

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

**TUESDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2021
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

Jay Farrell
Christopher Schrack
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Eugene Naydovich
Nancy Pontone
Jeffrey Tubbs
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Falak Shahid
Stuart Rosenberg
Michael Alhadad
Jim Maransky

Randal Baron
Ben Derby
Judy Robinson
Paul Boni
Susan Wetherill
Jack Burns
Justin Coleman

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1221-25 N 4TH ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia, Department of Public Property

Applicant: Judy Robinson, Continuum Architecture & Design

History: 1895; Engine Company #29; John T. Windrim

Individual Designation: 7/12/1989

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition at the rear of the former Engine Company #29 building. The three-story brick and brownstone structure was designed by John T. Windrim and has been owned by the City of Philadelphia since its construction in 1895. The building ceased functioning as a firehouse in 1979 and has since been used by the Department of Public Property as storage. The Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority recently approved the sale of the property to allow for its development, which includes converting the building to residential use.

This application proposes to rehabilitate the front façade of the historic building, including masonry repairs, cleaning, new windows, and new doors that replicate the appearance of the historic doors. A portion of the rear roof would be demolished to increase the ceiling height at the interior, and a one-story addition would be constructed with a substantial setback from N. 4th Street. Green roofs are proposed for both the existing roof of the historic building and the roof of the one-story addition.

The five-story rear addition would be separated from the existing building by a covered exterior walkway, allowing the rear wall of the historic building to remain intact. Where it fronts Orianna Street, the addition would be clad in a brick veneer with a central copper bay and copper cornice. The ground-story parking area would be screened by greenery at two openings, and a central garage door would allow transparency into the space. The sides and rear of the addition would be clad in charcoal fiber cement siding. The top of the addition would feature a communal roof deck with green space.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct five-story addition with roof deck;
- Demolish rear portion of existing roof and construct one-story addition;
- Install green roofs; and
- Rehabilitate façade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition would require minimal alterations to the historic structure. While the rear wall would no longer be visible from Orianna Street, no character-defining features would be lost or obscured.
 - The proposed addition is compatible in massing, size, and scale.
 - The proposed materials, fenestration patterns, and architectural features, such as the copper cornice and bay, are differentiated from but compatible with the historic building and surrounding context.
- *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 addition would be undertaken in a manner that would have minimal impact on the historic building. The proposed exterior walkway between the historic building and the new addition would allow the rear wall of the historic building to remain intact. The addition's removal in the future would leave the historic property and its environment unimpaired.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Judy Robinson and developers Jeffrey Tubbs and James Maransky represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein stated that the massing of the proposed addition was appropriate. She expressed concern over the material choice of the walkways, adding that they will be visible from the street. She contended that glass railings are highly reflective and suggested using a metal railing instead. At the rear addition, she continued, the brick appears like wallpaper because it does not turn the corner. She also observed that the large copper cornice turns the corner and continues along the side of the addition where there is clapboard siding below. She recommended that the brick turn the corner at least 18" or that it extend across the full bay on both sides. She further suggested that wherever there is siding there should be a simplified cornice that matches the color of the siding.
 - Ms. Robinson agreed with Ms. Stein's comment regarding the cornice, adding that it is more an issue with the rendering than the actual design. She noted that a simple cornice will be proposed for the sides of the addition where there is siding.

- Mr. Detwiler agreed that the brick should wrap the corner and include the entire bay at both sides of the building. He further agreed that the cornice could be a simpler material where it caps the siding.
- Mr. Cluver asked for clarification on condition of and proposal for the front façade garage bay doors.
 - Ms. Robinson responded that two of the doors are existing but are covered by a roll-down grille. She clarified that those existing doors would be restored, and the door in the center that is currently missing would be recreated. To accommodate egress, she continued, there would be a modification to the existing doors.
- Mr. Cluver inquired how the existing doors would be modified to be code compliant.
 - Ms. Robinson explained that ultimately they doors may need to be recreated in order to be code compliant, but she noted that it is possible to cutting into certain areas.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that Ms. Robinson would need to work with the staff to make sure the doors maintain their integrity.
 - Ms. Robinson stated that drawing A2.1 shows a light dashed line to indicate where the smaller egress door would be cut or installed. She added that she does not have the final details on the doors yet.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that there is a long history of smaller doors being cut into ceremonial doors and the he accepts the concept.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the proposed door flanking the main garage doors and asked whether the doorway will be widened.
 - Ms. Robinson answered that the existing door is in poor condition and needs to be replaced. She noted that she is proposing to replace the door in kind.
 - Mr. Cluver remarked that the original door was likely paneled and asked that the new door be appropriate in style. He asked that the staff find photographic evidence of the original door. If none is found, he continued, the paneled design would be a suggestion but not a requirement.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that side elevations were not included in the application and asked that they be submitted prior to the Historical Commission meeting. He argued that the rear elevation would be more pedestrian friendly if it had a base, though he acknowledged that the cast stone medallions serve to create that effect. He suggested that they be carried across the stair tower to help scale down the tower.
- Ms. Gutterman asked where the mechanical equipment would be located, adding that it will likely be on the roof and should be inconspicuous from all public rights-of-way. She then noted that the Architectural Committee received public comment regarding the historic configuration of the front façade windows and asked that the windows replicate those visible in a historic photograph. She commented that the 4th Street façade should be restored to its historic appearance as much as possible. She called the addition sympathetic.
 - Ms. Robinson replied that the mechanical equipment will be located on the roof of the addition.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked that the units be identified on the roof plan prior to the Historical Commission meeting.
- Ms. Lukachik inquired whether the rear portion of the historic building would be infilled.
 - Ms. Robinson answered that the ceiling height at the rear is currently lower than 7-feet, due to a step-up at the rear and the slope of the roof. The application, she continues, proposes to raise the rear roof of the existing building.

- Ms. Lukachik questioned whether the capacity of the existing columns and footings has been investigated and if the applicant has confirmed that they can support the additional loads or if reinforcement would be required.
- Ms. Robinson replied that the building has been evaluated and the structural engineer has not indicated that any reinforcement would be needed, though she noted if any reinforcement would be needed that it could be executed at the interior. She stated that the existing structure has greater load capacity than needed for residential use.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that he is happy to see the firehouse reused. He agreed with the previous Architectural Committee comments regarding the wrapping of the brick. He suggested that a fiber cement panel be used instead of the HardiePlank siding. He argued that the clapboards allude to wood framing.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the staff provided the historic photograph that shows the divided light windows on the front. He asked Ms. Robinson if she would like to respond to the request to recreate the original pane configuration of the windows.
 - Ms. Robinson stated that she would recreate the historic appearance of the windows.
- Regarding Ms. Stein's earlier comment about glass railings, Mr. Robinson argued that there are very few residential units on Orianna Street, noting that there are many types of buildings with different materials in the neighborhood. She asked how strongly the Architectural Committee members oppose the metal and glass railings, adding that she prefers the glass system because it disappears.
 - Ms. Stein replied that she still feels that glass should not be used because it is highly reflective and would draw attention to the new addition.
 - Mr. Cluver agreed, though he noted that the preference for metal railings usually applies to railings on historic buildings and that this railing would be on the addition. He stated that, because of this distinction, he is less concerned about the material.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that glass railings are seldom approved and questioned whether a cable railing could be used as an alternative. He agreed that glass should not be used.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron stated that he felt the addition was nice and asked that the Committee recommend that the front façade windows replicate the original appearance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The 1895 firehouse will remain largely intact. Only a portion of the rear roof is proposed to be demolished in order to raise the ceiling height.
- A one-story addition is proposed over a portion of the existing firehouse.
- A five-story addition is proposed at the rear and would be separated from the historic building by an exterior walkway. The rear wall of the firehouse would remain intact.
- The project would include a series of green roofs and roof decks.
- The missing garage door on N. 4th Street would be recreated to match the historic door; the doors would be modified for egress purposes.
- The addition would front Orianna Street and would be clad in a brick veneer with fiber cement clapboards at the north and south elevations.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The brick veneer of the Orianna Street façade should extend to the sides of the adjacent bay, and preferably to the return of the bays; the fiber cement clapboard siding should be changed to a fiber cement panel; the copper cornice should extend only across the Orianna façade and the adjacent brick bays; and a simpler cornice should be installed above the walls clad in fiber cement panels. In general, the materials are compatible with the historic building and satisfy Standard 9.
- The addition is compatible in size, scale, and massing, satisfying Standard 9.
- The front façade will be restored to its original appearance. The doors, though modified for egress, will either be retained or will replicate the original doors; replacement windows should replicate the historic pane configurations. The work complies with Standard 9.
- The proposed new construction would require no demolition and would leave the historic firehouse intact if removed in the future, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided the following:

- the glass railing is changed to a metal or cable railing system;
- the side bays and return of the rear addition adjacent to the Orianna Street façade are clad in brick;
- the copper cornice should be included at the side bays of the addition, and a simpler cornice should be incorporated where siding is currently shown;
- a Hardie panel should be considered instead of clapboard siding;
- consideration should be given to how the existing 4th Street doors will be modified to allow for egress;
- the front façade windows should replicate the historic configurations;
- the southernmost door of the front façade should potentially be paneled rather than flush;
- the location of the mechanical equipment should be identified in plan;
- a base articulation should be added to the first floor of the Orianna Street façade;
- the front portion of the historic roof should not be occupied space; and
- the north elevation should be included in the application to the Historical Commission.

ITEM: 1221-25 N 4TH ST**MOTION: Approval, with conditions****MOVED BY: Cluver****SECONDED BY: Gutterman**

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1723 MEMORIAL AVE

Proposal: Construct three-story building with pilot house

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 1213 N 41 LLC

Applicant: Eugene Naydovich, 1213 N 41 LLC

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/11/2009

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

The 1723 Memorial Avenue is a non-contributing vacant lot in the Parkside Historic District. This application proposes to build a three-story building with pilot house on the lot. The Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction over this application.

SCOPE OF WORK

Construct new three-story multi-family residence.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.*
 - Generally speaking, the design of the proposed new construction project reflects the size, scale, proportion and massing of the architecture of the Parkside Historic District. The proposed materials, however, do not. Vinyl siding or stucco is proposed for the prominent bay window at the front façade, and vinyl windows are proposed throughout. A brick veneer is proposed for the front façade; however, it would be helpful to know if the intent is to match the thin, tan-colored brick that is seen throughout the district. The front windows at the third story are square-topped rather

- than curved like the majority of the houses on the block, and no decorative brick mold is proposed. The front façade also lacks the circular window at the top which is another design feature seen at most of the other houses in the row.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - Because this proposed new construction is being considered on a vacant parcel, no historic fabric will be impaired by the project.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed design is generally compatible with the historic district, but the windows at the front façade should be aluminum-clad or composite rather than vinyl; Hardi-board siding should be used rather than vinyl siding; the brick veneer should match the tan brick seen throughout the district; the windows at the third story should be curved; and decorative brick window surrounds should be added to the design of the front façade, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:29:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Developer Eugene Naydovich represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Naydovich commented that the proposal before the Architectural Committee was almost identical to two previous review-and-comment applications they had reviewed previously at 1728 Marlton Avenue and 1728 Memorial Avenue.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Naydovich to respond to the staff's comments.
 - Mr. Naydovich responded that he was willing to make the changes recommended by the staff. He said that he thought using a material other than vinyl for the windows and adding some decorative brick trim on the façade were changes he could make.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that the window proposed at the ground-story appeared to be a slider window despite the fact that the other houses appeared to have pairs of double-hung windows. Ms. Gutterman stated that a slider window was not appropriate on the front façade of this house.
 - Mr. Naydovich responded that they intended to use a double-hung window at the front façade of the ground-floor.
- Ms. Gutterman told the applicant that the massing and height of the pilot house appeared to be larger than it needed to be which would make it highly visible from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Naydovich responded that the pilot house would not be visible from the street. He explained it was only to access mechanical equipment that was to be located on the roof and not for any kind of roof deck.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that the pilot house be reduced to the minimum height required by code.
 - Mr. Naydovich replied that he believed the proposed height of the pilot house was the minimum required by code. He stated that they would have no problem reducing its height if the code allowed.

- Ms. Stein asked the applicant to provide more detailed information about the materials proposed for the masonry trim, the stoop, the porch and columns at the front façade.
 - Mr. Naydovich replied that all of the trim would be custom manufactured out of a specific kind of plastic that could be painted. He noted that this was the same product used at the previous projects they had recently completed in the area. Mr. Naydovich added that the brick coping at the top of the house as well as the top of window bay would be capped in copper.
- Ms. Stein told the applicant that these details about the materials needed to be noted on the plans. She asked about the material of the water table.
 - The applicant responded that the water table would be made of the plastic product he had mentioned before.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant provide images of the recently constructed projects to the Historical Commission since he kept referencing them.
 - Mr. Naydovich said that he had the photographs of the other houses with him but did not know how to share them with the members of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Cluver suggested that he email them to Ms. Schmitt, which he did so that she could share them.
- Mr. Detwiler recommended that Mr. Naydovich provide images of the houses on either side of this vacant lot in his revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Upon seeing the images of the recently constructed house, Mr. McCoubrey noted that the house had much more detail than was shown on their current plans. Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant if he was proposing the same level of detail for the house currently under review.
 - Mr. Naydovich confirmed that they were planning on constructing the next house using as much detail as what was shown in the photos. He added that the brick they used had to be custom made in order to match the color and the size of what was originally used in the historic district.
 - Ms. Stein told the applicant that the architect needed to revise the plans to show the level of detail that they were seeing in the photographs of the recently constructed house. She said that there was much more resolution to design details on the constructed house than what was being shown on the plans they were reviewing.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein's comments, adding that if Mr. Naydovich was agreeing to building the current project with as much detail as the previous projects, the Historical Commission needed to see this reflected on the plans.
- Mr. Cluver observed that because some of the design details had not been added to the façade of the recently constructed houses, it actually helped differentiate them from the historic houses.
- Mr. McCoubrey recommended that the applicant use something other than lap siding, which conveys the sense of wood and would not have been used on these houses. He suggested the applicant consider stucco or a stucco panel system.
 - Mr. Naydovich said he would investigate these options.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Naydovich about the proposed design for the front door.
 - Mr. Naydovich replied that they would base the design off of the measurements taken of the other doors on the block.
- Mr. Cluver commented that they had made several recommendations about design and materials, and that the staff could review the details of the applicant's revisions.

- o Ms. Stein agreed with Mr. Cluver's comments but said she still wanted the applicant to update the plans to provide more details regarding the proposed materials, how the cornice on the subject property would line up with the adjacent cornices, and more information about the windows and front door.
- o Ms. Gutterman added that the height of the pilot house also needed to be revised on the plans.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicant's architectural drawings were not detailed enough to convey the intent of the project, which was only understood once photographs of a similar, recently constructed house were shared. The applicant should update the architectural plans with more details about materiality, how the new building will fit in harmoniously next to the historic houses on either side, and updated window and door details.
- The use of vinyl windows at the front façade was not appropriate and another material such as aluminum-clad should be used. The window at the ground floor of the front façade should be a pair of double-hung windows, not a slider window as was shown on the plans.
- The height of the pilot house should be the minimum height allowed by code.
- A stucco or stucco panel system should be used rather than a vinyl or lap siding.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The level of detail demonstrated by the photographs of a similar, recently completed project showed that the design intent was very sympathetic to the context of the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed new construction is being considered on a vacant parcel and would therefore not adversely impact any historic fabric, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee finds that the proposed new construction will be appropriate within the Parkside Historic District if it reflects the level of detail shown on the applicant's similar recent project. The applicant should revise the plans to convey the level of detail demonstrated by the photographs of the other project, with the staff to review said details, satisfying Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 737 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct six-story building with mezzanine and decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sarah Investment LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a five-story, mixed-use building with a mezzanine and roof decks at the site in the Society Hill Historic District where a non-contributing building was recently demolished. The staff of the Historical Commission approved the demolition in October 2019.

The north side of the block, where this site is situated, has an important history as Sansom Row by Benjamin Latrobe, which marks the beginning of rowhouse development in Philadelphia in 1799. Before that time, builders only constructed houses individually or in very small groups. Twelve of the original houses still survive in the row, even if some have been modified. The row now consists entirely of three- and four-story historic buildings clad in red brick, brownstone, stucco, and other masonry.

The Historical Commission has reviewed earlier revisions of this proposed building. At its 8 May 2020 meeting and 14 August 2020, the Historical Commission denied earlier applications to construct a six-story building with a mezzanine and roof decks, stating that the size of the party walls overwhelmed the adjacent buildings, and the setbacks were too minimal.

The current application proposes a building with one fewer floors and greater setbacks than those proposed earlier. The proposed building retains the design of the first four floors, which the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission agreed were satisfactory in terms of massing, materials, and scale for Sansom Row. The façade materials are similar to those proposed in the application that the Historical Commission reviewed at its May and August 2020 meetings. The building would feature red brick at its upper stories and cast stone to imitate limestone at the storefront.

The section above the first four floors, which was the primary focus of discussion during the earlier meeting, is now a single floor topped by a mezzanine with a roof deck. The fifth floor is set back 10 feet from the front facade and the front wall of the mezzanine is set back 24 feet from the front façade. The total height of the building is 65 feet.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct five-story, mixed-use building with commercial ground floor with mezzanine and roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The size, scale, proportions, and massing of the proposed new construction is compatible with the surrounding context and the historic district. The core of the new building, its ground level and three upper floors, are in keeping with the historic forms and rhythm of Sansom Row. Although visible, the upper section of one story and mezzanine does not overwhelm the lower section of the building or the adjoining historic row. The proposed new construction satisfies Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:54:11

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked why the plan and rendering show different layouts of the windows on the west side of the mezzanine. She asked which is correct.
 - Mr. Rosenberg said they intend to have windows on the west elevation, and this is also the reason for the setback from the side yard property line of the mezzanine, owing to code requirements. He continued that the windows on this side will have a rhythm of pilasters and blind archways interspersed in between those window openings. Mr. Rosenberg said that the axonometric drawings shown on HC-09 best indicate the intent of punched openings.
- Ms. Stein asked about the material of the blank wall.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that it would be a stucco or Hardie material. He explained that it would all be uniform color made up of columns and pilasters interspersed with windows or blind archways.
- Mr. Cluver said there needs to be consistency among the pages of the application. He pointed out that one drawing notes material as Hardie board and another drawing says stucco. Mr. Cluver stated there should be a west side elevation provided in the application and a consistency of approach shown on all drawings.
 - Mr. Rosenberg said that they would be open to either the stucco or Hardie board. He added that it was his personal feeling that the Hardie board is more durable and appropriate material for this application. Mr. Rosenberg said they would be willing to commit to Hardie board.
- Mr. Cluver said that he thought stucco would be a more appropriate material because the design has some nice articulation on it and stucco with the scored joints would look good. He explained that he is always concerned with the Hardie board and how the joints get treated. Mr. Cluver pointed out that Hardie board required exposed fasteners, so the method of concealing them is a concern too.
 - Mr. Rosenberg reiterated that they open to either material. He added that they would use a three-layer build-up of the stucco material for thermal stabilization if they selected stucco.

- Mr. Cluver stated that the application still proposes a six-story building among three and four-story buildings. He continued that the applicant is calling it a five-story building with a mezzanine, but he would call it five stories with a penthouse not a mezzanine. Mr. Cluver reiterated they are really dealing with a six-story building in a block with three and four-story buildings. Mr. Cluver noted that, while the revised application is better, it is still tall and he is wondering if they are happy with it in comparison with what was provided before, or if this was the first time they were seeing it would they be objecting to this design. He said that he is still concerned about the height. Mr. Cluver explained that he would prefer a four-story building and then he could entertain the idea of a fifth story penthouse. However, it would still start to loom above the rest of the block.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that he agrees this is a significant reduction in massing and height. He continued that in his opinion the penthouse is a real appropriate way of terminating the massing of the building. Mr. Rosenberg said that as you can see it is reflected in the large building just east of this on the next block. He noted this is a very traditional way of designing massing.
 - Ms. Stein said the one-story reduction shown in the revised design makes the overall design acceptable to her personally. She explained the massing shown is appropriate for the neighborhood, and because it steps back twice, she finds it acceptable.
 - Ms. Gutterman said she is still troubled the so-called mezzanine that is really a penthouse. She clarified that she considers the sixth story a floor and is troubled by its relationship on the building and on the block.
 - Ms. Stein said she is also troubled by the materials, details, and rendering of it.
- Mr. Cluver said he wished to discuss the front façade. He asked about the stone shown on the front façade and inquired about the exact material.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that they are planning to use limestone or precast in a limestone color.
- Mr. Cluver said that there should be a more durable stone where it meets the ground, so it does not soak up the water and leave salt rings.
 - Mr. Rosenberg replied that they typically use a granite base 8-12 inches in height as a base course. He noted they use this material at the base for the exact reason Mr. Cluver is concerned about.
- Mr. Cluver also asked about the front façade's brick. He noted that there is an articulation to the brick on the drawing and renderings that appear to be bands or lines of brick. He asked if that was the intent or if a simple brick façade is the intent.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that the intent is a simple brick façade. He said they studied some variations but at the end of the day they are imagining a simple brick façade in running bond or Flemish bond pattern without the articulations.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the architect include all elevations of the building with the submission for the Historical Commission's review. He clarified that having a full set of elevation drawings is needed to provide a complete description of this building. Mr. Detwiler said he is glad to see the articulation shown on the side wall on page HC-12 because so many would have just shown that as a flat elevation. He added that it would be good to create a color or tonal difference between the subject building and the adjacent Stephen Singer building because right now the colors are too similar. Mr. Detwiler said that he is fine with the material and articulation.
 - Mr. Rosenberg said they can update their application to include the west and north façade elevations.

- Mr. Cluver said the cornice shown has a simplified profile and inquired if that was the intent or is that a modeling abstraction.
- Mr. Rosenberg said they did not wish to replicate a period cornice but felt the overall proportions and shadow lines should follow the articulation of a historic cornice.
- Mr. Cluver noted the shadow line comment is important because the rendering image on HC-12 shows how the historic cornice creates a very strong shadow line. The current cornice proposed for the building will not have a strong shadow line because it uses a slope rather than an overhang.
 - Mr. Rosenberg replied they can revise the cornice to be more compatible with historic row and can also provide the staff with a cross section of the proposed cornice.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that provided an east elevation drawing is important for the final review by the Historical Commission because right now there is no detailed image of that facade.
 - Mr. Rosenberg said they can provide all four elevations to the staff prior to the Historical Commission's meeting.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the proposed floor height of the mezzanine. He observed that it is the same floor height as the lower floors and asked Mr. Rosenberg if it could be lowered six or nine inches. Mr. McCoubrey also noted that the top edge of the mezzanine could be a little lighter to make it more like a penthouse. He reiterated that lowering the top level six to nine inches would be an improvement.
 - Mr. Rosenberg replied that they could look at that but noted they are trying to achieve a nine-foot ceiling height in all the units. He agreed that the reduction of height and revising the top edge of mezzanine would help reduce its visibility and massing.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the mechanical units. She said she does not see mechanicals on any plans and is clear that they cannot be placed on top of the mezzanine level.
 - Mr. Rosenberg said there will be nine units in this building and their plan is to place some of the HVAC units on the north side behind the mezzanine and the remaining HVAC units between the two terrace levels on the south side.
- Ms. Gutterman said that all mechanical units should be shown on revised plans submitted for Historical Commission review.
 - Mr. Rosenberg agreed to this request.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee failed to offer a recommendation. A motion to deny the application failed by a vote of 3 to 3.

ITEM: 737 WALNUT ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey		X			
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler		X			
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein		X			
Total	3	3			1

ADDRESS: 231 MONROE ST

Proposal: Construct exterior stair and roof deck; extend party wall and chimney

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robert Delaney

Applicant: Jack Burns, Jack Burns Architecture LLC

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Located at the northwest corner of Monroe Street and S. American Street, 231 Monroe Street is an individually-designated property in the Queen Village neighborhood. In November 2020, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a stop work order for the construction of a roof deck without permits. The partially-completed roof deck differs from the submitted drawings, which are intended as a revised, compromise position. The drawings show a deck set back five feet eight inches from the Monroe Street elevation and six feet eight inches from the American Street elevation, with an angled corner. As built, the deck is set back from the front elevation, but extends the full width of the roof, with no tapered corner. The builder has noted that they cannot put weight on the roof, and would like to keep a structure that extends the full width of the building to be supported by the exterior walls, so the architect has included steel structural supports that would extend to the party walls. The drawings show that the deck would be accessed by a switch-back stair that would be constructed on the existing second-floor roof deck. The stair has not yet been constructed. The drawings also show that the deck would be enclosed by a black aluminum railing on the street-facing elevations. A five-foot high wall clad in Azek siding would be erected along the party wall. An existing chimney would be extended.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct roof deck and stair
- Extend chimney

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 FEBRUARY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The partially-built deck is highly visible from the public right-of-way. If modified to comply with the submitted drawings, the proposed deck and stair would remain conspicuous from the public right-of-way, and therefore the application fails to satisfy this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jack Burns represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Architectural Committee members asked whether there was a deck on the main roof previously or if the existing deck was approved by the Historical Commission previously.
 - Ms. DiPasquale confirmed that there had not been a deck previously and that the existing deck was not presented to the staff or Historical Commission.
- Mr. Burns explained that he was contacted by the owners after they received a Stop Work Order and was tasked with developing a modified design that would comply with historic preservation and zoning requirements. He noted that the existing structure will be removed, acknowledging that it is too high, too big, and violates setback requirements.
- Mr. Burns explained that the staircase is as small as possible, but is still large since the distance from the existing second-floor roof deck to the main roof is large. He noted that they tried to reduce the visual impact by pushing it away from the street.
- Mr. Burns explained that the designer on the project sold the owner on the five-foot partition wall along the party wall, but that they could consider modifying or reducing the wall.
- Ms. Gutterman asked why the existing deck is so much higher than the roof and whether that is owing to the slope of the roof.
 - Mr. Burns responded that the existing deck is higher than it needs to be and higher than the application drawings propose. He noted that the proposed steel structure will be sitting on the cornice, whereas currently the structure is several feet above the cornice.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked exactly how high the deck will be above the roof as shown in the drawings.
 - Mr. Burns responded that the deck will be approximately 16 inches above the western party wall and the structure will increase as the roof slopes towards American Street as visible from the rear, north elevation.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that this will be perceptible from the street.
- Ms. Stein noted that, even if a deck had not already been partially constructed, the Architectural Committee would be hesitant to approve any deck at all on the roof of the main block of the building. She explained that its position as a highly-visible

corner property allows longer vistas of the roof and make it more conspicuous. The large staircase off the rear also makes it highly conspicuous. She noted that the property is individually designated.

- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the property already has a fairly large deck at the lower level, which will be mostly be taken up by the large staircase.
- Ms. Lukachik agreed that the roof could likely not support a deck without the structural members, but noted that it will be very odd to have structural beams sitting on top of the cornice, which will also be very visible and over time will rust and stain and cause problems themselves.
 - Mr. Burns responded that they could back the beams up so they are not visible.
 - Ms. Lukachik noted that the drawings and renderings show the beams visibly bearing on the cornice.
 - Mr. Burns responded that they have successfully used this technique in other roof decks on historic properties.
- Ms. Lukachik questioned how much the existing chimney will need to be extended.
- Mr. Burns responded that they will need to extend it three or four feet.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with his colleagues that the proposed deck is highly conspicuous as is the large stair. He objected to the concept of a roof deck on the main block entirely, particularly given the fact that there is an existing functional second-floor deck.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed roof deck, wall, structural supports and stair are highly visible and conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed roof deck will not be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and therefore fails to satisfy Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline

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

ITEM: 231 MONROE ST
MOTION: Denial
MOVED BY: Gutterman
SECONDED BY: Cluver

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1505 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Linggan Realty 89

Applicant: Adam Zangrilli, Zangrilli Design

History: 1859; storefront, new brickwork, stucco and cornice, 1923

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 1505 Spring Garden Street is a three-story building with a two-story rear ell. This application proposes to construct an addition so that the rear ell and most of the main block rise four stories in height. The addition is set back nine feet from the front façade, where a deck is proposed. Several other buildings on this row have full three-story rear ells, but only one has a fourth story, which is the property next door with the mansard addition, constructed about 1885. The only work to the front façade called out in the application is the replacement of the non-historic storefront windows and door, for which the staff can work with the applicant on the details.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct third and fourth floor 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 work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - As proposed, the new addition is not compatible with the size, scale, and massing of the row.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval of a rear addition with reduced or eliminated massing on the main block, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:28:50

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman commented that the massing of the addition should be held entirely to the rear ell, with no addition or deck on the main block.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that there are long views of this property, making it difficult for an addition to be inconspicuous.
- Mr. Cluver opposed a roof deck at the front of the building.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that a fourth-floor addition on the main block may satisfy the Standards if it is set back far enough from the front of the building, with no roof deck in front of it.
 - Ms. Stein and Mr. McCoubrey agreed.
- Ms. Lukachik commented that the proposed addition on the main block adds snow drift onto the adjacent roof which likely was not designed for snow drift.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Several other buildings on this row have full three-story rear ells, but only one has a fourth story, which is the property next door with the mansard addition.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As proposed, the new addition is not compatible with the size, scale, and massing of the row, and does not satisfy Standard 9.
- It could consider an application that proposes an addition on the main block that is set further back so as to satisfy preservation standards for rooftop additions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval of a rear addition with no massing or deck on the main block, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1505 SPRING GARDEN ST MOTION: Denial as proposed MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:36:40

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:37 a.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.