

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

**TUESDAY, 28 SEPTEMBER 2021
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Rich Villa
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Eva Johnson
- David Traub, Save Our Sites
- Gerry Gutierrez
- Serena Yin
- Sean Narcum
- Joan Roush
- Herbert Clayton Jr.
- Harrison Haas, Esq.
- Tiarra Bell
- Tamara Bell
- Marty Gregorski

Julia Limongello
Jerry Boyce
Jessica Radomski
Rustin Ohler
Keith Brooks
Joel Dworsky
Peter Kelsen, Esq.
LaVenus Clark
Lee Hyden
Jeff Aser
Kevin Yoder
Clint Steib
Rick Sudall
Jacklyn McBeth
Ryan Wilson
Ken Weinstein
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Dan Macey
Allison Weiss
Patricia Cove
Alfonso Escudaro
Mike Simone
Laura Lacy, Attic Brewing Co
Robert Mandeville
Kathy Dowdell
Gerald Boyce
Susan Wetherill
Thomas Ginnerup
Thaddeus Squire
Pavlina Vysochan
Lori Salganicoff
William Kerr, Esq.
Alba María Roldán
Jared Klein
Tom Bello
Ed Hughes
Suzanna Barucco
Joanne Carter
Selina Kwan
Sara-Ann Logan
Jim Nolen
Doug Mooney
Alison Eberhardt
Dennis Carlisle
Todd Lacy
Omar Zaater
Diana Fedorkova
Niki Green
Scot Lutte
P. Savidge
Travis Seal

Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Joseph McCarthy
Jay Farrell
David Witt
Renee Smith
Peggy Clayton
Ray Willis Jr.
Stephanie Graham
David Margolis
Jeanne Chavious
Sherman W. Smith III

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 6712 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Construct four-story building in rear yard

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Friends Dr. Kyu and Jung Hi Yi

Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1890

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Ave Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 6712 Ridge Avenue is a contributing resource in the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Historic District and is not adjacent to any other designated structures. This application proposes to rehabilitate the historic structure along Ridge Avenue, including installing new vinyl windows and new doors and repairing the slate roof, stucco, and exterior trim.

The application also proposes to construct a four-story building at the rear of the site. The building would be clad in fiber cement clapboard siding with a mansard roof. While the Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction, given the purpose of the thematic, not geographical, district to protect historic buildings along Ridge Avenue, the staff recommends that the Commission treat the new construction at the rear of the property with greater flexibility.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story building in rear yard;
- Install vinyl windows in historic building; and
- Rehabilitate historic building.

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.*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 SEPTEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- The application proposes to replace the windows of the historic building with Andersen 200 Series vinyl windows. Vinyl is not an appropriate material for the historic building. Provided the new windows match the historic configuration, wood, aluminum-clad wood, or a composite material would be more appropriate. The work does not comply with Standard 6.
- *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 building would be differentiated from the historic in its materials and style. Though large, the new construction would be located at the rear of the historic building with a large buffer and would not connect or be immediately adjacent to the historic structure. The new building would not destroy any historic materials that characterize the property and would be compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features, owing to its distance from the historic building. The application satisfies Standard 9.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - *Recommended: Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
 - The proposed new construction would be differentiated from the historic building and would be compatible with the historic building in material, massing, size, and scale.
 - The Ridge Ave Roxborough Historic District is a thematic, not geographical, historic district. The property at 6712 Ridge Avenue is not adjacent to any other designated properties. The new construction would not have a negative impact on the historic district.
 - The proposed building would be distanced from the historic structure and would not result in the diminution or loss of historic character of the historic building. The work complies with this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the windows on the historic building are an appropriate material and configuration, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rich Villa represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked whether it is necessary to remove the rear infilled porch on the existing building.
 - Mr. Villa responded that, according to historic maps, it does not seem to be original, adding that the goal is to create parking spaces between the historic and new buildings.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he appreciates the attempt to reference the surrounding architecture in designing the new building, but contended that the style needs to “go all the way” or not draw on historic references at all. He suggested removing the cornice brackets and adding a front porch to offer more of a residential scale. He contended that the building, though at the rear of the property, would be highly visible from Ridge Avenue. He then observed that the building has no base and asked that a base be incorporated into the design.
 - Mr. Villa agreed that the building has no base and offered to consider a base in some form, including a porch.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the front porch of the historic building would remain infilled.
 - Mr. Villa answered that the porch would remain infilled, though he added that he would like to remove the vinyl siding and see what remains of the porch. He then noted that he believes the interior front wall of the building has been substantially opened.
- Mr. D’Alessandro suggested cladding the new, rear building in stucco rather than siding and called the horizontal trim inappropriate. He suggested that the mansard of the new building share the same pitch as the roof of the historic building.
 - Mr. Detwiler observed that the mansard of the new building only wraps three sides and requested that it wrap all four sides. He then agreed with Mr. D’Alessandro that the slope should be adjusted.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the plans show that the front porch encloses a vestibule and asked whether the porch could be reopened in order to be more sensitive within the district. She then expressed concern over the proposed building’s massing, adding that it overshadows the historic building. She questioned whether the mass could be divided in some way to reduce its appearance.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that sizing of the windows is atypical. He suggested that the building be treated as a twin and that the applicant consider four windows on each floor of the front façade that match in dimension. He then recommended that the applicant consider a glazed front porch as an alternative to completely reopening the porch of the historic building. He agreed with Mr. Detwiler’s comment that a porch on the proposed building would help reduce the appearance of the mass.
 - The Committee members noted that the site slopes downward to the historic building, which exacerbates the mass of the proposed new construction.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that he would not find the mass problematic if the proposed building had a porch, regularized windows, and more typical dormers in the mansard. He remarked that the dormers are too wide and the cheek walls should be reduced. The side elevation, he continued, is very solid and should include more windows. He noted that the dormers do not align with the windows below and suggested that they be aligned.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the elevation emphasizes the smallness and narrowness of the windows and recommended that they be taller and wider.
- Mr. Detwiler asked that some type of porch remain at the rear of the historic building.

- Mr. Villa responded that a reduced version of an open porch could likely be incorporated.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the use of plank siding.
 - Mr. Villa replied that the siding proposed is a HardiePlank shiplap with Azek horizontal trim, which could be painted the same color, but as proposed it provides a shadow line.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that he does not mind the siding.
 - The Committee agreed that the horizontal trim, the beltcourses, should be larger to better match the scale of the building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the material and configuration of the windows.
 - Mr. Villa answered that the windows of the proposed building would be aluminum-clad wood and that they would be simulated-divided-lite sash windows.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 6712 Ridge Avenue is a contributing resource in the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Historic District and is not adjacent to other designated properties. The historic building has a minimal setback from Ridge Avenue with a large rear yard that contained no structures at the time of designation.
- The application proposes to rehabilitate the historic structure and construct a four-story building in the rear yard. Parking would be located between buildings.
- The historic building would largely remain intact, though an enclosed rear porch would be removed to allow for parking.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The massing of the proposed building is large and is partly exacerbated by the slope of the property. Design details should be adjusted to minimize the appearance of the massing, including incorporating a front porch, increasing the mansard's slope, reducing the mansard's dormer cheek walls, adding windows to the side elevations, and regularizing the window openings at the front façade. With some modification to the design, the application complies with Standard 9.
- The new structure would be located in the rear yard of the property and would not connect to the historic structure. A buffer would remain between the buildings. The work complies with the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction, provided the following:

- a porch is added to the first-story front of the new structure;
- the dormer cheek walls of the new structure are reduced to a more appropriate scale for a mansard dormer;
- the mansard wraps all four elevations, and the pitch of the mansard on the proposed building better relates to the mansard of the historic house;

- the brackets are eliminated from the cornice of the new building;
- the horizontal trim of the new building is modified or increased in size;
- the windows are regularized to an even dimension on the front façade of the new structure;
- more windows are added to the side elevations of the new structure;
- the front porch of the historic building is restored to an open porch, if possible; and
- a small porch or pent roof is installed at the rear of the historic building where the enclosed porch is being removed.

ITEM: 6712 RIDGE AVE					
MOTION: Approval 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 6370 CHURCH RD

Proposal: Reroof pent eaves

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Meredith Rainey and Thaddeus Squire

Applicant: Trisha Zellers, Russell Roofing & Exteriors

History: 1913; Bailey & Bassett

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Contributing, 11/8/2019

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 6370 Church Road was designated as a contributing resource in the Overbrook Farms Historic District in November 2019. According to the district's inventory, this Colonial Revival-style residence was constructed ca. 1913 and is attributed to architects Bailey & Bassett.

The application proposes replacing the existing asphalt-fiberglass shingles at the pent eaves with standing seam metal panels. No documentation has been found to indicate that this pent eave ever had a standing seam metal roof. In general, standing-seam metal roofs are not typical of Colonial Revival style houses.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace existing asphalt shingles at lower eaves with standing seam metal panels.

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.*
 - The application, which proposes to replace asphalt shingles with standing-seam metal panels at the lower or pent eaves, does not comply Standard 6. The original material was likely wood shake, slate, or a predecessor of asphalt shingles. The use of standing-seam metal for the roofing does not match the original roofing in design, color, texture, or materials and is not substantiated by documentary or physical evidence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:24:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Thaddeus Squire represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Squire why they were proposing the change in material from shingles to standing-seam metal.
 - Mr. Squire responded that the cost to replace the existing roof with slate was prohibitively expensive so they decided to use the dimensional shingles at the main part of the roof. He said that since he did not like the look of the dimensional shingles, he wanted to consider a different material for the lower eaves. Mr. Squire noted that several other properties close to his have standing seam metal roofs, and though this material may not have been used at his specific house, to him it represented vernacular materials that could have been used on the farmhouse that inspired his Colonial Revival-style home.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Mr. Squire if standing-seam metal was being proposed at the enclosed room at the side of the house that was currently being shown on the presentation slide.
 - Mr. Squire responded that the roof replacement for that particular section was part of a future phase of work that could possibly include installing a glass roof. However, for the time being, the roof would remain as is.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if Mr. Squire knew the original roofing material of the house.
 - Mr. Squire replied that he did not, though he believed it was likely either slate or shake.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that Mr. Squire look for evidence of the original roofing material once the work was underway. Mr. Detwiler asked if the dormers had metal roofs.
 - Mr. Squire responded that the dormers currently had tar paper roofing. He explained that they were still pricing out materials for the cheek walls but were considering copper or some sort of siding. Mr. Squire said that they would make a determination once the existing vinyl siding was removed from the dormers.

- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that Mr. Squire's application materials did not appear to correspond to the scope of work he was presenting to the Architectural Committee. He asked what the references to EPDM were on the roof plan.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that Mr. Squire is proposing roof work that the staff is able to approve administratively, and some of that scope was reflected in the application materials. She told the members of the Architectural Committee that the proposal currently before them is only for the use of standing-seam metal at the lower eaves.
- Mr. D'Alessandro told Ms. Schmitt that the dormer roofs should really be metal, not EPDM, and that there was a lot of information missing from the application materials.
 - Mr. Squire reviewed some of the aspects of the larger roof proposal that were being reviewed for approval by the staff.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that there is a harmony with the roofing of this house, and the more different materials that are installed, the more that harmony disappears. He observed the ways that all of the different roof sections relate to one another and said that he thought that the more they could harmonize the better. Mr. Detwiler acknowledged that he was on the fence about this proposal because he also understood the applicant's concern with the appearance of the dimensional shingles at the pent level. Mr. Detwiler told Mr. Squire that he recognized how much work they had put into the house over several years and commended them for it.
- Ms. Gutterman said that she agreed with Mr. Detwiler's comments, adding that the examples of other metal roofs in the neighborhood provided by the applicant were of porches rather than pents. Ms. Gutterman doubted that the metal at the pent eaves would look compatible with the rest of the building.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that a metal roof can last a very long time, whereas asphalt shingles would need to be replaced sooner. He wondered whether a future owner would be in a position to replace asphalt shingles either with a better replacement material or even with the historic materials.
- Mr. McCoubrey acknowledge the work and consideration the owners have put into the house. He said that, while he agreed that metal is a durable material, he asserted that the continuity of the roofing materials is important to this house. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the pent eaves intersect with another section of the roof that would have asphalt shingles, which would create difficulty in how the two materials would come together. Mr. McCoubrey also noted that the examples of nearby metal roofs that were provided by the applicant were of low-pitch roofs where metal needed to be used since shingles would not work. He said that, in the case of the subject property, asphalt shingles would work just fine at the pent eaves.
 - Mr. Squire remarked that they had considered using some of the composite replacement slate materials available. However, several roofers said that they would not work with these products because they were not yet time-tested.
 - Mr. Squire mentioned a future project for a glass roof at the sun porch that may be presented to the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated that there were still several unknowns about the dormers.
 - Mr. McCoubrey reminded Mr. D'Alessandro that the staff was working with the applicant on other aspects of their application. The dormers are outside the scope of this application.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Squire how much demolition was proposed at the dormers.

- Mr. Squire responded that the vinyl siding was going to be removed from the cheek walls of the dormers.
- Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Detwiler acknowledged that should any concerns arise, the staff could present them to the Architectural Committee for its review.
- Mr. McCoubrey cautioned the applicant not to use too many different kinds of metal for the other elements of the project such as flashing and gutters.
 - Mr. Squire replied that the proposal was quite consistently proposing copper for those elements.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The consistency in roofing materials is an important design feature of this house;
- The slope at the pent eaves does not require the use of metal;
- The examples of other nearby metal roofs were of porches or low-pitched roofs where asphalt shingles would not work properly.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Owing to a lack of documentation showing that the subject property's roof was history standing-seam metal, the proposal does not meet Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 6370 CHURCH RD 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 2017 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct rear addition with roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Blue Ink LLC

Applicant: Sean Narcum, Peter Zimmerman Architects

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove an original or early two-story projecting bay as well as a post-1950 one-story kitchen annex at the rear of the house and construct a large, three-story rear addition. A roof deck and pilot house are proposed for the roof of the main block of the building. At the top floor of the main block, the application proposes to remove two dormer windows in the mansard and replace them with three matching dormer windows. The existing roll up metal garage door would be removed so that the masonry opening can be widened to accommodate the proposed double-width parking. A wood-panel roll-up garage door is proposed at the building facade. A metal roll-up gate is proposed at the alley.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct roof deck and pilot house;
- Reconstruct rear mansard, replacing two dormer windows with three;
- Construct three-story rear addition;
- Widen garage entrance;
- Expand existing garage to fit two vehicles; expand existing parking pad to accommodate two vehicles.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - At the ground level, the new addition proposes to partially demolish and alter non-historic fabric that appears to have been constructed after 1950. However, the scope also includes the demolition of an early two-story rear bay and the existing dormers at the fourth, which does not meet Standard 9.
 - The new construction is in keeping with the mass and scale of other rear additions on this block.
 - The brick and wood cladding proposed for the rear addition are compatible with the original materials used.
 - The new garage door should be finished in a manner that does not draw unnecessary attention to it. In addition, no mechanical components of the garage door should be visible from Cypress Street.
- *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.*

- The rear addition would alter non-historic building fabric at the ground story; however, the proposal also includes the removal of historic fabric, including a two-story bay, rear wall of the main block, and dormer windows at the rear mansard. The removal of this historic fabric would negatively impact the essential form and integrity of the property.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The mechanical equipment zone would be located at the front of the roof. The staff has concerns about the visibility of this equipment from the public right-of-way.
 - The new roof deck and pilot house would be located on the roof of the main block of the house. The staff typically recommends that new roof decks are located off of the main block so that the essential form of the property is not adversely impacted.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:50:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sean Narcum and attorney Harrison Haas represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Narcum to respond to the staff's comments.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the date of the existing two-story, rear bay.
 - Mr. Narcum said that he believed it was re-skinned at the time the post-1950 kitchen annex work had occurred.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the existing bays at the rear had clearly been done with a tremendous amount of care and resources. Mr. Detwiler said that his concern was mainly with the amount of historic fabric the applicant was proposing to demolish. He asked Mr. Narcum to speak to the need for demolishing the existing two dormers at the rear in order to reconstruct three new dormers.
 - Mr. Narcum responded that the fourth-floor bedroom at the mansard was one of the main living spaces for the client, so increasing the amount of natural light as well as the views out to Center City would be more achievable promoted by creating an additional dormer window.
- Ms. Gutterman said that she agreed with Mr. Detwiler. She added that she also had concerns about the new addition encompassing the masonry wall at the rear façade, the proposed demolition of the dormers, and the visibility of the proposed roof deck and pilot house, especially from Delancey Place. Ms. Gutterman said that the placement of additional roof deck and mechanical equipment at the front of the roof, as well as the size of the proposed pilot house, concerned her.
 - Mr. Narcum responded that he was sensitive to such concerns. He explained that the elevator would run from the basement up to the roof deck, so the placement of the shaft was in the location that made sense to the interior program of the house. Mr. Narcum pointed out that the neighboring pilot house at 2015 Delancey Place is much larger than the one in this proposal.

- Ms. Gutterman remarked that Mr. Narcum is proposing a large area of deck in front of the proposed pilot house, which meant that the deck in this proposal actually extends out towards Delancey Place much more than the deck at 2015. Ms. Gutterman informed the applicant that the Architectural Committee did not typically recommend in favor of any kind of deck on the front half of the main block of a building.
- Mr. McCoubrey added that often they do not recommend approval of any roof deck on the main block of a building.
- Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Detwiler asked the applicant to address the location of the mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Narcum responded that the proposed location was towards the southern end of the roof, and that the equipment would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Schmitt if the staff was making site visits in light of the Covid-19 pandemic.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that in this case, since the site visit could remain outdoors, she believed it could be arranged safely and following the City's protocols.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that it would be precedent-setting to approve a roof deck that extended as far towards the front façade as this proposal, or even on the roof of the main block. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey expressed concerns about the extent of the proposed demolition at the rear. He noted that, even if the existing two-story bay had been re-clad, it appeared original to the house. Mr. McCoubrey also remarked that the proposed addition would extend all the way up to the third story of the building, ultimately obscuring the view of the mansard. He observed that many of the examples of nearby rear additions provided by the applicant are of two-story additions rather than three-story additions. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the ground-floor addition was not very visible from the public right-of-way, so there was less concern about it. However, the higher up the addition went, the more visible it would become.
- Mr. Detwiler thanked Mr. Narcum for the completeness of his application. He asked whether there was a photograph of the rear of the property at 2013 Delancey Place because he believed it had a similar configuration to the subject property. Mr. Detwiler said that he agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's comments about the height of the proposed addition at the rear, and suggested that the applicant look at the addition at 2013 Delancey Place, which he believed only extended up to the second story.
- Ms. Lucachik asked the applicant to address the work proposed at the basement and whether the underpinning at the party walls would impact the neighbors.
 - Mr. Narcum acknowledged that there could be some inconvenience to the neighbors with regards to noise. However, this type of work was something they had done on other projects with their same project team.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that he thought it was important to point out the extent of the proposed demolition, calling out the drawings on Sheet 18 that showed essentially removing the entire rear of the third story as well as the entire rear of the mansard. Mr. Detwiler commented that this was really his main concern with the proposal. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with these comments.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the rear of the subject property was highly visible from a highly used alley, and though he was confident that the project would be executed beautifully, his concern was with the extent of the proposed demolition.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Though the existing two-story rear bay may have been re-clad when other work was done post-1950, archival documentation shows that a bay was there historically.
- The Architectural Committee typically recommends that roof decks and pilot houses remain off of the main block of a house whenever possible;
- The Architectural Committee does not recommend the placement of any roof deck or mechanical equipment at the front half of the main block;
- The extent of demolition of historic fabric, including historic dormer windows, sections of the mansard roof, and the rear masonry wall, is problematic.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The extent of demolition of historic fabric, including the two-story bay, dormer windows, and sections of the mansard roof and the rear wall, do not meet Standards 9 or 10.
- The size and location of the proposed roof deck on the main block of the house, including on the front half of the roof, does not meet the Roofs Guideline.
- The location of mechanical equipment on the front half of the roof does not meet the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 2017 DELANCEY PL					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro					
Justin Detwiler					
Nan Gutterman					
Allison Lukachik					
Amy Stein					
Total					1

ADDRESS: 201 W JOHNSON ST

Proposal: Construct five-story residential building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Philadelphia Preservation Group, LP
Applicant: Niki Green, VBC Studio
History: 1895; Nugent Home for Baptists
Individual Designation: 10/8/2004
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to construct a five-story detached apartment building between the historically designated Presser Home for Retired Musicians and Nugent Home for Retired Baptists. The Historical Commission approved the location and footprint of the new building in-concept in 2007, and then as part of a final review which included the rehabilitation of the Nugent Home for Baptists in 2011. This is Phase 3 of the larger development project, with Phases 1 and 2 being the rehabilitation and reuse of the historic buildings. The proposed new building incorporates red brick up to the fourth floor, then a darker HardiPanel at the top floor. It does not connect to either historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct detached residential building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed new construction is compatible with the surrounding context in terms of massing, size, scale, and architectural features, satisfying Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:07:54

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney William Kerr and architect Sara Ann Logan represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern about the overall absence of detail, particularly at the top of the building. She suggested solutions such as a cap, a mansard, or a taller parapet. She commented that the roofline is extremely flat. Other Committee members agreed.
 - Ms. Logan responded that there is a low parapet proposed, but that they have considered changing the top floor to a mansard, or they could step back at the parapet or potentially have the center bay step up. She noted the inset balconies that will break up the façade.

- Mr. Detwiler agreed that this is successful in plan, but the elevation with the very flat roofline is the issue.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the existing carriage house on the site, stating that the carriage house provides an opportunity on the site.
 - Ms. Logan responded that the carriage house is not part of this scope.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about increasing the space between the new building and the historic buildings. He suggested removing a few feet on either side and adding it to the front of the wings.
 - Mr. Kerr responded that the footprint was approved previously and is a result of 12 or 13 years of discussions, primarily about parking.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested a tan or darker brick instead of the red brick tone, so that the new brick is further distinguished from, rather than similar to, the existing historic orange brick.
 - Ms. Logan responded that Civic Design Review had the opposite request, but that they are looking to have a brick that is a cooler tone. She stated that they will provide a mockup of several brick options for review by Historical Commission's staff.
- Mr. McCoubrey thanked the architect for designing this as a background building to the historic buildings, but observed that the white vertical elements are distracting. He suggested more of a horizontal scheme rather than vertical. He asked about the entrance and if it would include a porte-cochère or similar element.
 - Ms. Logan responded that the white elements can be toned down and also lowered so as to not interrupt the top floor. She stated that they could add a porte-cochère at main entrance.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the location of mechanical equipment on the roof.
 - Ms. Logan responded that there are no mechanical units proposed for the roof, and that the roof will only have the elevator overrun and stair tower but no mechanical equipment or roof deck.
 - Mr. Detwiler thanked the architect for omitting a roof deck.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if an extra story could be added, or the parapet extended in the center section, in order to add variation to the roof line. He stated that the flatness is the most unsuccessful part of the design.
 - Mr. Kerr responded that they would not be able to add an extra story owing to variances received, but they will explore ways to add variation to the roof line.
- The Committee members agreed that the location and massing of the building were appropriate, perhaps with a few minor adjustments. They also agreed that the design was largely successful, but could benefit from some variation in the parapet height, which is very flat. They agreed that a porte-cochère might help the design. They also appreciated the architect's offer to provide mock-ups of the bricks to ensure that the exterior color was compatible with the historic buildings. They noted that the Historical Commission had approved earlier versions of this design in 2007 and 2011.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert commented that he lives in the neighborhood and the design is “really really disappointing” and “really bad” and “really awful” and is not respectful of the neighborhood and is a box that could be anywhere.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:

- Following public comment, Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern about the driveway leading to the property as shown on the rendering. He asserted that it is too wide and should be redesigned. He withdrew his comment after the applicant informed him that it is an existing public street near the site, not part of the proposal.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that he also lives in the neighborhood and drives by the site. He stated that, following Mr. Beisert's comments, he finds the design to be uninspired. It proposes a box that could be anywhere and does not reflect or respond to the surrounding historic context.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission approved the location and footprint of the new building in-concept in 2007, and then as part of a final review which included the extensive rehabilitation of the Nugent Home for Baptists in 2011.
- The proposed building is completely detached from either historic building.
- The existing carriage house on the site is not part of the scope of this application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new construction is not compatible with the surrounding context, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 201 W JOHNSON 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 113-29 BERKLEY ST

Proposal: Construct six-story mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Wayne Junction Properties

Applicant: Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: 1884; Keystone Dry Plate and Film Works; Moore Push-Pin; demolished, 2021

Individual Designation: 12/12/2014

District Designation: Wayne Junction Historic District, Contributing, 7/13/2018

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to construct a six-story mixed-use building on a now-vacant site located in the Wayne Junction Historic District. Until earlier this year, a two-story former industrial building stood at 113-29 Berkley Street. In February 2021, the Historical Commission approved an application for complete demolition based on a finding of financial hardship, and the building was subsequently demolished. At 133 Berkley Street, which is part of this development site but which was excluded from the historic district, a tall four-story red brick industrial building was demolished in 2012 owing to its poor condition. The design of this proposed building takes cues from that earlier building, utilizing industrial-style windows and red brick pilasters to break up the façade. At the ground floor, a 1950s diner car will be returning to Wayne Junction, and will be incorporated as the entrance to the commercial dining space.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six-story residential and commercial building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed new construction is compatible with the surrounding context in terms of massing, size, scale, and architectural features, satisfying Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:39:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Ken Weinstein and architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman commented that the proposed building is too large of a mass for this site and the historic district. She asked if consideration was given to designing several smaller buildings rather than one large building.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that the intention has always been one large warehouse-style building, and that it is similar in height to the historic building that stood at

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 SEPTEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

133 Berkley Street until 2012. He noted that the façade has depth and articulation through the use of pilasters and overall footprint.

- Mr. Detwiler commented that he appreciates the façade articulation and detailing and the incorporation of the trolley car, but that the building is too large. He asked about a reduction in floor heights.
- Mr. Ohler responded that he can look into reducing the floor heights.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the height should be reduced, because the other buildings in the district are smaller-scale industrial buildings.
- Mr. Weinstein explained that the entrance for the parking was put on the side of the building so that it provided a buffer between this building and the historic building at 137 Berkley Street.
- Mr. Ohler clarified that a Civic Design Review is required and will be upcoming. He stated that they will review what can be done to reduce the overall height of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Allison Weiss, representing SoLo Germantown Civic Association, opposed the application. She commented that the building does not fit the character of the historic district. She stated that she was disappointed with the demolition of the Moore Push Pin Building. She stated that the Wayne Junction diner was not located on this street, but was a block away on Wayne Avenue.
- Joan Roush, an Apsley Street neighbor behind the subject property, opposed the application and the residential use.
- Jeanne Chavious, an Apsley Street neighbor behind the subject property, opposed the application and the residential use.
- Joanne Carter, an Apsley Street neighbor behind the subject property, opposed the application and lack of notice to the near neighbors.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, opposed the application. He commented that “the injection of the old diner into the hulking masonry mass is silly and trite bordering on the ludicrous.”
- Tiarra and Tamara Bell, near neighbors, opposed the application and the excavation work that will occur and the impact on properties that are outside of the historic district boundaries.
- Jack and LaVenus McElveen-Clark, Apsley Street neighbors behind the subject property, opposed the application and the massing of the proposed building.
- Ray Willis, an Apsley Street neighbor behind the subject property, opposed the application and the massing of the proposed building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The surrounding context of the historic district is primarily three and four-story red brick industrial buildings.
- The subject construction site is a cleared lot which historically had one four-story and one two-story industrial building on the site.
- The near neighbors who commented overwhelmingly opposed the application, with many opposing the residential use of the building. The Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over the use of a building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new construction is not compatible with the surrounding context in terms of massing, size, and scale, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 113-29 BERKLEY ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 140 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Union League of Philadelphia

Applicant: Lee Hyden, The H. Chambers Co.

History: 1864; Union League; John Fraser, architect; addition, Horace Trumbauer, 1910

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to construct a rooftop dining addition with terrace at the Union League building. The addition is proposed for the rooftop of the 1910 Horace Trumbauer annex building, at the western half of the property, fronting on S. 15th Street. A terrace with railing and no setback is proposed for the edge of the roof, with the addition starting approximately 15 feet back from the edge of the terrace. Proposed materials for the cladding of the addition and railing are not specified. The new work will be visible from various vantage points as documented in the application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish various rooftop features
- Construct rooftop addition
- Extend elevators to roof
- Replace windows in light well

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 SEPTEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:26:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Lee Hyden represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Hyden provided a summary of the project and design intent.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he appreciated the number of renderings provided in the application.
- Nan Gutterman said she believes it will be visible and that the proposed roof addition is just too massive. She stated she is not concerned about the windows and the light well which are not visible from the public right-of-way but is concerned about the proposed changes to the existing roof. Ms. Gutterman noted that, based on the massing proposed, she thinks it will be visible as you walk up and down 15th Street, as well as from Sansom Street. She continued that she is not sure that the addition could be set back far enough or reduced in size enough to satisfy preservation standards.
- Ms. Stein said she agreed with Ms. Gutterman. Ms. Stein said this is an iconic building in Philadelphia with a legacy architect. She pointed out that the building already has a highly detailed roofline, which includes the mansard and its dormers. If another full story is added on and is flush to the exterior wall and is highly visible from the street, it will be inappropriate. Ms. Stein said it is like adding another element to the top of a building that already has a decorative top. She contended that the scale of this addition overwhelms the architectural detail of the original building. She added that maybe there is way to have very significant setbacks and a roof deck that would not be visible, but it would take a lot more study and it would completely reframe the program that is being added to the top of this building. Ms. Stein noted that visible additions to the tops of buildings can be very successful, when the building is an infill building in the urban fabric, but this is not that building. She stated that this is a highly decorative iconic building that is already an object, and it is a very difficult challenge to add to something that already has that level of decorative effect. Ms. Stein concluded that there is nothing about this proposal that she believes the Committee can approve. She added that the application indicates

that they will be removing parapet masonry work that is on top of the mansard and other work that call into question the preservation standards.

- Mr. Detwiler noted that he agreed with Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Stein's comments. He said that it will be a visible roof addition. Mr. Detwiler commented that the articulation of the facade of the overbuild is minimal at best. He noted that they are proposing to add a basic box with a few punched openings on top of a masterpiece. Mr. Detwiler said that, if the addition wishes to defer to the Trumbauer design, it should be set back all around.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with his colleagues' remarks. He said that the proposed addition is not inconspicuous and that it is much too close to the edge of the building. He said he is not sure why it was not put on the other side of the existing penthouse, where it would be much easier to make it inconspicuous. He continued that locating the addition right out there on the prow of the historic building at 15th Street does not allow the addition to be inconspicuous and that it would be difficult to make it inconspicuous.
 - Ms. Hyden explained that it was an intentional decision to place the addition on the 15th Street side of the building rather than the Broad Street side. She said that it is on the edge of the 15th Street side so that the members can experience the wonderful views of the city from the proposed addition. Ms. Hyden said their intent was for it to not be noticeable from the street. She said that pulling it inside the mansard may be a way to address the concerns about visibility.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that although the Committee's purview is not the interior, he observed that there is a lot of kitchen and back of house program in the proposal. He said that he understands that the plan is to have a restaurant, but any way that the massing can be reduced would be good.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested a reduction of program because part of the issue is all the objects that are being put on the roof will be visible. She continued that it is not just the deck and the structure, but also everything that is needed for the program.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented on potential lighting issues with the addition. He pointed out that when you create something this large, it is going to have a lot of lighting, so you are going to have this glowing addition at on the top of this building. He commented that this also raises concerns about the environmental impact of the new structure as well.
 - Ms. Hyden responded that they have been working with their lighting designers and doing light studies. She noted they have been primarily focused on the lightwell, but the overall lighting is certainly something they are mindful of and their intent is not for it to not be overly bright.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked who would be using the restaurant.
 - Ms. Hyden responded that the proposed restaurant in the addition is for club members only and would not be open to the public or rented out.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance, opposed the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes a highly visible addition on an iconic building.
- The addition would compete with the Horace Trumbauer's design rather than being deferential to it.

- The addition should be set back from the mansard roof and cannot come right up to the edge of the roofline.
- The massing and scale of the addition is too large.
The lighting of the addition should be carefully considered and avoid drawing attention to the roof addition.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed rooftop addition is incompatible with the historic building in terms of massing, size, scale, and architectural features. This work does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed addition with terrace would be highly conspicuous from the public right-of-way. The application does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 140 S BROAD ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 520 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Construct three-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2622 West Hagert Street LLC

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Group G LLC

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 8/21/1973

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to construct a new three-story building at 520 Queen Street.

A two-story building, constructed circa 1860 and individually designated in 1973, previously stood at 520 Queen Street. The Historical Commission approved an application for the rehabilitation of the front façade and the construction of a new rear addition in 2018.

The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a building permit based on the Historical Commission's approval on 19 December 2019. Work commenced on the project in July

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 SEPTEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

2020. On 23 July 2020, a front dormer was removed that was outside the approved scope of work and the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation noting that a dormer had been removed and that an engineer's report on the safety of the property was needed. On 24 July 2020, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a stop work order owing to demolition work exceeding the scope of the issued permit. The stop work order stated that the demolition contractor had removed interior areas and load bearing walls outside the scope of the approved permit. Owing to the illegal demolition work, the building became structurally unsound, and the contractor completely demolished it. The party walls of 518 and 522 Queen Street were also damaged during the work.

For administrative purposes, the staff approved a demolition permit for 520 Queen Street at the request of the Department of Licenses and Inspections on 16 November 2020, after the demolition had been completed. The Department required the applicant to file an accurate demolition permit before a new construction permit could be filed

The current application proposes to construct a three-story residential building that is unrelated to the historic building that was lost when the developer exceeded the scope of his Historical Commission approval and building permit to adaptively reuse the historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story residential building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- Section 14-1007(3) of the City of Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance stipulates that "any person who alters or demolishes a building ... in violation of the provisions of this Chapter 14-1000 or in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a building permit issued by the Historical Commission shall be required to restore the building ... involved to its appearance prior to the violation."
 - The City's historic preservation ordinance does not give the Historical Commission any discretion when reviewing applications such as this one. The property owner "shall be required to restore the building." The Historical Commission must require the property owner to reconstruct the lost building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Section 14-1007(3) of the City of Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance. The historic building that was lost should be reconstructed.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:44:38

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gerry Gutierrez and property owner Jerry Boyce represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Mehley if the staff recommendation is suggesting that just the front of the building be reconstructed or the entire building with all its quirkiness.
 - Ms. Mehley replied that staff was focused on rebuilding the front façade. She noted that the 2019 application approved by the Historical Commission included an addition and roof deck along with a façade rehabilitation. Ms. Mehley said if

the applicant had re-submitted the plans approved by the Historical Commission as new construction, the staff would have approved them.

- Mr. Gutierrez provided a description of the proposed new building. He noted that the parcel is almost completely cleared of the historic building at this point except for specific elements that are providing some bracing for the adjacent properties. He explained that the historic structure had almost 100% lot coverage and it had a garage component at the street level and both will be very difficult to have approved by zoning. Mr. Gutierrez noted that the historic structure had a lot of problems on the facade, but they felt they could be stabilized and reconstructed. He said that given the nature of the demolition, things became very tenuous.
- Mr. Gutierrez stated they are proposing a new three-story structure building. He said their intent is that the zoning code will be complied with to the full extent so there will be no potential for refusal. Mr. Gutierrez explained that, based on RSA-5 zoning, they are not allowed to have a parking garage off the front, which is a sought-after amenity in Queen Village. He pointed out that this block has several three-story structures, both new and existing, and they are taking their cues and references from nearby buildings, and they are not trying to make anything grand. Mr. Gutierrez continued that they are trying to create a building that is in keeping with the character of the rest of the block by using similar materials, compatible window sizes, and a modest projected bay.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the building were to be reconstructed, would they be allowed to have a garage on Queen Street.
 - Mr. Gutierrez responded that they would be required to go through a refusal process and go through the zoning variants process.
 - Ms. Gutterman said that the previous 2019 plan showed a usable garage. She said she presumes that if the garage had not been demolished, the use of this garage would have been grandfathered in.
 - Mr. Gutierrez confirmed that the approved project was permitted under zoning and building allowed the use of the pre-existing garage component.
 - Ms. Gutterman concluded that it is not that you cannot put the usable garage back, but this would require the applicant and owner to go for an appeal to reconstruct the building with a usable garage.
 - Mr. Gutierrez replied that they can certainly propose this. He stated that in his professional opinion it is a very difficult task to obtain such a zoning approval.
- Ms. Gutterman said it is unfortunate that the contractor did what he did causing this building to have to be demolished. She noted that she supports the staff recommendation. Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Detwiler agreed with her.
- Mr. Detwiler said that the Committee can require a reconstruction. He noted that this type of situation rarely presents itself, but this is an example of where requesting reconstruction is within the Committee's right.
- Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the demolition was illegal.
- Ms. Gutterman said she presumes that the demolition was forced because of someone's negligence.
- Mr. Detwiler said the original roofline is important. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that they could model the gable roof based on the adjacent building.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the applicant had come to the Committee with a garage door building, would the Committee have considered restoration to its eighteenth-century character.
 - Ms. Gutterman commented that they could have occupied first-floor area as living space, with the garage door in place, as an alternative to using it as a functioning

garage. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey commented that they could not recall the proposed use of the garage's interior space in the approved application and the drawings are not clear about use.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the two-story building with the gable roof and a dormer were the character-defining features of the original building.
- Mr. Boyce identified himself as the owner of 520 Queen Street. He stated that some of the statements made were not 100% correct about the building's demolition. He noted that there was a lintel that ran across the top of the garage that was completely rusted out. Mr. Boyce explained that when this was discovered during demolition, the demolition contractor contacted the Department of Licenses and Inspections and told the Department that the building was in danger of collapsing, and he was taking it down. Mr. Boyce said that that was his judgement call. He said that since the contractor does demolition for a living, Mr. Boyce took him as having the authority on this. Mr. Boyce stated that they did not want the building to collapse and possibly take down the neighboring structures. He explained that the Department of Licenses and Inspections came and wrote it up afterwards and he cannot control how the Department wrote it up. Mr. Boyce said that Department inspector Rodney Anello came out and agreed that it was in danger of collapse and that is why they demolished the building. Mr. Boyce stated it is not because he wanted to get a three-story building. He noted that the neighbors have fought him tooth and nail on this building. Mr. Boyce said that he is already \$100,000 out of pocket on the project because of the neighbors and because of the Historical Commission. Mr. Boyce added that he is not blaming anyone but is saying this because the project has become a money pit. He continued that he is over \$400,000 out of pocket and there is not even a structure built. Mr. Boyce said that he cannot tell the Department of Licenses and Inspection how to write in a violation, but it took the Department three or four months to give him a violation. He noted that the Department's inspector then said he cannot remember telling them to knock it down and he went back and forth with the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Mr. Boyce concluded that if he cannot build a three-story building, then he will not build anything. He said he will let the property be an eyesore in Queen Village. Mr. Boyce remarked that he lives in Queen Village. He stated he is not putting any more money into the project.
- Mr. Boyce requested to speak again after public comment. He inquired what was historical about the building since it had aluminum siding on it and pointed out that it had obviously been altered since its historic form by the time he purchased it. Mr. Boyce questioned how the property was added to the Philadelphia Register.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that this was not a discussion for this Committee. He noted that if they wished to go through a decertification process, that is his option.
 - Mr. Farnham said that Ms. Mehley could provide information after the meeting on the rescission process. He stated that there is no guarantee, as it would be up to the Historical Commission's discretion as to whether the property should be removed from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Farnham to provide information on the Historical Commission's authority.
 - Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission would have the discretion to determine whether it should be removed. He continued that absent the rescission of this property from the Register, the Historical Commission it is legally obligated to require the reconstruction of the building, and noted that the

Historical Commission has no discretion in this regard based on the ordinance section cited by Ms. Mehley in the overview. It states that any person who alters or demolish is a building in violation of provisions of the historic preservation ordinance, or, in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a building permit shall be required to restore the building to its appearance prior to the violation. Mr. Farnham said that legally the Historical Commission is required by the preservation ordinance to mandate reconstruction. He agreed with the Committee's chair and said this is probably a discussion better held before the Historical Commission itself and in the presence of Historical Commission's attorney, who can advise the Commission on legal issues.

- Mr. Boyce asked if that preservation ordinance supersedes the safety provisions in the building code.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that Mr. Boyce's question is calling for a legal conclusion which he cannot make. He indicated that this discussion should be held at the Historical Commission meeting and include the Historical Commission's attorney.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert opined that the building should have to be reconstructed to a historic appearance without a garage entrance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building at 520 Queen Street was illegally demolished in July 2020 after the demolition contractor exceeded the scope of the approved building permit.
- This application proposes a new building that does not relate to the historic building that previously stood on the parcel.
- The owner does not wish to reconstruct the historic building per the plans approved by the Historical Commission in 2019 that included an addition and roof deck.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The project submitted does not represent a reconstruction of the historic property demolished in 2019, when the applicant exceeded their building permit. The Committee concluded that the application must meet Section 14-1007(3) to receive a recommendation of approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1007(3) of the City of Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance. The historic building that was lost should be reconstructed.

ITEM: 520 QUEEN ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 717 GLENGARRY RD

Proposal: Construct additions, garage, and pool; add openings

Review Requested: Final Review

Owner: Sherman and Renee Smith

Applicant: Kevin Yoder, K Yoder Design

History: 1963; Dorothy Shipley White residence; Mitchell/Giurgola Associates, architects

Individual Designation: 10/13/2017

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

Located in the Chestnut Hill neighborhood on a larger wooded lot, the former Dorothy Shipley White residence at 717 Glengarry Road is a Modernist landmark designed by Mitchell/Giurgola Associates in 1963. The existing building has sat vacant and deteriorating for many years. This application proposes to rehabilitate the building, making minor alterations to visible portions of the property, and constructing two rear additions, a free-standing garage, and pool with open pavilion.

The proposed additions take cues from the Modern cubic forms of the existing house, but would be clad in a buff brick to differentiate them and remain compatible with the light stucco and brown brick of the historic building. Existing rear window openings would be cut into doorways and the additions connected through the use of hyphens. The proposed second-floor addition would be set in from the parapet walls of the existing one-story rear mass. The garage and pool pavilion would be located at the rear and not connected to the historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate building
- Construct rear additions
- Cut select new openings

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*

- The historic character of the property will be retained and preserved during the rehabilitation and addition project.
- *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.*
 - The proposed additions are compatible with the size, scale, proportion, massing, materials and features of the historic building. They will be differentiated from the old, and require minimal impact to historic fabric. They will be located at the rear on a portion of the property that slopes down, and be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:11:23

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Kevin Yoder and owners Sherman and Renee Smith represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the first-floor addition is acceptable as proposed, but that he finds the second-story overbuild more problematic. He conceded that it is not very visible, but he has trouble with the use of brick on an overbuild over stucco. He expressed a preference for a larger, free-standing addition rather than an overbuild, but noted that that might be programmatically difficult.
 - Mr. Yoder explained that they made an effort to make a functional use of the existing second-story space that was historically an art gallery and whose floor levels approximately match the space over the rear addition. He noted that it seemed like a good place to add square footage without adding so much off the back. He expressed concern that a larger, freestanding, two-story addition might fight the original volumes, noting that as such, they chose to split the massing over two levels. He commented that the finish material is negotiable, and they welcome suggestions and comments. He explained that they chose a lighter brick because they felt it was in keeping with other Modernist residential buildings of the time, and understand that stucco would be too similar, and felt that wood cladding does not feel appropriate.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether the proposed brick is the same as the existing chimney.
 - Mr. Yoder responded negatively; it would be a lighter, complementary color.
 - Mr. Dewiler noted that he likes the lighter brick on the first-floor addition, and that it does not try to match the existing brick chimney.
- Mr. Yoder noted that the garage, pool and pergola are a bit schematic and noted that they plan to involve the Chestnut Hill Conservancy in discussions about those designs. He explained that the original drawings showed a future pool house, so they are positioning the garage and pool in that general alignment, but are flexible in their placement and design. He noted that the main goal is to proceed with the main house renovations and additions.

- Mr. Yoder explained that they felt the additions are located where they would be least conspicuous, but noted that they will require variance for steep slopes. He noted that other options were to locate additions where they would be more visible from the street.
- Mr. McCoubrey circled back to the second-story addition, noting that the original building is very cubic and has particular shapes and volumes. He opined that the second-story addition seems to fight the original composition.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that the addition is proposed on top of one of the one-story saddlebags.
 - Mr. Detwiler questioned whether a different material such as glass would make the addition more palatable.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting he is particularly troubled with the brick over stucco, and opined that metal or glass would be more obviously differentiated.
 - Mr. Yoder responded that they considered a glass pavilion, but programmatically there was too much of the space that could not be glass. He noted that on other Mitchell/Giurgola works there is vertical standing-seam metal siding, which might work here. He explained that they thought that the material would be more obviously a contemporary addition, so they did not present it. He noted that, in the interest of the program, the proposed space is very useful as the primary bedroom. He explained that the house was originally designed with generous volumes but was built for a single woman, so it lacks some family spaces, such as a second living space and bedrooms.
 - Mr. Yoder noted that they are proposing to set the second-floor addition back on one façade, and questioned whether it would be better to make it flush with the existing lower portion.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that he likes the setback there. He noted that he does not mind the lighter brick on the one-story addition, but is open to a different material for the second floor or both additions.
 - Ms. Stein commented that she is also struggling with the second-floor addition. She opined that the original design was so playful with its stacked cubes, but that the proposal is not playful. She suggested thinking about less masonry and more playful cube. She suggested that lead coated copper on the additions would be more in the vein of the original design, and that perhaps the second-floor addition is flush or sits proud so it looks like a cube on the cube. She also opined that the horizontal windows are out of context, and that vertical windows would be more appropriate.
 - Mr. Yoder responded that the horizontal windows are a result of including Mitchell/Giurgola's response to function and need for function, and that they saw precedent in other Mitchell/Giurgola residences, such as the Dayton House, which is more contemporary than the current house, but is a playful mix of horizontals where horizontals make sense and bold and dominant window blocks. He presented the precedent photographs sheet from the submission packet, noting that the Franklin Roberts House utilizes lead coated copper. He suggested that they could make the horizontals more punched, but then that speaks more to masonry than metal cladding. He agreed that on the driveway side, the addition could be flush but have a beautiful reveal with the stucco below and metal above it. He explained that another challenge with the saddlebag portion is that the lower existing ceiling height is only 7 feet 7 inches, so the addition proposes to raise the ceiling in the center to closer to 8 feet 6 inches. He noted that the goal is for the addition not to be seen from the street.

- Ms. Stein noted that she would rather see the addition taller than set back, if there is enough separation and it is clad in a different material. She suggested having a link-like element at the lower height, but the addition box could raise up.
- Mr. Yoder and Mr. Smith responded that that would be functionally desirable.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein that the second-floor addition would be better in a metal system, pulled to edge of the existing volume below, with a nice reveal. He liked Ms. Stein's notion of it being playful, and opined that an addition is achievable that would not fight volumetrically with the existing building but also be clearly distinguished.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that he was okay with a setback if the addition was masonry, but would support a metal addition flush with the existing building below.
- Mr. Yoder noted that if the addition volume is taller, it will make it visible from the public right-of-way and might be perceived as violating some of the Standards.
- Ms. Stein disagreed that it would be more visible, since it seems to tuck behind the existing volume and is setback. She opined that it will still be inconspicuous if it is slightly taller.
- Mr. McCoubrey concluded that the Committee appreciates seeing this house come back to life.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia welcomed the constructive criticism from the Architectural Committee. He noted that the Alliance worked with the Chestnut Hill Conservancy and docomomo to nominate the property, and are happy to see the project moving forward. He explained at they are conceptually supportive if through this meeting and future meetings the design is tweaked slightly.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed alterations and additions are generally appropriate and do not adversely impact the historic property.
- The second-floor addition warrants additional consideration, including of its cladding, massing, setback, fenestration, and playfulness.
- Lead-coated copper siding or a similar material would be more appropriate for the second-floor addition than the proposed brick, and the driveway side of the metal addition should be flush with the stucco below, with a reveal between the existing and new.
- The height of the proposed second-floor addition could be increased, provided it is connected by a lower hyphen, but the potential visibility relative to the height should be studied so that the addition remains inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The historic character of the property will be retained and preserved during the rehabilitation and addition project, satisfying Standard 2.
- The proposed additions are generally compatible with the size, scale, proportion, massing, materials and features of the historic building, but alterations should be made to these elements of the second-floor addition in order to make that portion of the project more compatible. The additions will be differentiated from the old, and require minimal impact to historic fabric, and will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided adjustments are made to the design of the second-floor addition and the balance of the height and visibility are studied, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ITEM: 717 GLENGARRY RD MOTION: Approval with conditions 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: 211-25 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Willings at Independence Park Condominium Association

Applicant: Thomas Bello, Bello Architects, PC

History: 1850 and 1871; refaced, c. 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW:

Located at the northeast corner of S. 4th Street and Willings Alley, the structure at 211-25 S. 4th Street is a large, four-story Colonial Revival building, classified as Contributing in the Society Hill Historic District. Around 1989, prior to the designation of the district, the property underwent a complete renovation, at which time the original windows were replaced with the existing clad Pella windows. The application proposes to install new aluminum-clad Pella sash within the existing thick, clad frames. Existing transoms will remain. The application claims that it intends to replace the windows in kind; however, the configuration and details of many of the windows does not replicate the existing appearance, much less the historic appearance. The proposed windows will also have between-glass muntins that do not appear to replicate the appearance of the existing between-glass muntins, which have an unusually deep profile for between-glass grilles. The staff notes that the proposed Pella Architect Series windows offers a more appropriate simulated-divided lite option with an interior and exterior 7/8-inch muntin and spacer bar.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace all window sash

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 SEPTEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The application proposes to replace non-historic windows with windows that do not replicate the historic appearance of the windows. Historic photographs document the original window configurations that should be used as the basis for the replacement. The application fails to satisfy this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:39:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Tom Bello and contractor Ed Brady represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Bello explained that intent of the project is to replace only the movable sash portions of the windows, with the transoms and half-round windows and frames to remain. He noted that the exterior fixed glass panes of the existing windows are coming loose.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the existing windows have between-glass grilles.
 - Mr. Brady responded that the existing windows are an odd series that Pella produced for a short time and which are not produced anymore. They have glass on the outside, and on the interior there is a second piece of glass with an interior and exterior applied grille. He explained that only the sash are replaceable; the transoms and half-round windows cannot be removed. Responding to the staff suggestion that simulated-divided-lite windows would be more appropriate, he commented that the difference between the portions of the windows to remain and the new windows would be more pronounced if there are simulated-divided-lite sash and between-glass grilles on the transoms.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the glass is falling out of the transoms as well.
 - Mr. Brady responded that it is not; it is just a failure of the sash, which are rotting.
 - Mr. Detwiler questioned how much longer the fanlights and transoms could last before needing to be replaced owing to seal failure or other issues.
 - Mr. Brady responded that they could last indefinitely. He reiterated that they have glass on the outside with removable grilles and glass on the inside.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted there is no guarantee that the transoms and fanlights will not start failing.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the windows are such a major feature of this building. He noted that the visible glass was greatly reduced when the windows were replaced in the 1990s. He opined that it is difficult to allow new sash that are still wrong for the building. He noted that there is a weird hybrid situation which he sympathizes with, but that there would be so much more light and visibility if they went back to the original configuration.
 - Mr. Brady and Mr. Bello disagreed, opining that he thinks the window sizes are pretty close to what was there originally.

- Mr. Detwiler responded that the replacement windows have a different configuration from the original windows, with wider frames and more mullions between the sash and multiple transoms, as opposed to the original configuration of single sash over single sash.
- Mr. Bello responded that that is what was available at the time they were replaced. He explained they are looking for a solution for safety and weather protection. He noted that they are making a commitment to uniformity by replacing all of the sash.
- Mr. Bello noted that the original windows were not insulated.
- Mr. Detwiler responded that it is now possible to replicate the original window configuration with insulated units.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the proposed units will be identical to what is there currently.
 - Mr. Brady responded affirmatively.
 - Ms. Gutterman explained that she understands the transoms and fanlights are not operable and are not proposed to be replaced, but opined that their retention is no reason to continue a bad thing with the sash below. She suggested that, even if they were to replicate the existing configuration of the windows, they would look better with simulated-divided-lites as opposed to between-glass grilles.
 - Mr. Bello reiterated that they are unable to change the transoms and fanlights, so if they install new sash with simulated-divided-lites, which Pella calls ILTs, there will be more of a mismatch.
 - The Committee members understood but reiterated the preference for simulated-divided-lite windows.
- Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the staff and Committee are recommending that the applicants try to get closer to the historic appearance of the windows, rather than simply replacing in kind.
- Mr. Brady asked whether the windows out of public view could have between-glass grilles.
 - Ms. Gutterman opined that all the windows should be the same.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the staff could provide guidance on the appropriate configuration, depending on the visibility from the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing windows were replaced prior to designation and do not replicate the appearance of the historic windows. The existing replacement windows have a different configuration from the original windows, with wider frames and more mullions between the sash and multiple transoms, as opposed to the original configuration of single sash over single sash.
- Only the operable sash are proposed for replacement; the fanlights and transoms will remain.
- An attempt should be made to get the windows closer to their original appearance. Simulated-divided-lite sash with the muntin pattern to match the existing windows is preferable to between-glass grilles, even if it creates a mismatch between the

transoms/fanlights and sash.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application proposes to replace non-historic windows with windows that do not replicate the historic appearance of the windows in material or design, failing to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 211-25 S 4th ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 300 N CHRIS COLUMBUS BLVD

Proposal: Construct 25-story mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 300 Columbus LLC

Applicant: Gary Handel, Handel Architects LLP

History: 1675; West Ship Yard Archaeological Site

Individual Designation: 8/26/1987

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a 25-story mixed-use building at a site that was individually designated for its archaeological resources and is also located at the northeast corner of the Old City Historic District. No structures stand on the site at this time. The building will include 360 apartments, 10,000 square feet of retail space, and parking.

The Delaware River Waterfront Corporation, which owned the site until 2020, and the current owner have been working to ensure that archaeological resources at the site are protected during any redevelopment. A report on the due diligence archaeological investigations that have been conducted at the site as well as an archaeological data recovery plan are included with the application materials and have already been approved by the staff. The new building will be located on the southern half of the site to protect significant archaeological resources located at the northern half. Where new construction has the potential to disturb archaeological resources, the data from those resources will be recovered before construction begins. Also,

archaeologists will be on site to monitor construction activities that have the potential to disturb archaeological resources.

The new building will consist of a residential tower on a podium that will house lobby and retail space, parking, loading dock facilities, and other storage and support spaces. The building will be contemporary in style and will be clad in curtain-wall, metal-panel, and storefront systems. The northern section of the tower will be supported on exposed concrete columns. The northern section of the site will be landscaped and include recreational facilities. The occupied spaces in the building are raised above the flood plain.

The building currently proposed is 291'-10" to the parapet and 322'-8" to the highest point. The building to the south, at 250 S. Christopher Columbus Boulevard, which the Historical Commission approved in 2012, is 171'-5" and 16 stories tall. In 2005, the Historical Commission approved a 345-foot-tall, 30-story building for that site, but it was not constructed.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Conduct archaeological data recovery and monitoring where construction will disturb subsurface resources.
- Construct 25-story mixed-use building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 8: Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.*
 - The proposal satisfies Standard 8, provided the archaeological data recovery and monitoring activities are undertaken as proposed. The staff has already approved the data recovery plan.
- *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 building is differentiated from but compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features with its environment. The environment in this section of the historic district, east of I-95, is very different from that of the central section of the district to the west. The environment to the east of the highway is defined by the size and scale of the highway, Ben Franklin Bridge, pier buildings, other large buildings, and the Delaware River.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the archaeological data recovery and monitoring activities are undertaken as proposed, with the staff to review archaeological details, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:56:15

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect David Margolis and archaeologists Joel Dworsky and Doug Mooney represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Margolis presented an overview of the project to the Architectural Committee. He stated that the site is just over one and a half acres and is currently a parking lot. The project has received approvals from zoning, Civic Design Review, the Central Delaware Advocacy Group, and the Delaware River Waterfront Corporation. He showed photographs of the site and described the architectural plans. He pointed out on a site plan that the building is located at the southern end of the site and the northern end will remain open space and be used as a public park. He also noted that the view from the Wood Street steps to the water will be maintained. The tower has been oriented to provide views from the apartments towards Center City. He described the material palette starting from the bottom. He explained that the V columns that mark the residential entrance are exposed concrete. The podium is wrapped in Bethel white granite. The lobby is a storefront system. The retail storefront is glazed. The parking is screened with vertical louvers. The tower is made up of a glass curtain wall system with clear glazing, back painted spandrel glass, and shadow box. The building is topped off with the metal panel system. He displayed some renderings of the building. He showed a view of the retail space along Christopher Columbus Boulevard and an aerial view of the public plaza on the north side of the building entrances and driveway. He pointed out the playground, paths, and seating.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the designation status of the property.
 - Mr. Farnham stated that it is individually designated for archaeology and also included within the Old City Historic District. He stated that it is located at the far northeast corner of the district, at the intersection of Christopher Columbus Boulevard and Callowhill Street. It is located in the part of the historic district that is east of the interstate highway and north of the Ben Franklin Bridge.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if there are any proposed changes to the paving of Water Street.
 - Mr. Margolis replied that they are not proposing to change the public street.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the developer would display any of the archaeological findings. She asked about archaeology in general.
 - Mr. Dworsky stated that the area within the footprint of the structure will be completely excavated and the archaeological data from the area will be recovered. He noted that archaeology is inherently a destructive science, so they will document everything they remove. In the area where they are not excavating, archaeological deposits will remain in place. He added that the treatment of the surface will not really have any impact on the more deeply buried cultural resources, which have survived for hundreds of years.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked where artifacts discovered on the site will be stored.
 - Mr. Dworsky explained that most of the material will wind up with the state museum in Harrisburg, but there have been some discussions about trying to keep some of the more notable materials for display on site.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked if there will be any interpretation of the archaeological discoveries at the site, for example in the park, informative panels or other educational materials.
 - Mr. Dworsky replied that there will be panels along the trail. Exactly what they will contain will largely be dependent upon what is encountered during the archaeology.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked why the building has been twisted off the grid.

- Mr. Margolis replied it was rotated to take advantage of the spectacular views of Center City.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked why the retail along Columbus Boulevard is elevated up a significant number of steps above the street and does not really engage with the sidewalk.
 - Mr. Margolis replied that the building is completely within the flood zone and everything in the building had to be elevated above the flood level.
- Ms. Stein asked about the very large opaque box at the top of the building that contains mechanical equipment. She asked what was located in it and why it needed to be so big. Ms. Stein asserted that it looks larger than a typical mechanical penthouse.
 - Mr. Margolis stated that the mechanical penthouse contains cooling towers, generators, energy recovery systems, and other things like that that take up an incredible amount of space. He stated that there are the elevator overruns as well.
 - Ms. Stein asked if it had to be a painted metal box.
 - Mr. Margolis replied that it is actually a curtain wall system with metal panels on a curtain wall system and it is powder coated.
 - Ms. Stein asked about the color.
 - Mr. Margolis answered that it is a medium gray with flicks of mica that so that it actually has a little bit of radiance to it.
 - Ms. Stein opined that a lighter color and more reflective color would be better and help minimize the mass and appearance of the dark element against the sky. Reducing its length and height and making it lighter in color will make it more successful.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that any articulation that can be given to the plinth, the box at the base, would improve it. Any minimizing or warming of it would be appreciated.
 - Mr. Margolis said that they could add planting at the top of the podium level around the entire perimeter to soften the top level. He also noted that, with the using louvers at the parking garage, they have taken the standard louvers and alternated them in direction in six-foot bands across the facade to help break down the scale a little bit. He also noted that signage will be added later.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission individually designated the property as historic for its archaeological resources, and also included the property in the Old City Historic District for the same reason. No above-ground resources exist at the site, which is a vacant lot.
- The northeast corner of the Old City Historic District, where this property is located, is cut off from the main section of the historic district by the I-95 corridor and the Ben Franklin Bridge.
- In 2005, the Historical Commission approved a 345-foot-tall, 30-story building for the lot to the south, 250 S. Christopher Columbus Boulevard, but it was not constructed. In 2012, the Historical Commission approved the building that does stand at that site, which is 171'-5" and 16 stories tall.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The report on the due diligence archaeological investigations that have been conducted at the site as well as the archaeological data recovery plan, which includes monitoring during construction, will ensure that some archaeological resources are protected in place and that data regarding archaeological resources that must be disturbed are recovered prior to construction, satisfying Standard 8. The Architectural Committee suggested that archaeological artifacts discovered at the site should be displayed onsite and interpretive signage about the archaeology should be included in the park space
- The proposed building is differentiated from but compatible with its environment, the section of the historic district east of I-95, which is defined by the size and scale of the highway, Ben Franklin Bridge, piers and other large structures, and the Delaware River. The proposed building satisfies Standard 9, but can be improved if the Architectural Committee's suggestions that the base and mechanical penthouse of the tower are made less boxy and the height of the mechanical penthouse is reduced are implemented.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the archaeological data recovery and monitoring activities are undertaken as proposed, and with the suggestions that the base and mechanical penthouse of the tower are made less boxy, the height of the mechanical penthouse is reduced, archaeological artifacts are displayed onsite, and interpretive signage about the archaeology is included in the park space, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

ITEM: 300 N. Christopher Columbus Blvd					
MOTION: Approval with conditions and suggestions					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 04:20:25

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 01:20 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.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 SEPTEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.