

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

**TUESDAY, 24 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 9:00 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		

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

Barbara Eberlein
Liz Scott
Mary Ann
Mathew Huffman
Monica Ortiz
Vern Anastasio, Esq.
Zachary Gant
Lauren Thomsen
Maurice Edwards
Laura Hansplant, Studio Sustena
Tyler Martin
Andrea Haynes, Studio Sustena
Susan Wetherill
Matt Gindlesparger
Nissa Eisenberg
Ben Estepani
Hal Schirmer

Diego Figueroa
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Gabriel S. Fellus
Mark Cartella, Alterra
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Kevin King
Mohd Faizaan

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 106 BAINBRIDGE ST

Proposal: Reclad building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Elizabeth Ann Widdicombe
Applicant: Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
History: 1835
Individual Designation: 1/25/1960
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW:

On 4 April 2022, Historical Commission staff was informed by a neighbor that significant exterior work was occurring to the historic frame building at 106 Bainbridge Street without building permits or the Historical Commission's review. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a Stop Work Order, and violations for both interior and exterior work done without permits. This application was submitted in response to the violation for exterior work.

This application proposes to install new fiber cement lap siding over the existing exterior sheathing and weather resistive barrier, which was apparently installed overtop of the historic wood Dutch lap siding. The existing windows and doors are proposed for retention. The staff notes that the existing windows are in poor condition and will require significant restoration work. The trim around the windows and doors, which appears to have been removed during the course of the unpermitted work, will be recreated and installed over the new siding.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install fiber cement lap siding over top of existing wood siding.
- Install new trim around windows and door.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o Wood lap siding rather than a fiber cement product should be used if approval is granted for new siding over the existing siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Matt Gindlesparger and Lauren Thomsen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Gindlesparger explained that Lauren Thomsen Design was contacted by the general contractor after the work was done without permits and a Stop Work Order was issued. He stated that the existing Dutch lap siding was determined by the contractor to be part of the structural stability and therefore it was retained, and a sheathing product was applied over it to not disrupt the structure. He confirmed that the application seeks approval for recladding the building over top of the existing siding and sheathing with a fiber cement lap siding with a five-inch reveal. He confirmed that the existing windows are proposed for retention, and new window and door trim would be applied as part of the recladding scope. He confirmed that the existing cornice and dormer are proposed for retention.
- Ms. Stein asked if there had been an effort to repair the existing siding rather than apply siding over it.
 - o Mr. Gindlesparger responded that his understanding from the contractor was that the existing siding was deteriorated in too many areas and would have required replacement which could have jeopardized the structural integrity of the building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if there is additional sheathing under the existing siding, and asked if the current proposal is going to create a moisture and mold issue.
 - o Mr. Gindlesparger responded that the contractor confirmed that there is no additional sheathing under the existing exterior siding.
 - o Mr. Cluver disagreed that the proposed scope will automatically result in a moisture issue, as the sheathing product installed is appropriate for this use.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the shadow lines, which are crucial to this building, will be altered by this over-cladding with a different profile than that of the historic siding. He stated that the James Hardie fiber cement siding is too different, but that boards could be milled to match the historic profiles.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the reality of the situation is that part of the work is already done, which has likely resulted in the existing siding having numerous nail holes in it and with no water barrier behind it. He stated that much damage has been done.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that this is not a good solution.
- Mr. Cluver outlined two approaches, one being the scope proposed in the application, and the other being the removal of the sheathing and siding, bracing the walls, and then installing new siding.
 - o Mr. Detwiler expressed concern about the Architectural Committee attempting to determine what system should be used within the wall for waterproofing when the Committee does not know exactly what is there now. He stated that the Committee should instead focus on the design intent and let the staff work through the details with the applicant.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that he wants to make sure that what the Committee recommends can be executed in a way that does not endanger the long-term health of the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Dutch lap siding can be replaced or replicated, and that as proposed, the only areas to be somewhat compromised are the

intersections of the barge board and cornice, and that the other profile depths could be reproduced.

- Mr. Detwiler stated that he is not convinced that the existing siding need to be replaced, as there are no photographs or other documentation in the application materials to show the extent of deterioration. He questioned if the siding could be selectively removed and repaired.
 - o Mr. Cluver commented on the number of nail holes that now exist in the siding.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the nail holes could be fixed.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the existing siding is a character-defining feature of the building and therefore it should be retained if possible.
- Ms. Lukachik noted that there are likely even more screws and nails through the existing siding than expected and that the best path forward for the building structurally is to keep what is there now and find a siding that matches the historic character. She stated that it would likely do more harm to try to remove the sheathing and existing siding at this point, and that one would likely find that there is very little to salvage.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The current condition of the building's exterior results from recent work by a contractor without a permit. The applicant for this project was retained after the non-permitted work was done so that upcoming work can be approved and permitted.
- Currently, the existing siding is covered with an exterior sheathing and weather resistive barrier.
- The new profiles of replacement pieces should match the historic profiles.
- The joints should be finished to manage water infiltration.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- If new siding installed over the existing siding and sheathing replicates the historic appearance of the existing siding, it can satisfy Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 3 to recommend approval, provided the new siding has a Dutch-lap profile, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ITEM: 106 Bainbridge St MOTION: Approval with condition MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
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	4	3			

ADDRESS: 502-04 S JUNIPER ST

Proposal: Demolish buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James Ernst

Applicant: Vern Anastasio, Esq.

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish the historic three-story building at 504 S Juniper Street and the adjacent non-historic, one-story garage at 502 S Juniper Street. This application proposes a complete demolition and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments.

The Historical Commission and its advisory Architectural Committee reviewed an application for this property in late 2017 which proposed demolition of the rear wall and roof of the historic building, demolition of the non-historic garage, and construction of a four-story addition. At that time, the Historical Commission voted to deny the application pursuant to Standards 2, 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. The Architectural Committee, in its recommendation of denial at that time, suggested that the applicant produce a letter from a structural engineer that substantiates the reasoning for the proposal. This current application includes two engineering reports from 2021 which recommend demolition of the buildings owing to the condition.

The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) issued Unsafe violations for this property in 2018 but have not since ungraded the condition to Imminently Dangerous, nor has L&I informed the Historical Commission that demolition is the only means of abating the unsafe condition of the historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish buildings

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 proposed work will destroy the features, materials, and spaces of the property.
- *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.*
 - o This application proposes a complete demolition and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:37:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Vern Anastasio and demolition contractor Maurice Edwards represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked if demolition of the non-historic garage was an issue, given that the structural reports in the application include a good amount of information about the structural integrity of the garage.
 - o Ms. Chantry responded that the garage is non-historic and can be demolished without a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the Historical Commission reviewed and denied an application for the partial demolition of this building in 2017. He asked what was done since that time to stabilize the building and prevent further deterioration.
 - o Mr. Anastasio responded that work was done since that time to the rear wall to prevent its condition from getting worse. He stated that the recent engineering reports show that the building is in serious disrepair to the point of being

- dangerous. He stated that he would be willing to schedule an inspection by the Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) should the Architectural Committee prefer to rely on a report from L&I. He stated that his client is willing to work with the Historical Commission on details for a replacement building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the structural engineering reports made any recommendations.
 - o Mr. Anastasio responded that the reports state that the building is not structurally safe and should be demolished.
 - Ms. Lukachik stated that she is struggling with this application because she has worked on buildings in worse shape that were preserved. She stated that the building probably does have parts that are unsafe, but it is a question of repair versus complete demolition.
 - o Mr. Anastasio responded that it was not the owner's intent to demolish the building, but it has become apparent that demolition is the safest path forward. He stated that anything can be saved with a million dollars, but it is not practicable in this case.
 - o Mr. Edwards, the demolition contractor, described the structural condition of the building, including rotted joists and star bolts that are not holding the front wall as well as they should. He agreed that anything can be repaired with a million dollars, but that he has seen many buildings in poor condition owing to his job as a demolition contractor, and this building is in bad shape. He stated that a lot of the brick is damaged and deteriorated so it would not be able to be salvaged and reused in a new building.
 - Ms. Gutterman questioned if the real problem is that the property owner has taken no steps over the last five years to stabilize and repair the building.
 - o Mr. Anastasio responded that the owner shored up the rear wall.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the Architectural Committee is being told that brick is failing at the front and side walls.
 - o Mr. Anastasio acknowledged that work has not been done to the front or side walls but that the owner is deployed overseas and that these conditions existed several years ago.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that this is a hardship application to demolish a building.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that roof replacement is not difficult on a building of this size and he does not understand why that was not done.
 - o Mr. Anastasio responded that the owner's intention is to build a new home but that the building was in poor condition when it was purchased. The owner's intention was to rehabilitate it, but it was determined that the condition is too poor to save.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that the 2017 application called for significant demolition of the rear and it was denied owing to the extent of demolition.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented on the amount of time which has passed since the last application proposing demolition. He stated that this could be considered demolition by neglect.
 - o Mr. Anastasio responded that the property had been neglected prior to the current ownership.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that a building needs to be maintained and not allowed to deteriorate further.
 - o Mr. Anastasio stated that the rear wall is in better condition today than it was previously.

- o Mr. Detwiler responded that the rear wall is not enough now that the entire building is proposed for demolition.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that this property is individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and the façade is important.
 - o Mr. Edwards responded that the façade is in very bad shape and would have to be taken down and rebuilt regardless, owing to the condition of the bricks. He stated that he could salvage as much brick as possible to use in the rebuild, and could find other old brick from the houses he demolishes.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that there has not been significant enough investment in this property to maintain it, which has resulted in this application for complete demolition. She stated that this is a hardship case that has not been proven.
 - o Mr. Anastasio responded that anything can be saved with enough resources, but resources are not unlimited. He stated that he understands the Architectural Committee's position and its mission, but that there are two reports from engineers, as well as Mr. Edwards' testimony, that the building is beyond reasonable repair.
 - o Ms. Gutterman stated that the structural engineer on the Architectural Committee has given a different opinion.
 - o Mr. Anastasio responded that the Architectural Committee's structural engineer has not personally inspected the property.
 - o Ms. Lukachik, the Architectural Committee's structural engineer, responded that she is not claiming that the reports from the structural engineers in the application are wrong that the building has areas where it is not safe. She stated that the reports support what the engineers were asked to recommend, which is demolition. The reports do not say that the building cannot be saved or that it is beyond repair. She stated that the Architectural Committee has seen nothing on this building that is insurmountable in terms of repair and restoration. She stated that the garage is a separate structure which can be demolished and that it is misleading to conflate what is happening between the two buildings. She noted that the floor areas to be replaced are rather small in terms of square footage.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission's staff has recommended to this property owner many times over the years that a real hardship application is the way to solve this problem. He noted that statements were made during this review about it costing a million dollars to repair and that repair is impracticable. He stated that this is exactly what the hardship process is designed to determine. A complete financial hardship application would include construction cost estimates and estimates for the return on that investment, and the Historical Commission could determine whether or not it was reasonable to repair the building. He stated that L&I has confirmed that it does not consider this building to be Imminently Dangerous. He stated that the materials before the Architectural Committee are insufficient to make a hardship decision. He stated that it may very well be that it is not financially feasible to repair the building, but that the applicant is obligated under the law to provide the documentation to prove it.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the reason why this property was designated as historic.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that the designation predates the use of nomination forms, but that presumably it was seen as a good representation of a pre-Civil War building in the Washington Square West neighborhood.
 - o Mr. Anastasio noted that the building is one of four or five on this block that are identical in appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented that this is a clear example of demolition by neglect. He suggested that the owner sell the property to someone who respects the historic building and can restore it.
- Hal Schirmer commented on the history of sales of the property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The circa 1830 three-story house was individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1984.
- L&I has determined the building to be Unsafe, but not Imminently Dangerous.
- An application proposing demolition of the roof and rear wall of the building was denied by the Historical Commission in 2017, owing to the extent of demolition.
- The two engineering reports provided in the application recommend demolition, owing to the poor condition of the building.
- Claims were made about the cost to rehabilitate the building, but no documentation was provided to substantiate those claims.
- The one-story garage is non-historic.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work will destroy the features, materials, and spaces of the property. It would not satisfy Standard 2.
- This application proposes a complete demolition and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments.
- The one-story garage may be demolished.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the demolition of the three-story building, pursuant to Standard 2 and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, but approval of demolition of the adjacent non-historic one-story garage.

ITEM: 502-04 S Juniper St					
MOTION: Denial of demolition of main building; approval of demolition of non-historic garage					
Moved BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
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: 8110 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Construct ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Sons of Union Veterans

Applicant: Joseph Perry, Grand Army of the Republic Civil War Museum

History: 1805; Lewis-Pattison House

Individual Designation: 2/4/1982

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to make accessibility modifications to a c. 1805 building in northeast Philadelphia as it is converted from a residential building to a Civil War museum. The application proposes to remove the existing concrete sidewalk and stoop and to install a new extended concrete stoop and switchback ADA ramp to the front entrance. It is unclear from the application materials how the existing fence would be modified. The application also proposes to slightly modify a c. 1915 rear frame addition to accommodate a new accessible restroom by decreasing the slope of the roof and infilling the rear windows. The existing side windows of the addition, which are visible from Frankford Avenue, would be retained, and new siding installed to match the existing.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install ADA ramp
- Modify rear addition to accommodate ADA restroom

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed ramp is set away from the historic building and could be removed in the future without causing damage if there is a change in use that no longer requires accessibility.
- *Accessibility Guideline | Recommended: Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.*
 - o While the exterior ramp would be visible from the public right-of-way, there are limited alternative locations where an accessible entrance could be provided, and the installation of the ramp does not impact the historic features of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:07:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Board member Mary Ann Hartner represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MAY 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver questioned whether the sidewalk along the southwest side of the building was on the property line and, if it was not, whether the ramp could be relocated to the side.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the front door is shown as 30 inches wide, which is not sufficient to allow wheelchair access under ADA requirements.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the ramp in the front is held back from the property line but has a huge landing. He suggested that a 1/20 pitch sloped walkway would be a less invasive alternative. He noted that a railing could still be provided, but it would not be as visually obtrusive.
 - o Ms. Stein agreed, noting that an L-shaped ramp could also be achieved with better grading.
- Ms. Stein commented that there is a lot of hardscape proposed that detracts from the historic character of the property. She suggested eliminating the railings and adding more landscaping. She commented that the property is well-maintained.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the option of providing access to the rear by sloping the sidewalk along the southwest elevation had been explored.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed, noting that the walkway appears to be wide enough.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that a window in the frame addition at the rear could be cut down to create a new accessible door.
- Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Gutterman noted that creating a separate entrance at the rear is not ideal from an accessibility standpoint.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that the whole first floor is proposed as gallery space, without a designated reception desk.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey opined that, while it would be better to have an accessible entrance through the front, the front door and doorway are historic and should not be modified, while the rear could be much more easily modified without compromising the character of the property.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the Architectural Committee does not know the history of considerations for accessibility for this property but suggested the other options should be explored further.
- Ms. Lukachik questioned how wide the opening should be for ADA accessibility.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that the code calls for 32-inch clearance, so the doorway itself needs to be even wider than that.
- Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the rear is frame construction, so it would be better and easier to install a new doorway there.
- Mr. Detwiler reinforced that the front door and doorway are character-defining features of the property and should not be modified in any way.
- Ms. Hartner explained that the property line runs along the far side of the cement walkway.
- Ms. Hartner questioned whether the front door is accessible by a wheelchair and whether they would need to come through the rear.
- Mr. Cluver responded that it does not appear to be, as it is shown in plan as 30 inches wide, and code requires a 32-inch clearance. He noted that much of this is a question for the designer.
 - o Ms. Hartner responded that they would go back to the drawing board.
- Mr. Detwiler summarized that a new door at the rear could be made wide enough to accommodate a wheelchair, and the sidewalk along the side of the property could be ramped up gradually to meet the threshold of a new rear door so that an accessible entrance is provided at grade.

- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the building's setback, front yard and landscaping, and fence are character-defining features of the property and that the proposed front ramp compromises that.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicants work with the staff to provide a more sensitive solution that meets ADA requirements.
- Ms. Hartner asked whether the existing gate would need to be changed.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that it may need to be if it is less than 32 inches wide, but the drawings provided do not have sufficient information to make that determination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Hal Schirmer opined that the front doorway does not need to be widened to provide accessibility. Instead, grab bars could be installed at the doorway, and a person in a wheelchair could lift themselves up out of the wheelchair with the grab bars, fold the wheelchair and move it through the unaltered entrance, unfold the wheelchair, and lower themselves down into the wheelchair within the building.
 - o People expressed doubt about Mr. Schirmer's grab-bar solution.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Providing ADA accessibility to the property in some way is critical. Providing a single entrance for all occupants would be ideal if it is feasible without compromising the character-defining features of the building or its site.
- The front doorway, doorway, and surround are character-defining features of the property.
- The setback of the house and its small front yard and iron fence are character-defining features of the property.
- The proposed ramp could be reduced in height significantly by regrading the front walkway to a 1/20 pitch, which would make railings optional.
- An L-shaped ramp with plantings would be preferable to the switchback ramp proposed.
- The question of a front ramp may be moot, as the existing front entrance is only 30 inches wide, which does not meet the 32-inch clearance required by code for accessibility.
- The sidewalk along the southwest elevation of the building is wide enough to accommodate a wheelchair.
- The frame addition at the rear could be altered to provide a code-compliant doorway that does not compromise the historic character of the property.
- The application did not know the width of the gate in the historic fence and whether it would need to be modified to provide ADA access to the property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The project as proposed does not meet code requirements for ADA accessibility, and therefore fails to satisfy the Accessibility Guideline.
- Widening the historic masonry doorway and wood door and surround from a 30-inch to a 32-inch clearance would be structurally difficult and would irreversibly compromise the historic character of the building, failing to satisfy Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.
- Other options for providing access that do not significantly alter the front façade should be explored.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ITEM: 8110 Frankford Ave					
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	7				

ADDRESS: 325 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Construct addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: OCF Realty

Applicant: Ben Estepani, Pace Architecture & Design

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for the removal of the existing rear ell and the construction of a rear addition with roof deck and porch at 325 S. 18th Street. The property is located at the southeast corner of S. 18th and Delancey Streets. The side elevation of the property is visible along Delancey Street. The property was constructed about 1855 as a three-story building with a three-story rear ell, like the buildings to the south. The building has been modified many times, especially at the rear ell. A mansard fourth floor was added to the main block and rear ell. A projected addition at the intersection of the main block and rear ell was constructed. Two and three-story additions on piers were constructed and later removed at the rear of the rear ell. After they were removed, the rear ell was open to the weather for years. The rear ell was reconstructed with a new brick façade, non-historic window openings and a new second-floor bay. The building is currently sealed.

In addition to the many alterations, the building has been neglected since it was purchased by the most recent owner in 1973. That owner has allowed the building to deteriorate for decades. Taxes were not paid. Numerous violations were issued. It was listed for sheriff's sale many times but reclaimed by the owner each time. The City took the owner to court numerous times but had little success in compelling her to bring the property into compliance. About 10 years ago, the title to the building was stolen and then ultimately recovered, while the building continued to deteriorate in the meantime. In 2013, it was featured in a story in the Inquirer about neglected buildings. In 2016, the community association and near neighbors initiated an Act 135

conservatorship action. Despite the owner's numerous attempts to block the conservatorship, the community eventually prevailed, and the Philadelphia Community Development Coalition took custody of the building. The validity of the conservatorship was confirmed as recently as April 2022. Without a doubt, this property has consumed more Historical Commission, Law Department, and Department of Licenses and Inspections time on enforcement than any other historically designated property. Now that the conservator has gained control of the property, the Historical Commission should expeditiously approve a redevelopment project so that this building can be saved and returned to productive use.

Owing to its nearly 50 years of neglect, the building, which has been open and vacant, is in very poor condition. The conservator is working with a developer to restore the salvageable main block and remove the deteriorated rear ell and construct a wider rear addition with roof deck and rear porch and carport. The proposed work to the main block such as windows, doors, and masonry repair will be reviewed and approved by staff.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear ell.
- Construct new addition with roof deck.
- Construct rear metal deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize of property will be avoided.*
 - o The proposed restoration of the main block and rehabilitation of the side bay meets Standard 2.
 - o Although historic fabric may exist in specific areas of the rear ell, this section of the building has lost a lot of historic integrity from numerous alterations and long-time neglect. Owing to this, the removal of the rear ell meets 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 new addition would be compatible with the existing main block with its massing, size, and scale. For these elements, the proposed design meets Standard 9.
 - o The rear ell is much altered and in very poor condition. Its removal will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The removal of the rear ell satisfies Standard 9.
 - o The design of the proposed mansard-like roof surrounding the new roof deck should be further refined to be more compatible with the existing mansard roof on the main block. It should be noted that the elevation drawings show a more refined design than is illustrated in the rendering; the design intent should be clarified at the Architectural Committee meeting. The windows of the addition currently appear larger than the windows on the main block. The size of the windows should be compatible with the size of historic windows on the main block. Refining these details will enable the proposed addition to meet Standard 9.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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 area of the building that currently maintains the essential form and integrity of the historic property is the main block. The new addition maintains a clear line between the original main block and the new area of the building. In the future, this area of the building could be removed without altering the historic character of the main block, therefore the application meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the details of the design of the rear addition are refined, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:31:48

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ben Estepani and developer Liz Scott represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman stated she was concerned about the massing of the addition. She acknowledged that the addition's windows and mansard are not original but pointed out the solid appearance of the proposed mansard. Ms. Gutterman opined that the proposed deck at the rear is totally inappropriate based on its size and detailing. She said she is aware of the building's challenges and history but does not think these are appropriate modifications to the historic fabric.
 - o Mr. Estepani noted that the rear deck design was inspired by an older painting of the building showing a veranda at the rear. He explained that the intention was to enlarge that design and pull it out to allow for a modern amenity such as parking underneath the deck.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the veranda shown in the painting (and included in the application) was small and the proposed design has increased it in size which comes back to the issue of scale. She explained that she appreciates the level of detail shown in the application. Ms. Gutterman said that the modernized design has resulted in a loss of scale and delicacy that may have originally been there.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that when people design something in a traditional way it needs to follow a lot of the traditional proportions and detailing. He continued that the moment it gets too big or stretched or simplified the whole thing looks wrong. Mr. Detwiler said you can either go modern or go traditional in a traditional way.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the low wall along the sidewalk and asked if it was within the property line.
 - o Mr. Estepani said it was outside of the property line and they would need City Council approval to construct it.
 - o Mr. Detwiler noted that the inclusion of the low wall created a narrow walkway along the sidewalk and public space.
 - o Ms. Scott said that the overall design works fine without the wall, but she does like it.
 - o Mr. Detwiler objected to the loss of public space. He noted he is not in favor of the low wall.

- o Mr. Estepani pointed out the egress wells along the sidewalk and pointed out that the low wall helps conceal them.
- Mr. Cluver inquired how the existing mansard at the rear ell compares in height to the proposed mansard.
 - o Mr. Estepani responded that the proposed parapet mansard roof is 40'-4.5" inches tall and the existing is 42'-2". He explained the intent of the mansard was to conceal the use of the rooftop area rather than having a visible railing in this location.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated he is troubled by the large mansard and that typically a mansard would have windows in it. He observed that it does not have the dimensions of a usable mansard. Mr. McCoubrey wondered if a traditional cornice would be a less visually intrusive solution. He added that to conceal a deck behind a mansard with no visual breaks and little slope is difficult.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated the rear deck looks like a porte cochere for the Union League. He opined that to place a porte cochere in this open space is not an appropriate solution given the relationship of the yards in this district. He suggested something akin to a wall and a screened parking area may be more appropriate.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested a parking court with gates to pick up on the historic character. He pointed out that this block is a carriage house block and allowing the design to reference this would be good. Mr. Detwiler also commented that the rear deck with the parking area underneath is too large.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out the large windows on the side of the bay that are much bigger than any other windows on the building and kind of dissolve the sides and are out of character. He noted that the bay is massive and wished it had one less floor. Mr. Detwiler continued that the applicant has the right vocabulary on the north side of the bay but the scale on the east and west elevation should be reduced with the window openings.
 - o Mr. Estepani responded that they can work on the window proportions. He added that the bay exists; it is not proposed.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated the fourth-story front mansard with dormers currently has a rear wall that is vertical, and that wall should be sloped. He explained that the rear wall should have the same slope as the other walls of the mansard.
 - o Ms. Scott pointed out this section of the mansard is an existing condition, and they would prefer not to change this portion of the building owing to structural concerns. She stated that the mansard has not been altered since it was installed in the nineteenth century.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey acknowledged this. He suggested that it needs a visual termination that looks reasonable.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed that, ideally, the back wall of the mansard would have the same slope as the other three sides.
 - o Ms. Scott reiterated that it is a historic condition.
- Ms. Scott and Mr. Estepani and the Architectural Committee discussed the challenges of replacing the proposed rear mansard with a cornice and railing above. The applicants agreed to review this aspect of the project.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out the door on the north elevation and asked if this could be centered on the window above. He asked the applicant to consider adding a transom to the doorway as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia spoke in support of the application. Mr. Steinke said the two main objectionable aspects of the application have been addressed by the Architectural Committee. He said this includes the overscale mansard and the large porte cochere. Mr. Steinke urged the applicant to listen to the comments and advice of the Architectural Committee and revise their application accordingly so that it can be approved.
- Barbara Eberlein, a longtime resident of the 1800 block of Delancey Place, spoke in support of the application and the feedback provided by the Architectural Committee members. She commented that further refinement of the design through the incorporation of the Architectural Committee's comments would help achieve a successful project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee recommended the following revisions to the application:

- Remove the carport and replace it with a garden wall or similar design element to enclose the parking area.
- Reduce the depth of the second-floor rear deck and revise the design to be more compatible with the building.
- Eliminate the low wall along the north elevation at the sidewalk.
- Center the door under the window above on north elevation. The door should be taller or have a transom.
- Revise the size of the bay windows on the east and west elevations of the projecting bay to match the size of the windows on the north elevation of the bay.
- Remove the mansard on the rear addition and replace it with heavy cornice with metal deck railings; or add dormers to the mansard roof to match historic character of front mansard.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The project could meet Standards 2, 9, and 10 if the design is revised to incorporate the Architectural Committee's feedback as enumerated above.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the details of the design are refined as recommended, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 325 S 18th St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Detwiler 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	7				

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MAY 2022

17

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ADDRESS: 509 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Victor Fellus

Applicant: Victor Fellus

History: 1815, Stephen Girard, developer

Individual Designation: 10/30/1962

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl, one-over-one windows installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. Six-over-six wood windows are the correct windows. In addition, the dormer window should have an arched sash. The correct windows are documented by photographs and an insurance survey. A similar application at 523 Fairmount Avenue, which included both windows and door, was reviewed by the Historical Commission in 2019 and the Commission voted to deny the legalization request. In that instance, the original brickmould was panned. In this case, the original brickmould remains intact and the new windows were inserted into the existing frame.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize windows

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The windows do not match the historic elements in design or materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:08:23

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Gabriel Fellus represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Fellus stated he was told by the staff to match the windows on the other houses. He could not clearly identify who he or Victor Fellus, the property's co-owner and general contractor, had spoken to on the Historical Commission's staff.
- Mr. Detwiler said that each homeowner who contacts the Historical Commission's staff would have been given direction specific to their property and instructions on a window type and configuration based on property records and possibly archive images. He pointed out that any future proposals for exterior work to the house should be reviewed by the Historical Commission before the work is undertaken.

- Ms. Gutterman noted that the building is individually designated. She echoed Mr. Detwiler's comments regarding staff consultations. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Historical Commission typically does not approve vinyl windows for the front-facing elevation of a building.
- Mr. Fellus stated that the original shell framing remains in place.
- Mr. Detwiler said, in this case, appropriate sash replacements could be inserted so that the windows will be a cohesive unit with the historic frames rather than just inserting a unit to sit inside the frame. He continued that one goal of window replacement is to maintain, not reduce, the amount of the glass. He added that all the details of the new windows should match the original windows.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said that the older windows were made in a way so they could be taken apart when in need of repair or replacement. He explained that they were designed so that the older sash could be removed and replaced with new sash. Mr. D'Alessandro noted there a number of millwork companies that replicate original windows. He added that an alternative would have been to have the older windows reglazed.
- Mr. Farnham said the staff reviews several hundred window applications annually and that this type of review is one of the most common. He explained that the staff helps property owners to identify the historically appropriate windows and then requires shop drawings to review for final approval. Mr. Farnham said he cannot recall an instance when a staff member told an owner to look on the street for a model for a replacement window. He stated that that is not standard operating procedure.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Six-over-six wood windows were replaced with one-over-one vinyl windows.
- The original frames with brick molds remain in place.
- The replacement windows were inserted into the original window openings and are smaller than the historic windows with less glass area.
- The owner did not consult with the Historical Commission's staff to identify the replacement or repair options for the windows. No shop drawings for the windows were submitted for review.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The replacement windows do not match the historic elements in design or materials; therefore, the replacement windows do not satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 509 Fairmount Ave MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler 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	7				

ADDRESS: 3701-15 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: CSC Co-Living

Applicant: Matthew Huffman, ALMA Architecture LLC

History: 1970; International House; Bower & Fradley, architects

Individual Designation: 12/11/2020

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to add a structure for retail use on the western section of the plaza at International House in University City. It also proposes to rehabilitate the eastern section of the plaza. The Historical Commission designated International House, a Modernist hi-rise, in December 2020. At the same meeting, the Historical Commission approved in concept the construction of a structure to house a retailer on the western section of the front plaza of the property. While the in-concept application approved in 2020 was not an explicit financial hardship application, the owner did argue that International House had several idiosyncrasies that would render its adaptive reuse expensive and difficult, and the retail structure would offset some of those expenses. The owner agreed not to oppose the designation in exchange for the Historical Commission's commitment that the retail structure as well as a rear addition would be approved. The Historical Commission indicated its commitment with the 2020 in-concept approval, when it approved in concept a retail addition, provided it was limited to the western section of the plaza, to the west of the main entranceway.

The new retail structure at the plaza is designed to stand on its own, without any support from the historic building. Its construction will require no significant alterations to the historic building, allowing for it to be removed in the future and the historic building restored to its original condition. It will incorporate the existing concrete wall that runs along Chestnut Street and encloses the plaza. The design has been revised slightly since it was approved in concept and the structure is now slightly taller and longer. The front of the retail structure now steps down from the main roof height to the two-story glass box, to the one-story glass box, to the canopy over the entrance, referencing the terraced façade of the historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct retail structure on western section of the plaza,
- Rehabilitate eastern section of the plaza.

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 The new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.
 - o The new construction 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.
- *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 new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of December 2020.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:21:10

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Mathew Huffman, landscape architects Andrea Haynes and Laura Hansplant, and developer Mark Cartella represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Huffman stated that he is seeking "conceptual design approval" on behalf of his client. He explained that the construction of the addition would not require any demolition. The addition would have its own separate structural system and would only be integrated into the historic building at the second-floor balcony. The addition would be able to be removed and the historic building restored to its original condition in the future. Mr. Huffman showed renderings of the proposed structure and stated that the original wall around the plaza will be incorporated into the structure. He stated that they will rehabilitate the eastern half of the plaza. He provided information about the materials of the structure, which includes textured metal panels. The texture breaks down the mass. He stated that they attempted to design a structure with a lightness and thin lines to contrast with the heaviness of the concrete of the original building. He noted that the structure steps down at the east end, where it meets the plaza. The step-down system reduces the mass of the addition. He pointed out the proposed green roofs and greenery along the Chestnut Street wall. He added that they are proposing to retain all features of the plaza

- except the returns on the Chestnut Street walls, where they extend back into the plaza. Mr. Huffman explained how the addition would lightly touch the historic building. He showed detail drawings of the attachments.
- Mr. Cluver asked how much of the ground-floor façade of the historic building would be covered.
 - o Mr. Huffman showed a plan of the proposed design. He stated that the addition begins about 15 feet west of the main entranceway.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if the structure is larger now than when it was shown to the Historical Commission in 2020.
 - o Mr. Huffman stated that it is slightly larger than originally proposed.
 - o It was noted that the Historical Commission's 2020 in-concept approval did not stipulate a specific size for the addition but did limit it to the western half of the plaza. The current proposal complies with that limitation.
 - o Mr. Huffman showed an image of the design that was approved in concept in 2020.
 - o Mr. Huffman stated that the current design steps down in several steps at the eastern end of the addition, reducing the height and scale as the addition approaches the open plaza. He stated that the addition was designed to attach to the historic building at existing mullions in the windows so that the windows in the historic building would not be altered.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that he was concerned that light from the addition would flood out onto the plaza. He also objected to the box-like quality of the addition. He stated that he very much appreciates how gently the addition touches the historic building. He stated that he appreciates the windows and planting beds on Chestnut Street but suggested doing more to reduce the scale of the addition.
 - o Mr. Huffman stated that the awning and step-down feature were intended to reduce the scale at the plaza end of the addition. The awning on the addition also relates to the concrete awning at the main entrance.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that the proposed addition is "a massive mass." He asked if the box could "dissolve" more.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested including drawings of all elevations in the application for final approval.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the retail establishment would use space in the historic building. He asked if the retail structure could be an entirely separate building.
 - o Mr. Huffman explained that the store will use some back-of-house space and the existing loading dock in the historic building.
 - Mr. Cluver asked if they would incorporate the existing wall along Chestnut Street or build a new one to look like the existing one.
 - o Mr. Huffman stated that they will use the existing wall, which has one step in it to account for the change in grade. He stated that the historic wall will not bear the weight of the addition. The addition will have its own foundation.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if the structure approved in 2020 was a one-story building and if the structure currently proposed is a two-story building.
 - o Mr. Huffman stated that the 2020 design also called for a two-story building. He pointed out the escalator up to the second floor in the original design.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested notching the projecting glass portion of the building at the sidewalk to allow more views toward the main entrance of the historic building. He suggested that it could be notched back at the connection to the historic building as well.

- Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant should provide more information about the existing conditions.
- Ms. Stein asked if it is appropriate to locate the entrance to the store opening onto the plaza. She suggested that shopping carts will pile up in the plaza. She opined that the entrance should open onto the street, not onto the plaza.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that the plaza will become “shopping cart central.” The people and their shopping carts will take over the plaza.
 - o Mr. Cartella responded that this retailer’s urban stores do allow shopping carts outside the store. There will be no shopping carts in the plaza.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he thinks that the metal panels are too dark. He stated that he likes the texture but would like to see the panels in a lighter color.
 - o Mr. Huffman stated that the color is lighter on the materials sheet. He stated that the rendering shows them darker but is not accurate. They are proposing a lighter color as shown on the materials sheet.
- Mr. Cartella stated that the proposed structure is slightly larger than the one reviewed in 2020. He explained that they marketed the approved design and found that there was no interest in it among retailers. He stated that they adjusted the size based on the demands of the retail market. He noted that they house another of this retailer’s outlets in their Lincoln Square project at S. Broad Street and Washington Avenue. He noted that shopping carts are not a problem at their Lincoln Square development. No cart has ever been outside the store at Lincoln Square.
- Mr. Cartella stated that the current plaza with its tall walls with returns creates a safety hazard. It attracts vagrants.
- Mr. Cartella stated that he would consider reorienting the entrance from the plaza to Chestnut Street, if they have the appropriate clearances.
- Mr. Cluver and Mr. D’Alessandro objected to the green roof on the historic building’s canopy. Mr. D’Alessandro asserted that all green roofs look terrible after five years.
- Ms. Haynes, one of the landscape architects responsible for the green roofs, disagreed with Mr. D’Alessandro and explained that her company has significant experience designing, installing, and maintaining green roofs. She stated that they are proposing a green roof for the canopy on the historic building because it currently drains stormwater directly onto the plaza, creating a safety hazard in cold weather. She stated that the current drainage system does not comply with storm water management requirements. They are proposing to capture the storm water and use it for the plants on the plaza.
- Ms. Hansplant, another landscape architect, stated that the green roof would be maintained and could easily be removed in the future.
- Mr. Cluver requested more details regarding the green roof.
- Mr. Detweiler asked if the developer has a committed tenant.
 - o Mr. Cartella stated that they do have a tenant but cannot reveal its identity.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that an allowance for this retail structure would be a reasonable trade-off for the rehabilitation of International House. It is reversible. He also added that the store will activate the plaza, which will be a positive aspect of the project. He stated that he does not like the sheer wall at the sidewalk but cannot be avoided. He stated that the project will do no damage to the historic fabric. He stated that the retail store will make the entire project viable. He added that the concerns about shopping carts is unfounded. At an urban location like this one, the shopping carts will remain within the store. He stated that this is an

acceptable accommodation to help support the viability of revitalization of International House.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission approved an application in concept for the construction of a retail structure on the western end of the plaza in December 2020.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The current application would satisfy Standard 9, if revised as suggested.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following suggested revisions:

- The entry to the store opens onto Chestnut Street, not the plaza.
- The glass section of the structure steps back slightly from the street.
- More information is provided on the green roof.
- The tone of the grey metal panels is lightened.
- More fenestration and/or other features like divisions are added to the Chestnut Street façade to reduce the mass of the façade.

ITEM: 3701-15 Chestnut St					
MOTION: Approval with suggested revisions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detweiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:05:40

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:06 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.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MAY 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES