

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

**TUESDAY, 23 MAY 2022
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 9:03 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

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

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

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner I
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

Stuart Rosenberg, SgRA
William O'Brien, Esq.
Jeremy Avellino
Jordan Mrazik
Chris Carickhoff
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Nathan Curwen, Heritage Consulting
Herb Schultz
Beth Johnson
Greg Mastalerz
Angelo Molinari Jr.
Ben Munk
Alex Reiner

Tim Shutes
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
James Melasecca
Ryan Lohbauer
Emily Khalid
Steven Peitzman
Fred Ritter
Dennis Carlisle
Ryan Douglas
Ryan Alligood
Jimmy Stiving
Will Kunkle
Karl Schreiter
Jay Farrell
David Landskroner
Nancy Pontone
Carolyn Klepser
Trish Fonde

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 700-02 AND 704 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Construct new structure

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: 700 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Michael Phillips, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg LLP

History: 700-02: 1922; Washington Square Building; Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris, architects

704: 1853; new façade and other modifications, 1896; G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Chestnut Street East Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2021

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

OVERVIEW: This application requests in-concept approval of a revision to the design for a new structure at 700-04 Chestnut Street that the Historical Commission approved in concept in February 2023. The new structure would include the reconstruction of the front façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street to its c. 1896 appearance, the construction of a new structure behind the rebuilt façade, and the construction of an overbuild on the historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street.

In February 2023, the Historical Commission voted to grant final approval of the demolition and faithful reconstruction of the front façade of 704 Chestnut Street, provided no demolition occurs until the building permit and financing are in place for the new construction, and in-concept approval of the revised application for the new construction, provided the 10th-floor recess on 7th Street is eliminated and the overall grey color is selected for the overbuild, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code and Standard 9.

Since that approval, the developer conducted addition assessments of the historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street and learned that some unexpected structural conditions will require modifications to the design approved in concept. In general, owing to the capacity of the historic

building to carry additional loads, the overbuild will need to be shifted to the southwest, away from the intersection of 7th and Chestnut Streets. To accomplish this shift, the setback along Chestnut Street will be increased, the height of the addition nearest the intersection of 7th & Chestnut Streets will be decreased, and the height of the addition at the rear will be increased. In general, these changes will shift some of the mass of the addition away from the public right-of-way. Other minor changes to the design are also proposed.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Revise design of new structure.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o As the Historical Commission found at its February 2023 meeting, the addition will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street, reconstructed façade at 704 Chestnut Street, and the historic district as a whole and therefore will satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval in concept of the application proposing the revised design for the new construction at 700-04 Chestnut Street, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Michael Phillips and architect Herb Schultz represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Phillips stated that his team undertook further investigations of the existing structures after receiving the original approval in concept. They discovered differences between the original architectural drawings and the building as constructed at 700-02 Chestnut Street. Owing to the differences, they will need to add structure to the building, which will allow for the overbuild to be shifted to the southwest, away from Chestnut Street, as Mr. McCoubrey and others had originally suggested. The setbacks will be increased at the front in exchange for more height at the rear. He stated that all of the design changes recommended by the Historical Commission in February have been implemented.
- Mr. Schultz summarized the structural issues that they recently encountered. He stated that the building was originally designed with the assumption that an overbuild would eventually be constructed. The building was constructed with much thicker floor slabs than shown in the original architectural drawings. Therefore, additional structure is needed to support the loads of the overbuild. He stated that they are proposing a revised design that accounts for the extant structure and shifts the bulk

- of the overbuild to the rear. Mr. Schultz displayed drawings of the approved and revised designs.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the change from darker and lighter panels to all lighter panels was suggested by the Historical Commission.
 - o Mr. Schultz responded that the change was suggested by both the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Schultz to specify where the metal and stone cladding panels would be used.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that the addition is clad with the stone panels everywhere except in the recessed spandrel areas, which are metal panels.
 - Mr. Detweiler stated that he disapproves of the fact that the addition at the south is now larger than the base building. The addition also lacks the horizontality of the base building.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Historical Commission objected to the upper recessed glass floor that divided the addition into two sections and asked the architect to remove it.
 - o Mr. Detweiler stated that the proportions of the overbuild are not correct. It is too large and top-heavy.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro thanked Mr. Schultz for accounting for the as-built conditions.
 - Mr. Cluver asked if the revised addition is larger in terms of square footage than the approved addition.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that the revised addition is about 1,000 square feet larger but still well below the allowable square footage from a zoning standpoint.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that the changes are not significant.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the shifting of the mass toward the rear is a positive change. He also noted that a tall building stands across 7th Street from this site.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that the increase in size of the addition will adversely impact the historic building. He stated that the National Park Service does not allow overbuilds of more than one or two stories. He stated that we are “stumbling into an unregulated lack of policy” here in Philadelphia. He stated that Philadelphia should not deviate from the National Park Service’s policy on overbuilds.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The as-built building at 702-04 Chestnut Street was not built according to the final architectural plans for the building. The floor slabs are much thicker and therefore the current loads are larger; the existing building cannot support the overbuild without added structure.
- The revised design shifts the overbuild to the south, toward the rear of the building and away from Chestnut Street.
- The revised design proposes a slightly larger overbuild than the one approved in concept. The revised overbuild is approximately 1,000 square feet larger.

FAILED MOTION: A motion proffered by Mr. Cluver and Ms. Stein to approve the application in concept, pursuant to Standard 9, failed by a vote of 3 to 3.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee declined to offer a recommendation on the application.

ITEM: 700-04 Chestnut St					
MOTION: Approval in concept					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro		X			
Justin Detwiler		X			
Nan Gutterman		X			
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	3	3			1

ADDRESS: 4044, 4046, 4048 AND 4050 MAIN ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building, alter rooflines, add and replace windows and doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Citylight Church

Applicant: Jeremy Avellino, Bright Common

History: 1850; Roxborough Mills/Fidelity Machine Works/Wilson Childs Wagon Works

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main St Manayunk Historic District, Significant, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the historic industrial building at 4050 Main Street and to utilize now-vacant parcels to the southeast to provide pedestrian and vehicle access through new openings into the side elevation of the building. The project site includes four properties: 4044, 4046, and 4048 Main Street, which until recently included three Italianate rowhouses classified as Contributing to the Main Street Manayunk Historic District, and 4050 Main Street, a former industrial building, which is classified as Significant. In November 2017, the Historical Commission approved an application that called for the retention of the facades of the three rowhouses and construction of a large addition with ground-floor parking accessed through an altered opening in the façade of 4048 Main Street. At that time, the Commission found that the buildings were in very poor condition, and that although the proposal would constitute a demolition, the work could be considered necessary in the public interest, given that the buildings were in the floodplain.

In 2020, the buildings at 4044, 4046, and 4048 Main Street were additionally damaged by flooding, and in 2021, the Department of Licenses and Inspections declared the buildings Imminently Dangerous. In consultation with the Historical Commission's attorney, the staff of the Historical Commission approved the demolition of the buildings at 4044, 4046, and 4048 Main Street in 2022, with the following provisions:

- the front facades of the buildings are documented with a laser scan prior to demolition;

- the cornices, marble steps, marble banding between basement and first story, front doors, transoms, door frames, window frames, and shutter hardware are salvaged prior to demolition; and,
- the front facades are faithfully reconstructed to their historic appearances as part of the larger development project approved by the Historical Commission on November 10, 2017.

The facades were laser-scanned prior to demolition. It is unclear whether any building elements were salvaged. Since that time, the property has been sold to new owners, who were unaware of the conditions placed on the demolition permits or the prior development plans and do not intend to reconstruct the buildings. Instead, the current proposal would use the now-vacant parcels as a landscaped and paved approach to the proposed new entries on the side elevation of the existing building as well as a playground area. The former southeastern party wall, into which the new entries would be cut, would be painted, and new windows would be added at the second-floor level. The requirement to reconstruct the facades at 4044, 4046, and 4048 Main Street runs with the land, regardless of the property owner and cannot simply be waived. If the current owner deems the construction infeasible, that owner must seek and secure the legalization of the demolitions before any project that does not include the reconstructions can proceed. The approved reconstruction of the facades included a garage opening for parking. The approved residential conversion plan may be able to be amended to incorporate the current plan for parking in the basement of the industrial building.

On the Main Street elevation, window openings would be restored and windows replaced. An existing garage entrance would be infilled and a pedestrian door added. The flat roof of the west addition would be gabled to match the adjacent structure.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Leave parcels at 4044, 4046 and 4048 Main Street undeveloped
- Rehabilitate front façade of 4050 Main Street
- Add, replace, and restore windows on 4050 Main Street
- Cut new pedestrian and vehicular entrances in and paint southeast elevation
- Alter roofline at side/rear addition

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - o Demolition of the buildings at 4044, 4046, and 4048 Main Street was predicated on the reconstruction of the facades to match the old, with salvaged elements. Documentation created as part of the demolition would allow for their reconstruction. If it is infeasible to reconstruct the facades, the property owner must seek and secure the legalization of the demolitions before any project that does not include the reconstructions can proceed.
 - o The application also proposes to remove modern storefront window openings and restore them to their industrial appearance, satisfying Standard 6.

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The application proposes to slightly modify the roofline of the west addition and to remove a rooftop overbuild at the rear facing the river. These elements do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property and are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, satisfying Standard 9.
 - o The application proposes to cut large openings into a former party wall to create new pedestrian and vehicular entrances. The Historical Commission generally treats former party walls as non-historic and allows modifications.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, provided the front facades of the buildings at 4044, 4046, and 4048 Main Street are reconstructed as required by the demolition permit.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:28:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney William O'Brien, architects Jordan Mrazik and Jeremy Avellino, historic consultant Nathan Curwen, and owner Tim Shutes represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. O'Brien introduced the project team.
- Mr. Mrazik explained that the proposed project includes alterations to an existing two-story building to convert it to a house of worship with accessory parking. He noted that it is within the Manayunk flood plain, which makes the first floor uninhabitable. He noted that the parcels were recently consolidated.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicants about their thoughts on the staff recommendation of reconstructing the facades of 4044, 4046 and 4048 Main Street.
 - o Mr. O'Brien responded that his clients found out about the reconstruction condition by email about one month ago, and opined that he could not find a public record of it anywhere. He noted that it was not recorded in the Recorder of Deeds office and opined that if the intention was for the reconstruction requirement to run with the land, it should be recorded in the deed. If had been, he continued, his clients may not have acquired the properties or might have negotiated with the Historical Commission prior to purchase. He explained that the proposed scope does not include any construction on 4044-4048 Main Street.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that the Architectural Committee cannot weigh in on legal aspects, but that the expectation of the intent appears clear from the Historical Commission's records.
 - o Mr. O'Brien responded that the Historical Commission has legal counsel.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey supported the staff recommendation, noting that there is a legal road regarding the reconstruction condition that is outside of the Committee's purview.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned the proposed entrances as well as how congregants would enter if the facades were reconstructed.

- o Mr. Mrazik responded that they are proposing to maintain the main entrance on the front Main Street façade and to install a side entry because the ground floor will be used as parking lot. He noted that they had some hesitation about bringing folks into the building through the parking lot and see the side entry as a way to create an entrance procession. He explained that most people will be parking at surface parking lots nearby, and the side entry will become the new main entry.
- o Ms. Gutterman noted that the entrance from Main Street appears to take people through the garage to the elevator and stairs.
- o Mr. Mrazik responded affirmatively, noting that the main entrance will bring people through two drive aisles of traffic, so they want to provide a side entrance so they do not have to do that.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro responded that it is not uncommon to have to cross traffic to get somewhere.
- o Mr. McCoubrey suggested moving the core to eliminate the necessity of crossing traffic in the garage.
- o Mr. Mrazik responded that they have attempted to locate the elevator and stair core away from Main Street, owing to concerns about changing the mass of the historic building from the Main Street side.
- o Ms. Gutterman questioned the location of the elevator overrun in west elevation.
- o Mr. Mrazik responded that in the axonometric view, just below number 5, the elevator overrun slightly breaks the roofline near but not at the peak. He noted that it is not possible to locate the core directly at the roof peak because it would be in the middle of the drive aisle.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether the parking is just for the church.
- o Mr. O'Brien responded that it is accessory parking to the religious assembly use. He noted however that the nearby 4000 Main Street is a 70-car parking lot that is mostly empty on weekends.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the public entry should be treated first.
- o Mr. McCoubrey opined that most people will enter from Main Street because they will be walking and will not want to go all the way around the side of the building to enter.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the previous plans from 2017 showed 13 parking spots and the current proposal has 16, so there has not been a large increase in the floor area for parking. He suggested that they could accommodate more spots behind the reconstructed facades and create a better Main Street entrance.
 - o Mr. Avellino responded that it is not that simple, and explained that the use is different, with a landscaped procession designed to bring people to the river and nature.
 - o Ms. Stein replied that having garage entrances immediately adjacent to the entry kind of diminishes that feeling.
 - o Ms. Gutterman noted that, especially if there is a large parking lot adjacent to the property, the project could create a better entrance, which should be on Main Street, not the side.
- Ms. Stein commented that she had trouble understanding how the applicants are proposing to alter the historic buildings, noting that the sanctuary spans two separate structures. She asked whether they are removing load-bearing walls or if it is the way it is currently configured.
 - o Mr. Mrazik responded that they are proposing to remove portions of masonry load-bearing walls. He explained that the church wants a more horizontal plan

rather than a long vertical one. He noted that they have been working with structural engineers, and will expose the structure internally, thus the request to extend the existing gable roof on the addition.

- Mr. Detwiler opined that the application reads as in-concept, not final, application. He explained that there is not as much detail in the drawings as one would expect for a final review and that it would be helpful for the Historical Commission to have more information, including a demolition plan, attachment details for new elements to the existing building, and other aspects of the proposed design.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The legal question of whether the new property owner is obligated by the conditions placed on the demolition permits for 4044, 4046 and 4048 Main Street is not within the purview of the Architectural Committee. However, the Architectural Committee supports the staff's recommendation that the facades must be reconstructed.
- The proposed design shifts the entrance to the side of the building, moving focus away from the historic primary entrance on the front, Main Street side of the building.
- The application lacks critical information on the feasibility of the reconstruction of the facades at 4044, 4046 and 4048 Main Street as well as details on the proposed design. Additional plans, including demolition plans and details of proposed attachments of new elements into the historic building, should be provided for review by the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not supply sufficient information on the feasibility of the reconstruction of the 4044, 4046 and 4048 Main Street facades, failing to satisfy Standard 6.
- The entry focus should be along Main Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

ITEM: 4044, 4046, 4048 and 4050 Main 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 1716 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Legalize windows, decks, etc.; install railing and siding; replace masonry

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1716 Spruce LLC

Applicant: Christopher Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture LLC

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the current exterior appearance of the property at 1716 Spruce Street. The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) issued violations in 2021 for exceeding the scope of work beyond issued building permits. The Historical Commission's staff requested that L&I inspect owing to the window replacement, and a separate violation was issued in May 2022. Exterior alterations have been made without permits under a previous owner and current owner. The current owner is requesting legalization of the window installation, repointing front façade, painting of masonry elements on front façade, installing rear roof decks on third and fourth floors, cutting down of windows for access doors on rear decks, installing fiber cement siding on rear ell, and installing HVAC equipment and vents on rear ell.

In addition, the applicant is seeking final approval for proposed work including the installations of siding on the rear ell and side elevation, the replacement of masonry header and brick on a rear egress well, and a solid metal railing at front entry stair to replace existing hollow metal rail.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize exterior work including installing windows, rear roof decks on third and fourth floors, fiber cement siding on the rear ell, HVAC equipment, and vents; cutting down windows for access doors to rear decks and installing doors; repointing front façade, and painting masonry.
- Approval of proposed work including the installations of rear ell siding and a solid metal front entry railing; and the replacement of a masonry header and brick on a new egress well.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - o The front and rear windows historically appeared to be double-hung, two-over-two windows. The windows on the front façade and specific windows on the rear elevations do not match the historic configuration; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

- o The rear decks on the third and fourth floors include materials, specifically railings, that are incompatible with the architectural features of the property and do not meet Standard 9.
- o The style of new exterior doors on rear elevation are not compatible with character of historic property and do not meet Standard 9.
- o The proposed infill of window opening with siding on rear elevation does not meet Standard 9.
- o The mounting of HVAC condensers on side elevations of building does not 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 The rear decks on the second and third floors could meet the Roofs Guidelines if the visibility of the structural elements under the decks were minimized.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of all aspects of the application except denial of the legalization of the windows, third and fourth-floor deck railings, visible rear egress doors, and HVAC equipment and vents, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:50:03

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chris Carickhoff, owner's representative James Melasecca, and general contractor Angelo Molinari represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein stated that a lot of work has been undertaken without building permits and approvals. She stated that the Architectural Committee must review the changes as if they had not yet occurred and noted that the Committee will apply historic preservation standards during the review of the project.
 - o Ms. Gutterman agreed.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant to explain why the construction occurred without building permits and approvals.
 - o Mr. Melasecca responded that the current owner purchased the building as a bank foreclosure and did not understand the extent of work completed without building permits. The current owner and its representatives have reviewed the interior and exterior work with the Department of Licenses and Inspections to resolve any non-compliance with codes and fix work that was incorrectly done. As part of this, they understood that the exterior work must be approved by the Historical Commission. Mr. Melasecca said the team is committed to going through all necessary reviews to gain compliance, but unfortunately the team has limited knowledge of the details of construction done prior to the current ownership.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the front windows and commented that the four-over-four configuration does not look right. He said this is not the most egregious work completed on the building. He asked the applicant about the window manufacturer.

- o Mr. Carickhoff replied they are Pella windows, but he does not know the specific model. He pointed out that the new windows have simulated divided lights.
- Mr. Cluver commented on the visibility of the third and fourth-floor decks and the height they are raised off the roofs.
 - o Mr. Carickhoff noted that this is likely due to the slopes of the existing roofs.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that, if drawings had been submitted to the Historical Commission prior to construction, the Architectural Committee would not have approved the changes made.
- Ms. Gutterman said she does not believe that the Architectural Committee can recommend legalization of any of the work as presented. She contended that the Architectural Committee needs a detailed list of proposed changes. She stressed once more that they have to consider the work as if it had not been completed yet.
 - o Mr. Carickhoff pointed out that the work is categorized in the drawing annotations. He noted that the annotations that begin with “Legalize” are for work already completed and “Proposed work” for new projects planned for the future.
 - o Ms. Mehley said the staff worked with the applicant to best identify and discuss the work already completed. She explained that the staff was concerned about removing the repointed mortar and damaging the existing brick more.
 - o Ms. Gutterman agreed that removing the mortar may cause damage, but it is important to find out what type of mortar was used in the repointing work. She said that the paint should be removed from the brownstone material before it causes more damage to the stone.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Ms. Mehley if the full scope of unpermitted exterior work is shown in the application.
 - o Ms. Mehley responded that she believes the application shows most of the recent work completed without building permits by the prior owner.
- Mr. Detwiler said that the degree of visibility with decks is important.
 - o The Architectural Committee members provided feedback on the decks, noting that they appear too large, too wide, and higher off of the roofs than they need to be.
- The Architectural Committee members agreed that interior floor plans should have been submitted with the application.
 - o Ms. Gutterman said that without understanding what is happening on the interior, they cannot recommend legalization of anything. She stated the application is incomplete and requested a detailed list of changes be created for future reviews. Ms. Gutterman continued that it should be a checklist that provides details on the impact on the building.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the drawing annotations are detailed.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed but added that he would like an analysis for each façade.
- Mr. McCoubrey requested that the application be revised with more photographs of the rear façade from the public right-of-way. He commented that decks should be significantly reduced in size.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that, although windows at the roof decks were cut down for access doors without prior approval, the Architectural Committee has recommended approval of a similar work in the past.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- A significant number of changes were made to the building exterior without the Historical Commission's approval or building permits.
- Many of the changes do not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- The rear decks on the third and fourth floors are currently too large and built too high off the roofs.
- The application does not present the scope of work in a manner that allows the Architectural Committee to successfully review the extent of work completed. The application should be updated with a clear list of changes to accompany the drawings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6, owing to the historically incompatible replacement of the front façade windows and select windows on the rear façade. Incompatible replacement and repairs also occurred to the front railing, masonry, and rear doors.
- This application fails to satisfy Standard 9, owing to the addition of the rear decks at the third and fourth floors, creation of rear access doors, infill of rear window openings with incompatible materials, and mounting of HVAC equipment on side elevations.
- This application fails to meet the Roofs Guidelines, owing to the high visibility of the rear decks on the third and fourth floors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 1716 Spruce 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 1724 ADDISON ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Peter Haas

Applicant: Elizabeth Johnson, Brighton Architecture + Design LLC

History: 1845

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck with accompanying rear spiral staircase at 1724 Addison Street. This property is a three-story contributing rowhouse with a low-pitched gable roof located in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. It has an existing small deck on the rear two-story ell. This application proposes to build the 17' by 16' upper deck set back from the front cornice by 9'. The front of the proposed upper deck would be constructed over and in front of the roof ridgeline. The proposed materials are composite decking and a 42" black metal railing which would not be visible from the narrow Addison Street. There is no public service alley at the rear, thus the deck would be inconspicuous from any public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Build a 17' by 16' upper roof deck with an accompanying rear spiral staircase to connect it to an existing lower back deck.

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 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.*
- *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 gable roof is a character-defining historic feature that would be obscured by the proposed roof deck.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:21:23

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Johnson claimed that the deck would not be visible from Addison Street. Nearby buildings have rooftop additions that cannot be seen from the street. There is no

public view to the back of the building. The rear property line is also the boundary of the district.

- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the deck could be pulled back so it was not over the ridge, which would make it 12.5' x 16'. She stated that a deck of that size is "more than adequate." She noted that the proposed deck is larger than some apartments and asked whether people really need a deck that large.
 - o Ms. Johnson responded that her client could consider that revision if the Architectural Committee found it acceptable. She explained that she was presenting the application as a best-case scenario.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the further back the deck is pulled from the ridgeline, the lower it could be.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she would feel better if the deck were not overhanging the ridge.
 - o Ms. Johnson explained that part of the reason the homeowner is looking to add the rooftop deck is the small size of the existing rear deck. She explained that the 9' x 9' lower deck may sound like a reasonable size, but once furniture or a grill is added, it makes the deck much smaller and limits the amount of usable outdoor space.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the proposed addition would necessitate any new modifications to the existing south side opening.
 - o Ms. Johnson confirmed there would be no modifications to the current openings or the existing house structure itself, including the façade.
- Ms. Stein voiced her opposition to the upper deck proposal. She stated she believed the spiral stair takes up so much space and if it were taken away, the back deck would be an adequate deck for a house this size.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the door onto the lower deck was lower than the deck level, necessitating the steps.
 - o Ms. Johnson responded in the affirmative. She also stated that, to her knowledge, the lower deck had all the correct approvals.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with his fellow Architectural Committee members that the spiral stairs seemed like a lot of trouble to get up to the proposed upper deck. He agreed with the comments of Ms. Stein, that the lower deck as it is, is adequate for a house of that size.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the property had a backyard.
 - o Ms. Johnson answered that it has a small backyard.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested an option for the back stair to come up through the middle of the deck, with the upper deck moved back to be over the existing deck. He commented that more studies of options are needed.
- Mr. Detwiler noted the absence of roof decks on the aerial photo on page 2 of the application.
 - o Ms. Johnson noted what appears to be two deck structures on the roofs of the neighbors to the west.
 - o Ms. Gutterman pointed out that those roofs appear to be flat.
- Mr. Cluver asked for clarification on the Roofs Guidelines.
 - o Ms. Hendrickson read the Roofs Guideline as it appears on this application.
- Mr. D'Alessandro claimed that the deck would have an adverse impact on character-defining historic features.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he would be in favor of this application if the deck was behind the ridge.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated it would be possible to extend the second-floor deck further back with the use of brackets, to make it larger.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, adding that the applicant could also relocate the upper deck.
- Ms. Johnson expressed her appreciation for all the Architectural Committee's comments, and said she presented a design that included all of her client's wishes.
 - o Ms. Gutterman pointed out that an applicant may propose more than one option.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro added that an applicant may show multiple concepts.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- There are several additional alternatives for the configuration of the upper and lower decks.
- A roof deck overhanging a roof ridgeline does not meet the Roofs Guideline.
- There are no other examples of such a roof deck on a gable roof in the vicinity of the property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- With the deck straddling the roof ridge, the application fails to satisfy Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 1724 Addison St roof deck proposal					
MOTION: McCoubrey					
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			1

ADDRESS: 1919 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Legalize door replacement

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Final Flats LLC

Applicant: Ben Munk, Tunic Group Property Management

History: 1889

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Contributing, 1/29/1986

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a non-historic front door that was installed at 1919 Diamond Street without the Historical Commission's approval. The property at 1919 Diamond Street is contributing to the Diamond Street Historic District and was built circa 1889. The current door was installed after the replica historic doors were stolen between June 2019 and May 2022. The current owner purchased the property in November 2021 and claims that the non-historic door was in place at the time of purchase. The theft of architectural elements has been a problem in this area. The doors that were stolen were not original but were replicas of the original doors that were approved by the Historical Commission. The current replacement door does not fill the doorway opening and is incompatible with this historic district in size, color, and material.

The Historical Commission requested an inspection, and the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the unpermitted door replacement in March 2023. The property manager, who is the applicant, responded in a timely manner in attempts to resolve this violation. The applicant claims the financial burden to obtain a historically appropriate door is too great for the property, which provides subsidized housing to low-income individuals through the Philadelphia Housing Authority. The applicant requests the legalization of the current door to clear the violation.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Legalize door.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The current replacement door does not fill the doorway opening and is incompatible with the historic building and historic district in design, features, size, color, and material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:33:08

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property Manager Ben Munk represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler empathized with the applicant, agreeing that architectural thefts have been on the rise.
 - o Mr. Munk noted that many properties in the neighborhood are missing their historic doors, potentially for that reason.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned whether there was a way to make a single door appear as a pair of doors that would be as wide as the opening and without infill.
 - o Mr. Munk stated that the door is about 48" wide. Such a door would be a custom door, a specialty item.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the replacement of the door is covered by insurance.
 - o Mr. Munk responded that the property was acquired in 2021, after the door had been stolen.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the applicant had explored architectural salvage.
 - o Mr. Munk responded in the affirmative but stated that a salvaged door would be too costly with shipping and installation. He added that if they must replace the door, they will find a way, but they are looking to avoid spending the money on a replacement door.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the historic door is a character-defining feature of the building. He stated that the door that was installed is unacceptable from a historic preservation standpoint.
- Mr. Munk stated that he reviewed the violation records for the area and determined that this property was singled out for a violation. Other properties have non-historic doors but do not have outstanding violations.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that there are many reasons why a building may have a legal yet non-historic door. For example, the door may have been in place at the time of designation and was grandfathered.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the door is a very important feature because the occupants engage with it every day. He stated that the white steel door that was installed is inappropriate.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Mr. Munk if he explored any options other than a new or salvaged double door.
 - o Mr. Munk stated that he looked at options available at local building materials suppliers, but the door would be too costly because it is a custom door, a specialty item.
- Ms. Stein stated that the door that was installed is much too small. She stated that she might consider a single-leaf door that filled or nearly filled the entire opening, as long as it looked like a double-leaf door. She suggested that the applicant explore other options.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicant work with the staff to explore other options. He stated that the current door is unacceptable.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant consider security when installing a new door, like security hinges or a metal gate. He then stated that he might accept a slightly narrower door with a wider frame, provided it was painted a darker color.
- Ms. Stein stated that the windows made the doors vulnerable to theft.

- Ms. Gutterman stated that a taller, wider door with a thicker frame would be acceptable. She added that the primary problems with the current door are its color and its asymmetric installation.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Mr. Farnham if the Historical Commission has approved single-leaf replacement doors for double-leaf doors that look like double-leaf doors but operate like single-leaf doors.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission has routinely approved doors that look like double-leaf doors but operate like single-leaf doors.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that there are other solutions, but the current installation is inappropriate.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed that a wider, taller door that does not replicate the historic doors might be acceptable.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the current installation is inappropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The replica historic doors were stolen between June 2019 and May 2022. The current property owner purchased the property in November 2021.
- The doors that were stolen were replicas of the historic doors, not the original doors.
- The property owner claims that installing replica doors, whether new or salvaged, would be too expensive.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The current replacement door does not fill the doorway opening and is incompatible with the historic building and historic district in design, features, size, color, and material. The application fails to satisfy Standards 5 and 9.
- A door that is wider, taller, and centered in the opening but does not replicate the historic doors might be acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

ITEM: 1919 Diamond 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 1900 MARKET ST

Proposal: Modify trolley entrances at 19th and Market Streets

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: SEPTA

Applicant: Greg Mastalerz, Sowinski Sullivan Architects

History: 1955

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Cast Iron Subway Entrances Historic District, Contributing, 3/8/2019

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

OVERVIEW: In 2019, the Historical Commission designated the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic Historic District, which includes historic entrances, ranging in date from 1928 to 1955, located along several subway and trolley lines throughout the city. As part of that designation, the Historical Commission maintains jurisdiction over the cast iron railings, granite curbs, and any historic auxiliary components, such as lamp standards, signage, and integral and free-standing light fixtures. The Historical Commission does not exercise jurisdiction over the steps, handrails, walls below the curbs, or any underground features.

This application proposes to reconfigure the trolley entrances on the northeast and northwest corners of the 19th and Market Street Station. Although the station dates to 1906, the above ground entrance was constructed in 1955. The northeast and northwest station entrances retain historic railings, while the southeast and southwest entrances have been reconstructed and are not contributing to the thematic district. This application proposes to install new headhouse structures at the northwest (contributing) and southwest (non-contributing) entrances, as well as separate elevators to allow for ADA accessibility to the west that will not be attached to the subway entrances.

The cast iron guardrail at the north side of the contributing northwest headhouse would be retained as part of the design while the cast iron guardrail at its west end would be removed. The cast iron guardrail on the south side of the northwest entrance would be relocated as part of the design of the new headhouse on the southwest corner. Construction of the headhouses will allow for security gates which can be locked when the station is closed. The design of the contributing northeast subway entrance will remain unchanged.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Reconfigure subway entrances.

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 application proposes to retain and reuse the cast iron railing on the north side of the new headhouse at the northwest (contributing) trolley entrance at 19th Street and Market Street.
 - o The staff recommends that the applicant also retain the cast iron railings on the west and south sides of the new headhouse.
 - o The staff recommends altering the roof of the northwest headhouse to make it as inconspicuous as possible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the existing cast iron railings are retained and the roof of the headhouse at the northwest entrance is made less conspicuous, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:53:35

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Greg Masterlez and Alex Reiner of SEPTA represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked if the proposed design is for this site only, or if this is a general design that SEPTA will use for other subway entrances.
 - o Mr. Masterlez stated the design is based in part on the specific location layout. He noted that the design is like the Tasker-Morris Station on the Broad Street line. SEPTA's concern on Market Street is securing stations at street level. Security gates are now located at the intermediate stair landings.
 - o Mr. Masterlez stated that roof designs are based upon stations' neighborhood contexts.
- Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the drawings are incomplete, with no demolition noted. He also expressed concern that the character of the stations is being changed significantly. He stated that the design should showcase historic components.
- Ms. Gutterman declared that the proposed rooflines need to be more compatible with the historic fabric.
- Mr. D'Alessandro added that if the new components of the entrances are removed in the future, the original appearance of contributing stations should be maintained.
- Mr. Cluver asked why the guardrail was proposed for retention on one side of the contributing entrance and not the other.
 - o Mr. Masterlez replied that the new work will be completely independent of the existing components. He explained that the south guardrail of the northwest entrance will be salvaged and reused on the new southwest entrance.
 - o Mr. Reiner stated that the design is based upon the subway entrances at Spring Garden and Broad Streets, although there are no historic components at that station.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that the roof is such a strong component of the new design that it detracts from the historic aspects of the station entrance. He stated that he supports keeping the historic components connected at one station and not distributing them to the new entrance on the southwest corner of Market and 19th Streets.
- Mr. Cluver suggested keeping the current configuration of the northwest entrance guardrails and building the new station outside of it.
 - o Mr. Masterlez agreed that the new components could sit outside of the existing guardrails.
- Mr. Detwiler said the roof dominates the historic railing because of its curviness and massiveness.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested simplifying the design to focus more on security and less on weather protection.
 - o Mr. Masterlez replied that lightening the appearance of the roof makes sense.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired regarding the base of the current entry.

- o Mr. Masterlez clarified that there is a metal base atop a concrete curb.
- Ms. Gutterman stated she supports constructing the new entrance outside of the current guardrails.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that SEPTA must maintain the nearby US Postal Service mailbox. He stated that mailboxes are in great demand these days.
 - o Mr. Farnham clarified that the Historical Commission has no authority to regulate the mailbox adjacent to the northwest trolley entrance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The metal guardrails and curbs at the trolley entrance at the northwest corner of 19th and Market Streets are character-defining components of the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Historic District.
- The proposal is to disassemble and reuse the character-defining features of the northwest entrance at 19th and Market streets.
- The proposed roof over the entrance is over-scaled in relationship with the metal guardrails.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 because it calls for the disassembly of the northwest trolley entrance and for the construction of an over-scaled roof.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 10 because the new trolley entrance at the northwest corner of the 19th and Market Streets intersection cannot be removed later and maintain the original appearance of the metal guardrails.

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

ITEM: 1900 Market St trolley entrances					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 2022 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Restore front façade, demolish rear ell; construct four-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2022 N Broad Street, LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects

History: 1880

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Conwell House Block Historic District, Contributing, 4/8/2022

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade, demolish the entire rear ell, and construct a four-story addition at this Contributing property in the Conwell House Block Historic District. The Historical Commission approved an application for the project in concept at its 12 May 2023 meeting. The application is now submitted for final approval. Construction of a four-story addition is proposed in place of the existing three-story rear ell. The main block of the building is four stories in height with a mansard roof. Restoration of the front façade returns the public view closer to its original appearance. The rear of this property is not visible from any public right-of-way, as there is no street or service alley that extends behind this row.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish three-story rear ell and bay window on side of main block.
- Construct four-story addition at rear.
- Restore front façade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - o The plans include restoration of the front façade by removing paint to expose red brick, and repairing or replacing architectural features in-kind such as windows, slate roof shingles, brackets and metalwork to comply with Standard 2.
 - o The plans call for a new front door and retention of the transom window. The new door will approximate the appearance of the original door.
 - o The plans call for restoration of the street-facing two-story bay window on the north façade.
 - o The plans disengage the rear addition from the historic mansard.
- *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 demolition of the rear ell meets Standard 9 because the ell is not visible from the right-of-way and therefore does not characterize the property.
 - o The plans disengage the rear addition from the historic mansard.
 - o The plans call for cladding of the rear addition with cementitious panels and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - o Mechanical equipment will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:23:40

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman commented that the pilot house is too large and there should be no railing at the back because there is no roof deck.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg responded that the pilot house will be replaced by a hatch and there will be no railing at the back.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the rear addition would be clad in cementitious panels, not clapboards.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg replied that the cladding will be cementitious panels.
- Ms. Gutterman made clear her desire to move the mechanical equipment on the roof from the rear towards the center.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg replied that he would create the drawings reflecting the relocation of the mechanical equipment.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if there are brackets on the north or west roofline of the building.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg answered that there are no brackets on the north or west rooflines.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the design of the roof on the front façade of the one-story bay window.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg answered that it will be painted to look like lead-coated copper.
- Mr. Detwiler proposed installing a grey roof that would not require painting.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the cladding of the north bay window.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg responded that it would be clad in cementitious panels.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- 2022 N. Broad Street is a contributing resource to the Conwell Block Historic District
- The application proposes the restoration of the front façade, demolition of the rear ell, and construction of a rear addition.
- The rear ell is not visible from any public right-of-way.
- No roof deck is proposed.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9, owing to the restoration of the front façade.
- The application satisfies Standard 10 because the changes to parts of the building visible from the public right-of-way are reversible.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the pilot house is converted to a roof hatch, there is no roof

deck, and the mechanical equipment is moved away from the edge of the roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 2022 N Broad St					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:33:50

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:38 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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