

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

**TUESDAY, 27 OCTOBER 2020
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

The following persons were present:

- Nicole Bronola
- Kim Washington
- Lorna Katz
- Yue Wu, PCDC
- Peter Bloomfield
- Timothy Kerner
- Dan Meza
- Blane Stoddart
- Alice Reyes
- Bill McCullough
- Ke Feng
- William Doll
- Randal Baron

Thomas Jay Rush
Jourdan McLeod
Kim Vernick
Noah Gustkey
Steven M. Clofine
Alex Balloon
Gussie O'Neill, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Nancy Templeton
B. Valunas
Frank Kern
Ellie Devyatkin
Janet Bernstein
Andrew Donaldson-Evans
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Mark Kocent
Paul Newlin
Bill Ritzler
James Palka
Robert Gurmankin
Suzanna Barucco
Jeff Wyant
Paul Boni, Esq.
Roger S. Tenant Sr.
Eva Lew
Susan Wetherill
Margo Huang
D. Tucker
Frederick Jackson
Julie Morningstar
Perry Garvin
Paul Steinke
T. Squire
Mary C. Tracy

ADDRESS: 11 BOATHOUSE ROW

Proposal: Remove addition, construct addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Ke Feng, University of Pennsylvania

History: 1875; College Boat Club of the University of Pennsylvania

Individual Designation: 1/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Opened in 1875 for the College Boat Club of the University of Pennsylvania, 11 Boathouse Row features several building campaigns spanning over a century. The core of the property is the original two-story stone Victorian Gothic boathouse dating to 1875. Additions were made to the east and north sides of the 1875 building in 1920. A second story was added to the southeastern addition around 1930. In 1980, a one-bay wide addition was added to the west side of the building, after being reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission. Plans for the 1920's and 1980's additions are available in the Historical Commission's files.

This application proposes to demolish the 1920's/1930's addition to the east and to construct a new addition in the footprint of the historic addition, but with larger massing. The new addition would be two bays in depth, and feature two cross-gabled portions extending from the roof of the 1875 building and its north-central addition at the north and south, with large dormers with recessed doors to create balconies. The area between the gabled-roof portions of the new addition would feature a steeply-sloped asphalt-shingled mansard with a parapet to conceal rooftop mechanical equipment. The application also proposes to enlarge the south-facing dormer of the 1980's addition to match the dormer balconies proposed on the new addition to the east, to reconstruct the south-facing balcony on the 1875 building, and to install new windows and doors.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar in-concept application in September 2020 and recommended the following:

- The roof height of the proposed addition should be reduced so that the ridge lines of the cross-gables where they intersect the roof of the historic 1875 building are lower.
- The height of the proposed addition along the north elevation should be lower than the south elevation, which should be lower than the 1980's addition to the west.
- The north and south planes of the addition should be pulled back from the central historic portion of the existing historic building.
- The east elevation of the connector between the two gable portions of the addition presents as a blank wall of shingles and should be reduced in scale and better articulated in order to be more compatible with the historic building.
- The proposed dormers are incompatible with the historic building and should be reduced in scale and split into two dormers.
- The proposed dormer balconies compete with the historic balcony of the central 1875 portion of the building.

This revised application takes into consideration some, but not all, of the Architectural Committee's comments. As recommended, the height of the north portion of the addition is reduced, as is the connector between the north and south cross gables. Two sets of windows have been added to the connector roof of the east elevation. The single dormer on the north

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 OCTOBER 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

elevation has been split into two dormers, the dormer eaves lowered, and the detailing modified to appear less contemporary. The height of the south portion of the addition and width of the single dormer window and balcony remain unchanged.

New to this application is a proposal to modify the entrance to the north-central pavilion facing Kelly Drive. The entrance, which is located in the 1920's addition to the 1875 building, historically featured a single, six-panel door flanked by individual six-over-six wood windows, the openings and frames for which still remain. The windows at the second-floor level historically led to a balcony, which has since been removed. The current application proposes to change the door and cut sidelites, and to narrow the flanking windows in the entrance bay.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish eastern additions
- Construct new addition
- Modify dormer on western/1980's addition
- Reconstruct south-facing balcony and install new windows and doors on 1875 building
- Modify entrance of 1920's north-central addition

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 3: Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.*
 - The proposed modifications to the north-central entrance alter the historic appearance of the 1920's addition to the north. The staff recommends that the northern entrance be restored to its historic appearance including the six-over-six windows, based on the architectural drawings available in the Historical Commission's files. The current proposal creates a false sense of historical development and does not comply with this Standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition is differentiated from the old, but remains overly large, competing with the historic building in scale, massing, and architectural features. The height of the south portion of the addition should be further reduced and the articulation of the east elevation should be more in keeping with the scale and features of the historic building. The application partially complies with this Standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration work to the 1875 building and approval of the proposed addition, provided the height of the southern portion of the addition is reduced, and the east elevation is better articulated, pursuant to Standard 9, with the staff to review details; but denial of the proposed modifications to the northern entrance, pursuant to Standard 3.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 OCTOBER 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Architects Ke Feng, Mark Kocent, and Andrew Donaldson-Evans and consultant Suzanna Barucco represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Kocent noted that they took the Architectural Committee's previous comments to heart and believe that they improved the design.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the east elevation can be made more pedestrian-friendly. She opined that the proposed design still appears too massive on the east and the south.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that the intention on the south, riverside elevation is to balance the rooflines with the 1980's addition to the west. He noted that they revised by pulling back the dormers and making them less portal-like.
 - Mr. Kocent noted that the east elevation is difficult because it is functionally just a connector between the gable ends. He explained that they had originally encouraged Ewing Cole to make the parapet higher to hide the rooftop mechanical equipment, but they were able to lower the equipment 30 to 36 inches and lower the roofline as well. He opined that lowering it further would impinge on the ergometer room/event space. Lowering it anymore would require structural changes. He noted that they tried to introduce additional windows to the façade to break it up further. He noted that the elevation is very close to the adjacent Vesper boathouse boat storage, which will be removed and reinstalled as part of the project. Between the boats and vegetation, he opined, the elevation is not highly visible.
- Ms. Gutterman asked why the windows at the ground floor of the east elevation have been removed.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that the windows would be mostly concealed by the exterior boat storage, and would look into boat storage on the interior.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked how far the east wall is from Vesper's boat storage. The Committee members noted that it has to be far enough for the fire escape egress.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that the storage is inches from the wall.
 - Mr. Feng noted that the fire escape is on the river side, at the end of the boat storage. The boats do not block the egress.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked how people exit the fire escape to Kelly Drive.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that there must be a path of some kind, but that the boats are packed in tight against the Penn boathouse.
 - Mr. Donaldson-Evans noted that the distance between the boathouses is approximately 26 feet.
 - Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the Historical Commission has purview over the reinstallation of the boat storage.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that that is likely out of the Committee's current purview.
 - Mr. Detwiler opined that the second-floor fenestration of the east elevation is not appropriate and suggested that it be made more regular in order to dissolve the mass of shingles. Mr. Kocent responded that they had explored a version with symmetrical windows, but did not consider that as appropriate to the interior use. He explained the interior configuration, noting that the triple window would be aligned with the back row of ergometers and the single window would be in the passageway to the men's locker room. The small round window is located in the men's locker room.

- Mr. Donaldson-Evans agreed that they could adjust the composition of the windows, noting that there are some structural elements and bracing within the wall they are trying to work with.
- Mr. Donaldson-Evans asked whether the goal is to balance the composition of the windows.
- Mr. Detwiler responded that his general reaction to the east and north elevations is that there is a lot of solid wall, and dissolving them in some way with more fenestration or wider fenestration, perhaps more of a ribbon of a window, or two triple windows, would improve the design.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that three double windows would help break down the mass more.
- Mr. Kocent responded that he is not sure if they can accommodate three double windows, but that they can look into a more balanced approach to the fenestration.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that there is a precedent on the west elevation with the band of ribbon windows, which creates more of an element of the windows and takes attention away from the mass of shingles.
- Mr. Kocent responded that the band of windows on the west elevation is over the lockers. He conceded that they have perhaps been working too much from the inside out rather than the outside in, putting windows where they make the most sense in plan, rather than considering the implications of the view from the exterior.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that, on the north elevation of the proposed addition, there is a mass of stuccoed wall between the pairs of doors and to either side of the door, where the addition to the west breaks down the mass through the use of small punched windows. He suggested looking at ways to reduce the blank space on the new addition, perhaps through the addition of sidelights or other details.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that a historic plaque will be reinstalled between the doors.
 - Mr. Donaldson-Evans noted that everything below the eave line of this portion of the addition is proposed to be reconstructed as it is today.
 - Ms. Barucco confirmed that the lower portion of the façade would be a faithful reconstruction of the 1920's addition.
 - Mr. Kocent noted that there may have been some trelliswork there historically as well, but the fenestration is consistent.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that there are also changes proposed to the entrance on the north and that the staff has recommended against those changes.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that they do not feel strongly about the proposed changes, but would like to bring in additional natural light if possible, and asked whether it would be possible to add glazing to the historic six-panel door.
 - Ms. Gutterman questioned the date of the design of the six-panel door.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that the six-panel door dates to the 1920's design, along with a balcony.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that the reconstruction of the balcony would bring protection and highlight the entrance.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that they could restore the north elevation of the 1920's addition to its historic appearance.
 - Ms. Barucco noted that the blueprints of the 1920's addition show what was constructed, and suggested that the tall middle panels of the door be replaced with glass, which would allow in light and visibility while also replicating the spirit of the panel door.

- The Committee members agreed that the reconstruction of the balcony and the use of glass panels in place of the tall middle panels of the six-panel door would be an appropriate alteration.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that he would concede the design of the door in favor of the reconstruction of the balcony and retention of the flanking windows.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the use of two dormers instead of one on the north elevation was an improvement from the previous design.
 - Ms. Stein agreed, noting that the reduction in height was also an improvement.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the massing of the second floor of the south, riverside elevation.
- Ms. Stein expressed concern over the proposed cantilevering of the balconies on the south elevation on both the new addition to the east, as well as the existing addition to the west. She noted that, while it is all painted red in the image, by breaking the cornice line, it makes the element larger than it needs to be and overwhelms the historic portion of the building with its delicate balcony. She suggested that the balconies be pulled back and the cornice line be unbroken.
 - Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that the balconies may become more like Juliette balconies.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that the users of the space would like to be able to go out onto the balconies, since almost every other boathouse has an exterior space.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that there would be no reason that the doors could not be opened and people could still get a similar experience without being fully outside.
 - Mr. Kocent responded that the depth of the balconies is five feet from the glazing to the railing to provide the appropriate turning radius for a wheelchair, so if they pull the railings back to align with the cornice, they would have to alter the entire dormer or maybe provide groups of doors that could open to create a pseudo-outdoor space.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that having sets of doors that are able to open would still permit the five-foot distance to provide access to the balconies.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the tripartite division of the dormer windows be maintained and emphasized to be more in keeping with the historic division of the windows.
 - Mr. Donaldson-Evans responded that the proposed doors are divided into three parts, with two posts, but it might be rendered more subtly currently.
- Mr. Kocent questioned the suggestion that the ridge line of the eastern addition on the south be lowered to match the existing roofline. He noted that there is probably some structural way to do so, but that they would prefer to align the ridge line with the 1980's addition to the west.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned whether the pitch of the roof of the east and west additions align.
 - Mr. Donaldson-Evans responded that the pitch remains consistent, and that the proposed addition to the east matches the height and pitch of the addition to the west.
 - Ms. Stein responded that she would accept the symmetrical ridgeline, but that the focus should be on pulling back the balconies and creating a continuous cornice line between the first and second floors. Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Revisiting the east elevation, Mr. Kocent noted that perhaps they could propose an element that is not fully glazed, but which has the appearance of being continuous across the entire elevation.

- Mr. Cluver confirmed that the decorative lights tracing the perimeter of the building would be reinstalled.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron reiterated the staff's recommendation that the north entrance should be restored to its historic configuration with six-over-six windows flanking the door of the 1920's addition.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia thanked the applicants and Architectural Committee for their discussions and improvements to create a sensitive design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The removal of the existing eastern additions is acceptable.
- The overall massing of the proposed addition is compatible with the historic building.
- The fenestration on the east elevation should be made more of a balanced element, whether through the introduction of a band of ribbon windows or creating regularized groupings of windows, rather than irregular windows punched into a shingled wall.
- The entrance of the north elevation should be restored to its historic appearance, including through the reconstruction of the balcony, replacement of the door in kind but with the possibility of glazing in the tall middle panels, and the use of six-over-six windows in the flanking openings.
- The height of the proposed addition is appropriate, provided the balconies on the south elevation to the east and west are pulled back and the cornice line unbroken.
- The dormer windows should be divided into tripartite divisions.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- With modifications as discussed, the proposed work satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration work to the 1875 building and approval of the proposed addition, provided the following, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9:

- The east façade fenestration pattern is revised to create more of an element with a regular rhythm;
- At the north central elevation, the single six-panel door is retained, with the option to replace the tall middle panels with glazing; the flanking window openings are retained and six-over-six windows installed; and the balcony is reconstructed;
- On the south elevation, the ridge line of the new addition to the east is acceptable as proposed, but the balconies should not extend beyond plane of the first-floor wall; and the new dormer should be divided into a tripartite configuration.
- The decorative lights that trace the building are reinstalled.

ITEM: 11 Boathouse Row MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 125 N 10TH ST

Proposal: Alter entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PA. Zhang's Associate LLC

Applicant: Anthony Palimore, Anthony Palimore, RA

History: 1967; Chinatown YMCA, Chinese Cultural and Community Center; Yang Chou-Cheng

Individual Designation: 6/14/2013

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 125 N. 10th Street is a mid-block parcel between Cherry and Arch Streets in the Chinatown neighborhood. Originally constructed about 1831 as Federal-style rowhouse, the building's existing elaborate façade and tile roof were constructed between 1967 and 1971 by the Chinese Cultural and Community Center. The nomination for the property, which was designated in 2013, identifies the period of significance as 1955- 2006, beginning with the year that the Chinatown YMCA opened on the second floor of the building, prior to the construction of the existing façade. In 1966, T.T. Chang, founder of the Chinatown YMCA, purchased the property and formed the Chinese Cultural and Community Center.

This application proposes to make modifications to the front entrance to provide ADA accessibility to the building, which is currently accessed by a flight of steps that leads to a recessed entrance. The rear of the property is inaccessible. This application proposes to relocate the entry wall and doors approximately 2.5 feet towards the interior to create an ADA-compliant landing. A chair lift would be installed along the concrete steps, and the chair stored at the top of the landing, in the recessed vestibule.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Relocate entry wall and doors
- Install chair lift

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Code-Required Work— Accessibility: Recommended: Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features... are preserved or impacted as little as possible; Installing a lift as*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 OCTOBER 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

inconspicuously as possible when it is necessary to locate it on a primary elevation of the historic building.

- While the proposed project shifts the entry wall and creates a larger exterior vestibule, it does not remove or alter the building's distinctive cladding, and maintains the general appearance of the original entry. The physical and visual impacts of the proposed chair lift will be minimal, and there is no alternative location where a lift or ramp could be placed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:45:29

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked whether there was any discussion with the applicant about installing a lift that someone in a wheelchair could ride onto as opposed to a transfer chair.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that she has not had discussions with the applicant about any alternatives or options.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that if an able-bodied person is not with the person in a wheelchair, she does not understand how they would call for the chair, transfer into it, and then get their wheelchair to the top of the landing. Ms. Stein agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that chair lifts such as the one proposed are usually used for interior installations.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting that she does not think the proposal will adequately address ADA needs.
- Ms. DiPasquale asked whether the Committee members feel the proposal meets preservation standards, regardless of the ADA requirements and the applicant's needs.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that she questions having an upholstered chair on the exterior of the building.
- Mr. Cluver opined that his understanding is that the chair would be removed and installed only when needed.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that that makes no sense.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that she believes the chair would remain but be stored at the top of the landing.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicants look at alternative lifts, such as foldable platform lifts.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the only other option he can imagine is adding a small elevator, which would require cutting into the decorative masonry exterior, and would not be ideal from a preservation standpoint. He opined that, if one accepts that the building must be made ADA accessible and that that accessibility must be provided from the front of the building, the current proposal seems like the least intrusive way to do so.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Cluver and Ms. Gutterman, suggesting that a similar system be used, but with a folding platform instead of a transfer chair. He noted that such a system will probably be larger, but would provide better accessibility.

- Mr. Detwiler noted that, regardless of the system, the track should be attached to the stairs rather than the decorative side wall.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron supported the staff recommendation and explained that he discussed this proposal with the applicant while employed with the Historical Commission. He noted that the existing exterior vestibule has a decorative coffered ceiling in a Chinese pattern, and noted that the architect had a reflected ceiling plan that showed the continuation of that pattern in the enlarged vestibule.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- ADA accessibility should be provided.
- The proposed system connects to the concrete steps rather than decorative masonry and does not alter any character-defining features of the building.
- The use of a transfer chair is not ideal, and the applicant should explore similar lifts but with a folding platform rather than a transfer chair.
- The existing pattern and decoration of the ceiling should be replicated in the expanded vestibule ceiling.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposal is the least invasive way of providing accessibility to the property and is reversible, satisfying the Accessibility Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the chair lift is replaced with an inclined platform lift and the decorative ceiling is extended to fill the enlarged vestibule, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline.

ITEM: 125 N 10th St					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 214-20 VINE ST

Proposal: Construct six-story multi-family building on parking lots

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Vine St Living LLC

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop Inc

History: Parking lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

BACKGROUND:

This Review and Comment application proposes to construct a six-story multi-family apartment building on several vacant, undeveloped parcels that currently function as a parking lot within the Old City Historic District. The properties at 214, 216, 218, and 220 Vine Street are currently enclosed by a non-historic fence and gate.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six-story multi-family apartment building with roof deck and pilot houses.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction over this site. 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 works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The building's design does not relate to the context of the Old City Historic District. While brick is an appropriate material for the district, the proposed building would be clad in dark gray brick rather than the red brick found on the district's earliest buildings to the more recent industrial structures.
 - The building's design elements, such as its undulating façade, rhythm and height of the fenestration, and incorporation of balconies, do not reference the district's architecture. While the design is differentiated from the historic fabric, it fails to achieve compatibility with the district's historic buildings. The proposed building does not comply with this standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - As the lots are currently vacant, there would be no adverse impact on the surrounding buildings or on the historic district if this property were to be removed in the future.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed new construction is not compatible with the historic district and does not satisfy Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:57:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Julie Morningstar represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Morningstar to discuss the design choices, such as the fenestration patterns and materials, and explain how the proposed building would fit into the historic district.
 - Ms. Morningstar answered that the owner was interested in a contemporary design, and that the proposal calls for brick on all sides of the building, since it is entirely visible. She stated that the design creates variation by introducing balcony doors and railings on the façade, along with the projections that create a nice rhythm from the street. She noted that the design detail would be mimicked on the rear as well. She added that since the building would have a contemporary design, the brick would have a stack bond coursing rather than running bond pattern. She then explained that two types of brick are proposed: one at the drum projections and one at the base. The bricks, she continued, are maroon-gray at the upper stories and dark gray to black at the first story to be more contemporary, rather than attempting to match some of the historic red brick buildings on the block.
 - Ms. Gutterman countered that even some of the more modern buildings incorporate red brick. She then noted that the difference between the brick colors is so subtle in the rendering that no difference is detectable. Ms. Gutterman noted that the Historical Commission received several letters from the public expressing concern over the design, and added that she has her own concerns about the dark gray brick, calling it too radical for the neighborhood. She further expressed concern over the fenestration pattern and balconies, though she stated that she understands the desire to design a contemporary building in 2020. She added that the windows do not read as punched openings, like those of the adjacent warehouse-style building at 222 Vine Street. However, she did not take issue with the height of the building. She concluded that she does not find the fenestration or selection of brick color compatible with the district.
- Mr. Cluver agreed that the height is acceptable, but asked that the ground story be extended by a foot or two to create a stronger base. He commented that the curves of the façade do not have a place in the district.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver, adding that the ground story is the least successful part of the design. He suggested that it is a missed opportunity to create street-level vitality. He contended that it would not be a very pleasant experience for the pedestrian, with a large, dark, looming building and a relatively blank street façade. He stated that better articulating the ground-story design would be essential moving forward.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether there are apartments at the ground story.
 - Ms. Morningstar affirmed that there would be apartments there and that the design is intended to provide some privacy. She noted that because of the zoning height limit of 65-feet, she cannot add to the height of the ground story.

- Mr. McCoubrey suggested creating different glazing, such as high clerestory windows, that allows for the ground-story to become more of a base on which the upper portion of the building sits. Right now, he continued, there is a scale issue. He commented that the brick selection makes the building look dark and grim. He questioned Ms. Morningstar's earlier comment about red brick not being modern and suggested that more contrast or variation be used.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's comments, adding that red or beige brick could be used instead of the dark brick. He commented that the east and west elevations appear as billboards of dark brick and asked that the massing of those walls be broken down through some articulation.
- Ms. Morningstar stated that some patterning or coursing to emphasize the locations of the floor levels could be used on the east and west elevations.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the building is essentially a box with added tubular elements. He noted that he would prefer to see them as bays, which could still be executed in a modern way, but so that they relate to many other buildings in the city. It would also allow for more useable space, he added.
- Ms. Stein commented that the windows are recessed into the tubular elements, and the whole façade become very dark. She added that there is no relief. In large part, she continued, what makes the building so incompatible with the Old City Historic District is the lack of a reflecting pattern and the scale of the windows, as well as the expression of masonry.
- Ms. Morningstar responded that she would take the Committee's comments to the owner and see if he would lighten the brick. She noted that, owing to zoning restrictions, only two bay windows are allowed on the street-facing façade. She explained that the tubular forms with the Juliet balconies were chosen to create a more equitable design across units, though she commented that she would review the depth of the windows and drums.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Robert Gurmankin, president of Franklin Bridge North Neighbors, the RCO for the northern part of Old City, noted that he submitted a position paper and commented that the RCO supports the development of surface parking lots. However, he argued that new development should be done in deference to the historic nature of the area. While not looking for a modern interpretation of a Federal or Georgian style building, he continued, the group contends that the design fails to acknowledge the historic character of the neighborhood, including the 1770s building that houses MOTO Design Shop, the project architect. He asked that the Historical Commission uphold the same standards it did for 222 Vine Street just a few years ago. He suggested that the process resulted in an improved design and a building that fits into the neighborhood. He asked that the developer and architect make the necessary revisions to create a building compatible with the district.
- Neighbor Gary Vernick stated that the Committee appropriately voiced concern over the fenestration and brick color and lack of relief in the undulating nature of the façade. He contended that the northern end of the district has been "discovered" more recently. Of the undeveloped sites on the 200 block of Vine Street, he noted that there is a gas station at the east end that will likely undergo redevelopment in the near future, the lot currently under discussion, and, until a few years ago, the site where a non-contributing building at 222 Vine Street was demolished and a new

building, approved by the Commission, was constructed. He suggested that this proposal is the beginning of a wave that will be ongoing for the next year or two. He asked that new construction be done appropriately and with sensitivity to the district, rather than with a “Darth Vader standout look,” as he described the current proposal. He compared the design to that of a dormitory, adding that it appears that it should house students on a college campus. He argued that it does not fit into the contributing and historic block where nearly all buildings consist of red brick. He then expressed concern that the proposed design, if constructed, would set a horrible precedent for any future construction, including any redevelopment plans for the Painted Bride site.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission has review and comment authority over this property, because it is an undeveloped site. It was vacant at the time the Old City Historic District was designated.
- The proposed design stands six-stories in height and incorporates a dark gray to black brick at the base with a maroon-gray brick above in a stack bond pattern.
- The façade consists of a tubular design with Juliet balconies.
- The building would be entirely residential, and the design of the ground story allows privacy to the units. However, the design could be strengthened through the creation of a base by adding height and changing the fenestration pattern at this level.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The brick color, tubular design, and fenestration pattern are incompatible with the district. The proposed design does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 214-20 Vine 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				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 504 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Infill open porch

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Frank & Sarah Kern

Applicant: Lawrence Gilbert, Lawrence Gilbert Architect

History: 1977; Irving Shapiro, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 504 S. Front Street was constructed in 1977 as part of the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority's efforts to revitalize Society Hill. The building is one of five contributing buildings on S. Front Street that comprise a group of 20 similar structures, which extend from Front Street to Lombard and Naudain Streets. The brick buildings are characterized by ground-story garages, second-story sliding-glass doors with balconies, and open porches positioned behind brick screening walls at the fourth story. The screening walls contain both squared and arched openings. The squared opening and a portion of the porch at 504 S. Front Street were enclosed at some point in the past; however, very few of the screening wall openings within the group of 20 buildings have been infilled over time. This application proposes to enclose the remainder of the open porch and to install a window in the arched screening wall opening.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install windows in screening wall opening at front façade
- Enclose open fourth-story porch

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - This application proposes to enclose the remaining open portion of the fourth-story porch and to install a window within the masonry opening of the front façade screening wall. The work would cause an alteration to the character-defining screening wall, a feature that is repeated in each of the 20 buildings along Front, Lombard, and Naudain Streets. The proposed work does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:15:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Lawrence Gilbert and owner Frank Kern represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked whether any of the houses built in the style have had all windows infilled.
 - Ms. Keller answered that this building has had one window infilled, the adjacent building has been completely roofed with its windows remaining open, and there has been some infill on Naudain Street. She added that she is unsure if any of the fourth-story porches have been entirely infilled.
- Mr. Gilbert stated that the open roof allows water to infiltrate the building and leaks badly. He noted that the owner has attempted several times to reroof the building but that leaks always form and water enters the house. He explained that, to stop the leaking, the owner would like to fully enclose the open porch and install a continuous gutter across the top of the building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked what the owners of the other similar buildings have done to address the water problem.
 - Mr. Gilbert responded that he happens to live in one of the units on Naudain Street and that he also has moisture issues. He stated that he does not know how else to address the issue, aside from roofing over the open porch.
- Mr. Kern stated that the previous owner replaced the roof and windows below the porch in 2005, because there had been significant leaking for a number of years. In 2014, he continued, another roof was installed to prevent leaks below the porch. He commented that he installed yet another roof in 2018, adding that the roof started leaking again in 2019 and there are now multiple areas with water damage. He noted that the 20 properties have a homeowners' association, and he contended that nearly every building within the group has moisture issues with the porch. He stated that he sees no way to correct the problem other than enclosing the porch.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that there is a fundamental difference between enclosing the porch by installing a roof and leaving the wall open and enclosing it by installing a roof and adding windows in the screening wall. He stated that the decision is important, because if these moisture issues are so prevalent at all the properties, other owners will follow the intervention at this property. He added that this decision will be precedent setting, and questioned whether there is a way to maintain the character-defining nature of the open porch that also satisfies the need to better accommodate the storm water.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification on all the elements visible through the screening wall, noting that there seems to be a series of catwalks and a stair to another deck.
 - Mr. Kern replied that there is currently a roof deck that would be removed as part of this work. He added that once the porch is enclosed, a new roof for the entire building would be planned. He noted that both the circular stair and upper roof deck would be removed, clarifying that the roof deck would be eliminated entirely.
- Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. Cluver that the infilling of what is a character-defining feature of the house would set a precedent, though she added that she understands the issue that the open porch has a troubled detail. She stated that she cannot understand why the water issue cannot be addressed and questioned whether the problem results from undersized downspouts or improper flashings. She expressed concern over both installing windows at the screening wall and roofing over the porch.

- Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the screening wall and porch are character-defining features of the property. He noted that there are many similar buildings that seem to be able to handle the moisture issues.
- Mr. Kern responded that nearly every one of the 20 owners experiences issues with leaking roofs, adding that the roof is not properly sloped. He elaborated that the slope cannot be increased, owing to the location of a sliding-glass door.
- Mr. Detwiler directed the Architectural Committee to the section drawing in the application and suggested ways to modify the slope. He noted that, if the right contractor and roofer could solve the problem, it would eliminate the need to infill the opening. He also called the porch a character-defining feature of the building and added that he is not in favor of roofing the porch. He contended that there are many buildings throughout the city with similar decks located behind a parapet wall with a scupper through the wall. He argued that with proper flashings and openings and the correct pitch, the problem could be solved.
 - Mr. Kern reiterated that many property owners have experienced the same issues and that multiple roofers have been involved in trying to solve the moisture problem. He questioned whether the issue could be resolved through proper flashings and modifying the roof slope. He argued that it is a basic construction design flaw.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that it is disconcerting to have a roofing issue lead to the creation of another room to the house. It would result in the loss of a character-defining feature.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the Architectural Committee seems to be in agreement that this proposal does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and acknowledged that there have been unsuccessful efforts to resolve the issue. He contended that the Committee does not know whether the failure was a result of improper repairs or if there is something inherent in the original design that makes the issue unsolvable. He reiterated that the Committee's answer seems clear, given that the work does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but suggested that the Historical Commission could take these other factors into consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lorna Katz Lawson stated that the Society Hill Civic Association Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee reviewed the application and supports the Architectural Committee's comments. She noted that several building groups within the Society Hill Historic District have had issues that the Historical Commission has helped address. In those cases, she continued, the buildings have retained their character-defining features. She argued that since the majority of the screening walls remain open, an effort should be made to retain the integrity of that feature.
- Randal Baron suggested that the owner contact an engineer who specializes in water infiltration issues.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The fourth-story screening wall and open porch are character-defining features.
- Of the 20 buildings on Lombard, Front, and Naudain Streets constructed in a similar design, the majority of the open porches and screening walls remain unaltered.

- The water infiltration issue is not unique to the building at 504 S. Front Street and has occurred at other buildings within the group of 20. It may result from an inherent design flaw.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The roofing of the open porch and installation of windows within the screening wall would alter a character-defining feature. The work does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 504 S Front St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 271 S VAN PELT ST, UNIT # 2

Proposal: Construct addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John A. Cunningham

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC

History: 1870; Stucco and parking added, 1970

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 271 S. Van Pelt Street is an Italianate carriage house constructed about 1870. This application proposes to construct a third-story addition and a roof deck. In 2012, the Historical Commission approved a similar scope of work for this same owner; however, that project was never built.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a third-story addition
- Construct roof deck

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The addition is set back from the street and would be minimally visible from the right-of-way. The exterior walls of the new addition will be finished with stucco to be compatible with the existing structure.
 - A wooden trellis is proposed and would be attached to the new addition.
 - A stainless steel railing is proposed to enclose the roof deck which is differentiated from the decorative iron work on the front façade of the original structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:38:30

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Kerner about the visibility of the green roof from the street and asked if there was any way to pull the plantings back to make them less visible.
- Ms. Stein agreed with Ms. Gutterman's comments and remarked that the edge of the planter also added to its visibility.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the additional layer being proposed was to accommodate the weight of dirt associated with the plantings.
 - Mr. Kerner responded that they needed to sit the structure for the green roof on top of the parapet. He explained that the parapet at the rear of the building was higher than at the front, which increased the height of the planter. Mr. Kerner stated that the structure was necessary in order to carry the weight of the plantings.
- Ms. Stein asked about the inappropriate silver exhaust duct on the side of the building.
 - Mr. Kerner responded that it is a fireplace flue.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Mr. Kerner about the distance was between the top of the cornice and the top of the planter.
 - Mr. Kerner replied that he did not have the exact dimension available, but he walked Mr. Detwiler through the heights of the roof deck components.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the proposal appeared to be a significant amount of structure which resulted in the entire roof deck being elevated higher than necessary. He added that he was not opposed to the concept of a roof deck here, but the height of the current proposal needed to be reduced significantly.
 - Mr. Kerner responded that he could not use a pedestal system in this case because the roof structure could not carry the weight.
- Ms. Gutterman agreed that both the roof deck and the third-story addition were too tall.
 - Mr. Kerner pointed out that the proposed addition was set back significantly from the street and suggested that this would decrease its visibility. He added that they could possibly set the green roof back farther from the building's façade.

- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Kerner to confirm how much additional height was being added to the roof structure so that the weight of the third-story addition could be supported.
 - Mr. Kerner confirmed that the structure was approximately two feet high.
- Mr. Detwiler asked what the ceiling height of the proposed addition was.
 - Mr. Kerner confirmed that the ceiling height was nine feet.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that reducing the heights of the various components could make a significant difference to the project overall. He suggested that the applicant study ways to reduce the height of the proposed third-story addition.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if they were going to be building directly on top of the existing roof system, and Mr. Kerner confirmed that this was their plan.
- Mr. Kerner explained that one of the character-defining features of the house's interior was the exposed roof structure. He said that the plan to build over top of the existing roof structure was motivated by a desire to retain this interior feature.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that he was concerned that the planter looked almost like an extension of the cornice, and that the planter needed to be set back far enough so that it was almost invisible. Mr. McCoubrey added that the height of the third-story addition also needed to be reduced.
 - Mr. Kerner responded that he could double the set back of the green roof to make it inconspicuous from the front and he also said that he could reduce the height of the addition by six inches. Mr. Kerner reiterated that he did not want to do anything that would destroy the interior ceiling, and said that he was hopeful that a solution could be agreed upon that would protect this character-defining feature.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that while green roofs were great, in this case, it should not be visible. He suggested that Mr. Kerner consider a planting system that was not as deep as the one he was currently proposing.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that it would also help to lighten the weight of the structure needed for the green roof. He added that if Mr. Kerner could reduce the height of the structure needed for the green roof, then he might not need to push it back too far from the front façade because the entire green roof would be lowered. Mr. Detwiler told Mr. Kerner that reducing the height of the addition could make an important difference.
- Ms. Stein commented that she did not think that pulling the planter two feet away from the front façade would be enough to make it inconspicuous. She noted that the property was located on a corner, which makes the proposal highly visible, presenting a difficult design problem.
 - Mr. Kerner responded that pushing the green roof back two feet would diminish the appearance by half. He also stated that he did not necessarily agree that the green roof needed to be invisible and was surprised that a green roof could be considered to have a negative aesthetic. Mr. Kerner said that he understood the Architectural Committee's concern with the thickness of the edge of the green roof system.
- Ms. Stein said that she was concerned that the stainless steel railing would be bright and shiny, and she would prefer to see something with a more subdued painted finish. Ms. Gutterman agreed with Ms. Steins comments.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Kerner if the pergola wood was going to be stained.
 - Mr. Kerner responded that the idea was to let the wood weather on its own; however, they could consider staining it.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Both the green roof and the third-story addition were too tall and needed to be lowered in order to make them less conspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The green roof should be pushed back away from the front façade so that its visibility from the public right-of-way was reduced significantly.
- The stainless steel railing would be too shiny and should be replaced with a railing that had a painted, more subdued finish.
- The wood of the pergola should be stained rather than left to weather on its own.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The height of the green roof and third-story addition needed to be studied so that they could be reduced enough to make them inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The proposal as presented does not satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal as presented, but approval if the heights of the third-story addition and the green roof are reduced to make them inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, the wood pergola is stained, and the finish of the railing is not shiny, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 271 S Van Pelt St, Unit #2					
MOTION: Denial as presented, but approval with revisions					
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				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

Address: 2215 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck with pilot house; replace side and rear windows; install siding on rear bay

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Thomas Jay Rush and Meriam Zandi

Applicant: Jeffrey Wyant, Wyant Architecture LLC

History: 1872

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

2215 Locust Street is a three-story residential building constructed in 1872 and is contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. This application for final approval proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house, as well as to rehabilitate the rear of building. The property is located mid-block and the back of building is not visible from the public right-of-way. Although a fire lane runs behind property, it is a private, locked alley for residents only.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct pilot house and roof deck.
- Extend chimney height.
- Re-clad rear double bay window at the back wall on rear ell.
- Create new window openings on rear ell.
- Close select window openings and infill with brick.
- Create new door opening from existing window on rear wall of main block. Construct stairs from new doorway to back breezeway.
- Replace windows and door.
- No work to 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 will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The project does not propose changes in materials, spaces, or spatial relationships that characterize the historic property.
 - All changes proposed will not visible from the public right-of-way and do not alter the public's perception of the building's or district's historic character.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The addition of the roof deck and pilot house will not destroy character defining materials. The design differentiates it from from the historic building but maintains compatibility with its massing, size, scale, and architectural features.

- *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.*
 - The addition of the roof deck and pilot house are reversible, and the essential form and integrity of the historic property is preserved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details and a mock-up of the deck railing, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10 and the Roof Guidelines.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jeff Wyant and owner Thomas Jay Rush represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the extent of visibility of the pilot house and roof deck from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Wyant explained that an existing roof deck and railing adjacent to this property's roof has railing posts that are just barely visible when standing directly across the street.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the staff has suggested a mock-up to confirm that the railing is not visible from the street.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that typically they do not allow roof decks on the front or main-block sections of houses. She noted that deck are allowed on rear ells but not on the front, main portions houses, even with a sufficient setback. Ms. Gutterman continued that the public should not see the deck or the furniture and other objects on the deck. She added that she was also worried about the overbuild that is required because of the existing roof slope.
 - Mr. Wyant responded that the overbuild is all above the existing roof.
 - Mr. Gutterman inquired if there would be access to the existing roof for maintenance purposes.
 - Mr. Wyant replied that they could create that.
 - Ms. Gutterman said she is not sure that a 21-foot by 15-foot portion of a deck is required. She added that she thinks that it is just too much space. The deck is too large. No one needs a deck that large.
- Mr. Cluver stated the deck next door, with a 10-foot set back, is sets a precedent and he does not think that a deck with the 10-foot set back would be visible from the street.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he was interested in hearing the staff's opinion since the staff believes the application complies with the roof guidelines.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission abandoned the absolute prohibition against decks on main or front roofs about 10 years ago after losing an appeal. He explained that, at that time, the Commission decided to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards guidelines, which stipulate that roof decks should be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Mr. Farnham added that the Historical Commission has approved dozens if not hundreds of decks on main roofs since that change in policy.
 - Mr. McCoubrey thanked Mr. Farnham for the clarification.

- Ms. Mehley added that the staff's interpretation of the Roof Guidelines, based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, was that the guideline would be met because the staff would ensure that the deck railing and roof were inconspicuous through the review for approval of a mock-up from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Stein inquired if the applicant pulled the deck back 10 feet, where the adjacent deck is, would there still need to be mock-up. She noted that the applicant's deck would be two feet to 18 inches lower than the adjacent deck.
 - Ms. Mehley replied that even if the Committee recommended the 10-foot set back, the staff would still visit the building to review a mock-up to confirm the front railing will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. McCoubrey said that he would suggest that the deck should not be visible from the street, and that the staff identify a setback so that it is not visible when standing on the other side of the street or looking down the street.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro noted that doing a mock-up would not be difficult and would produce a certain result.
 - Mr. Wyant agreed that a mock-up could be done.
- Mr. Rush said he would provide the deck railing mock-up. He stated that he really appreciates the house because it is historical and does not want to push the boundaries. He did note that he would like the largest deck possible and would be happy to assist to ensure that it is inconspicuous.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded and said the Committee appreciates the amount of effort they are putting into the window work and restoring other features of the house.
 - Mr. Rush added that he would really like it to look like it did the day it was built.
- Mr. Detwiler referenced the proposed rear elevation and noted that it is proposed to remove the aluminum siding on the bay, which is great, but that the window openings would be changed. Mr. Detwiler expressed concerns about the changes to the windows in the bay included the sill height change and the insertion of picture windows and other window types rather than traditional double-hung windows. He noted that the picture windows would be out-of-character for this house. Mr. Detwiler also questioned the new windows added at the fourth floor and the change of window configuration from one-over-one to two-over-two.
 - Mr. Wyant responded that only the bay's central window openings would be changed. He added that the sill height on the lower opening on the bay would be lowered as part of the design of the spaces on the inside. He stated that Mr. Rush would like to open them up and get as much natural light in them as possible. Mr. Wyant responded to a number of other questions about changes to the rear elevation. He also inquired about Mr. Detwiler's concerns and asked if these were an issue since the rear of the building is not visible from any public right-of-way.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the changes still alter historic fabric and create something that did not exist before. She noted that unless an applicant can show precedent or photographs justifying a change, even if not be visible from the public, the Committee will not support it.
 - The staff confirmed that the rear facades of the building are not visible from any public right-of-way and noted that the Historical Commission often approves minor changes to doors and windows at rear ell's that are not visible. The staff often approves such changes administratively.

- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the skylight on top of the pilot house and expressed concern about the amount of light it would give off at night. He noted that he would like to see the skylight removed from the pilot house.
 - Others noted that the skylight would not be visible to the public from the street.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the chimney that would be extended up and if the general size would be maintained. He also asked in the height was being required by code.
 - Mr. Wyant confirmed that the size and profile would be maintained, and the extension was a code requirement.
- Mr. Cluver said that, given the lack of visibility of the rear elevation, he was willing to take a more liberal view of the modifications to it. He noted that the Architectural Committee normally encourages pilot houses that are as minimal as possible. He recommended removing the top skylight of the pilot house to minimize it as much as possible.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that when the aluminum siding comes off the bay window, the original paneling or shingling may still be underneath. He added that it would be wonderful to just restore it back the way it was, and it would still have many windows.
- Mr. Detwiler objected to any changes to window types, configurations, and openings at the rear of the property even though the rear is not visible from any public right-of-way.
 - Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Cluver objected. They stated that the Committee should give the applicant more flexibility at that rear, given the lack of visibility from the public right-of-way and the fact that the rear is already altered. It was noted that the Historical Commission routinely approves changes like the ones proposed at the rears of buildings that are not visible to the public.
 - The staff agreed with Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Cluver and noted that the work at the rear could be approved at the staff level.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The roof deck is potentially visible in its proposed location.
- The pilot house roof should be simplified with skylight removed, even if not visible to the public.
- Historic materials, such as paneling or shingles, may survive under aluminum siding on bay window, and should be restored, even if not visible to the public.
- The proposed changes to window types, configurations, and openings on rear and side elevation are not appropriate, even if not visible to the public.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application meets Standards 2, 9, and 10, and the Roof Guidelines if the following revisions are made:
 - Set back the deck railing from front façade approximately 10 feet, with the staff to review mock-up to confirm that the deck is not visible from public right-of-way.
 - Revise pilot house design to remove the skylight and install a solid roof.
 - Investigate material under aluminum siding, and if the original configuration with paneling or shingles is extant, restore it in-kind.
 - Maintain existing window openings on rear and side elevations, with no infill or adjusted openings.
 - Maintain one-over-one window configurations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 2 to recommend approval of the deck and pilot house with a setback of the deck determined by mock-up and the skylight removed from the pilot house, but denial of the window changes at the rear, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, and Roof Guidelines. Messrs. McCoubrey and Cluver dissented, asserting that the property owner should be permitted to make minor changes at the rear, which is not visible from the public right-of-way.

ITEM: 2215 Locust St					
MOTION: Approval of deck and pilot house with conditions					
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				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4	2			

ADDRESS: 5129-35 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Demolish building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rite Aid of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Ronald Patterson, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1955; Penn Fruit; George Neff, architect

Individual Designation: 11/10/2016

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish the purpose-built Penn Fruit supermarket building at 5129-35 Frankford Avenue. It claims that the building cannot be feasibly reused, that requiring its preservation would impose a financial hardship on the property owner. The financial hardship application will be reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship as well as the Historical Commission. The building is a large, single-story purpose-built supermarket constructed in 1955. It is 37,666 square feet in size. The last supermarket tenant, occupying approximately 80 percent of the rentable space, closed its doors in 2016. The space has been vacant and the signature storefront system has been entirely covered behind a security system of panels since that time. The Historical Commission designated the property as historic on 10 November 2016 with a vote of 7 to 5, finding that it satisfied Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination argued that the arched-roof supermarket, constructed in 1955, possessed significant character, interest, and value as part of the development of Philadelphia in the postwar era, exemplified the legacy of the Penn Fruit Company as a major innovator in the supermarket industry; reflected the environment of the postwar era characterized by the popularity of exaggerated modernism; and embodied the distinguishing characteristics of the supermarket as a building type uniquely emblematic of this

era and style. The owner of the property, Rite Aid of Pennsylvania, objected to the designation in 2016, presenting an engineer's report claiming that the building was poorly designed and constructed and was in very poor condition, beyond repair.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance prohibits the Historical Commission from approving the complete demolition of a historic building unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted in order to justify a demolition, 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. This application claims that the condition of the building and the cost to repair it prohibit a sale or reuse of the building. This application also makes an argument for allowing demolition in the public interest, with a claim that the continued designation of the property will thwart the revitalization of the Frankford Avenue corridor.

The application includes a cover letter from attorney Ronald J. Patterson that explains that Rite Aid of Pennsylvania, the owner of the property, seeks a finding of financial hardship owing to three main reasons: 1) the building's essential features have reached a point of imminent and complete failure, making preservation infeasible; 2) Rite Aid has lost and continues to lose substantial money by keeping the property within its real estate portfolio; and 3) reuse of the existing building does not present the highest and best use, and an alternative design for the site would positively impact the community. The cover letter concludes that:

"the present conditions of the building make preservation both impracticable and economically infeasible, and being required to repair the building would work a hardship on Rite Aid as the owner. Moreover, the continued designation of the Property would directly contradict the sound goals and recommendations that the Planning Commission has established for this corridor, and would thwart redevelopment efforts encouraged by the neighborhood impacted by the Property's continued designation. For all these reasons, we respectfully request that the Commission exercise its discretion and grant Rite Aid's application for financial hardship."

The application includes an affidavit from Paul F. Newlin III, the Director of Real Estate Operations at Rite Aid Corporation. The affidavit states that the property has not been listed for sale, and no offers for purchase have been received. It also states that no reuse of the property is contemplated because the cost to rehabilitate the property is prohibitive. Exhibit "E" offers a construction budget estimate from 2018 of \$3,792,344 for a building rehabilitation and fit out, including site improvement, exterior construction, ceiling work, flooring, roofing, electrical, plumbing, and associated costs. An appraisal report prepared in 2016 at Exhibit "B" indicates that the property is valued at \$1.5 million with the current leases, and \$1.6 million with the best possible leases. Exhibit "A" documents a 24-month expense to Rite Aid of \$211,599.84 to keep the property in its real estate portfolio. The 2016 appraisal report which concluded that, although there are positive aspects of the market area and site, including excellent transit access to major job centers and good commercial exposure with three street frontages, the market for commercial uses was weak due to low incomes, declining rental rates, and negative absorption. The application includes two engineer's reports, at Exhibits "C" and "D," one from the time of historic designation, and the other from June 2020, that conclude that the condition of the property has only worsened from the extremely poor condition that it was in at the time of designation. The application includes a report from a land planning consultant at Exhibit "F" that opines that the current building and historic designation restricts the potential for vertical mix-

use development and prohibits the optimal use of the site for financial and community benefit. This report suggests that a conceptual plan for maximum potential use of the site would include a supermarket, but also additional ground-floor retail, with four stories of multi-family units above. The application also includes several letters of support from community organizations for approval of the hardship application.

The cover letter provided in the application includes mention of a request for rescission of the historic designation as an alternative, but no arguments are made in the application to support this request. Therefore, the staff recommends that consideration of a rescission is not part of this application.

After reviewing the initial application described above, the staff recommended to the applicant that they provide a discounted cash flow analysis of a project to rehabilitate the historic building for commercial use that is based on a ten-year pro forma and predicts yearly cash flows and a net present value. Such an analysis would demonstrate whether or not 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. The applicant provided this analysis, which is included at the end of the application. The analysis predicts negative cash flows every year and a present value for the project of negative \$5,028,291 in its current condition, negative \$3,836,470 with a retail tenant, and negative \$1,078,565 if sold today for market value. The conclusion drawn from the analysis is that only a redevelopment of the site would prevent a substantial financial loss.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that:

- The complete demolition of the designated resource triggers the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. For the Historical Commission to approve the complete demolition, the applicant must demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The implicit necessary in the public interest argument in the application should be rejected because, while the demolition and redevelopment that might bring economic revitalization to the area may be in the public interest, no argument is made that the demolition is *necessary* in the public interest, i.e. that the demolition is the *only* means to achieve an overriding public interest.
- The implicit rescission request in the application should be rejected because no argument regarding the satisfaction of the rescission criteria set forth in Section 5.14.b of the Rules & Regulations has been proffered.
- The assertion that the demolition should be approved to allow the property to be put to its highest and best use should be rejected. The Historical Commission may constitutionally regulate a property to the extent that it cannot be put to its highest and best use, provided that property remains able to furnish a reasonable rate of return. The measure in this case is reasonable rate of return, not highest and best use.
- The construction cost estimate relative to the appraised value indicates that it is unlikely the building can be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The construction cost estimate relative to the appraised value indicates that it is likely that a sale of the building is impracticable without a substantial financial loss.
- The condition of the building was very poor at the time of designation. The condition is reportedly worse today. If the financial hardship case is proven, it will negate any claims of demolition by neglect because a property owner cannot be compelled to invest in a property that cannot provide a reasonable rate of return.

- The financial analysis demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The Historical Commission may approve the application, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:27:30

RECUSAL:

- Mr. McCoubrey recused and exited the meeting. Mr. Cluver took over as Chair of the meeting.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Gussie O'Neill, structural engineer William Doll, land planner Nancy Templeton, and Paul F. Newlin III, Director of Real Estate Operations at Rite Aid Corporation, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification as to the Architectural Committee's role in the review of the financial hardship application.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that the Rules and Regulations require that both the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship review financial hardship applications, but the Architectural Committee's role is not well-defined. The Architectural Committee can assess construction cost estimates and whether or not the demolition of a historically designated resource satisfies historic preservation standards, but it is not tasked with evaluating financial analyses.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern about the application for demolition.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that the Architectural Committee's role is to advise the Historical Commission as to whether or not the applicant has proven its case that there is no feasible reuse for the building. A feasible reuse is one that is financially feasible.
- Ms. O'Neill explained that the property was designated as historic in 2016, which passed by a narrow vote of 7 to 5. At the time of designation, a structural engineering report was provided that stated that the preservation of the building would be difficult owing to its poor condition. The report stated that there were several elements that were severely damaged and in need of immediate and costly repairs, including extreme corrosion of the steel frame. An updated conditions assessment has been provided with the application which states that the building's features have reached a point of imminent and complete failure, which has made preservation physically and economically infeasible. Rite Aid, the owner of the property, is willing to redevelop the site in a way that will work for the community, but the historic designation is standing in the way. Letters of support for the application from community stakeholders are included with the application. The letter from the Frankford Community Development Corporation confirms Ms. Templeton's assessment that the property is not suited for any form of productive occupation and that the historic designation is a hardship on the community. The historic designation of the property contradicts the goals of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Development at this site is being thwarted by the historic designation. The building could stand in the way of a transit-oriented development at this site.

- Mr. Doll stated that he performed a visual observation of the building and a complete walk-through of the interior and the façade. Several items were observed which are of urgent concern. The storefront glass wall has deteriorated mullions and bowing glass, and is in danger of failing. Multiple cracks in the brick throughout the façade is a sign that water is penetrating through the façade, and rusting and expanding the steel frame that is within the façade elements. There are signs of water damage at the ceiling in multiple areas of the building, which is a sign that water is penetrating through the roofing system. There are multiple areas of first-floor concrete slabs that are spalling. All of these elements are urgent and extensive in their repair nature.
 - Mr. Cluver asked if these failures are because the property is not being maintained, or if there is something intrinsic to the design of the building that is causing the failures.
 - Mr. Doll responded the failures seem to be occurring, owing to a lack of maintenance and water penetrating through the building.
 - Ms. O'Neill noted that the 2016 structural engineering report, prepared by Fred Baumert of Keast & Hood, stated that the building was not constructed to be durable. The Penn Fruit buildings were designed to be inexpensive and last a generation or so. The building was not meant to last indefinitely.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that that is Mr. Baumert's opinion, and one would need to speak to the original designer to know if that is accurate.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that he also was not sure from Mr. Baumert's report if he was only referring to the glass storefront, or to the entire building.
 - Ms. Stein commented that it is not unusual to have to perform maintenance on a building that is 65 years old. Needing to repair or replace a curtainwall system is not surprising, given its age.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the panels covering the storefront.
 - Mr. Doll responded that they are metal panels that are covering the storefront glass façade. The panels are attached to the mullion system.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the panels may be adding to the storefront failure because of the way they are attached to the old system. He asked if the panels are for security or for structural stability.
 - Mr. Detwiler echoed Mr. D'Alessandro's concerns about the panels being attached to the storefront system.
 - Mr. Doll responded that there is no evidence that the panels are contributing to the failure, since the engineering report from 2016 documented the same deterioration and bowing. He stated that the panels appear to be for security.
- Mr. Newlin explained that Rite Aid had purchased the property in 2007 with the intention of demolishing the building and building a new Rite Aid building, but the economic collapse of 2008 required that the plans be put on hold. Then Walgreens had a deal to purchase Rite Aid, so plans for this site were stopped owing to that circumstance. The Philadelphia region ended up being retained by Rite Aid in the merger deal, so plans for the site were restarted. Then Albertsons, which owns ACME, was going to buy Rite Aid. During that time, this site was discussed with them, but they had no interest in the building itself. The sale of Rite Aid to Albertsons did not happen. Then, in 2016, the property was placed on the Philadelphia Register, putting all redevelopment plans on hold. At the time of designation, there was a tenant in the building who went into bankruptcy despite Rite Aid offering a reduced rent. That was the last major tenant. Rite Aid has made concerted efforts to find a new grocery store tenant, but has been unsuccessful in finding a tenant willing to pay more than \$5 per square foot in rent. The security panels were put in place at the

request of the community because the property was attracting those impacted by the opioid epidemic.

- Mr. Cluver asked about the cost estimates provided. He asked if the rehabilitation cost is estimated to be \$118 per square foot and covers the core and shell work. He suggested that \$118 per square foot seems low for a commercial property.
 - Mr. Newlin confirmed this and explained the pro forma. He stated that the low-end cost to renovate the building to get it suitable for a retail rental tenant is estimated to be approximately \$3.5 million and could be as much as \$7 million. The building needs all new mechanical systems. The basement floods. Rite Aid purchased the property for \$3.7 million and has spent substantial money over the years to maintain it. The remodel tenant improvements cost of \$3.5 million is an estimate of the cost to rehabilitate the space for reuse. Tenant improvement money would also have to be provided to a new tenant.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that \$118 per square foot is low, and that it will cost more.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the applicant performed an analysis to indicate what the cost would be, for comparable square footage, for a new building to a point where it is at occupancy.
 - Mr. Newlin responded that he did not.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that without that, this Committee does not have the basis for a comparison to say whether or not this is a practical rehabilitation or not.
- Ms. Gutterman announced that she would need to leave the meeting soon.
- Mr. Cluver reminded those in attendance that the Architectural Committee is charged with reviewing the application from the perspective of a reuse and is analyzing the rehabilitation costs provided. He acknowledged that there may be legitimate public interest arguments, but those are not within the purview of this Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, opposed the application. He referenced his letter, which had been provided to the Committee. He commented that the Preservation Alliance had nominated the building in 2016 as part of an effort to protect Mid-century Modern buildings. Rite Aid has owned the building since 2007 and failed to maintain a supermarket tenant. There is no indication that Rite Aid has made an effort to sell, lease, or maintain this building during its ownership. Multiple Penn Fruit supermarkets in the region that have been repurposed and it is incorrect to say that these buildings were designed to not be durable. Rite Aid has let this building deteriorate. It was boarded it up in 2016 without obtaining Historical Commission approval. The Preservation Alliance supports the goals of the Frankford community to revitalize this commercial district. The Penn Fruit building can and should be part of that revitalization.
- Ellie Devyatkin, Commercial Corridor Manager for the Frankford Community Development Corporation, supported the application. She stated that it was infeasible for the former tenant to make the necessary improvements to the building to make it a competitive grocery store. She stated that her organization has talked to numerous supermarket tenants, who are all very interested in the location, but not the existing building, especially with the historic designation. Other examples of Penn Fruit building reuses have undergone significant modifications that would likely not get approved if historically designated. Mayor Kenney has asked Rite Aid to make a move on doing what they need to do including applying for a hardship for this property, so that the property can go back into productive use for the community.

- Peter Bloomfield, an architect and Board member of the Frankford Development Corporation, supported the application. He urged the Committee to look big-picture and beyond simply the cost of renovations. He explained that he is a big advocate for Mid-century Modern architecture, but that this building is no longer serving the community. It is an opportunity to create a new village center, and unfortunately this building is standing in the way of conceivable plans for the neighborhood, which desperately needs services like a good grocery store and smaller-scale businesses.
- Blane Stoddart, of construction project management company BFW Group, supported the application. He stated that the community fiercely opposes the preservation of this building. Two engineering reports document that the steel on this building is compromised. The roof leaked and rats were in the building when the supermarket tenant was still there. The building is obsolete and sits on the site diagonally, in a way that makes the site unusable. There is nothing to be saved. The building poses a threat to the community. Four years ago, the tenant at the time tried to get the building designated as historic to hold up the development process. The community did not ask for the historic designation. The historic designation should never have happened. This site could be an anchor at the Frankford Terminal.
- Janet Bernstein, Constituent Services Advisor for State Representative Joseph Hohenstein of the 177th District, supported the application. She commented that the site could serve as one of the few supermarkets where people could use the public transit. No other property in Frankford that can allow a new building of the size the community needs. Demolishing the building to allow for redevelopment of the site would be the best thing for the community. It is not significant enough of a building to hold up the needed development for Frankford. She urged the Committee to consider the needs of the community.
- Roger Tenant Sr., President of the Frankford Community Development Corporation, supported the application. He commented that he worked for the Department of Licenses and Inspections for many years, and his family has lived in Frankford for generations. He stated that the community deserves a quality supermarket at this location. It is a prime location that can serve both young people and senior citizens.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The complete demolition of the designated resource triggers the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. For the Historical Commission to approve the complete demolition, the applicant must demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The implicit necessary in the public interest argument in the application should be rejected because, while the demolition and redevelopment that might bring economic revitalization to the area may be in the public interest, no argument is made that the demolition is *necessary* in the public interest, i.e. that the demolition is the *only* means to achieve an overriding public interest.
- The implicit rescission request in the application should be rejected because no argument regarding the satisfaction of the rescission criteria set forth in Section 5.14.b of the Rules & Regulations has been proffered.
- The condition of the building was very poor at the time of designation.
- Information was not provided to document that demolition is the only appropriate action.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Demolition of a building listed individually on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

ITEM: 5129-35 Frankford Ave					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Stein					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey				X	
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4			1	1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:33:30

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:34 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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