

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

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

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:04 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
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner I
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Judith Robinson, 32nd Ward RCO
William Morris
Christopher Miller
Carolina Pena
Michelle Kleschick
Michael Bosciano
Jackie Gusic
Stuart Rosenberg
Donna Lisle
Juliet Lee Fajardo
David Lockard
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Dale You
Stephen Bartlett

Modesto Bigas-Valedon
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP
Ruth Birchett
Jay Farrell
John Stortz
Todd Curry
Paul Boni, Esq.
Steven Peitzman
David Fecteau, Planning Commission

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 127-29 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Remove wall; construct addition; replace wood shingle roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pea Vine Properties

Applicant: William Morris, John Milner Architects

History: 1760; Man Full of Trouble Tavern; Restored c. 1963-65, Nelson Anderson, architect

Individual Designation: 2/15/1963

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore and add a small addition to the “Man Full of Trouble Tavern” at 127-29 Spruce Street, a three-story brick masonry building with a half gambrel roof that is both individually designated and classified as a significant resource to the Society Hill Historic District. The building was constructed in 1760 as a tavern and proceeded to be used for a variety of commercial purposes through the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. It was restored to its original appearance between 1963 and 1965. The project proposes to construct a new one-story shed addition on the east façade of the building to accommodate an accessible restroom. The application demonstrates the existence of a similar shed addition at this same location in the past. As part of the construction of the addition, a small length of deteriorated brick wall, likely a remnant of a neighboring twentieth-century structure, will be demolished. A small portion of a bulkhead door on the east side of the building will also be modified to accommodate the new addition. In addition, several repairs will be performed including replacing the wood shingle roof with shakes, repairing or replacing an existing pole gutter, repairing the existing second-floor balcony, repointing the existing masonry, repairing existing damaged exterior woodwork, and repairing a deteriorated first-floor window frame and replacing the sash.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a one-story shed roof addition on the east façade of the building.
- Alter the east bulkhead door framing to accommodate the addition.
- Remove a deteriorated one-story brick wall from the east end of the building.
- Replace wood shingle roof, repair or replace gutters, repair a second-story balcony, repoint masonry, repair woodwork, and repair a first-floor window.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 APRIL 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The proposed repair and restoration work meets Standard 6. The work aims to repair historic features and retain materials where possible and replace deteriorated pieces with appropriate new material that matches the old in design, color, and texture.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old but compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed shed addition meets Standard 9. It will not destroy any historic fabric that characterizes the property and will be differentiated from the old and be compatibly sized.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed shed addition meets Standard 10. It will be easily removed if needed in the future without impairing the historic integrity of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Detwiler recused from the review, owing to his firm's involvement as the architect for the project.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Christopher Miller and Will Morris represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Miller briefly summarized the application and offered to answer any questions from the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the building was currently ADA accessible.
 - o Mr. Morris responded that it is not, but the current owner would like to reopen it to the public and install an accessible restroom.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the small brick wall to be demolished and if the applicants were sure it was not an original part of this building.
 - o Mr. Morris stated that they believe it to be a remnant of a twentieth-century neighboring building. He pointed to the historical photographs and drawings included with the application that show a series of frame and then later brick buildings that were built next to the tavern in the location of the wall. He also showed images of the rear of the tavern and highlighted that it is constructed of rubble stone adjacent to where the brick wall is, implying that the brick is a later addition and not part of the historical fabric of the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked how the addition would affect the existing foundation and masonry around it.
 - o Mr. Morris stated that their objective is to preserve nearly everything. He pointed out that the only portion that will be affected is a small part of the adjacent

bulkhead and that they will need to repair and replace the existing doors on it and modify the north side hinges slightly, but that they will not need to modify the stone.

- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the gutter and its relationship to the window.
 - o Mr. Morris confirmed that though space was tight, the gutter will not impede the glass or the casing of the window.
 - o Mr. Cluver added that they could use some kind of diverter to protect the window from any potential water.
 - o The applicant agreed.
- Mr. D'Alessandro had an additional comment on the bulkhead hinge. He commented that he would like to see a straight connection to make sure the stone would not be affected by expansion.
 - o Mr. Morris stated that they could modify the design to accommodate the suggestion.
- Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the application proposes to repair the frame of a first-floor window and replace the sash. He asked for more details.
 - o Mr. Morris replied that the window in question is not original and is currently fitted with plate glass, so there is no existing sash to repair.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the choice of wood shakes for the new roof. He expressed concern about the potential for shakes to allow water in due to the shallow slope of the top portion of the roof and the thicker design of shakes.
 - o Mr. Morris said that they will take this suggestion into account.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building was constructed in 1760 as a tavern and proceeded to be used for a variety of commercial purposes through the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. It was restored to its original appearance between 1963 and 1965.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed repair and restoration work meets Standard 6. The work aims to repair historic features and retain materials where possible and replace deteriorated pieces with appropriate new material that matches the old in design, color, and texture.
- The proposed shed addition meets Standard 9. It will not destroy any historic fabric that characterizes the property and will be differentiated from the old and be compatibly sized.
- The proposed shed addition meets Standard 10. It can be removed if needed in the future without impairing the historic integrity of the property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 127-29 SPRUCE ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 4241 MAIN ST

Proposal: Legalize and approve alterations to front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael P. Bosciano

Applicant: Michael P. Bosciano

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize recent façade alterations to the second and third floors of 4241 Main Street. These alterations include the replacement of older aluminum siding with vinyl siding, capping of building and storefront cornices and window frames, and the installation of exterior lighting and cameras. This work was conducted without building permits or the Historical Commission's approval, and the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation in November 2022 at the Historical Commission's request. Photographs from the time of designation show that aluminum siding was present on the building prior to its designation in 1983. Photographs from the applicants and taken by staff in late 2022 show that the siding was briefly removed, exposing brick and stone details underneath, as well as Italianate building and storefront cornices, which were then covered in siding and additional capping. Pairs of double doors were installed in the storefront window openings, and the second-floor bay and third-floor windows were also capped. It is unclear whether the upper floor windows themselves were replaced as well.

As a compromise, the applicant proposes to renovate the first-floor storefront so that it is more in keeping with a traditional historic storefront. This includes removing the first-floor vinyl siding and inappropriate windows, constructing a wood paneled storefront with two plate glass windows, exposing and repairing the storefront cornice, and installing planters below the storefront windows.

In March 2023, the Historical Commission reviewed a proposal from this applicant to legalize all façade work done without permits or Historical Commission approval. The Commission voted to deny that application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize exterior façade alterations on the second and third floors including siding replacement, capping of cornices and window frames, and installation of lighting and cameras.
- Alter first-floor storefront to bring it closer to a historic appearance, which would include removal of vinyl siding, exposing and restoring storefront cornice, constructing a new wood exterior, removing inappropriate storefront windows and replacing with plate glass, and installing planters below storefront windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Main Street Manayunk review criteria restated in the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations include:

- *Section 6.9.b.2: Facings: Refacing of facades, bays, cornices with inappropriate materials such as aluminum siding, or brick veneer shall be prohibited. Existing inappropriate facade facings shall be removed at the termination of the useful life of the facing. Any inappropriate facing material lawfully in existence shall not be repaired or altered in any substantial manner.*
 - o The existing inappropriate façade facing was removed at the termination of its useful life and refaced using an inappropriate material in vinyl siding. The application proposes to keep the new siding on the second and third floors and does not align with this regulation.
- *Section 6.9.b.3: Elements: Original window and door openings, sills, lintels, and sashes shall be retained and repaired whenever possible. Replacement elements shall match the original appearance in proportion, form, and materials as closely as possible.*
 - o New capping covers original window frames.
- *Section 6.9.b.4: Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.*
 - o The proposed storefront restoration is compatible with the materials of the original building.

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 siding and cornice capping covers and obscures the historic character of the property. The application only proposes to restore the first-floor windows and cornice and thus does not meet Standard 2.
- *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 new window frame capping on the second does not match the old in appearance or materials and does not meet Standard 6.
 - o The proposed new storefront potentially meets Standard 6 depending on the final design and materials chosen, but the application does not include those details.
- *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 siding and capping are incompatible with the architectural features of the property and do not meet Standard 9.
- o The proposed first-floor storefront renovation satisfies Standard 9 and is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the legalization of recent exterior work including siding replacement, capping of cornices and window frames, window replacement, and installation of lighting and cameras pursuant to the Main Street Manayunk review criteria and Standards 2, 6, and 9; denial of proposed storefront renovation owing to incompleteness.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Michael Boscaino represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Boscaino briefly described his application with a focus on the storefront level renovation, which he is proposing as a compromise solution. He also explained that he was reluctant to pay for the creation of professional architectural drawings since he was not sure that the Architectural Committee would accept his proposal.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the applicant was proposing to return the storefront to the appearance it had before his renovations or to a historic appearance.
 - o Mr. Boscaino replied that he is proposing to restore it to a conjectural historic appearance including constructing a new wood-framed storefront with plate glass windows and exposing and restoring the first-floor cornice. He pointed to a photograph of an example of a building he wanted to use as inspiration. He added that he is also asking for legalization of the changes he made to the upper floors including the siding and window capping.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked why he was proposing to reconstruct the first floor with wood instead of restoring the existing brick.
 - o Mr. Boscaino clarified that there was no existing brick on the first floor, but instead a faux brick siding put on top of plywood framing.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey added that he believes the original storefront was likely mostly glazed. Mr. Boscaino mentioned that there were some historic photographs, but not any that show the storefront as it was before he purchased the property.
 - o Mr. Till confirmed that the oldest photographs found dated from the time of designation and the staff could not confirm what the storefront looked like before that time.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey added that there was a possibility of discovering more about the original design if the existing layers on the building were removed and examined.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the application does not include sufficient architectural drawings for them to truly review the new storefront proposal.
 - o Mr. Boscaino responded that he was hoping to have a conversation on the concept of restoring the storefront. He pointed out his finances as a particular difficulty for him related to this property and that he wanted to avoid the cost of having professional drawings made if the Architectural Committee was not amenable to the idea in the first place.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey commented that it would be difficult for the Committee to recommend approval of the changes made to the upper floors and though he

realizes that there has been some discussion with regard to compromises, most of the applicant's arguments are based on financial hardship and that the Committee is only allowed to consider the architectural qualities of the application as they relate to the city's preservation ordinance and the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

- o Mr. Boscaino explained that he thinks that his compromise proposals are not being taken seriously by the Committee and he was upset by this. He added that he plans to appeal a decision that does not include a compromise and pointedly stated that he will not change the siding on the upper floors. He again highlighted his financial hardship in this situation.
- o Mr. Cluver added that the Historical Commission could consider additional factors such as finances, but that this Committee needs to focus on architecture. The Architectural Committee must base its recommendations on the Secretary of Interior's Standards.
- o Mr. Boscaino reiterated that he is seeking a compromise solution and that he feels that the Committee is not offering to compromise or listen to his ideas.
- o Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the Committee did not offer to compromise, and that the applicant is out of order.
- o Mr. Detwiler added that there is nothing in the application that merits approval.
- Mr. Detwiler steered the conversation back to the building. He commented that the brick under the siding on the upper floors appears to be in good condition and that removing that siding and restoring the masonry would likely not be as expensive or difficult a project as the applicant appears to think it will be.
- Mr. Detwiler continued to explain that while the sketches that the applicant offered were helpful, the Architectural Committee requires scaled architectural drawings to accurately judge the proposal for the storefront.
 - o Mr. Boscaino replied that he understands the need for better drawings and will look into having them made. He disagreed about the effort and expense that would be required to restore the upper floor's brickwork explaining that it would require scaffolding, sanding or other paint removal, and potential lead remediation.
- The Committee members addressed the proposed new storefront design. They suggested the applicant look at neighboring storefronts for a general design for a new storefront.
 - o Mr. Boscaino explained that his proposal would be to construct a storefront out of wood framing with plate-glass windows.
 - o The Committee members explained that his sketches how a general idea, but need to see complete scaled design drawings showing the materials and appearance of the storefront including details for the restoration of the cornice.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance opposed the application, and offered to provide the applicant with references of architects who could produce the required drawings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application does not include sufficient drawings or designs to make an informed decision related to the proposed renovations to the first-floor storefront.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The alterations made to the property do not meet the guidelines laid out in the Main Street Manayunk review criteria listed in the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations and do not adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to the Main Street Manayunk review criteria and Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ITEM: 4241 MAIN 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	7				

ADDRESS: 2120 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Elena Laskin & James Wilcoxson

Applicant: Jackie Gusic, inHabit, inc

History: 1865

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks approval to remove the existing deck at 2120 Pine Street and construct a new roof deck and fourth-floor addition. The three-story historic building is adjacent to four-story buildings to the east and west along Pine Street. The existing deck and pilot house were legally permitted and constructed in 2014. The existing deck railing setback from the front façade is five feet, four inches and is not visible from the public right-of-way along Pine Street. The rear corner of the new addition would be visible from Van Pelt Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing deck and construct new deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 APRIL 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The massing and scale of the fourth-floor addition appears large for the historic property, but this can primarily be attributed to its gable roof, which is mostly hidden by the surrounding properties. Hardie plank siding is proposed for the addition's cladding and is compatible with the historic district. Since the rear wall will be the one area visible from the public right-of-way, the placement and size of the rear windows should be reviewed for better compatibility with the historic building and its environment. With minor revisions to the architectural features to the rear wall, the application can meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o If the fourth-story addition is removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired; therefore, the application meets 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 fourth-floor addition and roof deck will not be visible along Pine Street and will be minimally visible from S. Van Pelt Street; therefore, the application meets the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided that the design of the rear wall of the addition that is visible from the street is improved, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jackie Gusic represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gusic summarized the project. She noted that the existing deck was constructed in 2014 and because of the existing location of the pilot house and railing, they can confirm that the front of the proposed addition will not be visible along Pine Street. Ms. Gusic pointed out that both adjacent buildings are one story taller than 2120 Pine Street and that this limits light in the building. She explained that her client wished for this addition to be light filled and this is the reason for the large number of window openings.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the location of the existing pilot house.
 - o Ms. Gusic replied that the existing pilot house is located along the western party wall and pointed to an image within the presentation.
- Mr. Detwiler recommended creating an existing floorplan of the roof for consideration at the Historical Commission meeting. He said it would be helpful to see the existing floorplan of the roof side by side with the proposed floorplan.
- Committee members inquired about where the addition would be visible at the rear.

- o Ms. Gusic pointed to a photograph in the application showing the visibility from Van Pelt Street. She explained that the new rear wall would start where the existing structure of the pergola is located.
- Mr. Cluver said the area where the addition is visible feels like a back alley. He commented that, if he accepts the idea of an addition in this location, he does not believe the detailing of the addition is in keeping with the historic character of the area.
- Ms. Gutterman contended that she is concerned by the proposed overbuild on top of the main roof. She said she understands the desire to create the space but does not believe the design is complementary to the historic district. She continued there needs to be a balance between what the application is proposing and the existing materials of the neighborhood.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out that the addition just sits on top of the brick without any break, and it just extends up. He continued that he cannot tell where the floor line is in relationship to the windows on the rear elevation. Mr. Detwiler said that the rear should look like a mansard. He also noted the windows in the rear wall of the addition are very large compared to the ones on the floor below.
- Several Committee members voiced concerns that that the proposed window configuration specifically on the back wall is not compatible with historic district. They commented that the type of window and configuration was contemporary in its approach.
 - o Ms. Gusic said that she and her client could reconsider the design of the windows. She noted that they could explore other window configuration options including possibly adding a bay window to this area of the addition.
- Mr. Detwiler said he thinks the rear of the addition would be very visible.
- Ms. Lukachik inquired if the rear of the addition could be pulled back from the third-floor roofline. She commented that the addition has a lot of siding and a lot of windows.
- Mr. Detwiler stated he is not opposed to the overbuild but he said that the siding and windows as currently proposed are not compatible.
- Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Mehley about the staff's recommendation for approval and its reason for this recommendation.
 - o Ms. Mehley replied that the staff concluded that the visibility of the addition from the public right-of-way would be minimal. She pointed out that the only area visible would be the rear wall and the staff determined that, if the design of this wall was revised to be more complementary to the character of the district, it could be approved.
- Several Committee members stated they cannot recommend approval of the application as proposed and that the proposed design should be revised. They noted they would like to have the opportunity to review it again.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed addition and roof deck would replace an existing legally permitted roof deck.

- The building at 2120 Pine Street sits between two buildings that are one story taller. As a result, the front portion of the addition and the roof deck will not be visible from Pine Street. The adjacent buildings will largely hide the fourth-floor addition.
- The rear area, especially the new rear wall, of the new addition would be visible along S. Van Pelt Street.
- The proposed design of the addition's rear area is not compatible with the historic building and district. The visible massing, transition from existing to new rear wall, and window configuration must be revised to be more sensitive to the historic building and its historic environment.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The massing and scale of the fourth-floor addition appears large for the historic property and the rear wall and window configuration is not visually compatible with the historic building and district. Since the rear wall will be the one area visible from the public right-of-way, the placement and size of the rear windows should be reviewed for better compatibility with the historic building and its environment. The proposed design of the fourth-floor addition, especially the area visible from the public right-of-way, must be revised to meet Standard 9.
- If the fourth-story addition is removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.
- The rear area of the fourth-floor addition will be visible from S. Van Pelt Street and must be revised to be more compatible with the historic district and inconspicuous; therefore, the application does not meet the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 2120 PINE ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2022 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Demolish ell; construct four-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2022 N Broad Street, LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects

History: 1880

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Conwell House Block Historic District, Contributing, 4/8/2022

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade and demolish the entire rear ell and side bay window of the Contributing building at 2022 N. Broad Street in the Conwell House Block Historic District. The other half of the twin, at 2020 N. Broad Street, is classified as Significant owing to it being the former residence of Temple University founder Russell Herman Conwell. Construction of a four-story addition is proposed in place of the existing three-story rear ell. The main block of the building is four stories in height with a mansard roof. Restoration of the front façade is proposed, including removal of paint, which brings the appearance closer to its original red brick appearance. The rear of this property is not visible from any public right-of-way, as there is no street or service alley that extends behind this row.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish three-story rear ell and bay window on side of main block.
- Construct four-story addition at rear.
- Restore front façade.

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 shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - o Restoration of the front façade, including removal of paint, brings the primary façade closer to its historic appearance and complies with Standard 2.
 - o Details including window replacement and masonry repair need further refinement. As proposed, the windows do not replicate the historic appearance.
 - o Demolition of the north elevation bay window and rear ell does not meet Standard 2, as it is removal of historic materials.
 - o The proposed four-story rear addition does not meet Standard 2, as it cuts into the rear of the mansard. A more compatible solution would be to disengage the rear addition from the historic mansard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The demolition of the rear ell and north elevation bay window does not meet Standard 9. The rear ell is an original part of the building.
 - o Cladding of the rear addition with vinyl siding is incompatible with the historic main block of the building; however, this siding will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, provided the front façade restoration details are revised to show windows that replicate the historic appearance, the north side bay window is retained, and the fourth story of the rear addition is disengaged from the historic mansard, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Rosenberg stated that the proposal entails rehabilitating the front façade, demolishing the rear ell, and constructing a larger rear addition. He accepted the staff recommendations of retaining the north side bay, revising front façade windows to replicate the historic appearance, and disengaging the rear addition from the rear mansard.
- Mr. Detwiler noted the lack of detail regarding the work proposed for the front façade. He suggested that the application is more in keeping with an in-concept application rather than one for final approval.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg responded that many details of the front façade were not finalized. He agreed to a change the application from a final review to an in-concept review.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern about demolition of the rear ell. She identified the existing rear ell as a character-defining feature. She also observed that the vinyl siding proposal for the rear addition is inappropriate.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that siding is not the right material for such a large addition.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if a roof deck is part of the scope.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg responded that a roof deck is not part of the scope.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the roof access stair be changed to a hatch.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg agreed to this change.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that original elements such as dormers should be repaired rather than replaced. He asked about the original design of the first-story bay window and the character of the original balcony above.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg replied that an evaluation would determine what elements on the front are original and that those elements will be restored where possible.
- Ms. Stein suggested preserving the rear façade of the main block by separating the addition above the first floor from the main block of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance commented that the Alliance nominated the Conwell House Block Historic District and that it is great to see investment in this part of N. Broad Street. He also expressed a desire for Temple University to rehabilitate the attached home of Russell Herman Conwell, the founder of Temple University, at 2020 N. Broad Street.
- Judith Robinson, representing the 32nd Ward RCO, commented that it is good to see investment in North Philadelphia.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 2022 N. Broad Street is Contributing to the Conwell House Block Historic District.

- The application lacks the information necessary for final approval.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application was amended to from requesting final approval to requesting in-concept approval.
- Character-defining features on the front façade, north façade and perhaps the rear façade of the main block of the building will be retained or replicated, satisfying Standard 2.
- The rear addition can be redesigned to be disengaged from the mansard roof, potentially separated from the rear façade of the main block, with no vinyl siding, which would satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, provided character-defining features of the main block are retained and the rear addition is redesigned per the Architectural Committee suggestions, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ITEM: 2022 N BROAD ST MOTION: Approval in-concept MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 213-17 N 4TH ST

Proposal: Install banners over windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Veterans Multi-Service & Education Center, Inc.

Applicant: Ruth Brown, Brown Expediting Services

History: 1840

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 to install digitally-printed mesh signs over three bays of 6th-floor windows on both the 4th Street and Florist Street elevations of this six-story circa 1840 building in the Old City Historic District. The banners would be approximately 6.5 feet tall by 21.5 feet wide and would each require 26 concrete anchors into the brick. They would be highly visible from the Benjamin Franklin Bridge, as well as other vantages throughout the district.

SCOPE OF WORK:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 APRIL 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Install large banners.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Storefronts Guideline—Not Recommended: Using new, over-scaled, or internally-lit signs unless there is historic precedent for them or using other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features of the storefront and building*
 - o The proposed banners are out of scale with the building, and obscure six windows of the property, one of whose character-defining features is its consistent fenestration pattern.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the Storefronts Guideline.

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee members inquired about the material of the sign and whether the signs could be removed for maintenance.
 - o As the applicant was not present, those questions were not answered.
- The Committee members noted that the signage would not serve a wayfinding purpose at the street level as they would be most legible to vehicular traffic crossing the Ben Franklin Bridge to New Jersey, while still making a negative visual impact on the building for pedestrian traffic.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed banners were large and would detract from the historic appearance of the designated building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed banners do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, particularly the Storefronts Guideline.

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

ITEM: 213-17 N 4TH 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: 8330 MILLMAN ST

Proposal: Construct garage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David L. Lockard

Applicant: Donna Lisle, Donna Lisle, Architect

History: 1963; Vanna Venturi House, Mother's House; Robert Venturi, architect

Individual Designation: 11/10/2016

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 8330 Millman Street includes the significant Postmodern-style Vanna Venturi House designed by prominent Philadelphia architect Robert Venturi. The house is set back approximately 200 feet from Millman Street, centered on a long driveway running to the street. The T-shaped lot extends to the southeast and northwest, behind the neighboring properties at 8234 and 8336 Millman Street. The property is bounded by Navajo Street at the rear, though the rear of the house is not visible from that street, owing to heavy vegetation.

This application proposes to construct a garage in the location of an existing non-historic shed to the northwest of the Venturi house, on one of the arms of the T-shaped lot, behind the property at 8336 Millman Street. The proposed garage would be 35 feet in depth by 18 feet in width and 13.5 feet in height at its highest point. It would be located 48 feet from the northern corner of the historic house. The garage would be clad in vertical wood siding with a sloped standing-seam metal roof, aluminum windows, brick paving, and a schist retaining wall. The application offers two options for the roof and design of the northeast elevation of the proposed garage. Option 1 presents a continuous flat wall that extends to the full height of the roof pitch, while Option 2 creates a hipped roof, with a pitch along the northeast side in addition to the southeast and southwest.

At its January 2022 meeting, the Historical Commission approved an application for an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) of a similar design, but with a larger footprint, in the same approximate location. The ADU would have been 48 feet 8 inches in depth by 18 feet in width and positioned 37.5 feet from the historic house. At that time, the Commission found that the location, height, massing, and scale were appropriate for the site, owing to the lack of visibility

from the public right-of-way. The ADU was not constructed, owing to the opposition of a neighbor to a needed zoning variance.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct freestanding garage.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed one-story garage building would be differentiated from the historic building and would be compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features.
 - o The proposed building's location on the site would have minimal impact on the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - *Recommended: Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
 - o The new building would be located behind the neighboring property at 8336 Millman Street and a six-foot tall privacy fence, and would have minimal visibility from the public right-of-way; it would, therefore, not obstruct views of the Vanna Venturi House. The proposed building would be located on the site of a non-historic shed, behind the current parking area.
 - o Owing to the massing, size, and scale of the new construction and its siting 48 feet from the historic building, the new construction would not result in the diminution of the historic character of the Vanna Venturi House.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Donna Lisle and Juliet Lee Fajardo, and property owner David Lockard represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked how the garage design varies from the ADU design, which the Historical Commission recently approved.
 - o Ms. Lisle responded that the garage is 13 feet shorter, set slightly farther away from the property lines, and also at a greater distance from the historic house. She explained that the garage is comparable in form and materials to the previous ADU, the design of which started with the intent to be deferential to the

- Vanna Venturi house, with simple slopes and volume, a seamed metal roof, wood siding, but now with large doors for a single-car garage. She noted that the garage can also hold some of the storage from the shed being demolished.
- Ms. Lisle noted that the application shows two options for rooflines, as there are certain building code allowances for building height up to 15 feet if there is a “gabled roof,” but she is unsure how the Department of Licenses & Inspections (L&I) will treat the proposed roof, the total height of which is kept to 13 feet 6 inches in both schemes.
 - o Messrs. McCoubrey and Cluver expressed preferences for the Option 2 roofline, as being less imposing from the neighbor’s property, while Mr. Detwiler expressed a preference for Option 1.
 - o Ms. Lisle noted that either option is fine with the owner, but that she is not sure what L&I will determine, so Option 2 may be necessary.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that he is not sure if a hip qualifies as gable.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey opined that it does. He also noted that keeping the wall-roof joint lower makes the building less conspicuous.
 - o Ms. Lisle noted that they designed Option 1 originally because of the planar aspect of the Venturi house.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that it is better not to try to recreate the Vanna Venturi gable.
 - Mr. Detwiler expressed concern about the challenges presented by a set of out-swinging garage doors, given the size and shape of the driveway leading to it. He suggested studying the turning radius of a car getting into the garage, noting that 15 feet of paved area might not be enough to miss the door, and that they may need an overhead door instead.
 - o Ms. Lisle agreed that the current scheme may present challenges, suggesting that they may be able to design the doors so they swing further open, or park on a slight angle. She explained that the owner does not want to add any more impervious paving.
 - o Ms. Lisle asked whether they would need to return to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission if they decide they need to use an overhead door.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the applicants should alert the Historical Commission’s staff if they wish to change the door or other elements of the proposed design down the line.
 - o Mr. Detwiler replied that he does not have a preference on the swing of the door, noting that garage manufacturers have ways of disguising seams, and that the same general design intent may be able to be achieved in different forms, including a single-leaf out-swinging door.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that zoning setbacks for a garage from a property line are three feet, not the proposed 10 to 12 feet.
 - o Ms. Lisle responded that they are trying to be a good neighbor. She noted that they discussed moving the garage closer to the fence line, but with the proposed setbacks, the garage projects no closer to the house than it did as an ADU, so unless the Historical Commission objects, they would prefer to keep the garage located further away from property line. She noted that they intend to plant a vegetative buffer between the garage and fence line to additionally block views of the garage from the neighboring properties.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that it might be easier to access the garage if it were slid back closer to the property line.

- o Ms. Lisle asked whether it would be acceptable if they reconsidered the setbacks.
- o Mr. McCoubrey responded that they should let the Historical Commission's staff know if they would like to push the garage back, but that anything that moves it farther away from the historic house would be a positive.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the design team has discussed the concealed gutter detail, which he expressed concern over during the ADU review.
 - o Ms. Lisle responded that they have not yet worked out those details because the ADU project was denied a zoning permit. With the current garage proposal not requiring a zoning variance, they are prepared to move forward with those details, or to use a slimline gutter on the exterior since the garage is a more utilitarian structure. She offered to send sketches of proposed concepts.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that they hire a roofing consultant and consider the potential long-term issues related to the care of concealed gutters.
 - o Others suggested that a roofing consultant was not necessary in this situation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lori Salganicoff of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy supported the creation of a garage and the expansion of the use of this site to support the legal uses that have been established. She opined that creating a secondary structure is important to this property's continued use.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The design of the garage is comparable to that of the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) approved by the Historical Commission in a similar location in 2021 but reduced by 13 feet in length.
- Given the shape of the lot and the minimal visibility of the selected location for the garage, the construction will not have an adverse visual impact on the historic house.
- Both of the two roof options provided is acceptable.
- Additional garage door swing options may need to be explored to allow better vehicular access.
- The siting of the garage 10 and 12 feet away from the property lines is more than required by zoning and may be reduced if necessary.
- The details of the proposed concealed gutter have not been confirmed, and a hung gutter system remains an alternate option.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed garage is appropriate in massing, size, scale, architectural features, and materials, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed garage would be sited so that it is minimally visible from the public right-of-way. The work complies with the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with either roof option, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ITEM: 8330 MILLMAN ST MOTION: Approval

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

ADDRESS: 706 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dale You

Applicant: Carolina Pena, Parallel Architecture Studio, LLC

History: 1879; Quaker City National Bank

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Chestnut Street East Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2021

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a series of rear roofs and walls to construct a two- and three-story rear addition at 706 Chestnut Street, a contributing property in the Chestnut Street East Commercial Historic District. The current property has a main block of four stories, with a stepped rear ell consisting of two stories off the main block, and one story abutting Ionic Street, the rear service alley. The proposed rear demolition with accompanying construction would fill the building to a uniform four stories from front to rear. This new addition would incorporate a lightwell which would be sided with light-colored vinyl. This addition would only be visible from Ionic Street, which is a true service alley. The applicant is proposing a stucco finish for the rear wall and would install a new rear door, repair the rear concrete steps, and add lighting. No work to the front façade of 706 Chestnut Street is proposed as part of this application.

The building at 706 Chestnut Street has been part of the Chestnut Street East Commercial landscape from as early as 1851. The current façade is the product of alterations which took place around 1892 when the building served as Quaker City National Bank. The building has operated as a number of establishments ranging from a linen manufactory in 1859, to an engraving business in 1879, and most famously as the 1892 bank. As a staff, we believed the amount of demolition to this historic property surpassed our approval authority.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish portions of rear ell to construct a two- and three-story rear addition which would be visible from the Ionic Street service alley, creating a four-story building from front to back with an installed lightwell.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Carolina Pena and Michelle Kleschick represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Several Committee members questioned whether the historic front façade would be impacted as a result of the extensive demolition to the rear. They questioned if the applicants had retained the services of a structural engineer.
 - o The applicants assured the Architectural Committee they had structural drawings prepared which demonstrated there would be no damage caused to the front façade or to neighboring buildings.
- Committee members indicated they would have liked structural drawings included with the submission material.
 - o The applicants agreed to make these documents available to the Historical Commission. They explained there would be a new steel frame structure installed in the existing building.
- Committee members questioned whether there was to be any work done to the front façade as there were notes concerning the front façade indicated on the plans.
 - o The applicants stated the notes were kept on the plans in error and no work was planned for the front façade as part of this application.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated to undertake such extensive demolition without contributing to the rehabilitation of the front façade would be akin to taking without giving anything back to the building.
 - o The applicants explained they would be proposed work to the front façade at a later date, but not as part of this application. This would possibly include painting the front façade and the installation of new windows.
- Committee members commented they would prefer to see all proposed work laid out at once, to give them a complete picture of the undertaking.
- Ms. Gutterman noted the applicants should propose a different material other than vinyl siding for the lightwell even though it would not be visible from public right-of-way.
- Committee members questioned the materials proposed for the Ionic Street façade and stated it would be preferable if it were brick.
 - o The applicants explained it would be stucco over steel frame.
- Committee members expressed enthusiasm over the possibility of Ionic Street activation and suggested the addition of windows at the first floor of rear if possible.
 - o The applicants noted the owner's concerns about safety, especially with the building's new use involving children.

- Committee members suggested narrow windows at the top of the first-floor rear, or a transom, to let some light in. They noted it was not a requirement, only a suggestion.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the necessity of such a large pilot house and wondered if the owner was contemplating a roof deck.
 - o The applicants answered in the affirmative, but this work would be proposed at a later date.
- Committee members raised a question about the possibility of 706 Chestnut Street becoming taller than the adjacent buildings.
 - o The applicants noted the work approved at 704 Chestnut Street will involve the addition of many floors, so the pilot house on 706 Chestnut Street will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Structural plans were not included as part of the submission materials.
- The submitted materials included incorrect notes about work to the front façade, which need to be removed.
- Ionic Street is a true service alley.
- The proposed addition could activate Ionic Street in a positive way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Without structural plans, the application cannot be considered complete.
- With an incomplete application, the Committee must recommend denial.

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

ITEM: 706 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	7				

ADDRESS: 2100 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Construct public safety facility

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia, Department of Public Property

Applicant: Modesto Bigas-Valedon, Ballinger

History: 1875; Buildings demolished c. 1997

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a new public safety building and police facility on vacant lots within the Diamond Street Historic District. The Diamond Street Historic District was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1986. At the time of the designation, buildings classified as contributing in the district inventory, which were in very poor condition, stood on these blocks. Not long after the designation of the district, the Department of Licenses & Inspections cited these buildings as “imminently dangerous” and the blocks of houses were demolished, resulting in the vacant lots that are present today. In 2001 and again in 2018, proposals were reviewed by the Commission to amend the historic district boundaries to exclude these vacant lots. Owing to community opposition, the Commission took no action in 2001, and denied the application to amend the boundary in 2018. Therefore, the Commission retains plenary jurisdiction over the review of building permit applications for these lots which have been vacant for approximately 20 years and are located at the far western edge of the historic district.

In 2020, the Historical Commission reviewed an application for a police station at this site, which was met with much opposition from the community. The Commission voted at that time to deny the application, finding that the City of Philadelphia had not engaged the public sufficiently in the discussion of the proposed police station. While the exterior design of that building and this new design are not too different, this new proposal includes uses which were not part of the prior application, including a community space, a Police Athletic League (PAL) Center which will include an indoor basketball court and after-school study and recreation rooms, and outdoor recreation spaces for the community.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct two-story building and associated parking lots and public plazas.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed building is compatible with, yet differentiated from, the historic district. It is located at the far western end of the district, and as such, it is not seen within the context of the traditional red brick and brownstone rowhouses that defines the district to the east. The building façade incorporates ornamental brickwork found on residential buildings in the district. The overall massing, size, and scale appears to be appropriate for the historic district.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Stephen Bartlett and Modesto Bigas-Valedon represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Bartlett introduced the project and explained that improvements for community use are now proposed compared to the 2020 application. He stated that he has been informed that Council President Clarke was leading the effort to present the proposal to the community. He stated that he was not present at the community meeting or meetings, but heard it was presented to the community and was positively received.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the proposed mural.
 - o Mr. Bartlett responded that the Police Athletic League requested the large mural space. It is essentially a blank canvas for the Police Athletic League to work with the community on the mural, which would be painted onto the brick.
- Mr. D'Alessandro applauded the proposed architectural details including brickwork.
 - o Mr. Bartlett explained that this was an attempt to pick up on the historic detailing of the Diamond Street Historic District buildings.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the base of the building.
 - o Mr. Bartlett responded that it is proposed to be a dark brick, flush with the brick above, but that they could consider a small projection for the base.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the roof slope of the gymnasium. He observed that the parapet appears to be a bit heavy and could be improved.
 - o Mr. Bartlett confirmed that the roofs slope and that the intention is to use the parapet to hide mechanical equipment.
- Ms. Stein stated that the rooftop mechanical equipment should not be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - o Mr. Bartlett agreed and stated that he can provide sightline studies.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission should review the mural as a separate application once the mural content is decided upon.
 - o Mr. Farnham confirmed that applications for murals require review at these public meetings.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked how the Committee should review an application which was denied by the Historical Commission in 2020, owing to community members stating that they had not been part of the process. He noted that there appears to be some disagreement as to the extent to which this current proposal was presented to the community.
 - o Mr. Farnham explained that, should the Committee recommend approval and the matter is placed on the Consent Agenda of the Historical Commission, any Commissioner may request that the item is pulled from the Consent Agenda and reviewed in its normal course.
- Mr. Farnham explained that the purview of the Architectural Committee is narrow. The Committee's charge is to determine if the proposed building is architecturally compatible with the Diamond Street Historic District, and make a recommendation based on that determination. He noted that an approval by the Historical Commission only means that it finds the building to be compatible with the historic district, not that it necessarily finds that it is a good idea to put a municipal building on this site. He stated that other agencies have purview over parking, traffic, and building use.

Determining whether this site is appropriate for a public safety building should be left to the Mayor, City Council, Police Department, and the Department of Public Property. The Architectural Committee does not have the information or expertise to decide whether a police station is needed at this site. He also noted that the Historical Commission cannot compel a property owner to hold a community meeting. He encouraged the Architectural Committee to stay focused on its purview.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Ruth Birchett, a member of the community and founder of Heritage Community Development Corporation, commented in support of the application. She stated that she had an opportunity to view the drawings ahead of time at a community meeting. She recommended that the Historical Commission revisit modifying the western boundary of the historic district, owing to the extent of demolition which has occurred. She stated that she does not want to see preservation stand in the way of the police having the space required. She stated that she is very supportive of this project and is excited for the mural.
- Judith Robinson, representing the 32nd Ward RCO, commented that there has not been to a community meeting about this project. She stated that she opposes a change to the Diamond Street Historic District boundaries, which was proposed in the past but is not part of this application. She stated that the historic district is a benefit because it results in replication of historic buildings. She asked if a municipal building is the highest and best use of the land. She stated that there has not been a meeting about this matter convened by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. She stated that the worship site across the street needs parking. She asked that all development projects nearby are reviewed together. She suggested a location nearby on Norris Street as more appropriate for a municipal building. She claimed that Council President Clarke is lying if he says there has been a community meeting. She concluded that housing is needed on this site.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- In 2020, the Historical Commission reviewed an application for a police station at this site, which was met with much opposition from the community. The Commission voted at that time to deny the application, finding that the City of Philadelphia had not engaged the public sufficiently in the discussion of the proposed police station.
- The applicant and one community member have claimed that this project was presented at a community meeting. One community member has claimed that there was no community meeting.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Satisfying Standard 9, the proposed building is compatible with, yet differentiated from, the historic district. It is located at the far western end of the district and is not seen within the context of the traditional red brick and brownstone rowhouses that define the district to the east. The building façade incorporates ornamental brickwork found on residential buildings in the district. The overall massing, size, and scale is appropriate for the historic district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 6 to 1 to recommend approval, provided the mural is reviewed under a separate application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2100 DIAMOND ST MOTION: Approval with condition MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro		X			
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6	1			

ADDRESS: 208-12 VINE ST

Proposal: Demolish buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Charles Stortz

Applicant: Michael Phillips, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1780; John Stortz and Son Store; Building at 210 Vine St, c. 1870. Rear building added at 207 New St, 1948. Older buildings cut down at 211 New St, 1941, and 209 New St, 1943.

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish completely a complex of interconnected buildings at 208-12 Vine Street, on the south side of Vine west of 2nd Street in the Old City Historic District. The application claims that the buildings cannot be reasonably adaptively reused and therefore requests that the Historical Commission approve the demolition pursuant to the financial hardship exception in the historic preservation ordinance.

The complex consists of three buildings facing Vine Street (208, 210, and 212) and three buildings facing New Street (207, 209, 211), all of which are internally connected. The buildings at 208 and 212 Vine Street were constructed about 1780. The building at 210 Vine Street was constructed about 1870. The one-story garage building at 207 New Street was constructed in 1948. The one-story buildings at 211 and 209 New St were created by cutting down and altering older buildings in 1941 and 1943 respectively.

The Historical Commission individually designated the property at an undocumented date prior to the adoption of the current preservation ordinance in 1984, hence the 31 December 1984 individual designation date. The Historical Commission classified five components of the property separately in the inventory for the Old City Historic District when it designated the district on 12 December 2003. It classified the structures at 208, 210, and 212 Vine Street and at 209-11 New Street as contributing and the structure at 209 New Street as non-contributing.

Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance expressly prohibits the Historical Commission from approving demolitions of historic buildings unless it determines that:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 APRIL 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- the demolition is necessary in the public interest; and/or,
- the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

In the first instance, the ordinance authorizes the Historical Commission to approve demolitions for public policy reasons, when the public interest advanced by the demolition greatly outweighs the public interest in the preservation of the building. In the second instance, the ordinance authorizes the Commission to approve demolitions when preservation regulation of the property denies all economically viable use of it and thereby inflicts a financial hardship on the owner. This application asks the Historical Commission to approve the demolition because the complex of buildings cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

The application includes:

1. Affidavit of Thomas S. Bond, Real Estate Broker
2. Appraisal Report
3. Condition Assessment Reports from O'Donnell & Naccarato
 - A. Supplemental Condition Assessment, 2/27/2023
 - B. Supplemental Field Invest Report, 1/12/2018
 - C. Visual Condition Assessment, 11/3/2017
4. Construction Cost Estimates, Becker & Frondorf
5. Conceptual Approval Submission, 2014
6. Developer Letters
7. Photographs of Property
8. Photographs of Surrounding Neighborhood
9. Aerials and Maps
10. Zoning File for 244-58 N 2nd Street
11. Articles on John Stortz & Son Inc

The application details efforts to market the property for adaptive reuse since 2014. In 2014, the Historical Commission approved an application in concept to rehabilitate the buildings on Vine Street and construct a large addition on the buildings on New Street for residential use. Several developers sequentially entered into sales agreements for the property and evaluated residential conversions during their due diligence periods. In the end, all the developers who considered purchasing the property determined that adaptive reuse was infeasible and abandoned the projects.

The application includes several assessments of the condition of the property by a structural engineer. It also includes construction cost estimates for four scenarios: to stabilize the buildings; to stabilize the buildings and convert the space to a "vanilla box," presumably unfinished but code-compliant interior space; stabilization and residential fit-out in the existing buildings; and stabilization and residential fit-out in the existing buildings plus the addition approved in concept in 2014. The application includes letters from two real estate developers asserting that they have reviewed the in-concept redevelopment scheme, conditions assessments, construction cost estimates, and other materials and have concluded that the property cannot be developed in a way that provides a reasonable return on investment.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish all structures.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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.*
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - o The complete demolition of the structures fails to satisfy Standards 2 and 5.
- *Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the City's historic preservation ordinance: 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. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.*
 - o The application seeks to prove that the buildings at 208-12 Vine Street cannot be used for any purpose for which they are or may be reasonably adapted.
- *Section 14-1005(5)(b)(.7) of the historic preservation ordinance: The Historical Commission may further require the owner to conduct, at the owner's expense, evaluations or studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Historical Commission, to determine whether the building ... has or may have alternate uses consistent with preservation.*
- *Section 9.2.b of the Rules and Regulations: As provided by Section 14-1005(5)(b)(.7) of the Philadelphia Code, the Commission may also require the owner to conduct, at the owner's expense, evaluations and studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Commission, to determine whether the building ... has or may have alternative uses consistent with preservation. If the Commission requires an owner to conduct additional evaluations and studies, these shall, at a minimum, include:*
 1. *identification of reasonable uses or reuses for the property within the context of the property and its location;*
 2. *rehabilitation cost estimates for the identified reasonable uses or reuses, including the basis for the cost estimates;*
 3. *a ten-year pro forma of projected revenues and expenses for the reasonable uses or reuses that takes into consideration the utilization of tax incentives and other incentive programs;*
 4. *estimates of the current value of the property based upon the ten-year projection of income and expenses and the sale of the property at the end of that period, and*
 5. *estimates of the required equity investment including a calculation of the Internal Rate of Return based on the actual cash equity required to be invested by the owner.*
 - o The application identifies and provides cost estimates for a reuse and then offers the opinions of experts contending that the reuse is not viable, but it does not provide a 10-year pro forma that documents all the assumptions regarding hard and soft costs, incentives, expenses, and revenues and then estimates the net present value of the development project. Such a pro forma should be provided because it would allow all assumptions to be interrogated. For example, a pro forma would allow the assumptions to be tested with sensitivity analyses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission require the submission of a 10-year pro forma that will allow the assumptions behind expenses, revenues, and incentives for the residential rehabilitation project to be tested and confirmed.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Michael Phillips represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Phillips introduced himself and stated that his client John Stortz is the fourth-generation owner of the property and is in attendance to answer any questions. He added that Jeff, Tom, and Sam Stortz, who are now the fifth-generation owners of the company, are also available. Mr. Phillips reported that he is in the process of obtaining a 10-year pro forma as the staff recommended and will provide it as soon as it is completed. Mr. Phillips stated that his presentation will confirm all of the statements and positions that he set forth in his letter summarizing his case, which will show that there is no return on investment that could be yielded from the adaptive reuse of the property in question. He stated that he is not asserting that the building does not have historical significance or relevance. The Stortz family has been in this building and has conducted its hand tool business from this site since before the Industrial Era. He observed that what complicates any adaptive reuse today is the fact that the building was designed for pre-industrial use. The disjointed nature of the interior layout and the significant structural issues that have arisen are byproducts of time and lack of use. There really is no feasible adaptive reuse scenario. He stated that his team did take a careful look at the feasibility of the SgRA plan that was approved conceptually in 2014, and that proposed adding 16 additional units above the garage building at the rear. He stated that his application materials show that the construction costs for that project are estimated at a little over \$13 million. He observed that all of the developers who have considered this plan, which was undertaken in connection with the initial marketing efforts in 2014, passed on it after finding that it was not providing a realistic reuse or yielding a reasonable return on investment. Mr. Phillips explained that they also looked at just preserving the footprint of the building without the overbuild. That scheme would yield eight units. He noted that the SgRA plan actually proposed ground-floor commercial and included some units on the fourth floor, but, as noted in the O'Donnell & Naccarato report, there really is no feasible area to place any units on the fourth floor because of the shoring and the additional work that is needed there to stabilize the building. He explained that, instead, they proposed locating residential units on the first floor to still get that eight-unit yield. He stated that their proposal is consistent with the surrounding area and the residential context. He reported that a townhome development is being constructed on the lot to the east. There is a new residential development across the street. All of the parcels surrounding this property are being redeveloped for multi-family residential use, which is why his team focused on multi-family redevelopment. Mr. Phillips stated that the numbers speak for themselves. The cost to stabilize the building alone, setting aside any adaptive reuse, exceeds the appraised value of the property by about \$100,000, and that is before doing any work towards an adaptive reuse. He stated that his clients did not come to this decision lightly. He stated that Mr. Stortz can speak about the use of the building, and how it has changed over time. In the 1950s and 1960s, the building was filled with workers. Now, it is only used for storage. Everything occurs on the first floor,

- where there is an office. The Stortz family is looking to relocate to another property that fits their needs, which are now focused more on the e-commerce and distribution. He stated that they really do not use the building anymore and there are high carrying costs. Mr. Phillips indicated that Mr. Stortz would answer any questions that the Committee might have about the building.
- Ms. Stein stated that the financial hardship process is not really a study of the highest and best use of the site. Instead, it is a study of the potential reuses of the site. She noted that SgRA project of 2104 showed retaining the front buildings as well as the one-story buildings at the rear. She asked if the applicants studied an alternative in which the front portions of the front buildings along Vine Street were retained. The buildings along Vine Street are a very important part of the city's industrial heritage. She asked if the applicants studied other ideas and alternatives in addition to the SgRA proposal.
 - o Mr. Phillips stated that his team considered adaptively reusing existing buildings and also implementing the 24-unit SgRA plan. He stated that the SgRA plan was developed in 2014 to market the property. He noted that the SgRA plan yielded 16 additional units over the buildings themselves. He stated that the SgRA plan yields three times as many units, but it does not cost three times as much to construct. He stated that they looked at the SgRA plan to see if the additional yield could bring in some sort of a return on investment, but the numbers have not borne that out. He stated that they focused on what could be done to adaptively reuse the front buildings and convert them to eight units. He explained that the entire interiors would need to be gutted to make this property code compliant, ADA compliant. To convert them to a "vanilla box" would cost about \$3 million. To fit out the buildings would cost in the \$6 million range.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey asked him if the three front buildings included the main blocks plus the rear wings that extend out.
 - o Mr. Phillips replied that their analysis did include the rear wings or ells.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the reuse effort should focus on the front blocks of the Vine Street buildings, which are important. The rest, about 80% of the existing buildings can be demolished, can be cleared, and then you could get significantly more units on the site. Then you have more units to amortize the cost of the obvious costs of fixing up the historic buildings.
 - o Mr. Phillips replied that his team studied that question and found it to be infeasible. Engineers O'Donnell and Naccarato studied the feasibility of removing the rear wings or ells of the three Vine Street buildings and keeping the main blocks intact and then building at the rear. The engineers did not recommend that because of the ages and deteriorated conditions of the buildings, which were separate structures at one point, but then interconnected. He stated that the engineers concluded that the buildings would not survive the demolition because the structures would rack and become out of square and apply additional outward pressure on the already compromised front wall. He concluded that the engineers did not recommend that. He also noted that it would be very expensive. Mr. Phillips stated that they considered two scenarios. Rehabilitating the front buildings for eight units and implementing the SgRA plan for 24 units. Neither plan is feasible because of the amount of work that would be needed just to stabilize the buildings.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that neither of the two scenarios maximize the number of new units one could build on this site.
 - o Ms. Lukachik agreed.

- o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee recognizes the difficulties and challenges of restoring buildings like these but asserted that there are opportunities that have not been presented that would allow significantly more units on the site. He suggested keeping some portions of historic buildings in the front, and not necessarily just their facades.
- Ms. Lukachik stated that the structural problems could be addressed with a few joists here and a few joists there, some new flooring, retying the wall back to the diaphragm, maybe even reframing the roof of 212 Vine Street so that you add in a proper ridge beam and then eliminate the need for collar joints that make that space unusable. And the masonry could be repointed.
- Ms. Lukachik drew a line on the aerial photograph on the screen showing the sections of the buildings along Vine Street that should be preserved and the remainders of the buildings at the rear that should be demolished for new construction. She stated that a developer could tighten up and fix these front portions of the three Vine Street buildings, and then decouple the back structures, demolish them, which is about two-thirds of the structures on the site, half we're back 2 thirds demo that and then add on a much larger addition. The much larger addition would provide the space to rent or sell that would subsidize the work at the front. She stated that none of the structural issues that were raised are insurmountable and, in fact, given the ages of the buildings, are not that bad. She concluded that she does not see a reason why the small front portion could not be fixed and retained.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that the Architectural Committee has reviewed applications today for similar work.
 - o Ms. Lukachik stated that she has undertaken similar projects.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he has worked with O'Donnell and Naccarato and undertaken projects like the one that Ms. Lukachik just described. He claimed that they are quick, easy to do, and not complicated. Mr. D'Alessandro conceded that cost is a factor but observed that Mr. Stortz owns the building and the building needs money put into its historic fabric. He stated that he is opposed to the demolition. He concluded that the buildings cannot be lost.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that the buildings are very old and significant. "Once they're gone, they're gone."
- Mr. Phillips observed that the question is not: Can these buildings be stabilized? Anything is possible with the right amount of money. The question is: Can they be adaptively reused in a way that will provide a reasonable rate of return. The issue here is that the property is appraised at a value of \$1.2 million and the structural stabilization alone costs \$1.3 million. The buildings can be stabilized, but that is only the first step. Can they be redeveloped in a way that provides a reasonable return on your investment? The answer is no. The buildings can be stabilized but if they cannot then be monetized, that is a financial hardship upon the owner. The property owner must be allowed to utilize their property, to receive a return on investment for the property.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee understands that but has concluded that there are options that have not been considered. He stated that the owner should preserve the front sections of the structures and then do whatever needs to be done at the back to make the front preservation feasible.
 - o Ms. Lukachik stated that the problem with the applicant's analysis is that they are trying to retain too much of the historic buildings. They should only retain the front sections of the front buildings. She stated that, when she looks at the neighborhood, she sees several very tall buildings. They should consider clearing

two-thirds of the site and constructing a large building to support the preservation at the front. The structural repairs will not be insurmountable if they are undertaken as part of a larger development project. She stated that she often sees projects where the developer builds “something massive on the back and dumps in a bunch of units” and keeps “whatever is original in the front” and fixes it up.

- o Mr. Phillips stated that the test in the historic preservation ordinance is whether a property can be reasonably adapted for a new use, not whether a new structure can be built to subsidize the historic building. He stated that they explored the SgRA plan to see if there was an avenue to monetize the back of the property and preserve the entire complex of buildings. He stated that they performed that exercise to see if there was another avenue. However, the statute itself, which speaks to reasonably adapting, requires an analysis of the reuse of the existing structure not of the construction of an entirely new structure. The developers who have considered this property have seen no path to a feasible redevelopment project.
- o Ms. Stein responded that there is no path to an approval of the demolition of these individually designated buildings without seeing an option that includes significant new construction at the rear. She noted that large buildings are being constructed at several nearby properties.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the buildings at 208 and 212 Vine Street could possibly be saved as single-family residences and the building at 210 Vine Street could be used as an entrance to a larger development at the rear.
 - o Mr. Phillips stated that he could have his team assess that development scheme, but he cautioned the Architectural Committee that the construction cost estimates are indicating a cost of \$500,000 per unit in the historic buildings, which is more than twice what developers generally consider a reasonable investment. He stated that they can investigate other options as they develop their 10-year pro forma, but he again cautioned that the numbers are not revealing a viable project.
- Ms. Lukachik stated that, if her name was on a building, she would want to see it saved.
 - o Mr. Phillips responded that this property means a great deal to the Stortz family and they have spent many years trying to figure out how to save it, but they cannot spend money without getting a return on their investment.
- Ms. Lukachik again stated that the property owner should demolish all but the front sections of the front buildings and construct a large building at the rear, which would generate revenue to offset the high costs of stabilizing and retrofitting the remaining sections of the historic buildings.
- Mr. Phillips stated that they worked with reputable, well-known developers, who put the property under contract, and they could not develop a feasible project. He stated that they did not concentrate on new-construction developers because this would be an adaptive reuse project. He concluded that he understands what the Architectural Committee is requesting, that they preserve the front parts of the oldest buildings and construct another building that can offset the cost of the preservation. He stated that he does not believe that that is what the ordinance mandates. The ordinance tasks the property owner with determining whether the historic building can be adaptively reused, the footprint of the building as it stands. It does not require the owner to determine whether a new building can be constructed that will subsidize the preservation work.

- Mr. Cluver asked for details about the cost estimates.
 - o Mr. Phillips replied that the Becker and Frondorf cost estimates with a summary of the work that would be performed and where it would be performed are at Tab 4 in the application. It provides details on all four of the scenarios.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked if there is a drawing that shows the work that would be performed in the three historic buildings on Vine Street so that he could determine how much of that work falls within the area defined by the line drawn earlier on the aerial photograph by Ms. Lukachik. He stated that a single-family residence is in the 2,000 square foot to 3,000 square foot range, which when multiplied across three historic structures is not close to the 11,000 square foot number that is used in the application. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicants focus their restoration dollars on the front sections of the Vine Street buildings so that they can dedicate most of the site to a larger development that will pay for the restoration.
- Mr. Phillips observed that the Architectural Committee is recommending a new development project, not evaluating the existing buildings for adaptive reuse.
- Mr. Cluver again stated that an appropriate project for this site would include significant new construction at the rear to pay for the restoration at the front.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Phillips to explain why he is contending that there is a "problem" with the historic preservation ordinance.
 - o Mr. Phillips responded that he is not asserting that there is any "problem" with the ordinance. He stated that he is instead asking the Architectural Committee to take the hardship provision of the ordinance into account in its review. The ordinance indicates that the Historical Commission cannot approve a demolition unless it finds that there is no reasonable adaptive reuse for the property. The Architectural Committee is suggesting that the property owner construct a new building to subsidize expensive rehabilitation work to a portion of the historic buildings. Instead, the Architectural Committee should be determining whether the historic buildings can be reasonably adapted for a new use. Constructing a new building to subsidize the old buildings is not a reasonable adaptation.
 - o Mr. Farnham explained that the City's historic preservation ordinance prohibits the Historical Commission from approving a demolition unless the Commission finds that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. He stated that the Historical Commission has struggled in the past with an appropriate interpretation of the word "reasonable." The Historical Commission has sought to determine the bounds of a reasonable adaptation. It may be the addition of an elevator or stair tower, or perhaps a small overbuild to make a redevelopment project more financially feasible. In the case of the Boyd Theater, many people who opposed the demolition contended that the property owner should build a tower on the parking lot at the rear to subsidize the historic building. However, the Historical Commission concluded that building a tower with many times more square feet than the theater is not a reasonable adaptation. How much new construction should or must be included in the hardship analysis to make a project feasible before crossing the "reasonable adaptation" line? It is an open question that has not litigated within the auspices of the Philadelphia ordinance as far as I am aware. The line is probably somewhere between simply making the front entrance accessible and building a tower at the rear to subsidize the historic buildings.

- o Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Farnham why the Architectural Committee could not require the property owner to assess the feasibility of a project that included a large new building to subsidize the historic building.
- o Mr. Farnham responded that the simple answer to that question is that the Historical Commission must act in a constitutional, legal manner. He stated that he does not believe that the Philadelphia Historical Commission has the legal authority to compel a property owner to build a tower to subsidize the restoration of a historic building to overcome a hardship. The courts have not decided what constitutes a "reasonable" adaptation, but it is probably somewhere between a minor modification and the construction of a tower.
- o Mr. Phillips contended that the Historical Commission certainly could not legally assess the financial viability of the historic buildings by including new construction that required a variance in the redevelopment project. For example, there is a 65-foot height limit in Old City. The Historical Commission could not compel a property owner to seek a variance.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro retorted that "we can't be compelled to allow demolition either."
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee needs to look at the site as a development opportunity. Income from a new building at the rear can subsidize restoration work at the front.
- Mr. Cluver again advocated for redeveloping the front buildings as single-family residences and building large at the rear to offset the rehabilitation costs.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that these buildings are an important part of the Old City Historic District, and the Stortz family should be recognized for the longstanding business success at this location going back 170 years. He concurred with the staff recommendation to prepare and submit a 10-year pro form to facilitate a more complete evaluation of this application. He asserted that the threatened buildings are very historic. The two oldest buildings were built during the American Revolution, and the middle building has a rare, pressed-metal parapet with the name of the business. This trio of properties were individually designated in 1984, and they are also contributing to the Old City Historic District. The hardship application makes clear that serious efforts appear to have been made to redevelop the property while preserving the historic buildings going back to 2014. The Preservation Alliance is currently working with a preservation architect, a structural engineer, and a developer, who are all intimately familiar with this property and also familiar with the previous plans for its redevelopment. Mr. Steinke stated that his team has ideas on the design of a residential addition on the New Street side of the project that would dramatically increase the number of units compared to the proposal in the application, and therefore it would greatly increase the revenue potential of the project. He reported that they are working on reducing or eliminating onsite parking, which is in the proposal. He described it as a proposal to remove the rear ells and the industrial buildings facing New Street, which would have to be improved by the Historical Commission. It would require building a new building at the rear that would be one-story taller than the SgRA proposal, while still keeping it under the 65-foot height limit in the Old City Historic District. Mr. Steinke stated that he has questions as well about some of the financial assumptions made in the application, which he believes are unrealistically high. He stated that the Alliance's position will be put into a letter to the Historical Commission that will be shared in advance of the meeting of the Committee on Financial Hardship. He contended that

these buildings can be saved, and therefore can remain contributing to the Old City Historic District.

- Judith Robinson of the 30th Ward RCO asked the Architectural Committee to please give some love to North Philadelphia. She stated that the neighborhood is poor and mostly African American but has historic resources. She observed that 1935 Diamond Street was allowed to be demolished in 2018. She stated that historic preservation also matters in North Philadelphia. She stated that the government betrayed the neighborhood. She asked any attorneys listening, anybody interested in civil rights, environmental justice, fairness, and equitable distribution of resources, to contact her to help her in her fight for North Philadelphia.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The main blocks of the buildings facing Vine Street are the historically and architecturally significant structures at the site.
- The Stuart Rosenberg in-concept plan of 2014 does not maximize the amount new square footage that can be constructed and generate income to subsidize the preservation and restoration of the main blocks of the buildings facing Vine Street.
- All structures behind the main blocks of the buildings at 208, 210, and 212 Vine Street could be demolished and the cleared land used for the construction of a large building that could generate income to subsidize the preservation and restoration of the main blocks of the buildings facing Vine Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application should be denied because it has not demonstrated that it is infeasible to demolish all structures behind the main blocks of the buildings at 208, 210, and 212 Vine Street and construct a large building that could generate income to subsidize the preservation and restoration of the main blocks of the buildings facing Vine Street.

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

ITEM: 208-12 VINE ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Lukachik 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 Guttermann					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:58 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its advisory Committees are presented in action format. Owing to a technical problem with a Zoom account, no video recording is available for this meeting.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.