

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

**TUESDAY, 25 JUNE 2019
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-031
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		
Suzanne Pentz		X	
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

The following staff members were present:

- Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
- Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Steve Bertil, Esq., Fineman Kreksten & Harris
- Andrew Randazzo, Andrew Randazzo Architects
- Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
- Dennis Carlisle, OCF
- Lindsey Burstein, OCF
- Sam Easton, OCF
- Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker Partners
- Dan Kayser, Cecil Baker Partners
- Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker Partners
- Larry Spector, Society Hill Civic Association
- Jim Moss, Society Hill Towers
- Bruce Holberg, Society Hill Towers
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- P. Campbell, Center City Residents Association
- Adam Hunt, Stuart G. Rosenberg, Architects

Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Bob Parsky
Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg, Architects
Adam Hunt, Stuart G. Rosenberg, Architects
Ola Alkudsi, Stuart G. Rosenberg, Architects
Stephanie DeBusk
Tim Shaaban, Astoban Realty Group
Bruno Pouget, Astoban Realty Group
Brett Caspi, Astoban Realty Group
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Jim McAuliff, USA Architects
Matt Ulassin, USA Architects
Jason Coleman, O'Donnell Naccarato
Tom Broadhurst, Keating Contractors
Michael Williams, Keating Contractors
Mary O'Neill, Society Hill Towers
Jon Harris, Harris Architect LLC
Colleen Gaughan
Camillo D'Orazio
Joe Burda, Woodcock Design
Tim Kane, TJ Kane Enterprise, Inc.
Joshua Kiehl, John Milner Architects
Dave Wallis, Intech Construction
Kara Litvinas, John Milner Architects
Adam Smkills, Philly Prop
Brenna March, Gnome Architects
Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2022-24 CHANCELLOR ST

Proposal: Enlarge garage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2022 Chancellor Street LLC

Applicant: Andrew Randazzo, Andrew Randazzo Architects

History: 1890

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This three-story brick Italianate carriage house is a contributing structure within the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. In 2015, the Historical Commission approved the creation of a second garage at the rear of the building on St. James Street. The applicant is now requesting permission to combine the two existing garages into one large one.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Combine two existing garages into one large one at the rear of the property on St. James Street.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 10: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - This facade has already been significantly altered by placing two garage doors in areas where there were not door openings previously. This means that the proposal does not remove or destroy historic fabric or character defining features. In addition, this block of St. James Street is very clearly a service alley with several other garages.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Andrew Randazzo represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked whether the pier that separated the two existing garages was original fabric.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that it was not known for certain, but that she believed the brick was there at the time that the second garage was created.
- The Committee asked the applicant why he was proposing to remove the pier.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- The applicant responded that it was because currently, navigating a car into each garage was very difficult since the alley was so narrow. He said that without the pier, it would be easier to clear the turn into the garage.
- The Committee asked what would happen to the rain water conductor and the cast iron boot with their plan.
 - The applicant responded that they would have to be relocated.
- The Committee requested clarification that the proposal was to retain the jambs at the left and right of the existing opening and remove the center pier.
 - The applicant confirmed this was the proposal.
- The Committee asked if a new lintel would be installed, and if so, how many courses of brick would have to be removed to accommodate it.
 - The applicant responded that the plan was to install a new lintel by removing the brick.
- The Committee asked what the depth of the pier was and what size beam the applicant was planning on using.
 - The applicant responded that the pier had a depth of approximately 24 inches, and explained that he had not yet gone through the structural analysis to determine what size beam would be used, but he estimated it would measure approximately 24 inches.
- The Committee asked how much of the face brick would need to be removed in order to complete this work.
 - The applicant explained that he was proposing to use one continuous piece of steel across the entirety of the opening, He estimated the amount of brick that would need to be removed was approximately six courses, which would then be replaced once the structural elements were installed.
- The Committee asked what the cross-hatch represented on the plans.
 - The applicant responded that it was intended to distinguish the different condominium units of the building.
- The Committee commented that the proposal to create one large garage seemed like a convenience and not a necessity.
- The Committee asked if the blind arch above the garage openings would be removed to accommodate the installation of the new steel beam.
 - The applicant responded that if the brick removal was limited to the estimated 24 inches, the blind arch would remain.
- The Committee stated that they would recommend that the blind arch to remain, and that without a structural report they could not determine whether a 24-inch beam would be sufficient to support the proposed single opening.
- The Committee asked whether the applicant had considered narrowing the pier rather than removing it entirely.
 - The applicant replied that even if they were to narrow the pier instead of removing it, the lintels would need to be replaced, therefore the amount of work it would take to narrow it did not seem worth the limited extra room it would create.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application did not substantiate that a 24-inch beam would be enough to support the single opening as proposed.

- The applicant did not present an argument other than convenience for the proposal to combine the two existing garage openings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project that includes removing masonry does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 2022-24 CHANCELLOR ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 222-30 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish rears of buildings, construct 19-story tower, rooftop addition and deck

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 226 Walnut LP

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 222-24, Charles G. Mather & Company Building, Charles Barton Keen, architect, 1917
 226, Samuel Sloan, architect, 1856, refaced 1917
 228-30, John T. Brugger, architect, c. 1954

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes work at the site of three interconnected buildings on the south side of the 200-block of Walnut Street. The site runs south from Walnut Street to Thomas Paine Place. The application proposes to construct a tower behind the fronts of the two eastern buildings. To clear a site for the tower, the rear sections of two of the buildings would be demolished. The tower would be 19 stories and 240' tall; it would be set back 25 feet from Walnut Street and Thomas Paine Place. The tower would cantilever out of the rears of the remaining buildings, creating an overbuild of sorts. The western of the three buildings would be converted to a townhouse. A rooftop addition and deck would be added to the western building. Parking for the complex would be accessed from the rear.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove rear sections of the buildings at 222-24 and 226 Walnut Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Construct 19-story, 240' tower.
- Construct rooftop addition and deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The massing, size, scale, proportions, and height of the proposed tower with overbuild are not compatible with the complex of buildings or historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:13:08

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton, attorney Neil Sklaroff, and developer Tim Shabaan represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Leighton explained that the tower would include one dwelling unit per floor. There would be two units in the remaining section of the historic buildings. Parking would be located in the basement and accessed from Thomas Paine Place. Nothing can be built on the rear of 228-30 Walnut Street. Mr. Leighton explained the histories of the buildings.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the zoning. Mr. Leighton explained that the site is zoned CMX-3, which allows for an FAR of 500. He noted that they are planning for additional FAR, 750, through bonuses. He stated that the tower is set back 25 feet from each of the streets. There is no height restriction behind the 25-foot setback.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about a height restriction that is being considered but is not in place yet. Mr. Leighton explained that the City Planning Commission and community organization are considering a height limit but it has not been implemented.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the proposed building is "hugely tall" and not compatible with the surrounding historic district, where the buildings are primarily three stories in height. He stated that it would be "extremely big" for the area. Mr. Leighton presented a diagram that indicated the heights of various buildings in the area. He reported the Society Hill Towers are 31 stories and 309 feet tall. The Customs House is 17 stories and 287 feet tall. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the settings of the Society Hill Towers and this site are very different.
- Mr. D'Alessandro objected to the height of the proposed building as well as the demolitions of the rears of the historic buildings.
- Mr. Leighton directed the Committee to photographs of the rear of the complex of buildings. He noted that the rear wings of the buildings include newer, 1950s sections. He explained that they have not yet explored the structural aspects of the rears of the buildings but will if this in-concept application is approved. Therefore, they cannot precisely locate the point of demolition.

- The Committee members unanimously agreed that the proposed building is much too tall for this site across the street from the Merchants' Exchange building.
- Mr. Sklaroff observed that much of the project has not yet been developed. He stated that his client has presented an in-concept application to gauge the Historical Commission's opinion of the proposed massing of the tower. He stated that his design team will take all comments into consideration and revise the project accordingly. Mr. Sklaroff asked the Committee members if they could identify a satisfactory height for the tower. Mr. McCoubrey replied that any proposal for the site should remain within the contemplated 65-foot height limit. He added that the extent of the proposed demolition should be clearly stipulated. Mr. Sklaroff responded that 65 feet would not work for his client. Mr. McCoubrey stated that 65 feet should be the starting point for the discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Cynthia MacLeod, the superintendent of Independence National Historical Park, paraphrased a letter she has sent to the Historical Commission objecting to the application. She stated that the park abuts this property. She explained that the park is a National Register historic district that contains a World Heritage Site and five National Historic Landmarks including the Merchants' Exchange. She also noted that the United States government's first purpose-built building, the First Bank of the United States, is nearby. She noted that the site is also within the Society Hill Historic District. She contended that the project does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards including Standards 1, 9, and 10. She stated that a 19-story structure would not be compatible with the surrounding three-story structures. She contended that the excavation could destroy archaeological resources and could also damage surrounding structures. She added that the tower would cast large shadows on the park. Finally, she noted that the City Planning Commission has approved a height limit for the area, which will be considered by City Council. She asked the Architectural Committee to recommend denial of the application.
- Larry Spector, the president of the Society Hill Civic Association, stated that the project would be "disruptive." He stated that his organization opposes the application.
- Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association opposed the project.
- Bruce Holberg of Society Hill Towers Owners Association stated that his organization is in complete agreement with the Society Hill Civic Association and the National Park Service.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed project would require the removals of the rears of the buildings at 222-24 and 226 Walnut Street. The extent of the removal is not clearly indicated in the application.
- The project site is adjacent to Independence National Historical Park and directly across the street from the Merchants' Exchange building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The massing, size, scale, proportions, and height of the proposed tower with overbuild are not compatible with the historic buildings on the site or the surrounding historic districts and therefore do not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 222-30 WALNUT ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 1810 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Construct 14-story addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 1808 Chestnut LLC

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 1923-24; Samuel T. Freeman & Co. Auction House; Tilden & Register

Individual Designation: 1/1/3000

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

On 15 March 2019, the staff notified the property owner of 1810 Chestnut Street that the Historical Commission would consider a nomination for the Samuel T. Freeman & Co. Auction House and determine whether to designate the property as historic. At the time of notice, the current owner had intended to sell the property and subsequently requested to continue the review of the nomination, which remains pending, while a sale of the building was finalized. The property has remained under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction since 15 March. This in-concept application, submitted by a potential developer, includes retaining the historic six-story structure and constructing a 14-story addition with an 18' 6" setback from Chestnut Street and a 24' 3" setback from Sansom Street.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct 14-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

- Though the addition is not compatible in massing, scale and proportion, the application proposes to retain much of the historic building's exterior envelope, including the primary Chestnut Street façade, Sansom Street façade, and east and west elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, owing to the extensive plans for the development of the property already in place at the time notice of the nomination was sent.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:43:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Neil Sklaroff, developer Tim Shabaan, and architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Keller noted that the application was revised at the end of the previous week.
- Mr. Leighton explained that the revised application is inclusive only of the building at 1810 Chestnut Street and that the building extends from Chestnut Street to Sansom Street, lying just outside the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. He added that the building stands at six stories in height, totaling 77 feet. The property, he continued, is 45-feet wide on Chestnut Street, narrowing to 25-feet at Sansom Street, and is 235-feet deep. The existing building, he added, is 51,000 square feet, the bulk of which will be renovated. He noted that the proposed removals are very limited and are intended only to create light courts for the proposed dwelling units. He stated that the addition would be approximately 78,000 square feet. Mr. Leighton commented that the intention is to maintain commercial space within the first two floors of the building, which includes a portion of the existing auction house space. He clarified that the existing façade, entry, and display windows would remain. The project, he continued, would include creating 25 dwelling units, noting that the property is zoned CMX-5. He remarked that vehicles would enter from Sansom Street, where there is an existing loading dock. He then described the proposed programming of the proposed plans. He directed the Committee to the plans in the application to show where a light court would be created, noting that a freight elevator currently exists in that location and that the shaft would be repurposed for the light court. Mr. Leighton explained that the setback at the Chestnut Street façade was determined by the column line of the existing building, with the goal of building off the existing structure. At Sansom Street, he added, the setback aligns with the second column line to create the new south façade.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the party wall would remain unchanged.
 - Mr. Leighton affirmed, adding that the building is expressive of its structure and the column lines are visible at the exterior.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how much the Chestnut Street balconies would project, adding that the Committee does not typically recommend approval of balconies at the fronts of buildings.
 - Mr. Leighton responded that the balconies project about 8 feet.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired how the new structure would be structurally supported.
 - Mr. Leighton replied that the existing building is a large warehouse of robust construction and the first attempt will be to use the existing structure when it is converted from the commercial loading to residential.

- Mr. McCoubrey contended that the Chestnut Street setback is not sufficient for the historic building and requested that the new construction be set back significantly more. He added that the setback would ideally allow the new construction to appear as an independent building in the background and to give the historic building a sense of place and presence.
- Mr. Detwiler requested that the applicant provide street views, adding that the aerial images provided are helpful but that the street views of Chestnut and Sansom Streets would be more informative of the impact of the massing.
- The Committee discussed the heights of other buildings on the block.
 - Mr. Leighton responded that he has heights of some neighboring buildings and offered the dimensions.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether demolition plans were included or if he is to assume what is proposed for demolition.
 - Mr. Leighton explained that demolition plans were not included because no demolition is proposed other than repurposing an elevator shaft as a light court. He further clarified that no existing fabric would be removed at the first few floors, but that dwelling units would start at the fifth and sixth floors. He reiterated that at these floors, the existing freight elevator shaft would be opened to create a light court, and on the opposite side some floor would be removed to create a similar light court. He noted that further fabric would be removed for an elevator and staircase at the core of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building with the proposed addition would total 14 stories in height.
- Very limited demolition of existing fabric would be necessary for the proposed mixed-use conversion. The proposed demolition would allow the creation of two small light courts and the insertion of stairs and an elevator at the building's interior. While the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the interior, the Committee's recommendation is influenced by the proposed retention of historic fabric at the interior and exterior of the building.
- No additional structural support has been deemed necessary, and the addition would rely solely on the existing structure.
- The Chestnut Street façade would not be altered.
- The proposed addition includes balconies at both the Chestnut and Sansom Street facades.
- The addition would maintain an 18'-6" setback along Chestnut Street, and a 24'-3" setback along Sansom Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The current proposed setback along Chestnut Street is not appropriate for the historic building and should be increased. However, the height and massing of the proposed addition is acceptable, owing to the building's context along Chestnut Street and its proximity to multi-story buildings in the Rittenhouse neighborhood. In general, the proposed addition complies with Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend in-concept approval with the following comments:

- The massing and height of the building are appropriate, given the building's Chestnut Street location;
- The balconies are not compatible with the historic building and should be further studied;
- The setback along Chestnut Street should be increased; and
- A minimal amount of demolition is required at the interior and exterior to achieve the addition.

ITEM: 1810 CHESTNUT ST					
MOTION: Approval in-concept, with comments					
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				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 176 CONARROE ST

Proposal: Convert church to multi-family residence; rehabilitate rectory

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: American Living Concepts of Manayunk LLC

Applicant: Kelly Vresilovic, CaVA Architects

History: 1849; St. Mary's RC Church

Individual Designation: 8/12/2016

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church historically consisted of a church, adjacent rectory, burial ground, and parochial school, with the church standing as the oldest building, having been constructed in 1849. While the larger project includes the development of the entire St. Mary's complex and adjacent parking lots, the Historical Commission holds jurisdiction only over the church, rectory, and burial ground.

SCOPE OF WORK AT CHURCH:

- Install solar panel array at west slope of roof.
- Remove stained-glass lancet windows at east and west facades and replace with operable aluminum clad windows with painted aluminum trim and blue spandrel panel.
- Replace lower-level windows with aluminum-clad double-hung sash windows with painted metal trim.
- Create two new circular aluminum-clad windows at front façade.
- Restore existing door frames and stained-glass window at front façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Install new paneled wood doors at front façade.
- Restore stained-glass transoms and alter to remove religious symbols.
- Replace circular front façade window and lancet louvers with painted aluminum window and louvers.
- Rebuild brick cornice to match existing where damaged.

SCOPE OF WORK AT RECTORY:

- Install solar panel array on flat portion of roof.
- Install new two-over-two aluminum-clad windows with extruded aluminum trim at front façade and two-over-two fiberglass windows with metal trim at rear.
- Install new doors.
- Remove non-original rear addition.
- Clean, repair, and repoint brick.
- Remove capping from wood lintels and sills and repaint.
- Repair and repaint cornice, bay, and dormers.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The application largely proposes to restore the exterior envelopes of the church and rectory. However, the church's stained-glass windows are proposed to be replaced with operable aluminum-clad wood windows with spandrel panels to accommodate the addition of an interior floor. While the replacement of windows does not comply with this standard, the staff finds that such a change is necessary for the reuse of the building.
- *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.*
 - In addition to the replacement of the stained-glass windows, the application proposes to install new aluminum-clad wood windows with paintable extruded aluminum trim at the front façade of the rectory. The proposed windows would replicate the historic two-over-two double-hung sash windows in appearance. Provided the trim replicates the historic ogee molding in shape and dimension, the replacement of the windows complies with this standard. Other proposed work, such as the restoration of the stained-glass window and transom at the front façade, installation of new doors, and masonry and trim repair, complies with this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*

- The proposed solar panel arrays have an appropriate setback from the front façade of the church, and those proposed for the rectory would have no visibility from Conarroe Street; the proposed solar panel arrays comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:02:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Kelly Vresilovic, Charles Capaldi, and Kelly Piasecki represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Vresilovic stated that the owner, American Living Concepts of Manayunk, has done an extensive amount of work with the neighborhood in the past three years, noting that a Philadelphia Zoning Masterplan Overlay was created for the entire site, which includes land of a former brewery and the property containing the Catholic church and school.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about how much of the development is currently underway.
 - Ms. Vresilovic answered that the new construction on Carson Street was just permitted, adding that more work related to stormwater has been completed.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if, when the project is complete, the adjacent buildings on Conarroe Street will be constructed.
 - Ms. Vresilovic affirmed that the buildings will be constructed, stating that Conarroe Street is a very narrow 15'-wide cartway, adding that the owner purchased the property with the intention of creating a beautiful preservation project with high energy efficiency. She added that the solar arrays proposed for the church and rectory would not be visible from Conarroe Street and directed the Committee to a rendering in the application.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Vresilovic to confirm that the solar array on the rectory would not be visible from any point on Conarroe Street.
 - Ms. Vresilovic answered that the rectory roof is flat above the mansard, with only about a 5% slope, so it would not be visible from the street. She added that there is a set of rowhouses abutting the rectory that would prevent visibility from the approach down the street from the top of the hill.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the necessity of adding the round windows at the front façade of the church.
 - Ms. Vresilovic explained that the original balcony would be removed and a second floor would be added at the interior. She noted that the existing stained glass window at the front façade would remain in place, but the new windows are desired to allow light and air, because a bedroom is proposed at the interior.
 - The Committee discussed the size of the windows, commenting that they would be 3'-9".
 - Mr. Detwiler observed that the northeast window would be placed within an elevator lobby.
 - Ms. Gutterman opposed the insertion of the circular windows.
- Ms. Vresilovic clarified the configuration with the added floor, noting that a spandrel panel would be placed within the current windows.

- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the site's historic fencing and whether any would be removed.
 - Ms. Vresilovic answered that all historic fencing would be retained, though it would be scraped and painted. She added that the church yard, which historically functioned as a cemetery, would be repurposed as a park with benches and lighting.
- Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the application proposes to replace the existing wood louvers with new aluminum louvers. He asked whether there was any reason for replacing them.
 - Ms. Vresilovic stated that the existing wood louvers are located at the top of the tower and are largely in disrepair, allowing pigeons and debris to enter the tower.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro noted that every building has pigeons and asked whether the louvers could be replaced to match existing in wood.
 - Mr. Capaldi replied that they could but wood is very impractical given the location; wood louvers will be impossible to maintain at that location. Mr. Capaldi added that the louvers are one of the only areas, other than the side church windows, where they would be removing existing material, noting that most other historic windows have already been removed. He contended that the replacement louvers could be detailed to match the existing wood louvers.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked that the applicants address the proposed replacement of the church's lower-level windows with aluminum clad windows. He inquired whether the original wood frames would remain.
 - Mr. Capaldi responded that the sub-frame will remain and the clad windows would be inserted in the opening.
- Ms. Stein questioned the use of a blue spandrel panel, commenting that a blue panel could create a horizontal stripe across the building, which would compete with the verticality of the windows.
 - Ms. Vresilovic stated that all the stained glass windows contain blue circles as a motif, so the blue spandrels are to reference the blue stained glass of the historic windows.
 - The Committee opposed the use of the blue glass panel due to the striping effect that would be created.
 - The applicants agreed to substitute a neutral color for the spandrel panel.
- Ms. Stein asked that no HVAC units be visible from a public right-of-way.
 - Ms. Vresilovic remarked that the units would be placed at the rear of the rectory where units already exist and where they would not be visible from the street.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed project incorporates several buildings and vacant lots, covering a large site on Conarroe Street, though the Historical Commission has jurisdiction only over the church, church yard, and rectory.
- New buildings are proposed at the vacant lots, though construction has not yet begun. The new buildings would impact the visibility of the church from Conarroe Street.
- New circular windows would be installed at the front façade of the church, and the existing stained glass windows, lower-level windows, and louvers would be replaced.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The replacement of most windows is necessary for the functionality of the church as a residential building. While the replacement of historic windows does not directly comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, retaining the existing windows would be impractical for the church's future use.
- With the exception of the church windows, the proposed project would largely retain the historic fabric of the church and rectory. Therefore, the proposed work complies with Standards 2 and 6.
- The proposed solar arrays should not be readily visible from Conarrore Street, and any mechanical equipment should not be visible from a public way. The work complies with Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9, with the following comments:

- The louvers at the church tower should be documented prior to removal and the new aluminum louvers should replicate the existing wood louvers in dimension, profile, and size;
- The addition of the two new circular window openings at the front elevation of the church should be reduced in size or removed from the scope;
- The location of the solar arrays should be inconspicuous from the public way;
- The HVAC units should be invisible from the public way; and
- The spandrel panels should be a neutral color rather than blue.

ITEM: 176 CONARROE ST MOTION: Approval, with comments 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				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 2204 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Remove roof and rear mansard; construct 7-story addition with decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AMZ Four LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg, Architects

History: 1870; refaced c. 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The building at 2204 Walnut Street was designed by Frank Furness as a double wide house for John Ashhurst and constructed in 1872. Architect Wilson Eyre Jr. added a mansard and made other alterations later in the nineteenth century. In 1900, the building was remodeled for the Holman School for Girls. In 1938, the front façade was replaced when it was converted to a showroom for the Anthracite Industries, Inc., a trade organization. The rear ell was removed and the rear wall altered. In January 2019, the Commission approved rooftop additions with the proviso that they must be invisible from the public right-of-way as demonstrated to staff during a site visit. The staff has met with the applicants including their historic preservation consultant Robert Thomas and finds that all three levels of additions will be highly visible both from 22nd Street as well as to a lesser extent from Walnut Street. Unable to secure the staff's detail approval for the addition because it did not meet the condition placed on the overall approval by Historical Commission, the developer now requests that the Historical Commission relax its requirements and approve the visible addition.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove roof and portions of rear wall.
- Retain rear wall as part of light well.
- Construct seven story rear addition and four-story rooftop addition with setbacks from front façade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
- *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 additions and decks are not compatible with the scale of the existing building.
- *Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*

- The proposed additions do not comply with the Roofs Guideline as it will be highly conspicuous.
- *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 proposed roof configuration and addition would be difficult to reverse in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9, and 10, the Roofs Guidelines and the Commission's approval conditions of January 2019.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:25:32

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Stuart Rosenberg, Adam Hunt and Ola Alkudsi represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Baron explained that he conducted a site visit and included photographs showing the high level of visibility of the proposed construction both from Walnut Street and 22nd Street.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that the additions would be invisible from directly across the street on Walnut Street.
- The Committee asked about the proposed setbacks at each level.
 - Mr. Hunt explained that the fifth floor is not set back but is mostly hidden by the parapet. The sixth floor is set back 11 feet and the seventh floor is setback 22 feet. The penthouse will have a sloped roof. Mr. Rosenberg showed a rendering of the rooftop additions as recommended for approval by the Architectural Committee and a rendering of the additions as now proposed with greatly reduced setbacks. He said that he found the difference to be "de minimis." He also showed a photograph of the new construction at 2108 Walnut Street and opined that, since the Commission approved that design, then this one should also be approved.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that each building site has its own specific conditions and is looked at individually. She also noted that the building at 2108-10 Walnut Street is new construction on a vacant lot.
- The Committee noted inconsistencies in the application; the rendering does not agree with the section drawing, which in turn does not agree with the elevations. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the three central windows on the sixth floor seem to sit in a projecting element which is not shown in the rendering. Mr. Detwiler noted that the decks and railings are not shown on the rendering. Ms. Stein noted that the penthouse level is not shown on the rendering and that she does not favor visible decks and railings. Mr. Baron noted from the mockup photographs that all levels would be visible.
 - The applicant responded they had not shown all the levels because they did not believe that the penthouse would be visible from the vantage point that they chose to depict.

- Ms. Stein questioned the proposed design for the fifth-floor construction visible at the side notches in the parapet, and asked whether there would be any setback. She opined that it looks too close in its current form.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that he thinks the new wall would sit back at the inner side of the parapet but that they could also propose greater setbacks which could provide light to the units.
- The Committee asked if the additions could be a subtly different color so that the existing façade is not lost in the larger whole.
 - Mr. Rosenberg said that they could explore different color options.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed project is not shown accurately or consistently in the drawings and renderings.
- The proposed addition will be visible from the public right-of-way

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed additions with reduced setbacks do not meet the Commission's requirement of invisibility from the public right-of-way or the lesser requirement of inconspicuousness from the public right-of-way.
- The proposed project does not meet Standard 9, which requires that projects do "not destroy historic materials and spatial relationships that characterize the property," and "protect the integrity of the property and its environment."
- The proposed project does not meet Standard 10, which requires that new construction be able to be removed in the future, leaving the "essential form and integrity of the property and its environment unimpaired."

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, the Roofs Guidelines and the Commission's approval conditions of January 2019.

ITEM: 2204 WALNUT ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 400 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Cut new entrances, install doors and fencing, replace and coat terra cotta and brick

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 400 North Broad Partners, LLC, Joan and Peter Lesser

Applicant: Craig Gleason, Daniel Keating Contractors

History: 1923, Rankin Kellogg and Crane Architects

Individual Designation: 8/9/1995

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The Elverson building was constructed in 1923 as an office building and publishing plant for the Inquirer Newspaper. The City of Philadelphia is now transforming it into the offices for the Police Department and Medical Examiner. The staff has already approved some masonry repair and new windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert front and side windows into new entrances, retain existing transoms.
- Enclose the loading dock with overhead doors.
- Install security fencing along basement ramp.
- Install a guard booth on exterior ramp.
- Recoat terra-cotta and brick.
- Replace damaged terra-cotta units with micro-cotta.

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.*
 - Tests are still being conducted to see if the paint can be successfully removed. The replacement in real terra-cotta will be more expensive and take more time. However, it is possible. Moreover, alternative materials expand and contract at a different rate possibly causing damage to sound adjacent terra-cotta pieces. The Committee will need to evaluate these issues to determine if the work meets this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old, but will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The new entrances, garage doors, fencing, and guard booth all meet this standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The new entrances, garage doors, fencing, and guard booth all meet this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the entrances, garage doors, fencing, and guard booth, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. More information must be provided and evaluated to determine if the coating of the brick and terra-cotta and the replacement of terra-cotta with micro-cotta meet Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:48:24

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Historic consultant Robert Powers, architects Jim McAuliff and Matthew Ulassin, contractors Tom Broadhurst and Michael Williams, and engineer Jason Coleman represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked the applicant to explain the issues with the paint removal and the proposed coatings.
 - Mr. Powers responded that the first tests to remove the paint had not been very successful. The masons would like to complete the work this summer and therefore have applied to the Commission to coat the building in the eventuality that they are not successful with paint removal. He noted that they are working with the lab at ProSoCo and a terra cotta expert named John Harri to find a solution for paint removal. They are hopeful that they will be successful as there have been some positive results in the lab.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern that any new coating would trap moisture and fail to bond well to the old paint. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that, if not removed, any cracks in the old paint would telegraph through to the new coating.
 - Mr. Coleman responded that they are taking steps to reduce moisture infiltration and that the samples of the potassium silicate coatings applied in March so far are holding up. Mr. Powers added that the old terra cotta is a cream color rather than gleaming white like the paint.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if there are other reasons for replacing the terra cotta with micro-cotta other than cost and time. She also asked if the metal backup structure needs replacement.
 - The applicants responded that they are trying to get the work done this summer and the terra cotta will take longer to produce than the micro-cotta.
 - The applicants explained that they are monitoring the metal structure as they replace each piece to evaluate if any structural components need replacement.
 - Mr. Coleman noted that they are replacing between 100 and 600 mainly isolated pieces. He said that this would minimize a problem with expansion compared with replacing larger zones.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the doors and transom at the north end of the front façade could be made wider to eliminate the sidelights.
 - The applicant responded that they would do that.
- The Committee asked about the garage doors, guard booth, and fencing but were ultimately satisfied with the current design.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The paint should be removed from the terra cotta and brick if possible.
- The terra cotta should be replaced with real terra cotta.
- The proposed doorways are acceptable if the sidelights can be removed from the front façade door.
- The proposed garage doors, guard booth and fencing are removable and do not have a negative impact on the historic building.
- The coating of the brick and terra cotta and the replacement of terra cotta with micro-cotta does not meet Standard 6
- The garage doors, guard booth, fencing and revised doorways meet Standard 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the garage doors, fencing, guard booth, and entrances, provided the sidelights are removed from the front-façade door, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; denial of the coating of the brick and terra cotta unless staff finds that the paint cannot be removed; and denial of the replacement of terra cotta with micro-cotta, pursuant to Standard 6.

ITEM: 400 N BROAD ST					
MOTION: Approval of some elements; denial of others					
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				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 304 S PHILIP ST

Proposal: Install HVAC ductwork

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Adam and Stephanie DeBusk

Applicant: Stephanie DeBusk

History: 1810; Restored c. 1965

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The application proposes to replace traditional central air conditioning with a ductless system. This will require installing horizontal plastic pipes on a stuccoed side façade of the building, which faces a parking area. The application proposes to hide the ducts with paint and a trained ivy vine. The paint might trap water in the wall and the vine might damage the masonry. The applicant claims that the lines cannot be run through the house to the back wall. The wall where

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

the ductwork would be installed stands on the property line and the pipes may, in fact, be installed on the neighboring properties at 214 and 218 Spruce Street. If that is the case, then the application requires the authorization of the neighboring property owners.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install “ductless” HVAC system.
- Paint side wall.
- Install vines on side wall.

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, but will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - Neither the proposed ducts nor the paint or vines protect the historic integrity of the property or its environment. An alternative exists by re-installing a conventional central air conditioning system which allows the ducts to be hidden internally.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:17:14

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Owner Stephanie DeBusk represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee members noted that the rear yards of the houses on Spruce Street end at the wall where the proposed work would occur. They explained that the proposed work would likely extend onto the adjacent property. They explained that property lines typically run through the middle of the party walls and the adjacent owner’s approval may be needed to breach or cut through a party wall. The Committee members asked if the applicant had obtained the adjacent property owners approval to undertake work on that property.
 - The applicant described the proposed HVAC system and claimed that she cannot run the lines to the rear on the inside of the house. She said that the walls are brick with plaster applied directly to the wall.
- The Committee members noted that the work would be highly visible and that paint and ivy would damage the wall.
 - The applicant responded that she would propose a trellis to keep the ivy off of the wall.
- The applicant noted for the Committee that she can see condensing units and downspouts from the street on many properties. She asked how her proposed conduit covers would be different.
 - The Committee responded that they do regulate mechanical equipment and endeavor to have them located where they are not visible from the public right-of-way. It was explained that a downspout is a common historic feature. This

proposal involves a horizontal plastic element that would not have been seen historically.

- The applicant asked for the Committee's help in solving the problem.
 - Members of the Committee suggested a more traditional central air design with interior ductwork, acknowledging that that ductwork may necessitate a soffit visible inside the house if it cannot be fitted in the ceiling between floor joists. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested a high velocity system that might blow upward from the basement.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association explained that the Association had not yet met to review the proposal but that they had received a complaint from the neighbor at 214 Spruce Street, whose house yard abuts this wall. The neighbor is opposed to the proposal. He noted that it will be a highly visible alteration in an important streetscape.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed ductwork would be highly visible from the street.
- The proposed paint and ivy could damage the wall.
- The ductwork would likely project onto the adjacent property.
- There are alternatives for central heating and air-conditioning.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not satisfy Standard 9 because it introduces an element incompatible with the design of the historic wall.

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

ITEM: 304 S PHILIP ST MOTION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 MOVED BY: Rudy D'Alessandro SECONDED BY: Nan 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				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 338 S 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct additions; enlarge windows; alter dormer

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Colleen Gaughan

Applicant: Jon Harris, Harris Architect, LLC

History: 1972; Robert M. Parsky

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The building at 338 S. 2nd Street, constructed in 1972, is a Contributing building in the Society Hill Historic District, the significance of which includes the Redevelopment Era and its associated mid-twentieth century buildings.

This application proposes to extensively modify and “Colonialize” the mid-century building, as well as to construct rooftop and rear additions.

The staff notes that several alterations were made to the property without permits or the Historical Commission’s approval between 2012 and 2017, both before and after purchase by the current owner in July 2016. These modifications include:

- The replacement of the standing seam metal roof with asphalt shingles; cladding of the dormer window with vinyl siding; and replacement of the dormer windows (between April 2014 and May 2015)

The enlargement of the front second-floor windows and installation of vinyl windows with six-over-six sandwich muntins (between April 2016 and July 2017).

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Front Elevation:
 - Install pedimented PVC door canopy
 - Apply muntins to existing first-floor window
 - Legalize enlargement and replacement of second-floor windows with vinyl windows with sandwich muntins
 - Apply Fypon trim, lintels, sills, and shutters to illegal second-floor vinyl windows
 - Extend roof eave
 - Replace shed dormer roof with gabled roof
 - Install fiber cement siding on dormer
 - Replace dormer windows with two six-over-six vinyl windows
- Side Elevation:
 - Enlarge all window openings and install six-over-six vinyl windows with PVC trim
 - Infill recessed bay with fiber cement siding and six-over-six vinyl windows
- Rear Elevation:
 - Construct fiber-cement siding-clad cantilevering bay with roof deck and vinyl windows
 - Cut new door and replace windows
- Roof:
 - Construct gabled-roof penthouse clad in fiber-cement siding
 - Construct roof deck with exposed fiber-cement-clad parapet wall

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The application proposes to alter the overall form of the building, the shape and appearance of its character-defining features, including nearly all window openings, its dormer window, recessed bay, and sloped rear extension. The application fails to satisfy this standard.
- *Standard 3: Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.*
 - This application applies faux-Colonial and other architectural features to the building that are incompatible with its modern character. The application fails to satisfy this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - This application proposes to irreparably alter nearly all of the building's window openings—a key character-defining feature of any building—and to install windows that are incompatible with the historic integrity of the property. The application also proposes the extensive use of vinyl and PVC materials that are incompatible with the historic property and its environment. The application fails to satisfy this standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - This application proposes to irreparably alter the form of the building through the infill of the recessed side bay and construction of rear and rooftop additions. The application fails to satisfy this standard.
- *Roofs Guideline | Not Recommended: Changing the configuration or shape of a roof by adding highly visible new features (such as dormer windows, vents, skylights, or a penthouse).*
 - This application proposes to alter the shape of the front dormer window, remove the sloped roof of the rear extension, and to construct a highly-visible penthouse. The application fails to satisfy this guideline.
- *Windows Guideline | Not Recommended: Removing or substantially changing windows or window features which are important in defining the overall character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.*
 - The application proposes to replace the character-defining single-lite, horizontally-oriented modern windows with vertically-oriented double-hung vinyl windows with faux muntins. The application fails to satisfy this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 9, 10, and the Roofs and Windows Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:29:09

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jon Harris and owners Colleen Gaughan and Camillo D'Orazio represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The owners acknowledged that they expanded and replaced the second-floor front windows after purchasing the property, owing to water infiltration through the original windows. They apologized for conducting that work without a permit and offered to remedy the situation.
- The owners opined that the existing windows have wood frames and are not energy-efficient and that their rear metal roof is leaking and in need of repair or replacement.
- The owners noted that recessed angled window opening on the side elevation generates a considerable amount of heat inside the room.
 - The Committee responded that there are a number of possible alternatives for reducing heat gain/increasing energy efficiency without modifying the overall design, including through the replacement of the glazing or the use of low-e coatings.
- The Committee opined that the faux-Colonializing of the building is inappropriate, and that there are many ways to update the property and make it more energy efficient without destroying the vocabulary of the original design.
- The owners asked what kind of window replacement would be appropriate and whether the size of the windows is important in addition to the materials and configuration. The owners objected to the idea of installing custom windows.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff can approve replacement windows that replicate the overall appearance and dimensions of the historic windows. These windows can be energy-efficient windows such as double or triple-glazed as long as their exterior appearance replicates the historic appearance. Ms. DiPasquale also noted that the staff can approve roofing replacement.
- The owners asked whether the staff could approve the removal of skylights.
 - The Committee responded that it depends on whether the skylights are visible from the public right-of-way and whether they are part of the original design.
- The Committee noted that the Redevelopment Era buildings in Society Hill generally have unusual architectural forms that differentiate themselves from the Colonial buildings but are compatible in scale and materials with the older buildings. The Committee opined that the proposed design tries to create a false sense of history, and that it would be more appropriate to celebrate the building for its own architectural style.
- The Committee questioned the proposed roof penthouse and roof deck.
 - The applicant responded that the penthouse is intended as the termination of a planned elevator extending from the first floor to roof, as well as a continuation of the existing stairs on that south side of the building.
 - The Committee responded that the massing and visibility of the proposed penthouse is inappropriate. They suggested that a pilothouse might be acceptable if it is located along the neighboring party wall, the height is lowered

and pitched to follow the run of the stairs, and the pilothouse is demonstrated to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

- The owners asked if there could be “fencing” around the roofline.
 - The Committee responded that a simple railing set in from the edge of the roof so that it is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way might be acceptable, but noted that the building’s corner location makes any rooftop addition, including railings, pilothouses, or mechanical equipment, more conspicuous.
 - The owners stated that they thought the rule for roof decks is that the railing be set five feet back from the front façade.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that that is a zoning requirement, not a historic preservation requirement. She noted that the absence of a roof plan makes it difficult to understand the proposal.
 - The owners noted that there are nearby properties with visible roof decks.
- The Committee suggested that the applicants work closely with the staff to address immediate needs and other proposed modifications to the property.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Robert Parsky, the architect who designed the building in question in 1972 and a resident of Society Hill, acknowledged the need to update the building but opined that the proposed modifications bring a faux architecture and history to a building whose design is and was intended to be of its time. He opined that the proposed modifications change the character of the house.
- Paul Boni of Society Hill Civic Association supported the staff recommendation. He explained that the Civic Association understands the need to update the building, but noted the importance of the Redevelopment Era buildings in the Society Hill Historic District, and opined that the proposed modifications do not meet historic preservation standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building at 338 S. 2nd Street is a contributing building in the Society Hill Historic District.
- Modifications were made to the property without the review and approval of the Historical Commission or a building permit in the last six years.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project alters and removes character-defining features of the building, failing to satisfy Standards 2 and 9.
- The application applies faux-Colonial and other architectural features to the building that are incompatible with its modern character, failing to satisfy Standard 3.
- The application proposed to alter the roof shape and construct a highly-visible penthouse, failing to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.
- The application proposes to replace character-defining single-lite, horizontally-oriented modern windows with double-hung vinyl windows with faux muntins, failing to satisfy the Windows Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 9, 10, and the Roofs and Windows Guidelines.

ITEM: 338 S. 2nd ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 2100-02 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Legalize windows; install four historically correct windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joel and Stella Freedman

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design, Inc

History: 1889; Henry Louis Jr. House; R.G. Kennedy

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

Located at the southwest corner of Locust and S. 21st Streets, 2100-02 Locust Street is a single-family dwelling, and is listed as a Significant building in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District.

In July 2018, the Historical Commission staff witnessed contractors completing the replacement of all windows on the property and the panning of the original window frames, and requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue a violation for the work.

This application proposes to legalize all but four windows: three historically curved windows in the bow window at the second-floor, 21st Street elevation, and an arched one-over-one window at the first floor of the 21st Street elevation which was replaced with two double-hungs and a transom window.

The application claims that the basement windows, which were historically two-over-two, double-hung wood windows, are concealed from the public view. The staff contends that the basement windows are, in fact, highly visible, owing to the height of the base. On the Locust Street elevation, the tops of the basement windows are nearly six feet above the sidewalk, and on the S. 21st Street elevation, the tops of the windows vary from four and a half feet to five feet above the sidewalk (see below).

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize replacement of historic wood windows with metal windows and metal cladding
- Replace four illegal windows with historically-accurate windows on 21st Street elevation

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The property owners did not demonstrate that the windows that were removed were beyond repair. The new windows do not match the old in design (paned brickmold, slider vs. double-hung basement window configuration, etc...), texture (metal vs. wood), or materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration of the four windows, but denial of the legalization of the remaining windows, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:55:16

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Joe Burda represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked why the windows were replaced rather than restored.
 - The applicant responded that he does not know, because his firm was not involved in the project at that point.
- The applicant noted that the windows they propose to keep feature metal capping over the historic trim, which they assume is in poor condition.
- The applicant opined that proposing to restore the two most significant windows, the bow window on the second floor and the arched window on the first floor of the 21st Street elevation would be enough.
- The applicant directed the Committee to drawing SK-4, noting that on the bottom left shows the historic construction and that the biggest difference in comparing it to what is there now is that the replacement windows build down the windows slightly.
- The Committee explained that, when dealing with applications to legalize work done without permits, they have to review the application as though it is for new work. The Committee stated that they would never recommend approval of the build-down of the windows or the capping of historic trim, and therefore cannot recommend legalizing the work.
- The applicant argued that the basement windows, although replaced with windows of a different configuration than what was there historically, are obscured by iron grates.
 - The Committee responded that the basement windows are at eye-level, that the window openings have been built down, and that historic fabric has been covered.
 - The Committee noted that the current black color of the windows makes them somewhat less conspicuous, but if they were ever to be painted, they would be highly noticeable.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The windows at 2100-02 Locust Street were replaced and the frames capped without the Historical Commission's review or approval.
- The owners did not demonstrate that the historic windows that were removed were in such poor condition that they were beyond repair.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The new windows do not match the old in design, texture, or materials, failing to satisfy Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration of the four windows, but denial of the legalization of the remaining windows, pursuant to Standard 6.

ITEM: 2100-02 LOCUST ST					
MOTION: Approval of restoration; denial of legalization					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 4315 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Install stucco over wire mesh

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Presbyterian Church

Applicant: Timothy Kane, TJ Kane Enterprises Inc.

History: 1859-60; Presbyterian Church of Frankford; John McArthur Jr.

Individual Designation: 2/4/1982

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The Frankford Presbyterian Church was designed by architect John McArthur Jr. and constructed in 1859-1860. John McArthur Jr. is best remembered as the architect of Philadelphia City Hall (1872-1901). In preparation for the church building's upcoming anniversary, the congregation hired the applicant to re-stucco, clean, paint all exterior wood, and re-putty the windows.

Historical Commission staff members visited the site and met with the applicant on 6 May 2019 to review the scope of work and the exterior condition of the building. The staff observed areas of stucco missing and sections where the stucco appeared cracked or loose. Specific areas had

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

a brown material under a layer or layers of stucco and paint. Based on oral history and a review of historic photographs, the church was originally brownstone or a brownstone color and was most likely painted pink during the 1930 or 1940s.

After further discussion with the staff, the applicant engaged Schnabel Conservation to analyze the existing stucco conditions and review the proposed plan for stucco repair. Schnabel Conservation provided its observations and recommendations in a letter dated 30 May 2019.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Power wash all wood with cleaning solution.
- Remove all loose stucco and install bonding agent.
- Install wire mesh over all stucco and stone areas of building.
- Apply scratch coat, brown coat, and acrylic base coat. The final coat will match existing color of building.
- After stucco work is complete, scrape, sand, caulk, and repair the wood surfaces as needed.
- Reputty and glaze windows including stained glass as needed.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The new stucco will add approximately ¾" additional depth to the stucco areas of the building. The additional layers will compromise the projection of key architectural details and the overall appearance of the building.
- *Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.*
 - The current pink color of the church was not part of the original design. The plan by the congregation to maintain the pink color meets Standard 4, as the current congregation and local community have long identified the church by its distinct color and appearance.
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - The application of additional stucco layers will alter the distinctive features of this property.
- *Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.*
 - The details of the plan for pressure washing and cleaning wood areas of the building should be reviewed. The proposed work should comply with National Park Service's "Preservation Brief #10: Exterior Paint Problems on Historic Woodwork."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5. Based on the site visit and letter from Schnabel Conservation, the staff communicated to the applicant that the stucco portion of the project could be approved administratively if it was revised to stucco patching and repainting.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:02:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Tim Kane, owner of TJ Kane Enterprises Inc., Andrew Royds, President of the Trustees Frankford Presbyterian Church, and Pastor John Sweet represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Kane stated that Lorraine Schnabel of Schnabel Conservation determined that some areas of the stucco are detaching and some are firmly fixed to the structure. Mr. Kane explained that he is working with a stucco contractor who he has worked with for more than 35 years. He explained that this contractor inspected and strongly suggested to remove some stucco areas that are delaminating off the structure, infill those areas before infilling where stucco is falling off, put a bonding agent on, and bring the stucco out to the level to keep the structure from moving. The front of the church is approximately 175 feet away from the Market-Frankford elevated train line. If the wire does not bond to the solid surface as well as some of the questionable surfaces, they feel this is the best way to address the issue. He explained that they installed a test sample on June 22, on the recommendation of Ms. Schnabel to see how the wire bonds to the actual surface. Mr. Kane explained that they drove different style nails into the surface (1/2 inch with washers, 1 inch without washers, 3/4 inch with washers, and 1-1/2 inch with washers). He continued that they found when they drove the 1-1/2 inch nail it did hit the solid surface under the stucco layers. He stated that in his opinion that the bigger the fastener the better the bond. He noted that they will try to use 1 inch or 1-1/4 inch to see if that will bond it.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked how thick the various layers are back to the stone.
 - Mr. Kane responded that it varies depending on the location on the building. He stated that the deepest layer is field rubble. In some areas, the 1-1/2 nail went right in and in other areas it bottomed out. Mr. Kane stated that, in order to keep this structure tight, the best application is to wire the whole structure and stucco. The new stucco application will add approximately 3/4 inch beyond the current surface. Mr. Kane explained that they want to make this building as structurally as sound as possible with today's materials and workmanship.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how the additional 3/4 inch relates to the window architraves.
 - Mr. Kane responded the majority of the profiles stick out about 1 1/2 inches, in some areas 2 to 3 inches. He did note that in some areas the turned arches project only about 1/2 inch. He explained that the stucco would be tapered in in those areas.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated he followed Mr. Kane's verbal description but he did not find documentation of that approach, like a drawing of a jamb detail or a sill detail or head detail showing where the work stops and starts in the application. He stated that he does not understand what will and will not be cut. He noted that the application's documentation does not show what is intended and what end result will be.
- Pointing to photograph in application, Mr. McCoubrey asked if it was a brown coat shown in a condition photograph and if it was it delaminating in a fairly large area.
 - Mr. Kane confirmed that some areas are bonding, some areas are not and it could have been affected by the condition of the surface at the time it was applied. For example, the surface could have been too dry.
- Mr. Detweiler asked if the brown coat was the original finish.

- Mr. Kane responded that he did not think it was the original finish.
 - Ms. Mehley stated that, based on Ms. Schnabel's examination and historic photographs, the original finish was most likely a brown color. She noted that extensive research and probing has not been undertaken.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if they could just take a layer of surface stucco off to examine earlier layers.
 - Mr. Kane responded that certain areas really are bound and you may pull off more than necessary.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if non-original pink stucco be removed and the more original brown material be repaired.
 - Mr. Kane responded that he does not believe that the visible brown layer is the original material. He explained that the original layer was some stone product that was accepting water.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that if it was rubble stone finish, it was probably always covered with stucco.
 - Mr. Baron pointed out that, based on historic photographs, it was a finished brownstone building, where you can see the joints. He continued that he believes the brownstone failed and has received many coats of stucco over that. Mr. Baron noted that the base of the building is fieldstone rubble and is also proposed to be covered over. He also pointed out that the brick over the windows is corbelled with some of the corbels are already slightly recessed, owing to the number of stucco layers, and that some areas are proposed to be completely covered over with the new stucco.
- The Committee asked if architectural details will be covered with stucco.
 - Mr. Kane responded that they do not plan on covering anything and that they will taper the wire and the materials down to the exposed details. He explained that the proposal will taper the wire toward those areas and will include 1/4 to 5/16 inch scratch coat, 1/4 inch brown coat, and 1/8 to 3/16 inch of an acrylic finish for the top coat. He continued that this is a better application than just coming back and trying to patch this because they are trying to seal the bulk.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed out that an acrylic finish will make the walls non-breathable and if they are proposing to lath over the whole wall there is no going back to the old system with no wire. She continued that there will be no reversibility because there will be holes every 18 to 24 inches on center in order to anchor the washers. Therefore, there is no going back to the historic condition once the wire is installed. Ms. Gutterman stated that the proposal to taper the areas around the ornament may end up with coatings that are too thin and those areas may begin to fail.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that this is analogous to a wood floor that has been sanded too many times. He explained that the walls have already been built out an inch and adding another 3/4 inch has a huge impact on the projection of various architectural elements.
 - Mr. Kane agreed that this is not an easy solution.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that it is a beautiful building and she wants to see something done that is best for the building and is not sure covering the building with a new layer of stucco is the best solution.
 - Mr. Kane stated that patching is not going to work because it has been patched in years prior and that has failed. He indicated that, if there was more funding in the church budget, it would be a different story. There are not enough funds.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired if there was one area or wall of the building that was particularly deteriorated.

- Mr. Kane responded that it is spotty all over the building.
- Ms. Stein asked what percentage of the stucco is delaminated.
 - Mr. Kane responded that he estimates 15-20% of the surface needs to be addressed.
- Ms. Stein asked when the last stucco repair work was completed.
 - Mr. Royds responded about 1993. He noted that they have photographs of staging from 1993, so they believe it was done then.
 - Pastor Sweet stated that the building was painted about 10 years ago and it was painted on all four facades. He noted the damage shown in the photographs has occurred in the 10 years since the painting was completed.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the painting potentially caused harm because it trapped moisture in the walls and caused the stucco finish to delaminate.
 - Pastor Sweet responded that he does not know the theory but he sees Mr. Kane's solution as the best way of restoring it to its historic appearance. He continued that he has done an oral history with the oldest living members of the congregation and they remember the building as being pink. Pastor Sweet that it has been the "old pink Church" for 80 years. He added that the condition it is in now certainly does not look like its original appearance.
- Mr. Kane stated that the money that is associated with setting up scaffolding for fall protection and everything else OSHA requires today is an expensive task in itself. He continued that the Church cannot afford to undertake this project 10, 15, or 20 years down the road. It needs to do it now.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed out there is no guarantee that the proposed plan is going to work.
 - Mr. Kane agreed with this.
- Ms. Gutterman rejected the notion that this project will preserve the building once and for all. She continued that the adhesion or anchoring can fail one year from now, five years from now, or 10 years from now. She pointed out that this is a radical change, the covering of historic fabric. Ms. Gutterman suggested repairing one elevation and then waiting two or three years to see what happens. She noted that she understands that aesthetically this may not be the best approach, but they would see whether the approach is going to work. She explained they could put the scaffolding up on one elevation, do the work on that one elevation, and monitor what happens on that one elevation for a period of time. Ms. Gutterman added that they could check for pluses and minuses, check for moisture in the wall, and see what the long-term benefit is before doing all four elevations.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that before they start shooting things in to the wall, they should determine what it is getting anchored into. He noted he would want to know what is left of the brownstone behind the stucco. Is it ashlar or is it a nice smooth finish or rubble-like? Mr. McCoubrey added that this additional stucco is a heavy layer and the elevated train rumbles along nearby and the whole thing may start to fall off. He noted that the proposed stucco work is not an easy one.
- Mr. Kane stated that there is a huge cost to set the scaffolding up for the painting. He continued that water is penetrating the façade around the windows. The scope of work includes work around the windows. Mr. Kane stated that to save costs they are setting up the scaffolding and will address everything to keep the water from penetrating the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that they need to be sure the roof, the flashings, and the windows are keeping moisture out of the building. Mr. D'Alessandro added that the whole envelope that needs to be addressed. Mr. McCoubrey added that when he sees

stucco coming off the building similar to what is shown in their photographs, it suggests that the wall is damp.

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the major leak areas were around the window openings.
 - Mr. Kane indicated that the sources of water infiltration were unclear.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that, after looking at photographs of the stucco failing on church exterior, it looks like a surface failure. Mr. D'Alessandro stated he thinks it may be lintel related because of visible cracks shown in photographs. He noted that some areas may require an expansion joint. The Committee members and Mr. Kane speculated more about where the source of the water infiltration may be.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the type of stucco deterioration appears to show that an impermeable coating has been put on and that it does not have breathability. Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern and stated that four feet of stucco could be added and it still may not address the issue without knowing what is under it.
 - Mr. Kane responded that addressing what is under the stucco is cost prohibitive and stressed the cost limitations of the project. He recognized the professional experience of the Committee and stated he is looking for solutions just as they are but noted they have to be good stewards of places that worship God. Mr. Kane continued that they cannot be spending their money foolishly where they have to come back again and again. He stated that if the Committee feels that his solution could be tweaked, then he is willing to listen to what they have to say.
- Mr. Kane raised an additional building concern. He pointed out that front steeple, which rises 80 feet from the base of the building to the very top of the steeple, appears to be leaning toward Frankford Avenue. He explained that he does not know what is causing it to lean and based on information from the congregation there is a stay cable installed approximately 50 years ago and reportedly it has not moved. He expressed concern about the safety of his employees and the building's front façade. Mr. Kane stated again that he is looking for solutions that are going to work for the longevity of the building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if an engineer has looked at the steeple. She inquired if the masonry portion of the wall is structurally sound and asked if a design professional has looked at the wall to determine if it needs to be reinforced in any way.
 - Pastor Sweet responded that it has not been reviewed since the stay cable was installed.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if anyone has re-inspected the stay cable to make sure it is working in the way it was intended.
 - The applicant did not respond to the question.
- Pastor Sweet stated that the church building is 159 years old and the congregation is 249 years old. The year 2020 marks the 250th anniversary of the foundation of the congregation on this site. He continued that they would prefer not to do it with crumbling stucco, so they see contractor's solution as the best compromise.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she does not have enough information to determine if the proposed solution is going to work. She explained that she is not comfortable with the proposal.
- Pastor Sweet responded that they satisfied what Ms. Schnabel asked them to do and satisfied all of her suggestions.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if Ms. Schnabel had been out and agreed that everything was satisfied.
 - Mr. Kane responded that Ms. Schnabel had asked them to take photographs and they did. He explained that all of the anchors appeared to bite securely to the façade. Mr. Kane continued that they drove the anchors in using both a

pneumatic nail gun and hand-driven method, to see which one would hold. He noted they had challenges with both methods.

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked what kind of fastener they used.
 - Mr. Kane responded they were using a Ramset galvanized washer with a galvanized head.
- Mr. McCoubrey summed up the Committee's overall feedback. There is a level of investigation of the existing conditions that needs to happen so they all have confidence that whatever the solution is, it is one that is going to be meet the Church's needs, longevity, cost, and respect to the architectural details.
- Mr. Kane inquired about the other tests needed.
 - Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey responded that it is not the role of the Committee to specify this. Ms. Gutterman stated that the applicant should engage an engineer who will investigate how the work should be done and how the anchors should be tested. She continued that an area should be exposed to show determine the composition of the substrate. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that the Committee's role is to review the applicant's proposal. She explained that, based on her review, she does not feel comfortable agreeing to what has been proposed. She noted that there is not enough information provided to know if this is best so that they will make it to the 300th anniversary of the Church without having to do this again in 5 to 10 years.
- Ms. Mehley stated that it would be helpful for the applicant if the Committee could provide some guidance for who can assist with the direction of this project.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that they need a design professional who can come out and really assess the building. She suggested engaging Ms. Schnabel again.
- Ms. Mehley asked the Committee to make it clear to the applicant that they are requesting information, for example, from a team made up of what a preservation architect, an engineer, and an architectural conservator.
 - Mr. McCoubrey confirmed this is what they had in mind.
- Mr. Kane stated they did a test sample based on Ms. Schnabel's suggestion and it appears to be holding in place.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed out that Ms. Schnabel's letter stated that their work plan for the stucco will only work if it is only the outer layer that failed, that if it is the inner layer that has failed she does not agree that it will work long term. She continued that the Church needs to understand there is no forever with these solutions.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked how many coats of stucco are on the building.
 - Mr. Kane responded that they do not know. He noted that they took a hammer and beat into it and it was consistent all the way back to the stone.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated someone should take a core.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said the question from his standpoint is should they allow the ¾ inch layer of stucco to be added on top of the failing stucco.
 - Several committee members stated no, they could not allow the addition of the ¾ inch, observing that it could be allowed if this was the only solution that would work. The Committee members noted that they do not feel they have enough information to determine if this is the only solution that will work.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated to the applicant that what the Committee is trying get across that they are not allowing the ¾ inch to hide the profiles of the building such as the details at the windows and brick work. He suggested that they find a way to repair the stucco without burying the window frames and decorative features.

- Mr. McCoubrey urged the applicant to address that moisture management issue before the stucco work begins because, if moisture continues to get in the church, the building will continue to have issues with the stucco.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed project will add $\frac{3}{4}$ inch of stucco on top of the existing stucco façade, altering the appearance of architectural details, most notably details around the windows and brick work.
- The proposed project intends to address moisture management but the source of water infiltration has not been clearly identified, potentially risking any future new or repaired stucco surfaces.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not meet Standard 2 because the addition of the $\frac{3}{4}$ inch of stucco will compromise the projection of key architectural details and the overall appearance of the building.
- The application does not meet Standard 5 because the stucco work proposed will permanently alter the distinctive features of this property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial owing to incompleteness, specifically the lack of information on the exterior walls and the potential loss of historic fabric, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5.

ITEM: 4315 Frankford Ave MOTION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5 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				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 235 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Install ADA ramp at front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 235 Chestnut Street Associates, LLC

Applicant: Joe Kelly, Intech Construction, Inc.

History: 1856; Elliot Building; Joseph C. Hoxie and Stephen Button

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The hotel at 235 Chestnut Street lacks an accessible entrance. The existing non-historic concrete slab at the front façade, proposed for removal, was installed in 2000 after an approval by the Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove non-historic concrete slab and bulkhead doors at front façade.
- Install ADA ramp with painted iron railing.
- Install post-mounted ADA-compliant automatic door activation button.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction 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 ADA ramp could be removed in the future without impacting the integrity of the historic building.
- *Accessibility Guideline: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.*
 - The ADA ramp provides direct access into the main entrance of the hotel, and does not damage significant historic features of the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:40:10

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Detwiler recused owing to his firm's involvement as the architect.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Joshua Kiehl and Kara Litvinas Smith represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The applicants distributed a revised railing detail as part of sheet A2.0.

- The Committee asked about the encroachment into the public right-of-way by extending out an additional foot onto the sidewalk, and asked if the ramp could be narrower.
 - Mr. Kiehl responded that the ramp could be narrower at the ramped portion but not at the landing, where it is required to be five feet, and the goal was to not have the ramp step in and out.
- The Committee asked about the existing brass canopy posts, and observed that the plan may not accurately depict their location.
 - Mr. Kiehl responded that the location of the canopy posts will be verified and corrected if need be.
- The Committee suggested that this work may offer an opportunity to improve the public right-of-way as it relates to the canopy and its posts, owing to space being removed from the sidewalk. The Committee observed that the canopy no longer needs to extend so far over the sidewalk, as individuals entering the hotel will now be entering on the ramp along the building, rather than from the sidewalk directly in front. The Committee suggested that the canopy be reduced in length and supported at the railing level.
 - Mr. Kiehl responded that the idea will be posed to the owner for consideration, but that no work is currently proposed for the existing canopy.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed scope of work removes a non-historic concrete slab in order to provide ADA access to the main entrance.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed ADA ramp could be removed in the future without impacting the integrity of the historic building, satisfying Standard 10.
- The proposed ADA ramp provides direct access into the main entrance of the hotel and does not damage significant historic features of the building, satisfying the recommended Accessibility Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guidelines.

ITEM: 235 Chestnut St MOTION: Approval of revised design 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				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	4			1	2

Ms. Gutterman excused herself from the meeting.

ADDRESS: 1930 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct four-story building with garage on Waverly Street

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Isaac Jack Azran

Applicant: Brenna March, Gnome Architects LLC

History: 1888-89; J.R. Kates Row; F.M. Day

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The property at 1930 Pine Street extends from Pine Street to Waverly Street. No work is proposed in this application for the historic building at 1930 Pine Street. The proposed new construction on Waverly Street is a four-story single-family dwelling with recessed entry, front loaded garage, roof deck, and pilot house. Front façade materials include red brick and a black metal panel system.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story single-family dwelling at rear of 1930 Pine Street, fronting Waverly Street.

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 works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed building is not compatible with the historic district in terms of size, scale, proportions, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:51:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Gabriel Deck and Brenna March represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Deck described the design and materials of the proposed building.
- The Committee commented that the proposed building is not compatible with the historic context in terms of scale and massing, owing to the fourth story. The Committee commented that if the garage were removed and the building were to be three stories as a result, the massing and scale would be in keeping with the block. The Committee reiterated that a three-story building is appropriate for this block. The Committee remarked that Waverly Street is narrow and is lined with either garages or three-story rowhouses, but not both as one building.
 - Mr. Deck noted that the height and parking are both by-right per zoning regulations, and the parking is an important component of the project.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the proposed design is exacerbating the sense of verticality, and the brick appears to not be held up by anything. The Committee suggested that the brick be lower on the building. The Committee suggested that there are ways that four-story buildings can happen within a three-story context, when the top of the building is differentiated, but everything about the current design makes the building look like a massive four-story building, rather than taking the scale of the street into account.
 - Mr. Deck responded that the brick placement is dictated by adjacent buildings, and that he wanted to return the brick on the side, so floating the brick above resolved that issue.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the pilot house is taller and larger than it needs to be, and there are ways to minimize it, including sloping the roof, and not running the elevator up to the roof.
 - Mr. Deck responded that the pilot house roof can be sloped, but that the elevator extending to the roof is important to the client.
- The Committee suggested that a possible solution to allow a four-story building would be to maintain the cornice line at the front, and have a substantial setback for the upper floor, so that the building is perceived as three stories from the street. The Committee acknowledged that the proposed ceilings heights are already minimal, and that there is high visibility of the proposed building owing to a one-story adjacent garage.
 - Ms. Chantry referenced a recent application for the 1600 block of Waverly Street, where the applicant received approval for a contextual three-story plus steep gable roof to allow for living space at the fourth story. She noted that it also included a garage opening, but that it was building on top of an existing two-story building with an existing garage.
- Mr. Deck stated that he had prepared an alternate façade design prior to this meeting. He asked the process for presenting that alternate design.
 - The Committee responded that a new design needs to be part of the public record, and suggested that he work with the staff to determine next steps.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed project is located at the rear of the property known as 1930 Pine Street, but no work is proposed in this application for the historic building at 1930 Pine Street.
- The historic context for this site is Waverly Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project is not compatible with the historic context in terms of size, scale, and massing, and fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1930 Pine St					
MOTION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9					
MOVED BY: Stein					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman					x
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	4				3

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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