

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

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

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

- Suzanne Ponsen
- Susan Wetherill
- Kelly Edwards
- Alex Duller
- Union League
- Jim Bradberry
- Marjorie Russell
- Greg Katz
- Aaron Osgood
- Michael Ramos
- Mike Rufo
- Donna Lisle
- Oscar Beisert

Jared Klein
Scot Lutte
Juliet Fajardo
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Oliver Ingram
Anthony Sirizzotti
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Ben Estepani
Lionel Guerra
David Lockard
Bernard M. Jordan-Lambert
Francesca Crivelli
Audrey Hampton
Lee Hyden, The H. Chambers Co.
Matthew Connor
Jason Morris
Jay Farrell
Marty Gregorski
Tom Beck
Janice Woodcock
Constance Winters
Allison Weiss
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Bob Lane
Christopher Stromberg
Aaron Osgood
Colby Cauchon
May Narisaranukul
Russell Fulto
Matthew Rosen
Chris Mohr
Joe Burda

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 8330 MILLMAN ST

Proposal: Construct building for accessory dwelling unit

Review Requested: In-Concept Approval

Owner: David L. Lockard

Applicant: Donna Lisle, Donna Lisle, Architecture and Design

History: 1963; Vanna Venturi House; Mother's House; Robert Venturi, architect

Individual Designation: 11/10/2016

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 8330 Millman Street includes the significant Postmodern-style Vanna Venturi House designed by prominent Philadelphia architect Robert Venturi. The house is set back approximately 200 feet from Millman Street, centered on a long driveway running to the street. The T-shaped lot extends to the southeast and northwest, behind the neighboring

properties at 8234 and 8336 Millman Street. The property is bounded by Navajo Street at the rear, though the rear of the house is not visible from that street, owing to heavy vegetation.

This in-concept application proposes to construct an 800-square-foot, one-story residential building to allow the current owner to age in place. The new building would be constructed in the location of an existing non-historic shed to the northwest of the Venturi House, on one of the arms of the T-shaped lot behind the property at 8336 Millman Street. It would be positioned 36-feet from the historic house. At its highest point, the proposed structure would be 12 feet tall, and the roof would slope to a low point of 9 feet.

The general location, height, massing, and scale of the proposed building are appropriate for the site, given that the new building will be largely invisible from the street and is positioned behind an adjacent property. The staff questions whether rotating the proposed building 90 degrees and pushing it to the property line at the northwest would further reduce the impact of the new construction on the Vanna Venturi House.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct one-story accessory dwelling in the side yard.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed one-story building would be differentiated from the historic building and would be compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features.
 - o The proposed building's location on the site would have minimal impact on the historic integrity of the property and its environment; however, the staff suggests exploring whether rotating the building 90 degrees would increase the distance between the new structure and the historic building and thereby minimize any potential visibility from the public right-of-way.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - *Recommended: Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
 - o The new building would be located behind the neighboring property at 8336 Millman Street and would have minimal visibility from the public right-of-way; it would, therefore, not obstruct views of the Vanna Venturi House. The proposed building would be located on the site of a non-historic shed, behind the current parking area.
 - o Owing to the massing, size, and scale of the new construction and its siting 36-feet from the historic building, the new construction would not

result in the diminution of the historic character of the Vanna Venturi House.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided rotating the building is explored, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Donna Lisle and Juliet Fajardo represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Lisle stated that they are proposing a separate Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) because it would be inappropriate to add onto the iconic Vanna Venturi House, one of the most famous architectural landmarks of the twentieth century. She added that it would be difficult to modify the interior of the Vanna Venturi House to accommodate future needs.
- Mr. Detwiler asked the applicants to address the staff's question about rotating the ADU building 90 degrees.
 - o Ms. Lisle responded that the team initially considered it. While it positioned the ADU further from the historic building, she continued, the ADU would be much more visible. By facing the house, she added, it would engage the house and become part of the design. She commented that their intent is to create a modest building that defers to the Vanna Venturi House. She explained that the ADU is sited where there is lots of vegetation and where it can be subsidiary.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the proposed setbacks are the minimum required.
 - o Ms. Fajardo confirmed that the 10-foot and 8-foot setbacks are the minimum. She added that when they explored rotating the building, it became visible from inside the historic house. She questioned whether it would be appropriate to view the ADU from inside the Vanna Venturi House. She argued that, in its current location, the proposed building would not be visible from the street or from inside the house.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed with the decision, adding that rotating the building would cause it to project into the grassy portion of the landscape. He also agreed that the building would be visible from the interior of the historic house.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed, adding that he considered whether rotating it would be better, but concluded that the current siting is preferred.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the Committee accepts the principle of the ADU and whether further discussion of its appropriateness is warranted, or if the Committee accepts the ADU and would like to discuss details. He added that he finds it to be acceptable.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey replied that he is very familiar with the house, noting that it is extremely small. He elaborated that, as an alternative to an addition, the proposed ADU is far preferable. He affirmed that the site for the ADU is remarkably invisible, given the vegetation. Part of a rationale for an ADU at this location, he continued, is that the house is so small and that the ADU will allow for a larger family to reside at the property or for guests to be accommodated.

- Mr. McCoubrey asked to review the options presented in the application, noting that the options show different rooflines. He stated that he would strongly support the simple shed rather than the parapeted version. He suggested that the applicant drop down the portion of the roof facing the historic house.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the slope could be increased to be closer to the slope of the house. He stated it looked a little flat. He added that he supports the additional building on the property but noted that the footprint of the proposed building is as wide as the existing house. He questioned whether the footprint could be reduced and whether the corner closest to the house could be further set back.
 - o Ms. Fajardo answered that she considered those requests, adding that the ADU is only 800 square feet and that every square foot is needed. She remarked that the design includes an area to allow an existing Japanese maple to remain. The design decision, she elaborated, was to further integrate the garden into the unit.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey suggested that when the applicants submit for final approval, they look at options that eliminate the court space and show how the footprint could be reduced.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that the parapets should be eliminated, adding that he liked the switchback roofs.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey commented that the parapets on the original house have caused issues.
 - o Ms. Fajardo stated that the parapet was included to mimic the Vanna Venturi House and that they would serve mostly as a rainscreen. She elaborated that she thought the parapet would create a softer edge and allow the roof to look more permeable and temporal.
- Mr. D'Alessandro argued that water needs to be removed from the roof quickly, owing to the amount and speed of rainfall in the area. He stated that parapets trap water.
 - o Ms. Lisle responded that they were considering inline gutters for the parapeted design.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that removing the parapets reduces the height of the building and makes the building less intrusive in the landscape.
 - o Ms. Lisle raised the issue that mechanical equipment will need to be installed on the east side of the building and that they cannot lower the building much further than shown.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed that the applicants are showing a low-profile building. He added that he finds it acceptable to increase the slope slightly at the back of the building.
- Ms. Stein observed that cedar siding is proposed for much of the building but noted that the drawings show flat areas. She questioned whether the flat areas would be stuccoed.
 - o Ms. Fajardo answered that they are still in-concept with materials and are exploring stucco in the flat areas.
 - o Ms. Lisle added that the stucco would be used in select areas to bring cohesion to the site. She elaborated that they may incorporate Wissahickon schist into the low retaining walls to reference the stone used around Chestnut Hill. She described the site's topography and the intent behind the grading of the new structure.
 - o Mr. Detwiler supported the use of schist.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the gray palette would be appropriate, adding that he thought the wood siding would be appropriate cladding for the entire building

without the use of stucco. He contended that the new structure should be an independent building and does not need to incorporate stucco to tie into the main building.

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the material of the siding.
 - o Ms. Fajardo replied that it is manufactured by a local company that imports, treats, and finishes New Zealand pine.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey asked that the material be shown on the design when the application comes through for final approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Given the shape of the lot and the minimal visibility of the selected location for the ADU, the construction of the ADU will not have an adverse visual impact on the historic house.
- The parapets should be eliminated, and the roof should slope on the short side closest to the Vanna Venturi House.
- The materials seem appropriate and should be shown at scale when the application is reviewed for final approval.
- The massing could potentially be reduced with the elimination of the courtyard space that encloses the tree.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed ADU is appropriate in massing, size, scale, architectural features, and materials. The work complies with Standard 9.
- The proposed ADU would be sited so that it is minimally visible from a public right-of-way. It would also be sited so that it would not be visible from the interior of the Vanna Venturi House. The work complies with the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, provided further reducing the footprint of the new structure is considered, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ITEM: 8330 MILLMAN ST MOTION: Approval in-concept MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 224 W WASHINGTON LN

Proposal: Partially demolish building; construct duplex

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: LJP Holdings

Applicant: Benjamin Estepani, Pace Architecture and Design

History: 1861; Taws Cottage

Individual Designation: pending

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: On 28 October 2021, the staff notified the property owner of 224 W. Washington Lane that the Historical Commission would consider a nomination and determine whether to designate the property as historic. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction over building permit applications begins as of the date of the notice letters. The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) may not issue a building permit where the application is "filed" on or after the date the Historical Commission sends the notice letters, unless the Commission approves the application. At the time notice was sent, the owner had plans to subdivide the property and redevelop the existing building, evident by zoning permit ZP-2021-004730, which was processed by L&I on 30 April 2021. Two building permit applications (RP-2021-015619 and RP-2021-017667) were submitted to L&I around the time of the notice. RP-2021-015619, which proposes to demolish a portion of the existing building and construct an addition, was started in eCLIPSE on 4 October 2021 and determined complete by L&I on 3 November 2021. RP-2021-017667, which proposes to construct a three-story duplex adjacent to the existing structure, was started in eCLIPSE on 3 November 2021 and determined complete by L&I on 5 November 2021. The Historical Commission's staff will confer with L&I and the Law Department to determine whether RP-2021-015619 was "filed" before the date of the notice letters. If it was, the Historical Commission does not have the authority to review or deny the application.

The permit applications propose to demolish most of the building, a detached garage, and several landscaping features. At the first story, the rear half of the existing building would be demolished, as would the infilled front porch. Only the front wall and portions of the side walls would remain. The second story and roof would be completely removed. The work would constitute a demolition of the existing building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 NOVEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Following the subdivision of the property, a new semi-detached building would be constructed on each parcel in place of the existing building and garage. The new buildings would be three stories in height with roof decks and pilot houses. The new design would not retain any design features or architectural elements of the building proposed for designation.

Over and above the strict jurisdictional question related to the dates of the permit application was filed and the notice letters were sent, the Historical Commission, its committees, and staff may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications, pursuant to the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations Section 6.9.a.10. As noted above, this development project was underway long before the nomination was submitted, as is evidenced by the zoning permit.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish existing two-story building and garage; and
- Construct two, three-story semi-detached buildings on subdivided lot.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The existing building, garage, and site features would be demolished, with only a few walls of the structure remaining at the first story. The work would destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The work does not comply with Standard 9.
 - o The nomination makes no claim for the historic significance of the garage; it is assumed to be non-contributing.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed semi-detached buildings would result in an almost complete loss of the existing building. Though several walls of the existing structure would be incorporated into the new construction, the work would cause a loss of the essential form and integrity of the property. The proposed work does not satisfy Standard 10.
- *14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition. No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.*

- *14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish. The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.*
 - o Section 14-1005(6)(d) prohibits the Historical Commission from approving a demolition, the razing or destruction of a building entirely or in significant part, unless it finds that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it may be reasonably adapted. The proposed work constitutes a demolition in the legal sense. The application does not demonstrate that the demolition qualifies for the public interest or inability to reuse exception.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff offers no recommendation because of the open questions regarding the “filing” of the first building permit application relative to the issuance of the notice letters, and because the Historical Commission has not yet determined whether this property warrants designation or whether the development plans in place at the time of the notice warrant special consideration.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:32:38

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Michael Phillips, architect Ben Estepani, and owner Lionel Guerra represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the Committee should review the application as if the property were under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction, and that the question regarding the timeline would be answered at the Historical Commission meeting.
 - o Ms. Keller affirmed that that was the appropriate approach.
- Mr. Phillips stated that his client, Conarroe Jawn, purchased the property in November 2020 with plans to relocate lot lines and create two lots. He added that his client filed a zoning application in April 2021. He contended that on 4 October 2021, an application was begun for the almost complete demolition of the existing building on the lot and the renovation of that property. That application, he continued, was finalized and paid for on 21 October 2021, which he argued was one week before notice of the nomination was sent. He stated that it is his contention that permit application RP-2021-015619 is beyond the purview and jurisdiction of the Historical Commission. He added that a second building permit application was filed on 3 November 2021, but that he does not concede that the Historical Commission would have jurisdiction over that application pending the determination of whether the property warrants designation. That application, he continued, proposed new construction on what would become Lot 2. He reiterated that his position is that the Historical Commission lacks jurisdiction over the original building permit application for Lot 1 (RP-2021-015610) and that work may proceed upon the issuance of a building permit. He contended that the work would fundamentally alter the property such that historic designation is not warranted.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the work constitutes a demolition and does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

- o Mr. Estepani stated that he began working on the development project in September 2020, more than one year ago, without any knowledge that the property was historic, so he and the owner worked to obtain zoning permits and plan for the demolition of most of the existing building. He then explained the design intent.
- Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the design details are trivial, since the plans propose to demolish most of what could be a designated historic resource.
 - o Mr. Cluver questioned what the Committee's purview is for the review and whether it needs to simply acknowledge that the proposal is for a demolition of the historic building, or if the Committee needs to discuss the merits of the proposed design.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey answered that if the work is considered a demolition, then the Committee should not discuss the architectural details proposed for the new building.
 - o Ms. Stein posited that the property is not located within a historic district, so if it is not designated by the Historical Commission, any development plans will not be reviewed by the Committee in the future. She agreed that the Committee should not discuss the design, adding that the concern is a legal issue centered on when the permit application was filed.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the owner considered incorporating the existing building into the design and constructing a separate unit.
 - o Mr. Estepani answered that he reviewed the zoning code and designed the building to be constructed by-right. He added that he found the most effective way to use the lot was to construct two semi-detached structures and that he did not consider retaining the existing building and incorporating it into the new development.
- Ms. Stein asked Mr. Farnham how long it would take the City to make the determination regarding when the permit application was filed.
 - o Mr. Farnham replied that the project is essentially frozen while the permit application sits at the Department of Licenses and Inspections waiting for the Historical Commission to make a decision. The Law Department and Department of Licenses and Inspections will provide the Historical Commission with enough information and advice so that it can make a final determination in the matter at its 10 December 2021 meeting. He added that he has conveyed the preliminary conclusions to Mr. Phillips. He then stated that Mr. McCoubrey is correct that, if the Committee deems the application to be a demolition, then the new design is not germane to the review at this time.
- Mr. Guerra stated that the project was designed to be by-right to avoid having to obtain additional approvals. He contended that the neighborhood group submitted the nomination at the 11th hour to block the development. He commented that he purchased the property based on its current zoning and the potential development allowed, noting that he has invested a substantial amount of money in the project. He stated that on 21 October 2021, he chose the expedited option for the building permit submission, though he does not know how it affects the staff's statement that the permit application was filed on 3 November 2021.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert stated that the application proposes a demolition, which does not meet the Standards.
- Connie Winters commented on various zoning issues.

- Allison Weiss supported the designation of the property and opposed the application's proposed demolition.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia asked that the developers be mindful of Germantown's history and be open to reuse of historic structures.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission will need to determine whether the property satisfies Criteria for Designation and should be designated as historic.
- The Department of Licenses and Inspections, Historical Commission, and Law Department will need to determine when permit application RP-2021-015619 was filed, and if the date of filing predates the date notice of the nomination was sent.
- The application proposes a demolition of the historic structure.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work would result in the loss of most of the existing building. The application does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed work would cause a loss of the essential form and integrity of the existing building. The application does not satisfy Standard 10.
- The work constitutes a demolition and cannot be approved by the Historical Commission, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) prohibiting the demolition of historic structures, because the application fails to demonstrate that demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it may be reasonably adapted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the demolition prohibition.

ITEM: 224 W WASHINGTON LN 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 1900 S 16TH ST

Proposal: Convert church complex to multi-family residential use; construct detached building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: True Gospel Tabernacle Family Church

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design Inc.

History: St Elizabeth's Episcopal Church; Bailey & Truscott, architects; Chapel, 1889; Church and Parish House, 1897; Campanile, 1902

Individual Designation: 7/25/1967

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to convert the former St. Elizabeth's Protestant Episcopal Church to multi-family residential use. The chapel fronting on S. 16th Street dates to 1889 and is the earliest building of the complex. The church facing S. Bancroft Street and the parish hall along Mifflin Street were constructed in 1897. The 110-foot-tall free-standing campanile at the corner of 16th and Mifflin Streets was constructed in 1902 and was allegedly the first such tower to be erected in the United States. The church, parish hall, and tower were designed by Baily & Truscott.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert church complex to multi-family residential use:
 - o Remove, replace, cut down, and/or add new windows in multiple locations
 - o Construct small connector additions for circulation
 - o Construct dormer additions
 - o Construct detached three-story residential building fronting Bancroft 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 shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed alterations for this adaptive reuse are largely compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic property, satisfying Standard 9. However, the design, features, materials, and massing of the proposed three-story detached building are incompatible with the historic property and should be reconsidered in order to satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the removed stained glass windows are stored in a secure location, the siding material proposed for the historic buildings is reconsidered, and the overall design of the new detached building is thoroughly reconsidered, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:54:32

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Janice Woodcock and attorney Brett Feldman represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 NOVEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee members agreed that the overall proposal was a clever adaptive reuse of the historic church complex.
- The Committee members commented on the incompatible design of the proposed new building.
 - o Ms. Stein commented that the third floor is too tall, and the windows are not appropriately scaled.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed and added that the materials are also incompatible, noting that this is a red-brick neighborhood.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed and commented that a setback of the third floor may not be necessary if the height is reduced. He stated that the paired windows are not contextual.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that the use of contextual materials will help this new building to recede, not draw attention to itself.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that, instead of cutting down the window openings on the church, they should instead create a separate lower window opening below the existing opening.
 - o Ms. Woodcock responded that the goal is to get light into that lower level and that she will investigate creating separate window openings.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the largest opening on the chapel, which is infilled with windows and siding, both currently and as proposed.
 - o Ms. Woodcock noted that it was likely one large stained glass window historically.
 - o Ms. Stein agreed and suggested that the proposed siding could be replaced with a panel and a heavy frame around the opening to read more monolithically. Other Committee members agreed.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the proposed connector to the tower, noting that part of the significance of the tower is that it is free-standing. He stated that he is conflicted on the appropriateness of a connector to the tower but noted that it is well-designed.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed that the connector was designed to be inconspicuous but stated that he is also conflicted.
 - o Ms. Lukachik commented that she approves of the connector as proposed, observing that it is important to have a use in the upper tower space.
 - o Mr. Detwiler decided that he opposed the connector because of the significance of the tower being free-standing and because it was not crucial to put a residential unit in the tower at that level.
- The Committee members asked about dividing the proposed dormers on the chapel into smaller single dormers.
 - o Ms. Woodcock responded that this change could likely be accommodated.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The church complex was constructed in phases between 1889 and 1902.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed alterations for this adaptive reuse are largely compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic property, satisfying

Standard 9. However, the design, features, materials, and massing of the proposed three-story detached building are incompatible with the historic property and should be reconsidered in order to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the removed stained glass windows are stored in a secure location on site, the siding material proposed for the historic buildings is reconsidered, the overall design of the new detached building is reconsidered to be more contextual, new window openings on the church are added rather than enlarging the existing windows, the spandrels are treated with panels rather than siding, the proposed wide dormers on the chapel are changed to two single dormers, and the connector to the tower is reconsidered, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1900 S 16TH ST					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Guterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2000 WALLACE ST

Proposal: Construct three-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sandra Feldman

Applicant: Christopher Stromberg, S2 Design

History: 1947

Individual Designation: 7/6/1972

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to construct a three-story building at 2000 Wallace Street, located within the Spring Garden Historic District. Currently, a one-story, non-contributing structure stands on the site. Because the existing structure is non-contributing, the staff may approve the demolition permit application. However, the Historical Commission and its advisory Architectural Committee must review the proposed new construction for approval.

The new three-story, multi-family building would be located at the southwest corner of Wallace and 20th Streets. A red, running-bond brick is proposed at both the Wallace Street (front) façade and at the 20th Street façade, which is in keeping with the context of the Spring Garden Historic District. The fenestration proposed for the front facade is also seen throughout the district;

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 NOVEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

however, most of the buildings included on the “Context and Precedents” sheets in the application have slightly arched window openings and lintels rather than the flat-topped window openings proposed for the new construction. The proposed windows are double-hung composite throughout, with the exception of one bay of casement windows and one bay of picture windows on the 20th Street facade. A decorative cornice is proposed at the top of both sides of the building. Details such as cast stone lintels, sills and stairs, and a wood paneled door facing Wallace Street, fit into the context of the historic district.

At the center of the 20th Street façade, a decorative feature clad in fiber cement is proposed to extend the height of the building at what appears to be the main entrance to the apartments. A picture window is proposed at each floor at this location. Overall, the fenestration along the 20th Street façade appears random and driven by the interior program.

A pilot house clad in fiber cement is proposed to allow the upper unit access to a roof deck. It is difficult to evaluate the visibility of the pilot house from the application materials.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing structure
- Construct three-story building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed building is largely compatible with the massing, size, scale, and materials of the historic district, satisfying Standard 9. However, the fenestration and the fiber cement design feature on the 20th Street facade are incompatible with the district and should be reconsidered to satisfy Standard 9.
 - o The visibility of the pilot house from the right-of-way should be minimized to the greatest extent possible. However, it should be noted that the Standards and Guidelines require rooftop additions on historic buildings like pilot houses to be inconspicuous, but do not require rooftop elements on new, non-historic buildings to be inconspicuous. New buildings must be compatible with historic districts, and rooftop elements on new buildings must not detract from historic districts, but rooftop elements on new buildings do not necessarily have to be inconspicuous or invisible to comply with the Standards and Guidelines. The Roofs Guideline requiring rooftop additions to historic buildings to be inconspicuous is designed to protect historic buildings, not to limit new construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the fenestration and the fiber cement bay on the 20th Street façade are revised to be more compatible with the context of the district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:24:10

PRESENTERS:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 NOVEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Architect Christopher Stromberg represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant if they had any response to the staff's comments.
 - o The applicant responded that he was open to discussing a different material for the stair tower on the 20th Street façade. He explained that they had tried to create a rhythm to the windows along 20th Street and asked if adding additional windows could help.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that adding blind windows that matched the size and shape of the other windows could help. He further commented that he appreciated the traditional design of the building; however, the non-traditional fenestration of this façade was inappropriate.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he supported the concept of a change of material at the stair tower. However, he suggested that the cornice extend the length of the façade rather than stopping at the change of material. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. Detwiler. Mr. Detwiler commented that the single-pane windows at the stair tower appeared out of place with the otherwise traditional design, as did the pairs of casement windows.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the casement windows did not appear appropriate and suggested that double-hung windows would be a better choice. He added that rather than having a recessed change of material at the stair tower, the applicant might consider a bay or the use of a different color brick instead.
 - o The applicant responded that adding a bay would help the circulation of the stair. He asked if there were suggestions for how to clad the bay.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that metal, wood, and siding were all options for the cladding.
- Mr. Cluver remarked that he did not think there were many bays seen in the rest of the historic district. He agreed that breaking up the length of the façade along 20th Street would improve the design and also that the fenestration needed to be rethought.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The traditional design of the new building is appropriate to its context.
- The fenestration pattern of the 20th Street façade needs to be reconfigured to better reflect the building's traditional design.
- The design of the current stair tower should either be more recessed or turned into a proper bay.
- The current bay of casement windows at the 20th Street façade should be double-hung windows instead.
- The casement window at the third floor of the rear façade should be a double-hung window instead.
- The height of the pilot house should be as low as possible.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is largely compatible with the massing, size, scale, and materials of the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the applicant rework the fenestration pattern on the 20th Street façade, change the existing stair tower to be more recessed or a bay, and change the proposed casement windows to double-hung windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2000 WALLACE ST MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Guterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 1508-20 RACE ST

Proposal: Replace windows and doors; install ADA ramp, window wells, and solar panels

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Trustee of Central Philadelphia Monthly Meeting

Applicant: May Narisaranukul, Anchor Management Group

History: 1856; Race Street Meeting House; 1520 Race Street rowhouse, 1840, added onto 1880 and 1915

Individual Designation: 7/31/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make modifications to the rowhouse and library additions at the northwest corner of the Race Street Friends Meeting House and Friends Central School complex at 1508-20 Race Street. The circa 1840 townhouse at 1520 Race Street was acquired by the Meeting in the 1860s, with additions constructed about 1880 and 1915. No work is proposed to the meetinghouse itself.

The application proposes to replace the windows on the townhouse and additions with aluminum-clad windows, as well as to install a four-panel wood door in the main entrance of the townhouse. With the exception of the first-floor front windows of the townhouse, which are currently two-over-two, the windows on the townhouse and additions are six-over-six and nine-over-nine divided lite wood windows. The staff suggests that the door be a two-panel door consistent with the Greek Revival character of the townhouse, that wood windows with a clamshell brickmold be used for the front façade of the townhouse, and that an ogee profile brickmold and aluminum-clad windows be used on the additions. The staff notes that the brickmold shown in the drawings is a flipped ogee profile, which could be easily remedied. The application also proposes to install a large louver in the front dormer window opening of the townhouse, an item the staff did not initially catch. The staff recommends that the dormer be

restored, and if a louver is necessary, it be set behind the window sash with the glazing removed.

To the east of the front façade of the townhouse, the application proposes to remove the existing non-historic brick wall and install a new vertical metal picket fence and gate. Behind the fence would be a new ADA ramp, which would lead to a new aluminum storefront system within an existing doorway. The existing strap-hinge doors, which open out, would be pinned open. A low-profile metal awning would be installed over the doorway.

On the east side of the 1880 library addition, flanking its primary entrance, the application proposes to cut down four basement windows and install two large window wells. The two wells would project slightly beyond the depth of the existing stone stoop they flank and would feature four-inch masonry curbs covered with metal grates.

The application also proposes to install solar panels and a rooftop intake louver on the pitched standing-seam metal roofs of the rear additions and rear roof slope of the townhouse. The panels would be flush-mounted to the ridges of the roof and sit approximately eight inches off the lowest portion of the standing-seam metal roofs. Some of the panels would be visible from a distance, particularly from 16th Street, but would be inconspicuous or invisible from Race Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace wood windows; install aluminum-clad windows,
- Install louver in place of dormer window,
- Replace brick site wall with vertical metal picket fence and gate,
- Install ADA ramp,
- Install storefront door system; pin open existing doors,
- Install metal awning,
- Cut large window wells with curbed grates, and
- Install solar panels and rooftop intake louver.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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.*
 - o The application does not remove historic materials or alter features that characterize the property. The application complies with this Standard.
- *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.*
 - o The proposed windows generally match the historic windows in design and other visual qualities, if not materials. The application partially 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 work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*

- o As proposed, the large, curbed window wells alter the spatial relationship of the library addition to the meetinghouse site. This portion of the application does not currently comply with this Standard.
- *Accessibility (Code-Required Work) Guideline | Recommended: Finding solutions to meet accessibility requirements that minimize the impact of any necessary alteration for accessibility on the historic building, its site, or setting, such as compatible ramps, paths, and lifts; Minimizing the visual impact of accessibility ramps by installing them on secondary elevations when it does not compromise accessibility or by screening them with plantings.*
 - o The proposed ramp would be tucked along the secondary elevations of the townhouse and library additions, behind a new fence. It would utilize an existing door opening and not require modifications to character-defining features of the property, thus minimizing the impact of the alteration on the building and its site. The application complies with this Guideline.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof (such as heating and air-conditioning units, elevator housing, or solar panels) when required for a new use so that they are inconspicuous on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The proposed solar panels and equipment would be located on low-slope roofs, and would be relatively inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the proposed window replacement, provided the windows on the front façade of the rowhouse are wood with a clamshell brickmold, and a simulated-divided-lite window is installed in the front dormer opening; approval of the fencing, ADA ramp, storefront system and awning, and solar panels, provided they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way; and approval of the window wells, provided they are kept to the minimum size required by code, and are flush with the brick paving with no curb; pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9, and the Accessibility and Roofs Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:42:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Project managers May Narisaranukul and Mike Rufo, owners Michael Gary and Matt Rosen, architect James Bradberry, and solar representatives Micah Gold-Markel and Oliver Ingram represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Rosen and Mr. Gary introduced themselves and explained that Friends Select is excited to take on this project as they are celebrating 50 years in its current building and its decision to stay in the city.
- Ms. Stein asked about the solar panels.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the need for solar panels. He asked if they would truly provide a financial or energy efficiency benefit.
 - o Mr. Rufo responded that, while they can get power from PECO, the school is conscious about sustainability and using it as a learning tool. He explained that there would be a dashboard where the use of solar electric will be on display for the students. He opined that it is a responsible approach and opportunity to share with students.

- o Mr. D'Alessandro questioned how the students will benefit from the panels if they cannot see them from the grounds.
- o Mr. Rufo responded that the students will be able to see the usage. The school would like to set a good example for the students with regard to energy efficiency. The solar panels will be incorporated into the curriculum.
- o Ms. Gutterman questioned what percent of their electrical will be provided by solar panels.
- o The applicants responded that they estimate between 10-20% of their energy needs will be filled by the panels, depending on the time of year.
- o Ms. Gutterman opined that the rate of return does not seem worth the impact to the historic fabric.
- o Ms. Gutterman questioned whether there is any way to tie into the geothermal of the Meetinghouse.
- o Mr. Rufo responded that the geothermal system is for heating and cooling, not electricity, and they are not tying into it because it is not large enough to serve this building. He noted that they looked at geothermal but determined it is not worth the cost.
- Mr. Cluver questioned whether the installation of the solar panels has been discussed with the installer, noting that there may be unintended consequences to installing panels on older standing-seam metal roofs.
 - o Mr. Ingram, a representative from Solar States, explained that the standing seam attachment is not different than a normal installation, and uses S5 clamps to grip to the standing seams. He noted that they are making every attempt not to impact or penetrate the roof.
 - o Mr. Cluver questioned the material of the roof.
 - o Mr. Rufo responded that it is steel, not copper.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the roof needs to be repainted before anything is installed.
 - o Mr. Rufo responded that the roof will be painted prior to the solar installation.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that his concern with the solar panels is any potential visibility from public rights-of-way. He noted that the Historical Commission encourages the use of solar panels for sustainability but echoed the staff's question about the visibility from the sidewalk. He opined that perhaps only a few are visible, but it is difficult to tell from the application.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed, suggesting that the staff could review a mock-up of the solar panels on the roof.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff already requested a mock-up and the applicants indicated it would not be possible.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned why the windows need to be replaced and cannot be retrofitted rather than removed.
 - o Mr. Rufo responded that the existing windows are single-pane and have interior storms that are capturing moisture on the inside of the historic windows, and that many are inoperable. He opined that thermally broken insulated glass seems more responsible than the addition of an exterior storm.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro opined that a craftsperson would make the windows operable again and that he does not agree with the concept of replacing the windows because they will not totally match the historic windows. He noted that there are maintenance procedures in Quaker publications. He claimed that any new windows are not going to match the old ones precisely.

- o Ms. Narisaranukul responded that sustainability does not only cover historic materials, but also includes indoor air quality. She explained that the historic windows also have lead-based paint, and while that can be remediated, the school also has to consider the safety of its students.
- o Mr. Bradberry commented that the school is going to be amazing steward of building but does not have sufficient funding to continue to maintain the old windows. He reiterated that the windows are very large and the interior storms make them inoperable.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the windows be repaired in stages.
- o Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether there is the possibility of reglazing with insulated units.
- o Mr. Bradberry responded negatively, noting that the muntins are too thin.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the new storefront entrance, opining that aluminum feels off-key with existing building, particularly if it is bare anodized aluminum.
 - o Mr. Bradberry responded that they are taking a minimal approach, which is to pin open the existing doors, restore or replace transom in kind, and set the new storefront system back in the opening. He noted that the color does not have to be anodized, it could be a darker bronze color.
 - o Mr. Cluver suggested looking at the Athenaeum, which installed a set of sleek glass doors in a dark finish that does not impose upon the historic building. He suggested that a darker finish would make the system less conspicuous.
 - o Mr. Cluver questioned the need for a thick center rail.
 - o Mr. Bradberry responded that the thick center rail is to accommodate a buzzer system so it does not need to be installed on the door jambs.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned the light fixture selection.
 - o Mr. Bradberry responded that they have proposed a minimal bronze scone fixture that is sophisticated and simple, and obviously not historical. He noted it would be small.
 - o Ms. Stein opposed drilling through historic building to install the fixture and suggested that it would be preferable to locate a light fixture on a new element such as the underside of canopy.
 - o Mr. Bradberry responded that they were trying to provide more than canopy lighting, noting that if they put light in the canopy it becomes thicker. He noted that they would not be opposed to bollard lights.
 - o Ms. Stein responded that bollard or handrail lights that face down and do not light up façade would be preferable.
- Mr. Cluver cautioned that with the doors being pinned open, the applicants will need to protect the tops of the doors. He noted that he also does not know how the panels are held into place on the door, and that pinning them open exposes parts to weather that were never intended to be exposed.
 - o Mr. Bradberry responded that they intend to cap the doors and noted that, presumably, when the doors fold open 180 degrees, they should be able to pin latch the side with air space.
- Mr. Detwiler addressed the existing versus proposed window configuration, recommending that the applicants return to the original configuration for the first-floor windows. He suggested that the original configuration could be researched by the staff.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he is not too concerned with the proposed window wells but stated that the wells should not project beyond the existing granite stoop.

- o Ms. Narisaranukul responded that currently they are showing an alignment with the granite border around the stoop, but it should not be a problem to align with the stoop itself.
- o Mr. Bradberry presented two options for the window well configuration. He explained that in order to provide more light to the windows below, they would prefer to install a raised curb so the grating can be wider and bring more daylight into the basement. He noted that if they keep the grates flush with the brick and do not have rails, the areaway grating would have to be maximum of ¼ inch opening between grating slats, which would not provide much light. If the granite curb is flush, he explained, they would need a minimal metal railing to serve same function to prevent people from walking on the wider-spaced grating.
- o Mr. Cluver noted that both options show projection beyond the existing stoop and opined that the front edge of the window well curb should not project beyond the stoop.
- o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the curb should be solid granite, not a veneer.
- o Mr. Bradberry responded affirmatively, noting that they intend to salvage some existing granite curbing for reuse.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned the location of the proposed Friends Select sign.
 - o Mr. Bradberry responded that they are proposing a black laser cut sign on the new fence, and that it would not be anchored to the building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether any additional utility boxes or conduit would be required for the solar installation.
 - o Mr. Ingram responded that they need to install conduit on the standing seam roof, but that they will locate the switch boxes on the interior.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that he thought PECO required applicants to have an exterior shut off.
 - o Mr. Ingram responded that they have been working with PECO to avoid being held to that standard. He noted that such a waiver would require a site visit with PECO and the Fire Department, who will have plans that dictate how they enter the building and where the disconnect is in the electrical room. He explained that they have been having similar conversations for other projects. He explained that no conduit will be located on the exterior walls, and that the arrays on the roof will be connected using very thin conduit painted the same color as the roof and hidden along the standing seams. He noted that the diameter of the conduit is approximately one inch, which is the approximate depth of the standing seams. He noted that they can limit penetrations through roof and locate any necessary penetrations in areas that are not visible to the public.
 - o Ms. Narisaranukul noted that there is a flat portion of the roof on the west side that they could go through.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert commented that he understands the need to allow for things like solar panels, but opined that it would be more sustainable to hire local craftspeople to restore the windows rather than installing expensive solar panels that do not generate much return on investment. He opined that when the new windows eventually fail, they will be dumped in a landfill.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia commented that he toured site with applicants and opined that it is great that the building will remain in Quaker hands and occupied by Friends Select. He thanked the staff for

suggestions to improve the application and make the renovations in keeping with the character of the building.

- Chris Mohr, Executive Director of the Friends Center, the owner until recently, commented that they are excited to partner with Friends Select to increase the building's utility.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Solar panels should only be used if necessary and should be invisible on primary elevations and inconspicuous on secondary elevations.
- The roof should be repainted prior to installation of any panels.
- Windows should only be replaced if necessary. Repair and reglazing should be explored. The original configuration should be used for all windows, including the first-floor windows. The staff should research the original configuration.
- The aluminum storefront system is acceptable but should not be an anodized aluminum color. Darker colors such as bronze should be explored. It would be preferable not to have a thick center rail.
- The proposed exterior light fixture is too modern and attached into and through historic masonry. Lighting on bollards, in the canopy, or underneath the handrail of the proposed ramp should be explored.
- The doors that will be pinned open should be protected, particularly at the top.
- The end of the window well curbs should not extend past the granite stoop. The curbing should be solid granite, not a veneer.
- The existing brick wall is non-historic and the proposed vertical black metal picket fence is compatible with the character of the historic property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not demonstrate that the windows cannot be repaired rather than replaced, and the proposed aluminum-clad window details and proposed dormer louver do not replicate the historic appearance of the windows, and therefore fail to satisfy Standard 6.
- The application does not demonstrate that all of the solar panels will be invisible or inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, and therefore may fail to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.
- The proposed ADA ramp and entrance are located on a secondary façade and do not remove substantial historic fabric that characterizes the property, satisfying Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.
- The proposed window wells do not remove significant historic fabric, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the window replacement and installation of a louver in lieu of the dormer window; denial of the installation of solar panels until it can be proven that they are not visible from the public right-of-way; approval of the ramp and window wells, provided the wells do not extend past the existing stoop; approval of the storefront system, provided it is a darker color, not anodized aluminum; and approval of light fixtures not mounted to the building; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and the Roofs and Accessibility Guidelines.

ITEM: 1508-20 RACE ST MOTION: Denial of window replacement and solar panels; approval of other elements with conditions 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total					

ADDRESS: 2021 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Demolish majority of existing buildings; construct five-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: San-Mor Limited Partnership

Applicant: Jason Morris, 2021 Sansom Street Development Associates LLC

History: 2021 Sansom St: 1850; converted to roofing company in 1920s; theater in the 1960s
2023 Sansom St: 1860; converted to commercial use about 1900; theater in the 1980s

Individual Designation: None

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

2021 Sansom St: Non-contributing

2023 Sansom St: Contributing

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

OVERVIEW: Located in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District on a block of two to four-story mixed-use buildings, the consolidated property known as 2021 Sansom Street includes two formerly separate buildings, at 2021 Sansom Street and 2023 Sansom Street. The one-story structure at 2021 Sansom is listed as non-contributing, while the circa 1860 three-story former rowhouse at 2023 Sansom is listed as contributing to the district. The property at 2021 Sansom was developed as courtyard houses about 1850, converted for a roofing company in the 1920s, and converted to a nightclub and then a movie theater in the 1960s. The rowhouse building at 2023 Sansom was converted from residential to commercial use around the turn of the twentieth century. The buildings were joined when 2023 Sansom Street was converted to a movie theater in the 1980s.

This application proposes to demolish the non-contributing building at 2021 Sansom, and some of the contributing building at 2023 Sansom, retaining approximately 16 feet of the historic building at the front and creating openings in the party wall on all floor levels. A new building would be constructed behind the remnant of 2023 Sansom, building up an additional two floors from the ridge line of the existing gabled roof and straight up from the rear facade. It would be five stories in height and clad in tan brick, with a cast-stone veneer at the first floor. The upper floors of the five-story 2021 Sansom portion would feature paired casement windows with transoms. A four-story metal panel bay with paired windows would protrude from the Iconic Street facade. The application calls for the removal of the existing stucco on the 2023 Sansom

façade, and the enlargement of the existing windows in the façade and installation of cast stone lintels and sills.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing building and most of contributing building
- Construct five-story building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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.*
 - o The proposed construction removes significant amounts of historic materials and destroys the character-defining gabled roof shape, and therefore fails to satisfy Standard 2.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed construction destroys the historic massing of the three-story rowhouse building, removing substantial amounts of historic material that characterizes the property, including much of the gabled roof, and therefore the application fails to satisfy Standard 9.
 - o The proposed addition is five stories in height and clad in cast stone veneer at the first floor and tan brick above, with large, paired casement windows. A four-story stone veneer bay window. The use of masonry is generally compatible with the historic district, but the fenestration pattern and use of multi-story faux masonry-clad panel bay windows is out of keeping with the historic district. The application fails to comply with this Standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The addition would require significant demolition of the three-story rowhouse building, removing the essential form and integrity of the historic building, therefore making it irreversible. The application fails to satisfy Standard 10.
- *14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition. No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.*
- *14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish. The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.*

- o Section 14-1005(6)(d) prohibits the Historical Commission from approving a demolition, the razing or destruction of a building entirely or in significant part, unless it finds that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it may be reasonably adapted. The proposed work constitutes a demolition in the legal sense. The application does not demonstrate that the demolition is qualifies for the public interest or inability to reuse exception. The application must be denied.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:39:57

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Developer Jason Morris and architects Anthony Rizzotti and Matthew Connor represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether the applicants have a response to the staff recommendation.
 - o Mr. Morris responded that they originally proposed full demolition, which was not accepted. He explained that they wanted to revise the application to retain the existing historic building but to also utilize the property's CMX-4 zoning to build up on the non-contributing portion of the property and portions of the existing historic building. He noted that they want to restore the brick of the existing building and have proposed to clad the storefront in cast stone at the first floor but are flexible on the materials and design.
 - o Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the applicants have conducted a probe to determine the condition of the brick under the existing stucco.
 - o Mr. Morris responded that they have not yet done so.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the application shows no respect to the historic building at all. She acknowledged that the building has been modified over time but argued that the current application obliterates any remnants of the historic building. She opposed the proposed openings, setbacks, and design, explaining that the proposed building does not take into consideration its context. She noted that the applicants have kept 16 feet of the historic building but have not really tried to acknowledge the ground floor in any way, and that the proposed addition and first-floor design overwhelm the historic fabric that exists.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the addition be pulled back farther from the front façade.
 - o Mr. Rizzott responded that the addition is set back to the ridge of the gable roof.
 - o Ms. Gutterman asked the distance to the end of the existing roof.
 - o Mr. Rizzotti responded that it is not quite double the distance since the rear slope has been modified.
 - o The applicants responded that setting the addition back further would require them to modify their floor plan.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that the plans show a 10-foot setback not 16.
 - o The applicants responded that that must be a carry-over from the previous design.

- Mr. Detwiler commented that he would love to see first floor reimagined to a pedestrian-friendly Sansom Street storefront with a cornice, and suggested looking to the historic photograph and other historic storefronts along the block for inspiration. He opined that any effort to make a pedestrian-friendly street façade would be helpful.
 - o Mr. Morris agreed and asked if the Committee had suggestions for the storefront design of the non-contributing portion of the building. He noted that they have an apartment planned there and were trying to mimic the proposed storefront of the adjacent portion at 2023 Sansom.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that it would be important to maintain the cornice line, and to design something more related to Sansom Street than shown. He noted that it is less important to recreate the historic appearance, but to do something compatible. He suggested that breaking the fenestration of the Sansom Street façade into two individual punched windows would be preferable, noting that the existing design has a stripe of windows up the middle that is not in keeping with the rhythm of the block.
 - o Mr. Morris questioned whether casement windows would be acceptable.
 - o Mr. Cluver and Mr. Detwiler responded that the street has a strong double-hung punched opening rhythm.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that the transoms over the casements at the upper floors is also not in keeping with the block.
 - o Ms. Gutterman added that there should be no Juliet balconies facing Sansom Street.
- Mr. Morris asked whether it would be appropriate to install a more ornate cornice on 2023 Sansom.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that they should look to the historic photograph and attempt to replicate the historic cornice.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that there should be more distinction between the ground and upper floors.
- Mr. Morris asked whether they should differentiate the two buildings.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded affirmatively.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested pulling from the historic photograph as much as possible.
- Mr. Rizzotti questioned the amount of demolition of the roof slope that would be acceptable.
 - o The Committee members responded that at least the full front ridge of the roof should be retained, and that the applicants should provide renderings and study the visibility of the addition.
- Mr. Morris questioned the Committee's preference for the color of brick cladding.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that he would prefer to see red brick.
 - o Mr. Morris asked whether it would be acceptable to use a contrasting beige brick on the on 2021 side since there are a number of lighter structures on the block.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that the Committee would need to see color renderings showing the proposed colors in context.
- Mr. Morris noted that they are on a rushed timeline.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that they should take more time to revise so when they submit again the application is more likely to be approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The one-story portion of the property is non-contributing to the district and may be demolished, but the three-story portion of the property is historic and contributing to the district.
- The existing ground floor storefront has no historic value or character. The new storefront for 2023 Sansom should look to the historic photograph, and both storefronts should be in keeping with the character of the block.
- The design of the two portions of the property should be differentiated from one another.
- The proposed design is not sympathetic to the historic building or to the context of the block.
- Renderings should be provided to show the massing of the proposed addition as it relates to the setbacks on the gabled roof of the historic building, and in terms of material color selections for both portions of the property in the context of the block.
- The vertical stripe of casement windows with transoms is inappropriate for the context of the block which has a vocabulary of individual punched openings with double-hung windows.
- The rehabilitation of the historic building at 2023 Sansom Street should be based on historic evidence to the extent possible, including to the storefront and cornice.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed construction appears to remove significant amounts of historic materials and visually overwhelms the historic building and its gabled roof shape, failing to satisfy Standard 2.
- The proposed new construction is incompatible with the district in massing, materials, architectural features, fenestration, and rhythm, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition.

ITEM: 2021 SANSOM 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 140 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Union League of Philadelphia

Applicant: Lee Hyden, The H. Chambers Co.

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

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

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

A previous application for this project was reviewed at the September 2021 Architectural Committee meeting. This application incorporates feedback from that meeting into the updated design. The revised design includes the following changes:

- Reduced mass by minimizing the overall proposed rooftop dining footprint within the existing parapet,
- Reduced visibility from Sansom & Moravian Streets and elimination of all visibility from 15th Street,
- Refined architectural design to be compatible with the historic building,
- Refined roofline details and reduced overall height,
- Refined architectural scale, details, and proportion of the exterior elevations, and
- Updated color and material palette.

SCOPE OF WORK:

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

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The rooftop addition's design is more compatible in architectural features and materials than the previous application but remains incompatible in overall massing, size, and scale. This work does not satisfy Standard 9.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use*

so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.

- o The proposed addition with terrace would be highly conspicuous from the public right-of-way. Change in setbacks from earlier application are minimal. The application does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:06:37

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Lee Hyden and attorney Jared Klein represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Klein stated that their team had worked hard to incorporate the Architectural Committee's recommendations and feedback from the September meeting into the revised proposal and that they tried to go to great lengths to respect the architectural integrity of the building. He noted that they had provided the most compact version of the addition that they possibly could.
- Ms. Hyden summarized how their team reviewed the Committee's previous comments and addressed them through the revised design.
- Ms. Stein stated that she appreciated all the research and refinement done for the revised application but pointed out that the building already has an addition in some ways, which is the mansard level of the original design. She stated that the mansard makes it very different from the Yale Club, which was used as an example in the revised application. She pointed out that because the mansard is a level above a very pronounced cornice, it already appears to have an addition, so the context of the Yale Club versus the proposed project is very different.
 - o Mr. Cluver pointed out that the Yale Club building is substantially taller, so the view angles take on a whole different meaning.
- Ms. Hyden explained that they looked at how they could compress the program and how they could bring the addition within the parapet, which they did. She noted that they also reduced the height of the addition. She pointed out the revised materials and color palette, which are intended to complement the historic building.
- Ms. Stein said that she appreciated the refinement of the design but noted that one of the things they talked about extensively at September's meeting was the setbacks of the addition from the parapet of the building. She asked what modifications were made to the setbacks.
 - o Ms. Hyden described the setbacks shown in the revised roof plan. She stated that the setback from 15th Street is now 23'-6" from the facade. Ms. Hyden noted that they tightened it as much as possible and they brought the north and south elevations inside the parapet. The previous design located the side walls on top of the parapet, so we were able to bring those elevation in an additional 1'-8". Ms. Hyden contended they worked to maximize the setbacks, while creating a program that suits the needs of the client.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the rendered street views included with the application. He noted that some of the views are side-by-side and others are not. He asked if they are indicating that if there is no side-by-side view, this meant there was no visibility of the addition.

- o Ms. Hyden said that that is correct.
- Ms. Hyden walked the Committee through more of the presentation and provided detail on the changes to the earlier application. Ms. Hyden stated that they are excited about the revised design and feel it is extremely sensitive to the historic building while being both differentiated and compatible.
- Mr. Cluver said he appreciated the level of thought and detail that went into the revised application. However, he observed that the real question is whether such an addition should be constructed at all, given the degree of visibility and level of impact of an addition on a mansard roof. He continued that it does look like its impact will be slight based on the views provided in the application. Mr. Cluver stated that it just feels wrong to put this addition on this mansard roof, which seems like a complete architectural object that does not need anything else. He noted that he understands that they pulled the north and south facades back within the parapet, so they are tucked behind the metal coping edge, but their presence right on the edge of the roof may still be unacceptable. Mr. Cluver pointed out that if the north and south sides were pulled back approximately three or four feet, so one could circumnavigate the addition on the roof, the addition would seem more appropriate.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the ceiling height, noting that the addition is quite tall.
 - o Ms. Hyden replied that the exterior is 16'-4" at its highest point.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey said that the height certainly contributes to the visibility but that the extensive cornices projecting from the addition seems to make it more visible. He commented that a stepped arrangement that is higher in the middle but lower around the perimeter might reduce its visibility. Mr. McCoubrey said that is struggling with the addition's visibility from the street. He added that replicating the historic cornices on the addition ends up making the addition heavy, not lightweight.
- Mr. Cluver said that, while they do not necessarily consider views from private property, a glass box addition will look like a lantern to those around the building.
- Ms. Stein said the setbacks are the key to this design problem. The addition should not be visible on the top of a building, which already has an ornamental top, the mansard. Ms. Stein stated that the 1'-8" setback is insufficient, which is evident in the renderings in the updated application. Ms. Stein commented that floor plans were not provided, so it is not possible to determine the interior challenges that require the current footprint. She added that visibility is still an issue from her perspective, and she cannot recommend approval of the design as presented.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Ms. Stein.
- Ms. Lukachik said that she agreed with the comments on the minimal setbacks and feels that aligning the additions' walls with the inside of the parapet is not sufficient. She noted that the height of the addition is too tall and should be reduced.
 - o Ms. Hyden responded that the interior ceiling height is 9' except in the skylight area. She noted that 9' is the lowest acceptable ceiling height for a restaurant.
- Ms. Lukachik said she was struggling to understand because the applicant is saying that the ceilings are 9' but the addition is 16' tall. She added that they are missing some information. Ms. Lukachik noted that the applicant was thoughtful in the way she tried to address the Committee's comments from the September meeting, but the Committee still does not have enough information to understand all the ramifications of the design.
 - o Ms. Hyden replied that they can provide the additional information. She pointed out that the differential between the 9' ceiling height and the 16'

exterior height results from mechanical equipment space above the interior ceiling.

- o Mr. McCoubrey urged the architect to reconsider the section drawing of the addition to reduce the height, especially at the edges.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the railings. He noted that the railings will be highly visible on the large limestone peers and will be more visible at the corners. Mr. McCoubrey said he appreciated the architect's sourcing of the original building for some of the details, but there is a point at which this can be conceived as too similar rather than sympathetic. He added that this can result in elements that just make the design look bigger, such as the cornices.
 - o Ms. Stein said that a metal post railing would be more sympathetic because it would blend in. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that this would help in reducing the visibility. He also noted, as other Committee members had stated, that he still had fundamental issues about the proximity of the addition to the parapet walls along Moravian and Sansom.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the taller plantings shown along the front railing are going to add to the visibility.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- While the setbacks of the addition from the facades and parapets were increased with the revisions, they were not increased enough to make the addition inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The height of the addition remains too tall. Section drawings would better explain the relationship between the interior ceiling height and the exterior roof height.
- The revised materials and details of the addition are more complementary to the historic building than were the original materials and details. Some specific details, such as the proposed ornate railing facing 15th Street, should be simplified rather than replicating historic details of the original building.
- The application's renderings showing the estimated visibility of the addition should be clearer. Some of the images show the addition very lightly or ghosted in, making it difficult to determine how visible the addition would be from the surrounding streets.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The rooftop addition's design is more compatible in architectural features and materials than the previous version, but the proposed addition remains incompatible in overall massing, size, and scale. This work does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed addition with terrace may be conspicuous from the public right-of-way. Change in the setbacks from earlier application are minimal. The application does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 140 S BROAD ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 1736 ADDISON ST

Proposal: Construct pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lina Clavijo

Applicant: Alexander Duller, FUSA Designs

History: c. 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house at 1736 Addison Street. The property is a three-story brick row house with a three-story rear ell. Most properties along this block of Addison Street are of similar heights and scales. The rear of the property is landlocked; it does not face a public right-of-way or service alley.

The roof deck is proposed to be located on the main block and the pilot house on the rear ell. The roof deck and railing would be set back five feet from the front façade.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New addition, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spacial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed pilot house should be reduced in size, scale, and proportion to meet Standard 9.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use*

so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.

- o Locating the roof deck on the rear ell would allow the use of the internal stair while reducing the size of the pilot house. It is Historical Commission preference to locate roof decks on rear ells rather than the main blocks. The proposed design does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:44:33

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Alex Duller represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Duller explained that the property owner would like to extend the existing staircase up through house and put a small roof deck on the front of the building to experience the views of the city. He explained that there is currently a roof hatch that provides access to the lower roof. He noted their design intent was to have the least impactful kind of pilot house to achieve the owner's goals. Mr. Duller described interior changes to the third floor that would also be part of the overall project.
- Mr. McCoubrey thanked Mr. Duller for his explanation but noted that the Architectural Committee's primary concern is the exterior of the building. He continued that they understand that the proposed changes would be invisible but pointed out that decks belong on the rears of these buildings and not on the main blocks. Mr. McCoubrey continued that, owing to the placement of the deck on the front area, the pilot house ends up being enormous because as it must rise an extra half level up to the main roof level.
- Mr. Duller replied that they could lower the pilot house a little, but the problem is the existing stairs are switch back stairs that are only 30 inches wide and they had to shift the pilot house over a small amount to be able to do another flight. He added that they are not perfectly stacking the new stairs on top of the existing but slightly shifting over in that area. Mr. Duller said they looked at other scenarios but determined that there is not really a way to get up to a roof deck without doing what they proposed. He explained that the rear ell is so small that you do not end up with much of a roof deck with the 4'-6"-wide pilot house. Mr. Duller said that the design presented was the best solution to meet the owner's requirements, while trying to minimize the amount of construction to the building.
- Mr. Cluver and Mr. McCoubrey both commented that they had had concerns about the width of the stairs leading up into the pilot house. They said that the building code does not permit a stair to become narrower as you move from the top floor down.
 - o Mr. Duller replied that he believed it did meet code but would review the design.
- Ms. Lukachik suggested that, if the stair just went up to the lower roof and then had a deck that flattened it out, the pilot house would not be so tall, and it would not take up so much space for the stairs. She added that, if the back area is utilized, there would not be the need to make up the height differential and the pilot house would be

smaller. Ms. Lukachik pointed out that, without the very large pilot house, there will be more room on the back ell for a deck.

- o Mr. Duller responded that the goal of the owner was to have a view of the city and that placing the deck at the rear would not provide this view.
- Ms. Stein noted that a roof deck in a historic district is not a right. She stated that the Historical Commission ensures that decks satisfy the Roofs Guideline. This deck, as currently designed, does not.
- Ms. Stein explained that the applicant has a couple choices to proceed. She said that he could have about a week to revise his design with a smaller pilot house and the deck on the back of the property to show the Historical Commission at the upcoming meeting or he could withdraw the current application and submit a new application to the Architectural Committee at a later date.
- Mr. Duller withdrew the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:59:20

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:00 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.