

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

**TUESDAY, 26 MARCH 2024
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown
Alina Herzberg
Andrew Biggin
Andy Wasserman
Anthony Mascieri
Audrey Gusick
Barbara Bloomfield
Beth Johnson Hysick
Bill Warwick
Bob Mueller
Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNObdesign
Carolyn Klepser
Catherine Myers
Chris Beahan, Pella Commercial Windows

Claudia Becker
Courtney Disston
David Lo
David Schultz, DAS Architects
Dolores Curtis
Doug Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architects
George Badey
Ian Toner, Toner Architects
James Pearlstein, Pearl Properties
Jay Ernst
Jay Farrell
Jay Rockafellow, DAS Architects
Jeff Gelles
Jenn Patrino, Tier View Development
Jill Wasserman
Jody Greenblatt
Judy Neiswander
Justino Navarro
Keith Scheurich
Justin Krik, Esq., Krik Law
Lia Gentile
Linda Baldwin
Lisa Ernst
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Lorna Katz Lawson
Meredith Ferleger, Esq., Dilworth Paxson
Michael Badey
Michael Ramos
Mike Stanton, Barton Partners
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Patricia Freeland
Paul Boni, Esq.
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties
Richard M. Heiberger
Rick Herskovitz
Russell Fulton
Sam Katovitch, Toner Architects
Sandra Folzer
Sharon Gornstein
Stephanie Pennypacker
Steven Rubin
Sudev Sheth
Suzanne Biemiller
Tina Marie Hartnett
Valerie Rushmere

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1423 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building; construct seven-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: K of C Federal Credit Union

Applicant: David Lo

History: 1980; K of C Federal Credit Union; Arthur Basciano, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

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

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for the construction of a seven-story, mixed-use building with ground floor commercial space and apartments on floors two to seven. The existing two-story building was constructed in 1980 and is non-contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. Demolition of the existing building can be approved without a finding of financial hardship or public necessity. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of similar proposals at the September, October, and December 2023 meetings. The applicant withdrew consideration of the September and October proposals prior to Historical Commission's review. The Historical Commission heard the December proposal at its January 2024 meeting. The Historical Commission concluded that a seven-story height was appropriate with sufficient setbacks. The proposed eight-foot setback was deemed insufficient.

The revised proposal calls for a 75-foot-tall building, plus a parapet and pilot house, in the middle of the 1400 block of Spruce Street, the primary elevation, and the 1400 block of Bach Place, the secondary elevation. A nine-foot setback is proposed at the fourth story and an eleven-foot setback is proposed at the sixth story. A cornice at the fourth story relates to those of adjacent contributing buildings. The ground floor commercial storefront is mostly glass, surrounded by red brick. Floors Two to Seven of the Spruce Street façade feature three bays and windows are one-over-one of unspecified material. The windows have been adjusted to better conform to the pattern on adjacent structures. Floors Four to Seven on the east and west elevations will be clad in metal panels while the north elevation will be clad with cementitious panels.

All buildings on the north side of the 1400 block of Spruce Street and the south side of the 1400 block of Bach Place, except for the easternmost parcel, are within the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District and all but one is contributing. These buildings are three-and-one-half stories tall, except for the western-most structure, which is 19 stories tall. At the east end of the block, the 20-story Atlantic Building is not within the historic district. The contemporary Kimmel Center on the south side of Spruce Street is also not within the district. There is little historically significant context fronting Bach Place; only one building's primary facade fronts this street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct seven-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MARCH 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o Although the setback design endeavors to minimize height differences with the three-and-a-half story buildings extending along the 1400 block of Spruce Street, the proposed building remains noticeably taller. The application does not meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed building could be removed from the historic site in the future, leaving all surrounding contributing structures intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- David Lo and Steven Rubin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman expressed an ongoing concern about the proposed building's scale and materials, which are out of place in the middle of this block.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the applicant is seeking final approval but that the submission lacks many of the exterior details.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the brick on the front elevation should wrap the corners at least a bay's width so that it does not appear to be "brick wallpaper."
- Mr. McCoubrey described the proposed setback as insufficient.
- Mr. Detwiler said it appeared that the interior floorplans were driving the design and conflicting with the exterior having an appropriate appearance for the historic district.
- Mr. Rubin responded to the Architectural Committee's feedback, noting that the design team had already cut into the planned square footage to create a setback, resulting in smaller apartments. He noted that further shrinkage of the living space would compromise the financial viability of the project.
 - o Mr. Rubin further noted that the project had produced detailed renderings for the initial proposal and had not done so for the subsequent revisions and resubmissions as a cost-saving measure.
- Ms. Stein acknowledged that the designers have made significant changes to the materials of the proposed building in response to comments from the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission, but that the proposed massing in the middle of a block of mostly three-story buildings is still too large.
 - o Mr. Rubin answered that cutting the living space by 1,000 square feet was an attempt to address the massing.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the interior plan has largely not changed and contended that a proposal that shifted much of the interior space to the rear of the lot might be more acceptable.

- Mr. Lo pointed to the example at 262 S. 16th Street, which was offered as a positive precedent during a previous review. He suggested that the setbacks on this proposed building were similar to that building and asked for clarification on the suggested setbacks in this case.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the 16th Street building appears to be a four-story structure with receding floors above it, whereas this proposal looks like a four-story building on top of a three-story building.
 - o Ms. Gutterman points out that 16th Street is a narrower street than Spruce Street, limiting the visibility of the upper floors of the 16th Street building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Given the position of the property in the middle of the block and the height of neighboring buildings, the massing is too large at the front of the property and is out of scale with its surroundings.
- The submission lacks detail including architectural finishes and perspective views showing the proposed building in context.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1423 Spruce St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 6915 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Construct four-story apartment building on subdivided parcel

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tier View Development

Applicant: Zach Jones, CANNO Design

History: 1798; Joseph Gorgas House

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 6901 Germantown Avenue, located at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Gorgas Lane, includes a late-eighteenth-century stone structure, the Joseph Gorgas House, and a large parking lot at the side and rear. The property's large open space historically functioned as a side and rear yard. Aside from a wood-frame shed or stable building at the rear of the stone house, historic maps show that no other structures existed on the site. The property was recently subdivided along the western edge of the Joseph Gorgas House to create 6903 Germantown Avenue, which was then consolidated with the neighboring property at 6915 Germantown Avenue. This application proposes to construct a four-story, multi-unit building on this newly consolidated lot with frontages on Germantown Avenue and Gorgas Lane.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier version of this project in December 2023 and then significantly revised the design for the January 2024 meeting of the Historical Commission. This submission responds to feedback offered at those meetings by increasing the setback from the front corner of the Joseph Gorgas House compared to what was originally proposed and using materials that better respond to the historic structure.

This proposal specifically responds to comments from the Historical Commission, which encouraged the design team to use early twentieth-century apartment buildings in the area as inspiration, breaking up the façade with vertical and horizontal lines.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story, multi-unit building on a consolidated parcel that includes a portion of a designated property.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The new work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.
 - o The new work is differentiated from the old and is compatible in materials, but not in massing, size, and scale to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
 - o The application partially satisfies this Standard.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - o *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MARCH 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- o *Recommended: Ensuring that the addition is subordinate and secondary to the historic building and is compatible in massing, scale, materials, relationships of solids to voids, and color.*
- o *Recommended: Distinguishing the addition from the original building by setting it back from the wall plane of the historic building.*
- o *Recommended: Locating new construction far enough away from the historic building, when possible, where it will be minimally visible and will not negatively affect the building's character, the site, or setting.*
- o The façade facing Germantown Avenue is closer to the street than is typical for residential buildings in the neighborhood.
- o The proposed building does not defer to the Joseph Gorgas House and is sited closer to Germantown Avenue than the historic structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the new construction is set farther away from the Joseph Gorgas House, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:36:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carey Jackson Yonce and developer Jenn Patrino represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Gutterman asked for clarity about the distance between the proposed building and the Joseph Gorgas House at the closest point.
 - o Mr. Jackson Yonce noted that the distance is approximately 10 feet.
 - o Mr. Detwiler opined that the new building is still too close to the historic resource. He further suggested that there should be more “breathing room” around the building to follow the established pattern of the neighborhood.
 - o Ms. Lukachik suggested that there should be a corridor between the Gorgas House and the privacy fence.
 - o Mr. Yonce said the team would be open to shifting the fence.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the brick should wrap the corner on the facade along Gorgas Lane.
- Mr. Detwiler complimented the design team's attention to detail but asked for more rendered views, showing how the Gorgas Lane elevation relates to the Joseph Gorgas House.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the diaper pattern on the Northern elevation should be reconsidered.
 - o Mr. Yonce explained that it was a reference to the roofline of the adjacent library.
 - o Mr. Detwiler encouraged the applicant to move that wall away from the property line so that it could have windows and not be a blank wall.
- Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Stein remarked that the proposed building remains too large.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested breaking up the main elevation further into more “episodic” elements.
- Mr. Detwiler described the proposed building as looming over the historic building and asked that the massing be stepped down to address that issue.

- Mr. Cluver asked what was planned for the roof.
 - o Mr. Yonce answered that there is a small roof deck planned with a pilot house that can be seen on renderings from previous iterations of the project.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked that a roof plan be included in further presentations.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the proposed building does not respect the historic resource. He further suggested that the private yards should use some sort of fencing rather than an opaque privacy wall.
- Ms. Stein asked for more clarification of the relationship between the elevation along Gorgas Lane and the neighboring residences down that street.
 - o Mr. Detwiler asked for more renderings of the relationship of that facade to its surroundings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert expressed opposition to the application, noting the way the proposed building wraps around the Joseph Gorgas House.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, thanked the architect for moving in a positive direction with this project. He noted that there is a conflict between the zoning and the existing built environment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The material details of the proposed building are an improvement on previous proposals.
- Additional views of the portion of the proposed building's Gorgas Lane elevation would be useful to evaluate the building's relationship to the historic house and other neighboring structures.
- The privacy fences come too close to the Joseph Gorgas House.
- The overall massing still looms over the Joseph Gorgas House and could be improved by pulling it back or lowering the height near the historic structure.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, owing to the proximity of the proposed building to the Joseph Gorgas House.

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

ITEM: 6915 Germantown Ave MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 208-10 REX AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition and two freestanding houses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William H. Baltzell

Applicant: Jeffery Watson, BartonPartners

History: 1857; William L. Hirst/H. Louis Duhring House; additions 1893; 1927 by H. Louis Duhring

Individual Designation: 2/12/2021

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition and two freestanding residential buildings on the parcel at 208-10 Rex Avenue. The existing property features a large Italianate villa with an Arts and Crafts addition designed by H. Louis Duhring, who was also the owner of the property from 1919 to 1946. The historic building is surrounded by a large yard and has featured a semi-circular driveway since at least 1876.

The Historical Commission and Architectural Committee have reviewed several iterations of this project. Most recently, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application at its December 2023 meeting that addressed many of the Committee and Commission's earlier concerns and voted to recommend approval of the addition, provided the existing dormer on the rear of the Duhring addition is maintained and the masonry on the addition is lowered to first-floor sill height and below, and existing steel windows be maintained or replaced in kind; and conceptual approval of the freestanding houses. Following that meeting, the applicants revised components of the design to address the Committee's comments about the dormers and cladding of the new construction and additions, but also revised the site plan, shifting the new construction closer to the street and more into view from the public right-of-way. The revised application was presented at the Historical Commission's February 2024 meeting. At that time, the Historical Commission found that the freestanding buildings should be shifted back at least 10 feet on the site; that the color of the siding of the proposed freestanding buildings should be less creamy and more recessive; and that the stone base on the proposed freestanding buildings, particularly the elevation facing Rex Avenue, should be lowered and larger windows installed in the garage to create more traditional window proportions. The Commission remanded the application to the Architectural Committee, and the applicants have since revised the application

further to address the concerns raised, including by shifting the freestanding buildings back on the site, adjusting the color of the cladding, lowering the street-facing windows, and replacing the concrete curbing along the driveway with pavers.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate historic building.
- Construct rear addition.
- Construct two free-standing buildings and new driveway

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed project involves limited removal of historic materials and retains the spatial relationship of the historic building to the curved driveway and large yard.
 - o The new construction will be differentiated from but compatible with the historic materials, features, and massing to protect the property and its environment.
 - o The application satisfies this Standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o If the proposed rear addition and new construction buildings were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would remain, satisfying Standard 10.
- *Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction, Recommended:*
 - o *Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - o *Constructing a new addition on a secondary or non-character-defining elevation and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.*
 - o *Ensuring that the addition is subordinate and secondary to the historic building and is compatible in massing, scale, materials, relationships of solids to voids, and color.*
 - o *Distinguishing the addition from the original building by setting it back from the wall plane of the historic building.*
 - o *Locating new construction far enough away from the historic building, when possible, where it will be minimally visible and will not negatively affect the building's character, the site, or setting.*
 - The proposed rear addition is located on the least visible elevation, is subordinate to the historic building, and is set back from the wall plane of the historic building.
 - The new construction is located far enough away from the historic building to limit the impact on the building's character, site and setting.
 - The application satisfies this Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Guideline for New Exterior Additions and Related New Construction.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Meredith Ferleger, developer Mike Stanton, and architect Bill Warwick represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Stanton explained that, following the previous Historical Commission meeting, they revised the site plan to set the first single-family house back an additional 10 feet so that it is in line with the Duhring addition. He noted that other substantial changes to the site plan include the removal of the curbing shown in previous iterations and addition of Belgian block pavers throughout the site and at the three driveway aprons and as a border along the driveways. He explained that they have retained the rear dormer, cleaned up the drawings, made changes to the design and fenestration of the new construction and lowered stone cladding line per the previous Architectural Committee's and Historical Commission's comments. He noted that they will be using real Wissahickon schist for the stone cladding. He explained that they have been working with the Rex Avenue Neighbors Association (RANA) for two years to come to an agreement on the site plan and design and noted that RANA submitted a letter outlining four key items. He noted that they have addressed items one through three in terms of the site plan, use of real schist, and color of the new construction cladding, which will be a Hardi material in taupe or khaki. For the fourth item, the driveway, he explained that they had previously shown pavers next to historic house to reduce the blacktop, but that there have been differing opinions among the various groups, so they have now eliminated the pavers up the driveway and added Belgian block aprons and borders to reduce the blacktop mass. He clarified that the sidewalk on Crefeld will be handled through the Streets Department and coordinating with the neighbors.
- Mr. McCoubrey commended the development of the design, noting that the Historical Commission had a chance to see an in-between iteration that the Architectural Committee has not had a chance to see, and that he appreciates the changes that have been made.
- Mr. Detwiler also thanked the applicants for their revisions and for working with the community, opining that it is a much better project all around and a good example of how to not overwhelm the historic building and the site and to work with neighbors.
- Mr. Detwiler commented on some details of the existing building, noting that it will be critical for the staff to closely review window replacement, particularly of the metal windows on the Duhring addition. He explained that it is challenging to get contemporary metal windows that have the same details as historic steel windows and encouraged the applicants and staff to pay attention to the thickness of the muntins and other details. He argued that Duhring was an extremely important architect, and this was his own house, so the details of the metal windows on the Duhring wing are very important. He also noted that the materials sheet shows textured Hardie siding, but that smooth shakes should be used and the reveals of the siding on the historic bays should match the original reveals, which is sometimes more challenging in a substitute material. He also suggested making a mock-up of the schist cladding in the field so that it appears consistent with the surroundings.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed, noting that it can be difficult to achieve the same look with stone veneer as opposed to full-depth stone.

- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the landscape design, noting that the viewshed of the historic building from the street across an open yard is significant. He noted that a tree is shown in the middle of the yard in one of the renderings and encouraged the applicants to avoid trees in the line of sight from the street to the historic house and to leave the view unobstructed.
 - o Mr. Stanton responded that they could try to soften the views. He explained that they were trying to reduce the visibility of the new construction per previous comments.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed that the landscape is very important and that attempts should be made to screen the new buildings but keep a line of sight to the historic property and preserve the historic building more in its traditional context.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned key note number 1 that indicates that existing windows will be replaced in kind and asked for the applicants' intent.
 - o Mr. Stanton responded that there are a lot of different existing window configurations and types and that the intent is to repair as much as possible and replace with new windows to match the existing windows if repair is infeasible.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro asked if they intend to replace steel windows with new steel windows.
 - o Mr. Stanton responded affirmatively, reiterating that they intend to replace the windows with new windows to match the existing details.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed that the window component of the project is significant, and that repair is better than replacement, when possible, especially for steel windows, but any effort to restore would go a long way to maintaining the historic integrity of the building. He argued that the steel window design is critical to the Duhring addition, and it is important to get the details right.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the window details should be reviewed by the Architectural Committee, because this is too unique of a property for the staff to be trusted with the review.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that, while the window details are important, if the project were brought to the staff without the addition, the staff would be authorized to review and approve the replacement of windows to match the original without review by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro continued to question the window and door functionality and details.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that window and door replacement can be capably reviewed by the staff, and that, if there is a change that does not reflect the historic appearance, the staff will refer the design to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission for further input.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Courtney Disston, the chair of the architecture and design committee of RANA, thanked the developer for working with the neighbors and noted that her committee will continue to work with the developer on the driveway and sidewalk renovations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The staff should carefully review all window and door replacement details, as well as cladding material details.
- Louis Duhring was a significant Chestnut Hill architect, and his addition should be treated as sensitively as the main block of the house, including the details of metal

- window replacement.
- The fiber-cement shakes should be smooth rather than textured, particularly on the historic house, and should match the reveals of the existing siding.
- A mockup of the Wissahickon schist cladding should be done on site to ensure compatibility with the historic property.
- While the new construction should be screened with landscaping, views of the historic building across the lawn should be left unobstructed.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project involves limited removal of historic materials and retains the spatial relationship of the historic building to the curved driveway and large yard, and the new construction will be differentiated from but compatible with the historic materials, features, and massing to protect the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.
- If the proposed rear addition and new construction buildings were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would remain, satisfying Standard 10.
- The proposed rear addition is located on the least visible elevation, is subordinate to the historic building, and is set back from the wall plane of the historic building. The new construction is located far enough away from the historic building to limit the impact on the building's character, site and setting, satisfying the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Guideline for New Exterior Additions and Related New Construction.

ITEM: 208-10 Rex Ave MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2200-04 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: George J. Badey III

Applicant: Michael Drury, Seiler + Drury Architecture

History: 1904; Henry Butcher House; Field & Medary, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house at 2200-04 Locust Street.

The property is a significant historic resource to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish section of upper roof.
- Construct roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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.*
 - o Demolition is limited to a small, non-visible section of the upper roof. All proposed work is reversible and could be removed in the future; therefore, this element of the project meets Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The proposed roof addition could meet the Roofs Guideline if the pilot house was lowered in height by one to two feet. The roof mockup shows the flag visible 12 feet above the roof deck from viewpoints looking toward primary facades along Locust and S. 22nd Streets. The height of the pilot house is currently proposed to be 10 feet. If the pilot house is reduced in height by one to two feet, it will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way along Locust Street and S. 22nd Street.
 - o The proposed roof deck and railing could meet the Roofs Guideline if they are moved back five feet from Locust Street (east) and S. 22nd Street (north) elevations. With the additional setback, the railing will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way along Locust Street and S. 22nd Street.
 - o Elements of the roof deck structure and railing on the west elevation may be visible from the east further down Locust Street, but they will likely be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the height of the pilot house is reduced and roof deck is set back further along Locust Street and S. 22nd Street, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 1:41:52

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Audrey Gusick and Douglas Seiler, owner George Badey, and attorney Justin Krik represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gusick briefly summarized the project and acknowledged the staff's recommendation. She said that, in response to the staff's comments, they are prepared to reduce the pilot house by one foot. Ms. Gusick added they will also move the deck railing back three feet from the S. 22nd Street elevation. She noted they do not believe the railing on Locust Street will be visible in the proposed location, and to maintain as large a roof deck as possible, they prefer to keep the Locust Street railing where it is shown in the current application.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the pilot house. He pointed to sheet A-4.0 of the application and commented on reducing the pilot house. Mr. Detwiler observed the stair slope leading up to the pilot house and said that it is not really necessary for the pilot house to be as large shown. He asked the architect for background on the pilot house design. He noted they would gain more deck space if the pilot house size was reduced.
 - o Ms. Gusick acknowledged how it appears in the drawing but explained that the head clearance height is only seven feet at the top of the stairs. She said that the slope of the pilot house was designed to make it invisible from the public right-of-way because they knew that the top of the pilot house would be somewhat visible.
 - o Mr. Seiler pointed out that the height of the lowest part of the pilot house slope aligns with the deck railing.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the height of the pilot house and contended that the pilot house would be visible and that its height should be reduced.
 - o Ms. Gusick stated that, based on the staff's recommendation, they plan to lower the highest point of the pilot house from 10 to nine feet.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the amount of glass used in the pilot house will make it visible.
 - o Ms. Gusick responded that, if they lowered the roof of the pilot house to nine feet, the only part of the pilot house that would be visible from the public right-of-way would be the top of the pilot house roof, which is not glass.
- Ms. Detwiler inquired about the potential for a roof mockup that the staff could review in person.
 - o Ms. Gusick said they completed a study at the start of the project and placed flags in key locations to determine visibility from the public right-of-way. Photographs showing a flag mockup at specific heights were included in their application.
 - o Ms. Gutterman requested revised photographs and renderings to be included with the application presented at the Historical Commission meeting in April.
 - o Ms. Gusick and Mr. Seiler confirmed this would be done.
- Mr. Badey explained he has owned this building since 2010 and his law firm is on the lower levels. He said he values the historic character of the building and is sensitive to the Historical Commission's concerns. Mr. Badey pointed out that the Roofs Guideline states that roof additions should be "minimally visible", and he believes

with the revisions it will meet this guideline. He added that he will have a residence on the fourth floor of the building and a roof deck above and requested that the Architectural Committee recommend approval of the application with the revisions proposed by the architect. Mr. Badey noted his goal is to have the deck construction completed this year.

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the roof chimney would be raised as part of this project.
 - o Ms. Gusick said it is not an active chimney and is therefore not impacted by the roof deck project.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the condition of the roof.
 - o Mr. Badey said the roof is in good condition and has been prepared for this project.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicant agreed to reduce the height of the pilot house by one foot and set back the roof deck railing by three feet from the S. 22nd Street elevation.
- The applicant agreed to revise their application, including the roof mockups and renderings, prior to the 2024 Historical Commission meeting in April.
- The proposed revisions will make the roof deck's pilot house and railing inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Demolition is limited to a small, non-visible section of the upper roof. All proposed work is reversible and could be removed in the future; therefore, this element of the project meets Standard 10.
- The proposed roof addition could meet the Roofs Guideline if the pilot house was lowered in height by one foot. The roof mockup shows the flag visible 12 feet above the roof deck from viewpoints looking toward primary facades along Locust and S. 22nd Streets. The height of the pilot house is currently proposed to be 10 feet. If the pilot house is reduced in height by one foot, it will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way along Locust Street and S. 22nd Street.
- The proposed roof deck and railing could meet the Roofs Guideline if they are moved back five feet from the S. 22nd Street or north elevation. With the additional setback, the railing will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way along both Locust Street and S. 22nd Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the height of the pilot house is reduced and the roof deck is set back further along S. 22nd Street, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 2200-04 Locust St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 627 N 16TH ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 627 N 16TH LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition on an Italianate twin at a contributing property in the Spring Garden Historic District. The building was constructed in 1875 and is three stories tall with a pitched roof and prominent cornice. The addition will be located at the rear of the building and span the full width of the lot. The application proposes to demolish the three-story rear wall of the property along with a one-story rear shed addition and construct an addition at the rear of the building that will expand the footprint and extend slightly higher than the current rear ell of the historic building. It will be clad in fiber cement panels and feature six windows on the rear elevation but none on the side, party walls. The rear of the building is visible both obliquely from the front on 16th Street looking down the side of the building and prominently from the side and rear along neighboring Wallace Street. The addition will be visible both from 16th and Wallace Streets and particularly will present a large blank wall to the Wallace Street side.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a three-story rear addition.

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.*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MARCH 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- o The proposed new addition does not meet Standard 9. It is too large, wide, and is not compatible with the historic materials, massing, size, and scale of the historic building or district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:03:35

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Ian Toner and Sam Katovich and owner Anthony Mascieri represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Katovitch offered to answer questions about the project and pointed out that they are also proposing replacement of the side windows of the property.
- Mr. Cluver commented on the size of the new addition and described it as out of character with the original building and district. He added that it appears that it will have a prominent view from Wallace Street.
 - o The applicant confirmed the visibility from Wallace Street.
 - o Mr. Cluver added that the addition will add a mass to the rear that is larger than the main block of the house and appears to fill the site completely.
 - o Mr. Detwiler described the addition as “literally just a box.”
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the application does not include a site plan showing the relationship to the adjoining house and yard. He also highlighted the visibility of the addition from Wallace Street.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the proposed addition is also wider than the main block of the house.
 - o The applicant asked for some more specific feedback about the addition. He asked if the Architectural Committee’s main issues were regarding the massing and size or the detailing and material choices.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that the combination of material choices and massing are together the issue. A smaller, simpler addition may be acceptable and a larger and better detailed one may be as well. He further described the proposed addition as being too large and not in keeping with the neighborhood, so it will easily stand out.
- Ms. Stein commented that if the rear portion of the addition facing Wallace Street was, for example, clad with brick and featured windows on it, it would likely be more acceptable. She added that that façade really is part of the streetscape and as proposed, it is treated as a blank wall clad with mundane materials that do not fit within the district.
 - o The applicant asked for clarification regarding the suggestion to put windows on the wall facing Wallace Street.
 - o Ms. Stein clarified that as proposed, that wall is party wall and windows on it would be prohibited as is, but perhaps it needs to be changed to accommodate windows.
- The applicant asked about the proposed materials for the addition. Specifically, he asked if they opposed the use of fiber cement panels.
 - o Mr. Detwiler replied that ideally, it would be masonry or stucco.
 - o Ms. Gutterman suggested a combination of materials, perhaps brick on the rear

wall and for a partial return at the corner. She added that the overall starkness of the proposal overpowers the original building. She also suggested that the applicants rethink how the walls are treated and if windows could be added, it would also be an improvement.

- Mr. Detwiler commented that the historic building is rather simple but has a refinement to it that should be integrated into the proposed design. He added that it does not need to be complex but needs to be more in keeping with the district.
- Mr. McCoubrey described the existing rear ell of the surrounding buildings as having sloped roofs and being less intrusive. He described the addition as extending too far out and filling the entire lot. It will be highly visible, and it interrupts the rhythm of built and open space at the rears of the houses on the block.
 - o The applicant confirmed that the design currently extends out to the maximum permitted lot coverage.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that the massing seems to have been planned just for maximum coverage, and not for the design or its integration with the historic character of the area.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lisa Ernst, owner of the property directly to the north, opposed the application. She highlighted the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and how this proposal does not meet them.
- Jonathan Ohler, owner of the property attached to the subject, opposed the application. He was concerned with the size of the proposal.
- Jill Wasserman, a near neighbor, opposed the application. She added that the scale of the proposed addition is out of character with the block.
- Andy Wasserman, a near neighbor, opposed the application. He was concerned with the size of the proposed addition compared with the rears of the other houses on the block.
- Justino Navarro of the Spring Garden Civic Association and Spring Garden Community Development Corporation opposed the application. He added that neither organization supports this proposal and thinks it is too large and intrusive for the historic district. He also added that the materials are incompatible with the character of the district. He urged the Architectural Committee to recommend denial of the application.
- Andrew Biggin, a near neighbor, opposed the application. He objected to the size of the addition as it impacts the rears of the houses on the block and is visible from surrounding streets.
- Patricia Freeland of the Spring Garden community Development Corporation opposed the application. She agreed with the previous issues raised by other speakers. She also wished to see any revised plans returned to the Architectural Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed addition will be larger than the historic building in height and width and extend almost to the limits of the lot.
- The materials on the proposed addition are not compatible with the character of the historic district.
- The proposed addition will be highly visible from nearby public rights-of-way, particularly from Wallace Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9. It is too large, wide, and is not compatible with the historic materials, massing, size, and scale of the historic building or district.

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

ITEM: 627 N 16th St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 336 S 17TH ST

Proposal: Enlarge existing roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lia Gentile

Applicant: Elizabeth Johnson, Brighton Architecture and Design LLC

History: 1840; alterations, c. 1900

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enlarge an existing roof deck at 336 South 17th Street, a contributing property in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The property is situated on the southwest corner of S. 17th and Panama Streets. This block of Panama is a narrow dead-end segment of the street, with both garages and residential properties fronting the street. The existing deck is 11' x 16', with a portion being roughly 7' x 13'. The proposed roof deck extension would enlarge the deck by 5' x 28'-8" and result in a zero-foot setback from Panama Street. There is currently, and would continue to be, a 15' setback from S. 17th Street.

The property owner originally applied for a roof deck at this property in early 2020 and the matter was reviewed by the Architectural Committee on 25 February 2020. The original proposal called for a roof deck that was 11' x 37' with a 7'-3" setback from S. 17th Street and a 5' setback from Panama Street and a nine-foot-tall pilot house. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval provided the deck was set back from the front façade to align with the pilot house; the height of the pilot house roof was minimized; the structural beams were revised on the Panama Street side to reduce visibility; and the back of the deck was moved away from the rear wall, with the staff to review details. The architect

revised the plans to incorporate that feedback and the matter was placed on the Consent Agenda of the March 2020 Historical Commission meeting. Owing to the pandemic, plans were put on hold and a building permit was finally issued in May 2023.

The property owner contends that the property has a small, concrete pad as a yard, with no real usable outdoor space, and the roof deck, as built, has not provided sufficient outdoor space for the owner's needs. The property owner has indicated that she is very willing to consider any and all design options, materials, etc. that might be agreeable to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Extend existing roof deck by 5' x 28'-8"

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed deck does not meet Standard 9 as the roof deck, which would be visible from both S. 17th Street and Panama Street, would interfere with the historic integrity of the property and its environment, especially the narrow and picturesque Panama Street.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The proposed deck does not meet the Roofs Guideline, owing to the high visibility of the proposed deck from both South 17th Street and Panama Street.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:34:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Elizabeth Johnson represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The applicant noted that she was not the original architect on the project, and when the first project was proposed, the Historical Commission required a 15-foot setback from 17th Street and a reduction of height to the pilot house. The applicant noted that the deck, as built, retains a five-foot setback from Panama Street and that they would be looking to fill in that five feet, which would also require a zoning variance. The applicant stated that the property owner would consider any option that might be amenable to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission that would allow the roof deck to be maximized.
 - o Mr. Cluver commented that there was a reason for five-foot setbacks and in his observation, when roof decks extend to the edge of a building, they appear to be

extending beyond the building's edge. He noted that they take on an aggressive appearance, and that he did not feel comfortable approving an extension.

- The applicant questioned whether consideration would be given to a deck that only extended to the wall rather than to the edge of the roof. She noted that this could appear as an extension of the wall.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that this would appear as a parapet which would not be in keeping with the character of this building which has a very defined cornice.
- Ms. Gutterman added that, in her opinion, not every building is appropriate for a roof deck and the deck proposed in this application would be overwhelming. She noted that there was a reason the previous dimensions were approved in the original application. Ms. Gutterman opined that the roof deck, as built, does provide the owner with outdoor space. She echoed Mr. Cluver's opinion that the proposed application would be overwhelming to the building.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that he remembered the original application for a larger roof deck in 2020 and he noted that the Architectural Committee members settled on the current setbacks of the deck because they felt a larger deck would be too much for the house and its site, setting, and viewshed. He declared that his opinion has not changed since the 2020 application.
- The applicant noted that the five-foot setback in question was not a discussion point in the original application, which was only arguing the setback from 17th Street.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey explained that the five-foot setback is the absolute minimum for a corner property, and oftentimes can require more than five feet due to the diagonal visibility.
- The applicant noted that some example photographs were added to the application which show some properties that have roof decks with no setback from the roofline, highlighting that they all seemed to share a decorative railing motif and asked if this could be considered for this application.
 - o Ms. Chantry noted that one of the examples, 321 Chadwick Street, was built without a permit which. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation. She continued that 321 Chadwick then sought legalization of the deck as constructed through the Historical Commission, which was denied as constructed, but given approval if set back. She noted that this legalization work had yet to be done.
- Mr. Cluver summarized that the Architectural Committee had already recommended approval for the largest deck that they felt comfortable recommending.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- A corner property requires at least a five-foot setback for a roof deck.
- An application for a roof deck at this location was reviewed by the Architectural Committee in 2020 and at that time, the Architectural Committee recommended approval for the largest deck they felt comfortable recommending.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 as the roof deck, as proposed, would be highly visible from both 17th Street and Panama Street.
- The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline, owing to the high visibility of the

proposed deck from both 17th Street and Panama Street.

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

ITEM: 336 S 17th 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 708 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Construct 35-story mixed-use tower

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: JR Sansom Partners LLC

Applicant: Meredith Ferleger, Dilworth Paxson LLP

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Jewelers' Row Historic District, Non-contributing, pending

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a 35-story mixed-use retail and residential tower at 708 Sansom Street. The property known as 708 Sansom Street is an assemblage of vacant lots formerly known as 702, 704, 706, and 710 Sansom Street and 128 S. 7th Street. The property is in the proposed Jewelers' Row Historic District. The district nomination is pending before the Historical Commission, which continued the review of the nomination in May 2020 until the Historical Commission resumes in-person meetings.

The proposed building would be 35 stories in height, with a 31-story tower on a four-story podium. The building would have frontages on Sansom Street and S. 7th Street. The entrance to the retail space would be located on Sansom Street. The entrance to the residential lobby, parking, and loading dock would be located on 7th Street. The building would be clad in aluminum and glass. The top of the podium would align with the cornice height of the building to the west. Floors 5 to 20 would cantilever 7'-6" to the west, out over the building at 712-14 Sansom Street. Floors 21 to 35 would cantilever 4'-6" to the west.

The Historical Commission must determine the scope of its jurisdiction over this application, full jurisdiction or review-and-comment jurisdiction. Section 14-1005(4) of the preservation ordinance states that "the Historical Commission's scope of review of applications for building permits for construction, as defined herein, shall be limited to a 45-day period of comment."

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MARCH 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Section 14-203(76) of the ordinance defines “construction” as “the erection of a new building, structure, or object upon an undeveloped site.” Section 2.23 of the Historical Commission’s Rules & Regulations defines an “undeveloped site” as:

a property within an historic district which is not individually designated, to which the inventory in the historic district nomination attributes no historical, cultural, or archaeological value, and upon which no building or structure stood at the time of the designation of the historic district.

The site at 708 Sansom Street is not individually designated; the inventory for the proposed Jewelers’ Row Historic District does not attribute any value to the vacant lot; and no structure stands on the site currently. The site at 708 Sansom Street is an “undeveloped site.” However, some floors of the proposed building would cantilever 7’-6” over the property to the west, perhaps changing that determination. While the Historical Commission has reviewed and approved at least two applications involving towers with cantilevers over adjacent properties, neither involved an “undeveloped site.” Therefore, those cases do not shed any light on this question.

In February 2020, the Historical Commission reviewed and commented on an application proposing to construct a 24-story mixed-use retail and residential tower at this site at 708 Sansom Street. At that time, the Historical Commission concluded that its jurisdiction was limited to review-and-comment because the site was “undeveloped.” The 24-story tower project was eventually abandoned.

If the Historical Commission determines that it enjoys full, not review-and-comment, jurisdiction over this site because it is not “undeveloped,” owing to the cantilever, then the application is subject to the 90-day clock in Section 14-1005(6)(f) of the preservation ordinance. For properties under consideration for designation like this one, the Department of Licenses & Inspections is prohibited from issuing a building permit unless the Historical Commission approves the application, or the Historical Commission does not take a final action on the nomination within 90 days of the submission of the application. In other words, if the Historical Commission does not designate the district within 90 days of the submission of the application, the Department of Licenses & Inspections may issue the permit regardless of the Commission’s opinion of the proposal. The application was submitted on 12 March 2024. The 90-day review period will end on 10 June 2024, prior to the Historical Commission’s meeting on 14 June 2024. Given that the Historical Commission has no plans to resume in-person meetings in the next few months and has committed to providing new 60-day notice to property owners in the proposed district before resuming the review of the nomination for the Jewelers’ Row Historic District, it appears unlikely that the Historical Commission will complete the designation of the historic district within the allotted 90 days and the Department may issue the permit without the Commission’s approval.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct 35-story tower.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and*

architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

- o Given that the property where the tower will be constructed is a vacant lot, the new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 9. The four-story base or podium of the proposed building is not compatible with its environment in scale or architectural features, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9. It should be redesigned to be more compatible with the proposed historic district.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that, to satisfy Standard 9, the base of the proposed tower should be redesigned to be more compatible with the proposed historic district.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:45:08

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Meredith Ferleger, architects David Schultz and Jay Rockafellow, and developers Reed Slogoff and James Pearlstein represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Ferleger stated that she represents Pearl Properties. She noted that the Architectural Committee is likely very familiar with this site, owing to its review in 2020 of the proposed Toll Brothers tower for the site. She noted that the Historical Commission reviewed that application with review-and-comment jurisdiction. She stated that the tower that is currently proposed was developed after meetings with community representatives and various stakeholders. She noted that the proposed building would cantilever slightly over the building to the west, and therefore raises a jurisdictional question. She noted that the building cantilevers at the fifth story and above. The cantilever varies in depth between 4'-6" and 7'-6". She stated that the lot in question is an undeveloped site and that the correct level of review in this case should be review-and-comment, not full jurisdiction, because the cantilever extends into an easement. The easement does not create a separate legal ownership over the adjacent property and, as a result, should limit the jurisdiction to review-and-comment. She also noted that the Historical Commission seems very unlikely to complete its designation of the Jewelers' Row Historic District within 90 days of the submission of the application. She concluded that the development would enliven and strengthen Jewelers' Row. She noted that developers Reed Slogoff and James Pearlstein are in attendance and can answer any questions.
- Architects David Schultz and Jay Rockafellow presented the architectural plans to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Schultz explained that the building will be 35 stories tall and clad in copper or terra cotta color panels. The base or pedestal of the building aligns with the neighboring buildings. He explained that the cantilever to the west does not touch the adjacent building and is set back 12.5 feet from the front façade. He contended that the terra cotta color will blend with the brick in the area. He claimed that the tower appears to float above the base. Mr. Schultz displayed a series of elevations, sections, and renderings.
- Mr. Cluver stated that, setting the jurisdictional questions aside, the proposed building is too big and tall for the proposed historic district.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the construction of a 35-story building is not reversible. The historic district could not be restored to its prior appearance if the building were constructed. He objected to the tower wrapping around the house at the corner and

- to the underpinning that would be necessary to build the tower. He objected to the light that would emanate from the tower and to the projecting canopy at the parking entrance.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that, while the base corresponds to the height of the surrounding buildings, its features do not. He suggested revising the design of the base so that it is more compatible with the rhythms, scales, materials, and features of the historic buildings. The base should relate to its environment in a more accommodating and respectful way. He also objected to the canopy at the parking entrance.
 - Ms. Stein suggested that the Architectural Committee focus on the view of the base of the proposed building from the street, not the view of the tower from the air. She stated that the scale of the entrance canopy on 7th Street is too large. She said that it hovers over the street and will provide too much lighting at night. She also objected to the amount of glass at street level on Sansom Street because too much light will shine out at night. She suggested redesigning the storefront area to be more compatible with the historic district. She again asserted that the design of the base, not the tower, is important to consider in this context because the base will impact the people experiencing the building; the tower will not. She said that the base of the building, the first four stories, should be redesigned.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein and Mr. McCoubrey that the base should be redesigned to better blend with the surroundings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni, the chair of the zoning and historic preservation committee of the Society Hill Civic Association, introduced himself. He stated that the Historical Commission should assert full jurisdiction over this application. He stated that the property at 712-14 Sansom Street must be listed on the building permit application. He stated that he supports the comments made by the members of the Architectural Committee.
 - o Ms. Ferleger disagreed with Mr. Boni and stated that the property at 712-14 Sansom Street should not be listed on the building permit application. She stated that, other than the party wall, the proposed building will not in any way touch or connect to the building at 712-14 Sansom Street. There will be no openings in the party wall; it will be a simple party wall.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society stated that the four-story base should be redesigned to fit better with the context in exchange for building the tower. He objected to the canopy on 7th Street. He claimed that the canopy is “obnoxious.”
- Judy Neiswander, an architectural historian on the zoning and historic preservation committee of the Society Hill Civic Association, suggested a different color for the base of the tower.
- Rick Herskovitz a member of the zoning and historic preservation committee of the Society Hill Civic Association, stated that he is concerned with the base design. He expressed concerns about the canopy on 7th Street. He noted that his committee asked the architects to redesign the 7th Street façade of the base. He stated that the parking and loading needs reconsideration.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance nominated the Jewelers’ Row Historic District. He stated that this project highlights the problems confronted when the built environment and structures allowed by zoning differ significantly. He acknowledged that the design is very beautiful but is not appropriate for this site. He stated that the design of the base should be revised to add more masonry and eliminate some plate glass. The base should be redesigned for the

building to “be a good neighbor.” The base should be more contextual.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission reviewed an application for a tower for this site in 2020 and determined that it had review-and-comment jurisdiction over the application because it is an undeveloped site.
- The proposed building would cantilever out slightly over the building to the west but would not touch or connect to that building except at the shared party wall. There would be no openings or passageways from the tower to the adjacent building to the west.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The design of the four-story base or podium of the building is not compatible with the proposed historic district in design, scale, or features, and therefore fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- The four-story base or podium of the building should be redesigned to make it more compatible with the proposed historic district and to better relate to the pedestrian experience. The projecting canopy at the parking entrance on 7th Street should be reconsidered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial and suggested that the applicants focus on revisions to the podium of the building to make it more compatible with the proposed historic district and to better relate to the pedestrian experience.

ITEM: 708 Sansom St MOTION: Denial with suggestions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1827-31 BRANDYWINE ST

Proposal: Replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Valerie Rushmere

Applicant: Maggie McDevitt, Renewal by Andersen

History: 1875; Carriage Houses; cornice removed, all openings altered

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing six Anderson Fibrex windows on the front façades of these former carriage houses, historically associated with Green Street properties. The Brandywine Street buildings have been altered over the years and previously functioned as a heating and plumbing shop beginning in 1914, a floor layer's shop, and then a sheet metal shop beginning in the 1950s. According to zoning archive documents, it appears that many of the façade opening alterations date to the 1950s. No historic windows remain.

This application proposes replacement of two mansard windows and four second-floor windows with Andersen Renewal Series Fibrex double-hung inserts with no muntins. The application does not include drawings that show how the subframes of the Fibrex window would fit the existing frames. Based on a 1975 photograph showing two-over-two sash in the mansard windows, and the construction date of the buildings, the Historical Commission's staff concluded that two-over-two sash are appropriate throughout, and that an alternate material window could be appropriate for this particular property. However, the application does not provide sufficient information to understand if the Fibrex window can be installed in such a way that it does not build down the window opening.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing non-historic windows; install Fibrex windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing to incompleteness.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:21:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Window salesperson Keith Scheurich and property owner Valerie Rushmere represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MARCH 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Mr. Scheurich stated that wood window frames are intact throughout the building and will remain as part of the installation process. He explained that the new window insert goes into the existing frame.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the Fibrex material.
 - o Mr. Scheurich responded that Fibrex is a wood composite material and is not a clad window. He stated that it can be painted.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked if the color is integral or if it is surface applied.
 - o Mr. Scheurich responded that the windows come pre-finished in color, which is surface applied.
- Mr. Detwiler asked the staff about previous Renewal by Andersen applications.
 - o Ms. Chantry responded that only a few applications for Fibrex windows have gone before the Historical Commission, and in those cases the Renewal by Andersen sales representative was eventually able to provide the required drawings. She noted that the staff routinely approves this window in locations not visible from the public right-of-way. She noted that this building could be a candidate for this type of window owing to the fact that no historic windows remain on the building, the altered nature of the openings, and the surrounding context.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the application lacks sufficient information about how the new windows will integrate with the existing frames, sills, and heads.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that drawings are needed of a standard detail for each condition showing a head, sill, and jamb.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the staff's research shows two-over-two sash in the mansard.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the application does not provide muntin profile details. He stated that the muntins should be simulated-divided-light, not sandwiched between the glass or snap-in.
- Ms. Rushmere, the property owner, commented on the context of the block, stating that her property is right across the street from the Carpenters Union Hall which has huge modern metal windows. She stated that there are multiple surface parking lots surrounding her property, in addition to garages and the side of an apartment complex. She asked that the Architectural Committee take the unusual context into account. She stated that her building does not match any other one on the block. She stated her preference for windows without muntins.
 - o Ms. Gutterman explained that more information is needed to be able to review the application. She stated that this product is an option, but section drawings are needed, and the sash should be two-over-two simulated-divided-light rather than one-over-one.
 - o Mr. Detwiler explained that a window replacement project is an opportunity to restore a building back to its historically accurate appearance with replicas of the original windows.
 - o Ms. Rushmere questioned the appearance of other windows on her block.
 - o Mr. Detwiler explained that her property is classified as contributing to the historic district, and that other properties on her block may be classified as non-contributing.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MARCH 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application does not provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the Fibrex windows can be installed in such a way that do not build down the window openings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed windows do not match the historic windows in design or materials and therefore fail to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 1827-31 Bainbridge St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 502-04 S JUNIPER ST

Proposal: Construct single-family residence

Review Requested: Review In-Concept

Owner: James Ernst

Applicant: James Ernst

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a single-family residence at 502-04 S. Juniper Street. At its 8 March 2024 meeting, the Historical Commission voted to approve the demolition of the building at 504 S. Juniper Street, owing to a finding of financial hardship. As part of that application, architectural plans were provided which showed a reconstruction of the three-story historic building at 504 S. Juniper Street, with a four-story adjacent “addition.” However, the approval of demolition was pursuant to a finding of financial hardship and was not contingent upon the building at 504 S. Juniper Street being reconstructed. This in-concept application has been submitted with two options for new construction, one being the bi-level option included as an information-only part of the financial hardship application, and a second option being a level four-story option, with the 504 S. Juniper Street portion taking its design cues from the historic building, but rising to the height of the adjacent addition so that the interior floor heights are aligned. In both options, the “addition” component has been revised in several ways based on comments from the Architectural Committee during its review of the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MARCH 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

financial hardship application. These revisions include removal of a Juliet balcony, widening of the garage door piers, and salvaging and reinstalling the three marble steps at 504 S. Juniper Street. The property owner is also seeking approval of a small roof deck, either contained to the 502 S. Juniper Street portion, or spanning further if approval is granted for the four-story option.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct single-family residence.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed reconstruction in the bi-level option with the four-story "addition" provides an appropriate massing, height, scale, materials, and features to project the integrity of the environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept of the bi-level option, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:36:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the in-concept application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner James Ernst represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Ernst explained that he provided two options for his in-concept review, but very much prefers the level four-story option which is why he had his architect provide renderings for the four-story option only. He stated that he asked his architect to change from a pilot house to a roof hatch entry for the proposed roof deck, to minimize visibility from the public right-of-way. He concluded that he looks forward to incorporating comments from the Architectural Committee into a design to be submitted for final approval.
- Ms. Stein expressed support for either height option, pointing to the high-rise across the street and the taller residential houses on Lombard Street as well.
- Ms. Gutterman disagreed with Ms. Stein and stated that the bi-level option is more in keeping with the neighborhood.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed support for either height option, saying it should be up to the property owner.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he prefers the bi-level option because it is more appropriate for the block. He stated that he appreciates Mr. Ernst applying in-concept at this time so that details can be discussed.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the scale of the trinities on the block is important to maintain.
- Mr. Cluver asked about potential visibility of the roof deck.
 - o Mr. Ernst responded that the intention is for the deck to not be visible from

Juniper Street.

- Ms. Lukachik suggested a step back or some other way to differentiate the additional height on the 504 S. Juniper Street portion. She stated that a four-story building is not necessarily out of place here, but the wide facade stands out.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the block has a differing rhythm of massing.
- Ms. Stein noted that the neighborhood has many mansard roofs and suggested that a mansard roof might be a solution to gain a portion of a fourth floor but have a three-story brick front. She suggested this as a means of establishing a cornice at the third-floor level at 504 S. Juniper Street.
 - o Mr. Ernst responded that a mansard roof is a great suggestion and noted that he included photographs of some nearby mansards in his application materials. He reiterated the lack of depth of the parcel and therefore the importance of the additional room.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the roof deck needs to be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the brick needs to return at least partially on the sides of the building.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the facade should look like two different buildings on the exterior, which may be accomplished by altering the roofline as discussed at 504 S. Juniper Street, but also by ensuring that the front bricks are not totally aligned across to look like one wide four-bay object.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the windows could also be reconsidered to help the facade look like two separate buildings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- At its 8 March 2024 meeting, the Historical Commission voted to approve the demolition of the building at 504 S. Juniper Street, owing to a finding of financial hardship.
- This application was submitted in-concept. An application for final review will need to be submitted for review by the Historical Commission as a step in the process of obtaining a building permit.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- With the suggested revisions, the proposed new construction provides an appropriate massing, height, scale, materials, and features to project the integrity of the environment, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 6 to 1 to recommend approval in concept of a four-story single-family residence at 502-04 S. Juniper Street, with the suggestions that the fourth floor at 504 S. Juniper Street is a mansard or otherwise set back in a way to reflect the former roofline, the roof deck is not visible along the primary facade, and the brick returns on the sides of the building, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 502-04 S Juniper St MOTION: Approval in-concept of four-story option with revisions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman		X			
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6	1			

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:02:00

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:04 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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