof intact. He noted the new sloped roof that faces toward the front of the house was necessary to drain water from the roof.

- Mr. Cluver said that he is struggling with the lack of existing conditions drawings for the back of the building and the lack of photographs of the rear of the property.
 - o Mr. Barnhart pointed to the photographs included in the application.
 - o Mr. Cluver said the application does show the rear area where the elevator will be located but does not show the rear wall of the building.
 - o Mr. Barnhart noted that, because of the trees and an arbor in the backyard, taking good photographs in the confined area of the backyard was not possible.
 - o Mr. Cluver said additional drawings of this area would have been helpful for answering some of the Architectural Committee's questions.
- Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Mehley if the staff thought any of the proposed work would be visible from the public right-of-way, adding that it appeared that the staff's main concern was the demolition proposed.
 - o Ms. Mehley confirmed that it would not be visible.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she does not object to the elevator but does have object to the solarium. She said that, while it may not be visible, the Architectural Committee does not recommend approval of construction on main-block roofs. She also pointed out that the applicant is planning to reconstruct the roof of the rear ell as part of the construction of the solarium.
- Mr. Detwiler said the extension of the solarium roof onto the gable roof is the oddest part of the proposed scope of work. He observed that it would impact the original main block of the house. He suggested that it might be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - o Mr. Barnhart pointed out that the ridge of the existing roof was not visible in the photographs from different angles on Pine Street. He concluded that it will not be visible at all.
- Ms. Gutterman said that she would support the roof deck but not the solarium.
- Ms. Stein stated that the solarium and roof deck are acceptable. She pointed out that nearby buildings have fourth-floor mansards, so this overbuild would not be out of place in terms of massing and height. Ms. Stein said she is concerned with the project because there is a lot more to it than meets the eye. She said that the proposed work entails extremely complicated construction. Ms. Stein said she is concerned about the structural stability of the rear corner. She continued that removing that brick rear corner gives her major pause for concern. Ms. Stein remarked that, earlier in the discussion, the applicant talked about shifting the elevator away from Pine Street to allow the brick corner to remain and she said she would be an advocate of this plan. She added the main block rear wall should remain in place and the brick on the ell could be removed.
 - o Mr. Barnhart said Ms. Stein's points are well taken and that shifting the elevator slightly away from the rear wall and the main block makes sense as something that can be accommodated. He stated that a structural engineer has been retained to do the final structural analysis for this project but is not providing an assessment until the Historical Commission's review process is complete.
- Ms. Stein said if the elevator was shifted perhaps this would eliminate the need for the new window openings on the rear ell.

- o Mr. Barnhart responded that they really need those windows because they provide the only natural light into the stairwell.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he agreed with Ms. Stein's suggestion about moving the elevator away from the rear wall of the main block. He said he is concerned about the proposed demolition's impact on the overall structure. Mr. McCoubrey noted the new window openings in the rear ell are acceptable. He also stated that he is willing to vote for recommending approval of the proposed solarium and roof deck overbuild, owing to its lack of visibility from the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed solarium and roof deck overbuild will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
- The demolition of the rear corner where the elevator is proposed has the potential to structurally compromise the historic building. The applicant should explore moving the elevator shaft away from Pine Street. Relocating it would protect the structure and historic integrity of the main block.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application proposes demolishing sections of the main block's rear wall and rear ell walls at three levels. This is being done to accommodate the new elevator. This demolition does not meet Standard 9.
- The main block's original rear wall will not be maintained; therefore, this element of the project does not meet Standard 10.
- The proposed solarium and roof deck would meet the Roofs Guideline if the placement of the elevator is revised based on Committee comments.
- If the recommended revisions regarding placement of the elevator are incorporated into a revised application, the application would satisfy the standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 1916 PINE ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

Mr. Detwiler excused himself from the meeting.

ADDRESS: 1719 PINE ST

Proposal: Install vinyl windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Salih Grevious

Applicant: Dae Chang, Window Nation

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install vinyl one-over-one, double-hung windows on the front façade of this building at a Contributing property in the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The application also calls for replacement of windows at the rear, which the staff will approve owing to lack of visibility from the public right-of-way. Historically, based on the age and style of this building, and the existing historic clamshell brickmoulds on the upper floors, the windows on the front façade would have been wood, six-over-six, double-hung windows with 7/8" wide putty slope muntins. The existing vinyl one-over-one windows pre-date the historic designation of the property and therefore the Historical Commission's purview over the review of building permit applications for work to the exterior of the building. The application materials provided call for the existing frames to remain, but lack the information needed to determine how the new windows are proposed to fit into those existing frames.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace eight windows on front façade with vinyl, one-over-one, double-hung windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - o The proposed windows do not match the historic windows in overall appearance, design, texture, or materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:11:20

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver noted that the Architectural Committee does not recommend approval of vinyl windows for the front facades of historic buildings. It was additionally observed

that the drawings provided are for a full-frame window and there is no information provided to show how the window will be installed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing vinyl one-over-one windows pre-date the historic designation of the property and therefore the Historical Commission's purview over the review of building permit applications for work to the exterior of the building.
- Historically, the windows on the front façade would have been wood, six-over-six, double-hung windows with 7/8" wide putty slope muntins.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed windows do not match the historic windows in overall appearance, design, texture, or materials, and therefore the application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 1719 PINE ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:14:35

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:17 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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