

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

**TUESDAY, 26 JANUARY 2021
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

Richard Stokes
Thomas Queenan
Patrick Grossi
Paul Steinke
Nan Gutterman
Linda Baldwin
Andrew Cohen
Jim Hammond
Kevin Kilcoyne
Amanda Christine
Ken Weinstein
Jeff Dellaquila

Maureen Flanagan
Chelsea Hengstler
Leah Silverstein
Robert Mueller
Robert Couzin
Dolores Curtis
Stephen Marando-Blanck
Amie Leighton
Sandra Folzer
Cecil Baker
Bruce McCall
Doug Seiler
Jeffrey Gelles
Andy Mares
Ian Toner
Robert Powers
Sylvia Bastani
Hugh Gilmore
Mary DeNadai
Jody Greenblatt
Richard M. Heiberger
Sharon Gornstein
Catherine Myers
Douglas Marshall
Laurits Halverson Schless
Suzanna Barucco
Allison Lukachik
Kirsti Bracali
Scott Baldasare
Kate Schoener
Raymond Evers
Catharine Lowery
Mark Kocent
Kathy Willetts
Kyle Meiser
Sergio Coscia
David Koneil
Carl Primavera
Courtney Disston
Lance Saunders
John O'Toole
Martha Spanninger
Louis Richman
Suzanne Biemiller
Lori Salganicoff
Kara Smith
Ignatius Wang
Michael Sklaroff
Helios Exchange
Virginia Baltzell
Ben Derby

Eric Leighton
K.McGhee
John Dulik
Eileen O'Brien
Karen West
Jen Feden
Martha Gate
Raymond Rola
Johanna Stull
Mengying Wu
Jaime Rodriguez
Judith Himes
Jen Furniss
Kelly Chaido
Gian Vergnetti
Susan Wetherill
Alexis & Gian Vergnetti
Randal Baron
Hewson Baltzell

ADDRESS: 8419 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Demolish rear addition; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chestnut Hill Community Center

Applicant: Christopher Miller, John Milner Architects, Inc.

History: 1803; Charles Redheffer House; remodeled c. 1854

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The early-nineteenth-century stone Federal-style building at 8419 Germantown Avenue, historically known as the Charles Redheffer House, has functioned as the Woodward Community Centre since 1917 when it was established by Gertrude Woodward. The three-story structure has had several exterior alterations since its construction, most notably the 1918 addition of a two-story rear porch, originally intended to be temporary, and the removal of the front porch to allow for the construction of two large bay windows in 1925.

This application proposes to demolish the existing two-story rear addition and to construct a larger three-story addition to support the functions of the Chestnut Hill Community Centre Corporation, which operates out of the building. The addition would be three stories where it connects to the historic structure and would step down to two stories toward the rear of the property. It would include a stone water table, two-over-two double-hung sash windows, a standing seam metal roof, stuccoed walls, and an elevator penthouse. No alterations to the front or side facades of the historic structure are proposed.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-original rear addition;
- Construct three-story addition with elevator penthouse;

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition would require the demolition of a non-original two-story rear porch constructed as a temporary structure in 1918. The original Federal-style building would remain intact.
 - While the addition is large, the step down of the addition from three to two stories, the alignment of the floors with the historic structure, and the architectural detailing make the building compatible in massing, size, and scale.
 - The proposed materials, fenestration patterns, and architectural features, such as cornices and columns, are compatible with the historic building and surrounding context.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

- The proposed addition would replace a non-original two-story porch and would only impact the rear wall of the historic building. The future removal of the addition would have limited impact on the historic structure and its environment.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Kara Smith and Mary Werner DeNadai represented the application.

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Detwiler recused, owing to his employment with the applicants' firm, John Milner Architects, Inc.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. DeNadai stated that the building will continue to function as a nonprofit center and that the project will be completed in two phases. The first phase, she elaborated, would be the new rear addition and will allow the entire building to be accessible. The second phase, she continued, would be to restore the front of the building after some income has been generated from the tenants of the rear addition.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the proposed addition is sympathetic. She noted that an alternate west elevation with a Juliet balcony was provided and that she preferred the elevation without the balcony.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to explain why an alternative has been provided and if there is a preference.
 - Ms. Smith explained that the alternate elevation shows that the standing seam metal mansard roof would be substituted with a flat roof for cost saving purposes. She added that the sightline studies show that the mechanical equipment would still be minimally visible without the mansard, though the mansard is the preferred option. She further noted that the alternate elevation shows additional windows at the third floor of the proposed addition.
- Mr. Cluver agreed with Ms. Gutterman that he preferred the elevation with the mansard shown on drawing A2.5. He then inquired about the blind windows on the east elevation, adding that he understands there is storage along that wall. He asked the applicant to describe the context and whether a blank wall would be highly visible.
 - Ms. Smith responded that along this elevation there is a private driveway for the adjacent funeral home and there is heavy vegetation. She added that the drive is not publicly accessible and that the entire addition would be difficult to see from this perspective on Germantown Avenue.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that there is no cover over the entrance vestibule and suggested that some cover be added.
 - Ms. Smith replied that she could consider that suggestion.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that much thought had been put into designing the core of the building but questioned whether the addition could be pulled back further from the corner of the historic building.

- Ms. DeNadai responded that the layout is tight and the owner needs as much square footage as possible to finance the building renovation. She remarked that the location of the proposed addition is similar to the location of the existing two-story addition that will be demolished.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the new addition would be three stories in height where it intersects the historic structure, rather than two.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lori Salganicoff of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy stated that she is happy to see the treasured building find new life. She added that on behalf of the Chestnut Hill Community Association, she has been asked to clarify that the association has not been involved with the project or building. She commented that there may be confusion with the Chestnut Hill Community Association and the Woodward Community Centre.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The historic building has an existing rear two-story addition constructed in 1918 that would be demolished.
- The application proposes an alternate option that includes a Juliet balcony on the west elevation and a flat roof in place of the mansard roof. The alternate also includes third-story windows at the addition.
- No work to the front or side facades of the historic building is proposed in this application; however, a second phase of the project slated for the future would include the restoration of the front façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The addition is compatible in massing, size, scale, and materials. The proposed work satisfies Standard 9.
- The proposed addition would cause the loss of a non-original two-story rear addition and would only impact the rear wall of the historic structure. The addition could be removed in the future with minimal impact to the historic building. The proposed addition complies with Standard 10.
- The Committee prefers the addition's west elevation as proposed in drawing A2.5, but it acknowledges that the alternate shown in drawing A2.5a may ultimately be pursued owing to cost. The Juliet balcony shown on A2.5a may not be inappropriate and perhaps ought not be included if the alternate is pursued.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, noting that the west elevation reflected on drawing A2.5 is preferred over the alternate elevation reflected on drawing A2.5a.

ITEM: 8419 Germantown Ave MOTION: Approval 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				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5			1	

ADDRESS: 6625 LINCOLN DR

Proposal: Construct single-family residence on subdivided parcel at 6627 Lincoln Drive
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 6625 Lincoln Dr LLC
Applicant: Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect
History: 1902; Nichols-Goehring House; H.C. Wise & W.W. Potter, architects; addition, Rankin, Kellogg & Crane, 1921
Individual Designation: 1/11/2019
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a new house on a subdivided section of the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive. The new property with the new house would be known as 6627 Lincoln Drive. The Historical Commission designated the Nichols-Goehring House property at 6625 Lincoln Drive on 11 January 2019. The designated parcel is shown on a site plan in the nomination. The property owner subdivided the property that was known as 6625 Lincoln Drive into five parcels known as 6619, 6621, 6623, 6625, and 6627 Lincoln Drive with a deed that is dated 9 January 2019 and recorded on 11 January 2019, the day that the property was designated. A zoning permit for the subdivision had been issued on 17 September 2018. The Historical Commission notified the property owner that it would consider designating the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive on 12 November 2018, thereby initiating its jurisdiction over the entirety of the property originally known as 6625 Lincoln Drive, which was later subdivided into five properties.

In May 2020, the Historical Commission was notified that three houses were under construction at 6625 Lincoln Drive, presumably without permits. The staff visited the site and photographed three houses under construction as well as one foundation being excavated. The staff contacted the Department of Licenses & Inspections about the construction that was underway without the Historical Commission's review or approval. The Department responded that the houses had been permitted under the addresses 6619, 6621, and 6623 Lincoln Drive. The permits had been applied for on 26 April 2019 and issued on 10 September 2019. A Google StreetView photograph shows that site work and the construction of the foundations were underway in November 2019. The Department of Licenses & Inspections did not refer the new construction permit applications to the Historical Commission because they had been issued under 6619, 6621, and 6623 Lincoln Drive, addresses that did not exist at the time of designation; only 6625

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Lincoln Drive was identified as historic. The permit referral system was designed to catch subdivisions and carry the historic designation marker from the parent to the child property, but it did not in this case. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declined to revoke the permits because the mistake had been made within the City system and revoking the permits would open the City to liability.

The fourth house contemplated for the site was not permitted with the other three in 2019. Despite not having any permits for construction at 6627 Lincoln Drive, the developer began excavating for a foundation in the spring of 2020. The staff photographed the unpermitted work underway on 11 May 2020 and requested a violation for work without a permit on 12 May 2020 through the City's 311 system. That violation was apparently never issued. This application proposes the new house for the new parcel at 6627 Lincoln Drive. While the first three houses were located off to the side of the historic house, the fourth house would be situated directly in front of the historic house. The excavation for the foundation has been completed. The proposed house would be three stories tall and clad in Wissahickon schist at the front and stucco at the sides and rear. A one-story garage wing would be entered from a drive at the rear.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct house

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, features, and spatial relationships 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.*
 - While the design of the proposed house is compatible with the historic house and site, its location in the front yard of the historic house is not. The construction of a house in the front yard of the historic house would destroy historic spatial relationships. The new work would not protect the historic integrity of the property.
- *Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:*
 - *Recommended: Locating new construction far enough away from the historic building, when possible, where it will be minimally visible and will not negatively affect the building's character, the site, or setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Placing new construction too close to the historic building so that it negatively impacts the building's character, the site, or setting.*
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
 - The proposed house will be highly visible and will negatively impact the historic building's character, site, and setting. The new construction will result in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the older building and its setting. The yard directly in front of the historic house should be left open to maintain the historic space and views.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:14:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ray Rola represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein stated that it is a very unfortunate series of events that occurred with the property. She then contended that what is before the Committee, which is new construction at 6627 Lincoln Drive, should be considered on its own merit, notwithstanding the other three buildings recently constructed. She asked that the Committee consider whether this proposed building at this particular parcel is appropriate for the site.
- Mr. Rola clarified that the rendering in the application was the initial rendering for the proposed house and was presented for a zoning variance, which was denied. He noted that the existing stone wall would have been cut out for driveway access. Subsequently, he continued, the plan was modified so that the entrance to the garage was accessed through the existing driveway that leads to the designated building. The historic wall and fence will now remain intact, he added. Mr. Rola further elaborated that the garage has been reduced to a single-car garage accessed from the rear of the parcel, and the stone facing would remain on the front façade but would wrap around the side and end where it intersects the garage. He noted that the remainder of the side façade would be stucco.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether there is a site plan that reflects the changes Mr. Rola described, including a plan that shows the relationship of the proposed new construction to the historic building.
 - Mr. Rola stated that the site plan in the application reflects the actual proposed drive in which access is shared with 6625 Lincoln Drive.
- Ms. Stein commented that the application proposes to construct a home in front of a historic residence, which will block the viewshed from the public right-of-way. She stated that the other three houses built along the side are not as problematic. By placing the new house in front of the historic building, she continued, the evolutionary and contextual history of the historic Lincoln Drive houses would be lost. She concluded that the siting of the proposed house is problematic.
 - Mr. Rola responded that Ms. Stein has a valid point but argued that there would be a view of the historic house from the driveway. He further contended that in the past the land in front of the house was heavily wooded and the historic building was not visible from Lincoln Drive, except through the driveway.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein's comments and expressed his concern over the location of the proposed house. He argued that the siting is not simply blocking views of the historic building from Lincoln Drive but would be decreasing the livability of the house. He commented that the owner of the historic property would be looking at the rear wall of the new construction, and he contended that it would dramatically decrease the lifespan of the historic house. He stated that the area in front of the historic house is an unbuildable site.

- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and argued that the Committee should recommend that the proposed approach to new development at the site is not acceptable.
- Mr. Rola contended that the historic house is higher in elevation than the proposed house and the view would look over the new building. He then stated that the developer would restore the historic house, which is currently not in good condition.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned Mr. Rola's statement that the historic house would be elevated above the new building. He observed that there is only a 10-foot grade, explaining that the front door of the historic house would be at the same level as the second floor and roof of the new building.
 - Mr. Detwiler added that one does not only look straight ahead but also down. He contended that the view would include a lot of asphalt and blank wall. He stated that all relationship to the site would be lost.
- Mr. Cluver remarked that the appropriateness of any building at this location is the primary question, but added that he also has concerns over the design. He commented that some of the developer-style details should be avoided and contended that the stone on the side elevation would be stronger than stucco. He then asked what stone will be used and whether it relates to other buildings in the area. He stated that he could not find a current front elevation drawing, adding that the civil set also seemed outdated since it showed the double garage fronting Lincoln Drive.
 - Mr. Rola answered that the stone is proposed to be a 4-inch real Wissahickon schist veneer. He added that part of the reason the stone was eliminated from the side was structural rather than financial. He noted that there would be nothing to support the weight of the stone where the garage intersects the wall.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the original site wall would remain.
 - Mr. Rola responded that the developer would restore the wall, fence, and gate and that no new opening would be added.
- Mr. McCoubrey reiterated that the largest issue is whether a building at this location is appropriate. He added that he agrees with the previous Committee comments, noting that it is difficult to build on the site without blocking the view of the historic house, which had a particular relationship to Lincoln Drive.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission designated the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive, the Nichols-Goehring House, on 11 January 2019. At the same time, the owner subdivided the property into five parcels. The historic building remains on the parcel identified as 6625 Lincoln Drive. Three houses have already been constructed at 6619, 6621, and 6623 Lincoln Drive.
- The scope of the current application is for construction of a two-and-a-half-story single-family residence on the subdivided parcel identified as 6627 Lincoln Drive.
- The subdivided parcel at 6627 Lincoln Drive is situated directly in front of the historically designated resource.
- The existing historic stone wall and fence would remain, and the new house would be accessed at the rear from the existing driveway.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The construction of a new building in what was historically the front yard of the designated resource is inappropriate and would destroy historic spatial relationships, including the loss of the public's view of the building from Lincoln Drive. The proposed new building would not protect the historic integrity of the property and the work does not comply with Standard 9.
- The proposed new building would be highly visible and would greatly disrupt views of the historic resource from Lincoln Drive. New construction in the front yard of the historic property would negatively impact the historic building's character, site, and setting. Construction of a new building immediately in front of the historic building is inappropriate, and the parcel should remain open to maintain the historic space and views. The proposed work does not comply with the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ITEM: 6625 Lincoln Drive MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 341 S 25TH ST

Proposal: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Brooks Tanner and Penelope Carter

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: c. 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to add a third story with no setback on a two-story contributing building in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District. The front façade would be clad in brick, and the sides and rear would be clad in composite lap siding. The existing cornice would be salvaged and reinstalled at the new roofline.

While there are few precedents for similar additions, the Historical Commission has approved several full-story additions typically designed as mansards on carriage houses. In considering

the current application, the Committee might comment on the appropriateness of a mansard or other addition at this property.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct third-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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.*
 - Double rowlock brick coursing would differentiate the proposed addition from the original building; however, as proposed, the massing, size, and scale of the addition would not be compatible with the historic building. An addition of a different design or set back from the front façade may be more appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:33:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Ian Toner and Catharine Lowery represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman observed that the photographs show the row as three buildings each two stories in height, though she acknowledged that some properties across the small street are taller. She stated that she is troubled by the addition of an entire story. She commented that the Historical Commission has approved third-story additions to properties on Van Pelt Street designed to look like a mansard, but she questioned whether a mansard would be appropriate for this particular building. She then cautioned against removing and reinstalling the cornice.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he would be more open to considering an addition set back from the front façade so that the roofline could be maintained. As shown, he continued, the proposed addition would interrupt the streetscape.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, stating it would be inappropriate for this location.
- Mr. Toner inquired how much setback would be appropriate.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that the amount of setback is related to the visibility of the addition from the street.
 - Mr. Toner replied that no matter how much an addition is set back, there will always be visibility, owing to the siting of the property.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he is sympathetic to the need for space, but contended that an addition can overwhelm the mass of the house. He suggested that a sightline drawing showing a setback addition would be beneficial to the Committee. He agreed that there will always be visibility, but an addition could be made less conspicuous than the one proposed and would preserve the streetscape.
- Mr. Toner stated that the current proposal shows brick at the front and asked whether another material would be acceptable if the addition were set back from the façade.

- Mr. Detwiler responded that he felt a change of material would be acceptable to distinguish it from the original.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the addition be thought of as a penthouse rather than an extension of the house. He then stated that while a mansard roof was historically a typical way to expand a building, he argued that a mansard would be inappropriate in this particular instance, owing to the context of the other two-story buildings of the row. He agreed that a setback addition would be more appropriate.
- Mr. Cluver commented that with a setback addition, a deck at the front would not be appropriate.
 - Mr. Toner responded that the owner is not interested in a roof deck.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed third-story addition would occupy the entire footprint of the existing building and would have no setback.
- The front façade would be clad in brick to match the façade of the building, and the cornice would be removed and reinstalled at the roofline of the addition.
- The Historical Commission has approved full-story additions in the form of mansard roofs on S. Van Pelt Street in the past.
- The building at 341 S. 25th Street is part of a row of three two-story buildings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- An addition, though it would be visible, may be appropriate with a setback and should be as inconspicuous as possible.
- Sightline studies should be submitted to show the relationship of a setback addition to the streetscape.
- As proposed, the massing, scale, and size of the third-story addition is inappropriate and would alter the building's relationship to the historic row. The work does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 341 S 25th St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler 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				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 2035 S COLLEGE AVE

Proposal: Install mechanical equipment; modify openings; provide ADA accessibility

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Trustees of the Estate of Stephen Girard

Applicant: Doug Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architecture

History: 1833; Founder's Hall, Girard College; Thomas U. Walter, architect

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to make a series of upgrades to Founder's Hall, in part so Girard College can return the building to its original use as an educational facility and also be used as an event space. Founder's Hall has long been used to host events, many of which generate income for the school. The proposed work addresses current issues the building has with heating and cooling, ventilation, and interior space configuration. The application also addresses ADA accessibility.

The Architectural Committee reviewed this same scope of work at its last meeting of 15 December 2020, where it provided several comments and recommendations about the proposal. The main concern of the Architectural Committee was the lack of detail in the presentation, given the local and national significance of the building. While reviewing the nine proposed modifications, a member of the Architectural Committee commented that due to the lack of detail, the proposal should be considered as an In-Concept application rather than a Final Review and suggested that the applicant return the following month with more detailed plans. The minutes from this meeting have been included as part of this overview.

The application moved on to the Historical Commission's meeting of 8 January 2021 where it was reviewed as In-Concept. The applicant presented an updated set of drawings that reflected the recommendations made at the Architectural Committee's December meeting. The application was received with enthusiasm and the Historical Commission agreed that it would benefit from further review by the Architectural Committee. The current application is for Final Approval of the revised plans.

SCOPE OF WORK:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Install mechanical equipment.
- Modify openings.
- Provide ADA accessibility.
- Remove existing ceiling panels and replace with louvers.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.*
 - The proposed changes are motivated, in part, by Girard College's decision to return Founder's Hall to its original use as an educational facility, as well as to address issues that currently negatively impact the interior spaces used for events, including heating, cooling and ventilation.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The application proposes to pin back the front doors at the north and south entrances to create interior vestibules with frameless glass doors. The revised application includes the requested details (modifications #3 and #5).
 - The application proposes to convert two windows into doors by removing and storing the existing windows and stone spandrels and installing doors in the openings. The proposed door configuration and landings have been revised to reflect the comments from the Architectural Committee and the requested details have been provided. Several exterior door alternatives are also presented for consideration (modification #6).
 - Rather than removing an existing window to accommodate a new louver, the applicant updated the plan to install the louver behind the existing sash, and details have been provided, per the Architectural Committee's recommendation (modification #7).
 - The revised application includes the requested details regarding the new ADA ramps proposed for the north and south entrances (modifications #2 and #4).
 - The ADA lift proposed at the east side of the building has been relocated closer to the column to protect the spacious views of the building between the columns (modification #1).
 - The revised application includes the requested details regarding the new equipment ramp proposed at the west side of the building (modification #8).
 - The application includes a future scope of work that proposes to remove six original cast iron ceiling panels at the north side of the building and install louvers as required for the new HVAC system. The revised application provides the requested details, including mechanical drawings (modification #9).
- *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.*
 - If all removed elements like windows, stone sills and panels, and ceiling panels are securely stored on site, the proposed alterations could be reversed in the future, and the essential form and integrity of the building would be unimpaired.

- *Accessibility Guidelines: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the user while preserving significant historic features. Finding solutions to meet accessibility requirements that minimize the impact of any necessary alteration on the historic building, its site, and setting, such as compatible ramps, paths, and lifts.*
 - The proposed ramps would provide barrier-free access while preserving significant historic features. The proposed ramps would provide accessibility while minimizing the impact on the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the conditions outlined above, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 9, and 10 and the Accessibility Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:44:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Kirsti Bracali and Doug Seiler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Bracali thanked the Architectural Committee for its comments at the December 2020 meeting. She informed the members that they had presented their in-concept application to the Historical Commission earlier that month to get feedback from them as well. Ms. Bracali reminded the Committee members that the project was under review by local, state and Federal entities, owing to the significance of the building.
- Ms. Stein requested that the applicants focus on the changes that were made to address the Architectural Committee's comments at the last meeting. She said that it appeared that some of the comments had not been taken into consideration, so she wanted someone from the project team to walk through the revisions the team had made.
- Mr. Seiler explained that there were nine projects involved in the application and he felt confident that they had responded to the comments from both the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission with their revisions.
- Mr. Seiler said that the application had been revised to provide more details of the ADA ramps and railings.
- Ms. Stein commented that the Architectural Committee had made several comments, one of them being whether it would be possible to use a ramp without railings. She stated that the applicants had provided additional detail however it seemed as though suggested alternatives had not been explored.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that he respectfully disagreed that the feedback from the Architectural Committee had not been incorporated into their revisions, and he asked if he could briefly address each of the nine projects to explain.
 - Mr. Seiler explained that location of the inclined accessibility lift had been revised based on the comments of the Architectural Committee, and the number of posts had also been reduced.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the drawing in the presentation showed the posts were not placed at the joints. Mr. Detwiler asked Mr. Seiler if they had an elevation drawing of the proposed railings.
 - Mr. Seiler responded to Mr. Cluver that they could revise the location of the lift. He also responded to Mr. Detwiler by directing him to the product cut

sheet in the presentation. Mr. Seiler explained that a round pipe rail would be used.

- Mr. Detwiler expressed concern at the idea of using a generic pipe rail at a building of such architectural significance. He said that he thought it was important to have an elevation drawing of the railing to review the details.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that normally he would agree with Mr. Detwiler. However, this is an off-the-shelf product so the information included in the presentation was for the generic product.
- Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Detwiler asked if it was possible to fabricate the railing out of bronze, agreeing that this level of detail was important for this review.
 - Mr. Seiler replied he did not think that that option was possible but that he would look into it further. He explained that he saw this intervention, as well as the others being proposed, as removable and reversible. Mr. Seiler stated that they had studied a wide variety of solutions for this lift and, given the scale of the building's stairs, the proposed piece of equipment would appear inconsequential.
 - Ms. Bracali reiterated that they would be happy to look into using bronze and work out those details with the staff.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if a chain link fence was a requirement of this lift system.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that it was not. He directed the members of the committee to the photograph of the current lift and explained that the proposed lift would look very similar to it but with fewer posts.
- Mr. Cluver reiterated that a higher level of detail was important and, based on the applicant's submission, they could not determine what was being proposed in some cases. Mr. Detwiler and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. Cluver.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that Mr. Seiler request a shop drawing from the lift manufacturer.
 - Mr. Seiler agreed that this was a good idea. However, shop drawings usually were not produced until the order was submitted. He suggested that, if bronze was available, they would agree to use it.
- Ms. Stein told Mr. Seiler that the problem was that their submission was showing the use of chain link, and no member of the Architectural Committee was going to approve that for this building. She repeated that they were looking for an elegant railing system.
- Mr. Seiler moved on to the changes proposed at the north and south entrances. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Seiler how they were going to address the very visible dip in the marble stair at the south entrance.
 - Mr. Seiler replied that there could be a few ways to address this condition when installing the ramp, including shaping their new stone to follow the shape of the depression at the tread.
 - Mr. Seiler reviewed the revised ramps and pointed out that the number of areas that would require bolting into the stone had been reduced. He also reminded the Committee members that at their last meeting, the concept of considering the accessibility changes as permanent had been brought up. Mr. Seiler reported that their team had studied designing these ramps with that in mind, but ultimately found it inappropriate to start to remove historic stone or other fabric in order to accommodate this idea.
 - Ms. Bracali explained that the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission was also very much opposed to permanent interventions but

were supportive of locating the ramps at the side of the entrances at both the north and the south.

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the change in elevation at the ramp.
 - Mr. Seiler replied that it was seven and one quarter inches.
 - Mr. Seiler reviewed details about the materials of the ramp components to confirm where bronze would be used.
- Mr. Seiler moved on to the changes proposed to the exterior doors of the Board Room. He reviewed the occupancy loads and egress capacity for the floor and said that they had studied this further as a result of the comments and questions from the Architectural Committee's previous review.
- Ms. Stein asked Mr. Seiler if they were proposing alterations to exterior doors in order to accommodate an occupancy load that would never be realized in the building.
 - Ms. Bracali stated that because the building did not have a code-compliant enclosed interior stairwell, their discussions with the Department of Licenses and Inspections involved looking for alternatives that would not require altering the interior of the building.
 - Ms. Bracali also explained that the interior layout of the first floor was surprisingly disorienting to visitors. She stated that the Board Room was the one room that all visitors would pass through regardless of the type of event. Therefore, it was a good location to provide direct access to the outside in the case of an emergency.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Seiler about the occupant capacity of the Board Room and whether the room's exterior doors could accommodate this number.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that he believed it was 360 people and elaborated on Ms. Bracali's comments about the interior layout being confusing to visitors. He emphasized their use of the Board Room as an orientation point for visitors should an emergency occur.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Seiler if the windows that they were proposing to convert to doors would serve as emergency doors or whether they would be used in daily operations. He commented that if the doors were only to be used in cases of emergency, the proposed railings and landings did not seem necessary.
 - Mr. Seiler confirmed that they would be for emergency use only and explained that the historic grates located right outside of the windows on the ground of the peristyle required the use of the landings.
- Ms. Stein asked if it was possible to use a symmetrical pair of doors and still meet the building code. She opined that as currently proposed, the offset doors were very visually disruptive to the façade.
 - Mr. Seiler said he agreed with Ms. Stein's comment.
- Mr. Cluver asked if it would be possible to minimize the length of the landings.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that he believed they could and he also emphasized the reversibility of this intervention.
- Mr. D'Alessandro urged Mr. Seiler to simplify their interventions.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that the team had given much thought to the execution of the landing and railings they were presenting today.
- Mr. Detwiler requested that they move on to the review of the details of the door being proposed. Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicant why they were not proposing a single door instead of the double door shown on their drawings.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that he liked the idea of a single door.

- There was a discussion about whether the use of a single door would require motorized operators. During this discussion, Ms. Bracali clarified that she believed that the school planned on using this proposed door for more than just emergencies.
- Mr. Seiler agreed with Ms. Bracali and stated that he believed that a single door in this opening would require a motorized operator, owing to its size.
- Mr. Cluver said that he thought that a 42-inch leaf using the design at the center of the left-hand column on the presentation slide they were currently looking at would be the most appropriate.
- Mr. Seiler began to review the louver proposed at the kitchen window. Mr. Detwiler asked Mr. Seiler how far back the louver would be set from the sash, suggesting that it be placed as far back as possible.
 - Mr. Seiler told Mr. Detwiler that they had room to push it back and asked if six to eight inches seemed appropriate, to which Mr. Detwiler responded yes. Mr. McCoubrey agreed to the six to eight inches and also recommended that a shadow box be used.
- Mr. Seiler moved on to the review of the equipment lift proposed to replace the existing one. Mr. Cluver asked if it was accurate that the lift would not be centered on the access path.
 - Mr. Seiler confirmed that the lift was centered between two columns but not on the path.
- Mr. Cluver and Mr. Detwiler agreed that in this case, it may be more important to center the lift according to the architecture rather than the path.
- Mr. Seiler moved on to the review the next project, which was the installation of six louvers in the coffered ceiling of the north portico.
- Ms. Bracali stated that she had confirmed that both openings in the Board Room would be needed to comply with egress requirements. She also confirmed that the team had looked at putting an accessible entrance at the north vestibule as suggested by Ms. Stein. Ms. Bracali stated that the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission had not supported this approach, in part because it was not the most equitable access solution.
- Mr. Seiler reiterated that they had studied whether an accessible entrance could be located somewhere at the south façade. However, for a variety of reasons they were unable to make it work successfully.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The significance of Founder's Hall, to the city, state and nation, merits very carefully detailed and reversible interventions.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The interventions are motivated, in part, by Girard College's desire to return Founder's Hall to its historic educational use, satisfying Standard 1.
- The reversibility of the proposed interventions satisfies Standards 9 and 10.
- The equity and reversibility of the accessibility solutions satisfies the Accessibility Guidelines.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Owing to the reversibility of the interventions, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with the conditions suggested by the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

staff as well as with the following conditions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 9, 10 and the Accessibility Guidelines:

- the lift in Scope #1 be placed closer to the column and when possible aligned with the stairs' joints;
- for Scope #6, a centered door that does not require a motorized operator and a smaller landing that does not project out as far as specified;
- the louver in Scope #7 is placed approximately six to eight inches behind the muntin with a shadow box; and,
- bronze is used for the lift.

ITEM: 2035 S College Ave					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman				X	
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5			1	

ADDRESS: 2417 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Legalize partially constructed deck; relocate mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jonathan Freedman

Applicant: Daniel Bowen, Precision Decks and Remodeling

History: 1963, Walter Weissman, architect

Individual Designation:

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to legalize a partially constructed deck and relocated mechanical equipment at 2417 Delancey Place, a non-contributing building in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. In the beginning of November 2020, the Historical Commission received an application for a roof deck at this property in the Department of Licenses & Inspections' online application website called eCLIPSE. The staff reached out to the applicant for clarification about the proposal including the reason why the deck was to be raised so high above the flat roof, the location of the mechanical equipment, and the placement of the railing. At the time this correspondence began, staff was unaware that there was an open violation for the construction a roof deck.

When the staff received the requested additional information, photographs showed lumber already on the roof. It was at this point that the staff started to research whether the work on the roof deck had already started without a permit and discovered that a violation had been issued in September 2020 for an "outdoor deck." Upon further discussions with the applicant, staff

learned that the mechanical equipment had already been relocated in an effort to prepare for the roof deck.

The property is classified as non-contributing in the historic district. Therefore, the Historical Commission is not charged with protecting the historic character of this building. However, the Historical Commission is charged with protecting the historic character of the district. The question for the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission is whether the proposed deck and mechanical equipment would have an adverse effect on the district.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Legalize partially constructed roof deck.
- Legalize mechanical equipment that was relocated without a permit.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed roof deck does not destroy any historic materials, features, or spatial relationships associated with the building, as there are none.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The proposed railing and mechanical equipment should be set back from the façade of the building so that they are less conspicuous from the public right-of-way, thereby reducing the impact of the deck and mechanical equipment on the district.
 - The deck is currently shown to sit a minimum of three feet two inches off the roof. This should be minimized to make the roof deck less conspicuous from the public right-of-way, thereby reducing the impact of the deck and mechanical equipment on the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval if the railing and mechanical equipment are set back from the front façade, and the height of the deck above the roof is reduced, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:59:57

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Deck contractor Chelsea Hengstler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked Ms. Hengstler if she could respond to the staff's comments and whether the owner would be amenable to relocating the railing and the mechanical equipment so that they were less visible from the right of way.
 - Ms. Hengstler replied that she would appreciate understanding the appropriate locations, explaining that the owner had been informed by their architect and HVAC contractor that they mechanical equipment could be moved without a permit. She stated that the mechanical equipment had been relocated prior to her company coming on board to begin construction of the deck.
- Ms. Stein and Ms. Gutteman asked Ms. Hengstler if the mechanical equipment could be relocated and where on the roof it had been located previously.
 - Ms. Hengstler responded that the equipment had been located at the back of the roof before. She said that she assumed that it could be relocated again and asked for someone to specify if all of the equipment needed to be relocated or only the one closest to the edge.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that he was having a difficult time understanding the visibility of the mechanical equipment and asked if they were all visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Guttermann said that the unit located on the parapet was definitely visible. She added that she was also troubled by how visible the proposed spiral staircase was. Ms. Guttermann told Ms. Hengstler that she was troubled by how the deck was being proposed essentially at the front of the house, and that the railing, the stair and the mechanical equipment were all visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Guttermann advised Ms. Hengstler that the entire deck needed to be pulled back at least five feet from the front of the house and access to it needed to be designed using something other than a spiral stair.
- Ms. Stein, Ms. Guttermann and Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the entire roof deck needed to be set back from the edge of the recessed wall, not from the edge of the façade closest to the sidewalk.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the violation.
 - Ms. Hengstler responded that the violation was for work started without a permit.
- Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Guttermann agreed that they could not legalize anything.
- Mr. Farnham suggested that the Architectural Committee consider whether the proposed deck was appropriate for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. He suggested that the Committee not concern itself with legalizing or not. The Committee should apply the review standards to the proposed project and decide whether it satisfies those standards or not.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the properties adjacent to the subject property were classified as contributing or non-contributing to the district.
 - Mr. Farnham confirmed that the row of white houses that looked like this one were also non-contributing, however some of the other houses on the block were contributing. He advised the members of the Architectural Committee to consider whether the visible railing, mechanical equipment and spiral stair had an adverse impact on the historic district. He observed that the Historical Commission is not charged with protecting the historic appearances of this house or row, but is charged with protecting the historic district. He asked the Committee to provide a recommendation regarding the impact of the proposed deck on the district. Whether or not the deck, railing, stair, or mechanical equipment is visible from the street is not the endpoint of the

discussion. The Committee must consider whether a visible deck or other element has an adverse impact on the district as a whole. The Historical Commission has already decided that this building is not historically significant and, therefore, its historic appearance does not need to be protected.

- Mr. Cluver opined that the adverse impact to the district had already occurred when these houses were built; therefore, the proposed railing or spiral stair did not make much of an impact.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the spiral stair stood out as highly incompatible with the rest of the historic district.
 - Others disagreed.
- Ms. Gutterman said that she believed that the visibility of the railing, the stair and the mechanical equipment all detracted from the historic district.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the other similar houses had all closed up the original outdoor space at the second floor to convert it into habitable space, and not to the detriment of the design.
- Ms. Hengstler asked if the committee members had any suggestions for ways her client could access the roof deck that would be more successful than the spiral stair they had proposed. She noted that the house next door had a roof deck with a pilot house and asked if this would be a better option.
- Ms. Stein said that she thought that this house could get a roof deck approved if it was pushed back and accessed by a pilot house rather than a spiral stair. Ms. Gutterman, Mr. D'Alessandro, and Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked Ms. Hengstler why the proposed deck was elevated so high off of the flat roof.
 - Ms. Hengstler responded that they usually design decks this way because it takes weight off of the main roof. However, they could definitely redesign this deck to lower it.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- As proposed, the railing, spiral stair and roof deck would be too visible from the public right-of-way, creating an adverse impact on the historic district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed roof deck does not destroy any historic materials, features, or spatial relationships associated with the building, as there are none, satisfying Standard 9.
- If the roof deck was accessed by a pilot house rather than a spiral stair, it would have less of an adverse impact on the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.
- If the deck, railing and mechanical equipment are pulled back from the parapet wall, they could be made less conspicuous, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.
- If the height of the deck is lowered to sit closer to the flat roof, it could make it less conspicuous from the public right-of-way, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, provided:

- the deck is pulled back from the parapet wall by at least five feet;

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- it is accessed through a pilot house, not the spiral stairs;
- the deck is lowered to sit closer to the flat roof; and,
- the mechanical equipment and railings are relocated so as to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

ITEM: 2417 Delancey Place					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 2530 S CLEVELAND ST

Proposal: Install aluminum clad windows at front and vinyl windows at side and rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Johanna and Bryn Stull

Applicant: Johanna and Bryn Stull

History: 1909; James H. and John T. Windrim, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to replace twenty-two windows throughout the house at 2530 S. Cleveland Street. The proposal is for aluminum-clad windows at the front façade and vinyl windows at the side and rear. With few exceptions, the existing windows are original to the construction of the house and are in varying states of deterioration.

The majority of the replacement windows propose to maintain the original pane configuration.

The exceptions are as follows:

- Two existing narrow double-hung windows that flank the large middle window at the front façade will be changed to picture windows (see Type G in application).
- Two existing narrow double-hung windows at the side of the house will be changed to picture windows (see Type C in application).
- Two existing French casement windows at the bump out at the side of the house will be changed to picture windows (see Types K and M in application).

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install aluminum clad windows at front and vinyl windows at side and rear.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features 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.*
 - Aluminum-clad windows can be appropriate at the front, side and rear of this property, as long as the proposed details reflect a close enough match to the existing windows.
 - The details presented in this application show a change in pane configuration for two prominent windows at the front façade, which should be changed to replicate the existing pane configuration.
 - The windows proposed to replace the two French casement windows at the side of the house should match the configuration of the existing windows more accurately.
 - The section drawings provided seem to indicate that the glass of the replacement windows would sit proud of the existing frames, which creates a non-historic condition. These section drawings should be revised to show that the exterior glass of the replacement windows will be installed in the same plane as the existing windows.
 - Vinyl windows will not match the historic wood windows sufficiently enough to meet this standard. An aluminum-clad window with the correct details could be an acceptable alternative to wood in this case.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, as proposed, but approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6, provided the following:

- the exterior glass of the replacement window is installed in the same plane as the existing windows;
- the pane configuration of the four narrow replacement double-hung windows accurately reflects the original 2/1 configuration;
- the replacements of the two French casement windows accurately reflect the original configuration; and,
- aluminum-clad windows are installed at the side and the rear where the current application proposed vinyl windows.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:15:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Johanna Stull represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked Ms. Stull if she had any response to the staff's overview.
 - Ms. Stull responded that she did not understand why the window contractor's proposal indicated that the two small windows at the front façade were to be picture windows instead of double-hung windows. She explained that the window company had told her that they could provide double-hung replacement windows at this location and so she needed to discuss this change with them.

- o Ms. Stull remarked that most of the houses on her block have vinyl windows, and her understanding was as long as the windows were not visible from the street, they could be vinyl.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the existing windows could be restored rather than replaced and urged Ms. Stull to consider this, especially at the front façade.
 - o Ms. Stull responded that all the windows were in various states of decay. She noted that the windows at the front façade were particularly inefficient and allowed significant air through.
- Mr. D'Alessandro repeated that he just did not see a need to replace the existing windows and told the applicant that a restoration expert could make the existing windows efficient.
 - o Ms. Stull replied that window restoration was not cost effective.
- Mr. D'Alessandro replied that he was not trying to address her cost concerns. He said that it was not appropriate to remove the existing windows and replace them with new ones, especially at the front of the house.
 - o Ms. Stull said that is precisely what most of her neighbors had done so she did not understand why her application was being treated differently.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he also did not understand how this could have happened.
- Mr. Detwiler remarked that some of the replacement windows could have been installed before the historic district was established.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that there was a cost factor and there was also an environmental factor associated with full window replacement. She recommended that Ms. Stull get an estimate for window restoration prior to the Historical Commission meeting. She also said that, based on the photographs in the application, the wood casing and sills were in much worse condition than the sashes themselves which concerned her. She asked Ms. Stull how this was going to be addressed since covering up the deteriorated areas was not an option.
 - o Ms. Stull responded that the window contractor was proposing to replace all of the deteriorated areas of wood.
- Ms. Gutterman responded that the staff would need to review detailed drawings of the window contractor's proposal in order to be able to evaluate it.
 - o Ms. Stull asked if this information was not already in her application materials.
- Mr. Cluver confirmed that there were some details provided in the application. However, they were incomplete because the window section indicated that the existing frames were to remain, which clearly was not an option for some of the windows. He also expressed concern about inserting an additional frame inside the existing frame, which would build down the masonry opening and reduce the amount of glass.
 - o Ms. Stull replied that she believed the window contractor was going to remove the existing frames and install a new frame and new sashes.
- Mr. Detwiler referred Ms. Stull to the window section drawings, which indicated that the existing frames were to remain. He suggested that Ms. Stull have the window contractor clarify this matter since her home would benefit from receiving as much natural light as possible.
 - o Ms. Stull agreed with Mr. Detwiler's comments and said that she would follow up with her window contractor.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the proposal from the window contractor was creating some problems. He said they were proposing to use a picture window at the front façade instead of a double-hung because they were not capable of making a

- double-hung in the size the house required. Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated his opinion that the existing windows should be restored, not replaced.
- Mr. Detwiler said that historic windows could be restored and made to be extremely efficient. He noted that it could be a question of cost and suggested that Ms. Stull get an estimate for window restoration, at least for the front elevation.
 - o Ms. Stull asked if the Architectural Committee had any recommendations for contractors who specialized in window restoration.
 - o Ms. Schmitt responded that she could provide Ms. Stull with a list of contractors who had worked with the Historical Commission in the past. She added that while the staff of the Historical Commission routinely approves window replacement applications, the proposed use of vinyl windows in locations visible from the public right-of-way prevented the staff from being able to approve this specific application.
 - o Ms. Stull confirmed that she understood this point, and stated that she had never received any information from the Historical Commission about what changes could be made to their house once they purchased it. Ms. Stull said she had been making her decisions about replacing her windows based on what her neighbors had told her.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron offered comments.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application for window replacement was not appropriate because it proposed the use of vinyl windows in areas visible from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application could be revised to specify the correct historic pane configuration;
- Vinyl windows could be approved at areas on the house that were not visible from the public right-of-way;
- The two narrow windows at the front façade should to remain double-hung and picture windows should not be installed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Denial, as proposed, but approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6, provided the following:

- the exterior glass of the replacement window is installed in the same plane as the existing windows;
- the pane configuration of the four narrow replacement double-hung windows accurately reflects the original two-over-one configuration;
- the replacements of the two French casement windows accurately reflect the original configuration; and,
- aluminum-clad windows are installed at the side and the rear where the current application proposes vinyl windows.

ITEM: 2530 S Cleveland St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: D'Alessandro 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				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 1718 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Scott Baldasare

Applicant: Richard Stokes, Stokes Architecture

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, multiple classifications, 2/8/1995

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a two- and three-story addition at the rear of the property at 1718 Delancey Street, facing Panama Street. The new addition would incorporate an existing non-historic addition and an existing parking area, which are located on lots identified in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District inventory as 1717 and 1719 Panama Street and classified as non-contributing. Panama Street dead-ends at this property, but is not a service alley. Several three-story rowhouses front on the block. The proposed addition would connect to the historic house through a second-floor connector on top of an existing one-story connector. The addition would be clad in light-colored stucco, would feature bays of different heights and depth, and a combination of double-hung and fixed aluminum-clad windows. An overhead garage door with a wood-like appearance would provide access to the addition. A roof deck would be located on the two-story portion of the addition.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct addition facing Panama Street

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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.*
 - The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the building. The new work is differentiated from the old, and its general massing, size and scale are appropriate to the historic

property and the district, but that the fenestration and materials do not correspond with the character of the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, which, while diverse, is characterized by more traditional/Classical forms, proportions and detailing, regularized fenestration, and masonry materials of brick and stone. Bays are common on rears and sides of buildings in the district, but are typically differentiated from the masonry facade materials. The application partially complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the features and fenestration are revised to be more consistent with the character of the historic district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:41:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Richard Stokes and Jeffrey Dellaquila represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Stokes summarized the project and explained that they expect a zoning refusal owing to the lot coverage, so the project will also be reviewed by the Center City Residents' Association and the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro objected to the overhanging bay windows, and questioned whether it is even legal to overhang the property line to such an extent.
 - Mr. Stokes responded that it is legal and that the Department of Licenses & Inspections' initial review did not comment on the two bay windows.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the projecting bays change the character of the block.
 - Mr. Stokes disagreed and responded that it is at the very end of a small, dead-end street and opined that the proposed design does not impact any of the historic houses on the street.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that this block of Panama Street is not an alleyway.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that the design of the addition is inappropriate to the character of the historic district.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented it is a beautiful street and that the proposed white building with bay windows is jarring.
 - Mr. McCoubrey questioned the height of the building, and whether the existing addition is driving the height.
 - Mr. Stokes responded affirmatively, explaining that they are building over the existing roof rather than removing it.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the existing addition is subdued, whereas the new addition projects bays and is taller and is more pronounced at the end of the street.
- Ms. Gutterman explained that she is troubled by the design as presented. She noted that an addition would likely be acceptable, but that the design should be more restrained.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed. He suggested that, if one buys into ins and outs of the façade, it would be better if it happened in more of a recessive mode rather than extending out over what is already a narrow street. He suggested that the design be restricted to within the street plane in order to have less impact on the block.

- Mr. Stokes responded that part of the reason for the bays is to provide additional interior space.
- Mr. Dellaquilla noted that there are houses on the street with projecting bays.
- The Committee members noted that no photographs of those buildings have been provided, and that they doubt that the bays are square and of the same material as the façade.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that the rigidity of the design and squareness of the bays are not appropriate for the context.
- Mr. Stokes asked whether the Committee objects to the use of stucco, noting that there are many stucco buildings and additions in the neighborhood.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that it is not the stucco as a material that she is responding to per se, but the whiteness of the stucco, the shape of the openings, and the projection of the bay windows. She argued that it does not look like it belongs in this neighborhood on this block. She suggested looking for inspiration of other bays on the block.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that bay windows are usually more window than wall and are not the same material as the façade.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Neighbor Jim Hammond of 1714 Panama Street explained that, as the closest owner-occupied home to the addition, he has several concerns. His first concern are the overhanging bay windows. He noted that the front of house his house faces north, so he is reliant on reflected natural light. The overhangs, he argued, would reduce his natural light. His second issue is the overall design aesthetic, which seems more appropriate for Miami than Rittenhouse Square. He noted that it is an inconsistent design choice on a street with homes largely consisting of red brick or painted brick. He explained that he is fine with the concept of an addition, and to the proposed height, but that the addition should be limited to the property line and the bay windows should be eliminated.
- Neighbor Kelly Chaido agreed with Mr. Hammond's comments. She opined that the overall look and aesthetic of the existing addition was a bad design in the 1980s, and now the aesthetic has been escalated to two full lots and two to three stories in height. She argued that it is incompatible with the charming and tiny block of red brick with Federal and Georgian appearance. She stated that the materials and design choice and protrusions are inappropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The height of the proposed addition is compatible with the historic property and its context.
- The design is stark in comparison to the traditional brick rowhouses along the block.
- Stucco may be an acceptable cladding material, but its use as shown, particularly on the large bay windows, is inappropriate.
- The detailing of the design, as well as the shape, size, and projection of the bays is inappropriate for the context and incompatible with the block and the Rittenhouse Fittler district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application is not compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion of the historic district and therefore fails to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the projecting bays, detailing, and starkness of the design in relationship to Panama Street and the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1718 Delancey PI MOTION: Denial; Standard 9 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				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 208-10 REX AVE

Proposal: Construct 4 twins; rehabilitate building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Hewson and Virginia Baltzel

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 1857; William L. Hirst/Louis I. Duhring House; additions 1893, 1927 by Louis Duhring

Individual Designation: 1/1/3000

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application seeks guidance from the Historical Commission about potential redevelopment of a property currently under consideration for designation. The existing property at 208-10 Rex Avenue features a large Italianate villa with an Arts and Crafts addition, designed by H. Louis Duhring, who was also the owner of the property from 1919 to 1946. The historic property is surrounded by a large yard and has featured a semi-circular driveway since at least 1876. This application proposes to construct four sets of 3,000+ square foot twins and to create condominium units within the existing historic building. The new buildings would be accessed by a wide driveway. The semi-circular driveway would be replaced by a wide driveway for the new townhouses and a front-yard parking lot for the condominiums in the historic house.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert existing house into condominiums
- Create paved driveway and parking lot
- Construct eight townhouses

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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.

- The proposed project does not destroy historic materials that characterize the historic building, but does alter the spatial relationships that characterize the property. The NPS guidelines explain that any new additions should be subordinate to the historic building, and should be scaled and located far enough away from the historic building to maintain its character and that of the site and setting.
- The proposed construction is overly large, obstructs views of the historic house, and includes an excessive amount of paving that alters the sense of the expansive lawn.
- While residential in use, the proposed buildings have an institutional rather than residential appearance, and are incompatible with the residential property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9, but approval of some new construction on the site, provided it is of a residential character, is reduced in scale, does not obstruct views of the historic house, retains the sense of the curved drive, and the overall amount of paving is reduced.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:05:21

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Carl Primavera and architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Primavera noted that they are seeking in-concept approval for the redevelopment of the property in parallel with the review of the nomination proposing designation. He noted that, although his clients have concerns about the nomination and practicality of designation, they are trying to find a path forward and are seeking some new construction on the property to offset the cost of rehabbing the historic building. He explained that the Committee's input will ultimately allow them to move forward in a complicated process of dealing with the designation and zoning issues downstream. He expressed hope that the Committee's input will lead to a consensus that has so far been difficult to come to.
- Mr. Baker commented that the existing property is clearly a neighborhood asset, and that the existing building lays out very easily and nicely as four condominiums. He noted that it has been sitting on the market for a while as a single-family house and there have not been any buyers. He explained that they are trying to make new construction fit on the site and could work something out with the existing driveway per the staff recommendation. He acknowledged that the community has an architectural consultant and noted that he would be happy to work with them on appearance of new construction. He explained that they are early in the design process but that their intent is to take cues from the historic building, with flat roof architecture, compatible materials, and punched window openings.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the fundamental question is whether there is a need for so much new construction on the property. He opined that the massing and proposed

density on the site has a very different feel than the existing open site and the neighborhood context. He also noted that the steepness of the site impacts the proposed construction.

- Mr. Leighton responded that the RSA zoning district that allows for the twins ends at Crefeld St and then transitions to RSD-3 to the other side of the site. He explained that their proposed construction is intended to be in keeping with the zoning that is between the more-dense twin zoning and single-family zoning. He noted that management of the slope is what suggested to them the layout. He explained that rather than try to flatten the site to create an easier place to build, they are proposing that the driveway ascends the hill up the property. Each pair of twins steps up the hill, and there will be two different twin types.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned where the top of the mansion is relative to the proposed houses.
- Mr. Leighton responded that the existing house is 40 feet from the ground to the top of the roof, and the new buildings are average 38 feet on grade. He explained that the top of the existing house will be between the first and second pairs of twins.
- Mr. Leighton explained that the wide driveway and extra paving are intended to help the fire department address how to get an apparatus in to fight a potential fire in the railroad. He noted that they could look into limiting the pavement and providing enough support for the fire trucks under landscaping. He explained that the area in front of the mansion is proposed to be a stormwater management area, with a combination of subterranean infrastructure and beautiful landscape. For parking for the condominiums in the existing house, they have proposed a lot with eight spaces and six parallel parking spaces for visitors along the driveway to limit street parking.
- Mr. Leighton explained the layout of existing building into four condos, with the undercroft and first floor in older part of mansion as one unit, with a two-story unit above. The hallway created by Duhring for the addition would provide access to two bi-level apartments in the historic addition.
- Mr. Primavera commented that the side lot shown in their plans as 210 Rex Avenue was part of the original parcel but has been separately conveyed by the family in the twentieth century, so they see it as two separate sites. He opined that the proposal does not change the property's character-defining features. He noted that Hill House looms over the property at the rear, and opined that this discrete infill is consistent with the neighborhood. He argued that no one is going to buy the mansion and put in the money to make it a grand home again. He argued that the market for the type of proposed housing will be strong and the proceeds of the infill will underwrite the cost of the rehabilitation of the historic building.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that it sounds like a financial hardship argument. He noted that they will be getting income from the condoization of the historic building itself, plus eight new single-family dwellings on not that large of a site.
 - Mr. Primavera responded that the property is 1.4 acres, in a dense part of Chestnut Hill where the average lot size is smaller. He noted that if it were not for the nomination, they would have gone through a zoning exercise, but they are trying to avoid a situation where the nomination goes to the Commission, the Commission designates the property, and then a year later they come back with a financial hardship application and get the designation rescinded. He opined that that sets the wrong mood for preservation. He asserted that they know the property would have a hardship. He noted that they tried to align the review of

the new construction with the designation so the Commission can do something forward-looking rather than piecemeal.

- Mr. McCoubrey responded that, without the benefit of a hardship review, they have no idea what density on the site needs to be.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the closest proposed building to Rex Avenue is not set back far enough and negatively impacts the property, blocking views of the historic house and interrupting the setting for the original house.
 - Mr. Primavera responded that they are trying to prioritize what is special about the property, which, he opined, is the front view. He noted that they hope that through this process, the Commission will identify and prioritize the special aspects of the property so they can avoid stepping on a priority if they can design around it.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. McCoubrey, arguing that the mansion needs to stand alone and not look like it is part of a development.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that they have taken one of the greatest properties in the garden suburb of Chestnut Hill and ruined its context in the landscape. He agreed that some development of the property would be acceptable, particularly at the back of the site. As proposed, he noted, the driveway even widens as it gets closer to the house, making the proposed development and paving come within a few feet of the mansion.
 - Mr. Primavera responded that he understands. He explained that in initial conversations with the neighborhood, parking was very important, so they tried to provide more parking than they might have otherwise.
- Mr. Cluver opined that he might take a different approach from the other Committee members. He agreed with the sense that the proposed construction and paving crowds the historic building and leaves only a sliver of green in front. He noted that he could almost buy into the concept of a narrow road being built between original house and new houses, with six smaller twins of a residential scale being built along the side with no cut out for parking, and a turn around and parking at the rear. He opined that, because of the way the site slopes up, anything built behind the house will tower over it.
 - Mr. Detwiler and Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that they should limit the new construction to a smaller zone and should preserve the sweeping landscape and curved driveway.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, noting that the twins do not all need to be the same size, and perhaps could be reduced in scale.
 - Mr. Leighton responded that they looked at a scheme for what it would mean to enter on Rex Avenue with a narrower driveway and turnaround and out onto Hilltop, but that the topography where Hilltop turns into Crefeld is a steep slope into 208 Rex Avenue.
 - Mr. Baker commented that there is greater density at Millman Place so they are taking cues from there and on Hilltop Road.
 - Mr. Detwiler acknowledged that there is some greater density in the neighboring area, but noted that this property is unique because of the large Italianate mansion sitting in the middle of a large yard.
 - Mr. Baker responded that parking in the rear is interesting and viable option, but that they have to be able to get "economic steroids" into the property to make it work.

- Mr. Detwiler responded that he finds it hard to believe that four units in the historic house plus eight new houses are the minimum number to make the rehabilitation of the historic house viable.
- Mr. Baker responded that this is what worked for the developer.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the Committee has not yet addressed the architecture of the proposed construction, but that the massing and layout need to be addressed first. He noted that, as a general comment, the proposed construction should relate to massing and materials to the historic property, since it is not in a historic district.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that the property is in a National Register-listed historic district.
- Mr. Primavera noted that they appreciate the Committee's input, and that the exercise is one that brings out many issues. He expressed their desire to preserve the specialness of the mansion, but every time they move one thing, it impacts another part. He explained that they want to find out the key things stakeholders want to maximize and preserve, and where are the areas of flexibility.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jeff Gelles of the Rex Avenue Neighbors Association explained that the neighborhood group agrees with staff recommendation that the proposed development is incompatible with the historic property. He argued that the proposal is too intense for the property, and the new buildings too massive, tall, institutional, and dense. He noted that the surrounding area is a well-balanced neighborhood, and that the proposal blocks and overwhelms views of the historic house from multiple directions. He urged the Committee to reject this concept, and explained that they look forward to a more appropriate development of the site.
- Sergio Coscia, architectural consultant for the Rex Avenue Neighbors Association, noted that the proposal lacks dimensions, setbacks, and relative scale, making it difficult to truly evaluate the proposal. He noted that the design is very vertical, but that the section drawing lacks detail, and does not show the fourth set of twins or how they relate to the historic building. He noted that it is not clear whether the proposed houses have pilot houses, and that, he estimates that the rear building is about 56 feet above the road. He opined that it would be easy to show more detailed elevation marks and give actual heights. He argued that the fact that the property is intact going back to the 1800s says something about the importance of this house and grounds to the neighborhood. He opined that the townhouses seem out of character and scale with the historic property and its context. He noted that the nomination talks about the property being an example of the suburban villa. He noted that, while there are some townhouses in Chestnut Hill, they are not prevalent on this type of property.
- Lori Salganicoff of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy explained that her organization nominated the property in 2017. She agreed with the staff recommendation and the Committee comments about the overly dense and out-of-scale proposal in concept for this site. She noted that the Rex Avenue open space perspective has been unchanged for many years and is a key view of the property. She noted that the proposal is for a side-oriented homeowner association, not a subdivision, in an RSD-3 zone, which calls for single family detached dwellings. The proposal calls for multiple primary houses on a lot that has not been subdivided for that purpose. She noted that existing twins facing Rex Avenue are on subdivided lots that have gone through that process and face the street. She objected to the side-facing development on a driveway that is meant to serve sort of like a road. She argued that

the semi-circular driveway is a character-defining feature of the historic property, but has been replaced with a parking lot right up against the street, which is not often seen in Chestnut Hill. She agreed with the applicants that they should find of areas of flexibility and areas of preservation, but opined that the neighborhood is not defining them the same way as the applicants. She noted that there are similar setbacks in the neighborhood but also very different ones, and larger lots than what is proposed. He noted that the proposal has not gone through any community review at the conceptual level or otherwise. She noted that the reviews by different parties may impact what the Historical Commission would ultimately consider, but urged the Architectural Committee to decline to recommend approval of this concept to the Historical Commission. She expressed her desire that the Historical Commission settle the question of the designation prior to talking about the appropriateness of the proposal.

- Near neighbor Linda Baldwin expressed her love for the historic building and the open space of the property. She noted that ideally it would be nice if someone would fix it up and convert it into a bed and breakfast or an art center. She objected not only to the density of the proposal, but aesthetically to the design, which she opined is commercial and stark. She suggested that some density may be acceptable if the buildings are charming and residential, perhaps with pointed roofs and front porches like those found on Midvale Avenue in East Falls.
- Near neighbor Alexis Vergnetti acknowledged that she can see why this design developed the way it did, but expressed concern over the scale of the proposal. She opined that eight buildings of 2500-3000 square feet each is too large. She suggested that a design that is quaint and more characteristic of the street would be acceptable, but not this proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed construction is overly large, obstructs views of the historic house, and includes an excessive amount of paving that alters the sense of the expansive lawn, and the property's significance as part of the garden suburb of Chestnut Hill.
- The proposed project does not destroy historic materials that characterize the historic building, but does alter the spatial relationships that characterize the property.
- While residential in use, the proposed buildings have an institutional rather than residential appearance, and are incompatible with the residential property and its environment.
- The applicants should explore options that restrict construction to the rear of the property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9, but approval of some new construction on the site, provided it is of a residential character, is reduced in scale, does not obstruct views of the historic house, retains the sense of the curved drive, and the overall amount of paving is reduced.

ITEM: 208-10 Rex Ave MOTION: Denial as proposed 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				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 11 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Raymond J. Evers
Applicant: Laurits Schless, LHS Residential Design
History: 1775
Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish a non-historic two-story rear addition, and construct a three-story rear addition on a slightly larger footprint, and also construct a stair hall with deck on the existing two-story sloped rear addition. Visibility of the rear of the property is limited to the side when looking east on Queen Street. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviewed a similar application in August and September 2020. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission determined that the massing, roof overhang, and overall architectural embellishments of the addition were not in keeping with the historic character, and the application was denied. The applicant and property owner did not participate in the reviews owing to the emails from the Historical Commission staff being routed to the applicant's spam folder. The applicant subsequently reviewed the meeting minutes and meeting recording and has submitted a new application based on the comments from the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. This design narrows the rear addition by an additional one-foot three-inches on the visible west side, simplifies the roof cornice, and simplifies the overall architectural embellishments of the addition.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish two-story rear addition; construct three-story rear addition.
- Construct stair hall with deck on existing rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the*

property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

- The proposed rear addition and stair hall with deck have been redesigned to be more compatible with the historic building's features, size, scale, and massing.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:56:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Laurits Schless and property owner Raymond Evers represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked about the difference in application materials between the prior submission and this submission.
 - Mr. Schless confirmed that the page showing sketches of views from Queen Street has not changed. He explained that the massing in the current application is slightly smaller than the original massing, the addition has been set back on the side an additional one-foot three-inches, the roof overhang has been minimized and simplified, and the overall architectural style has been simplified.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how the new roof structure will connect to the existing historic half gambrel roof. She stated that she would like to see the new structure not engage the historic structure.
 - Mr. Schless responded that he is proposing the use of an Acrymax coating system for the entire roof, which will not be seen from the public right-of-way. He stated that the connection between the new roof structure and the half gambrel roof is at the bottom of the bargeboard, but that he can look into lowering the roof even further at the connector, although it may not be possible owing to code requirements.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the use of Acrymax, which needs to be reapplied every five to 10 years, creates a maintenance issue for the homeowner and should be reconsidered.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern about the overall massing of the addition. She stated that she did not recall the Committee's comments from the previous review, and questioned if this application addressed the reasons for the previous recommendation of denial. She questioned why the applicant did not consider any of the comments from the previous review.
 - Mr. Schless reiterated the changes made in this application, including a reduction in setback on the side, minimization of the roof and roof overhang, and simplification of the overall architectural embellishments and style. He stated that the comments from the prior review were received loud and clear, but he did not take away from that review that the massing itself was not approvable. He explained that code requirements for the new third-floor master bedroom are driving the height.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the bump-up over the new door on the third floor rear elevation should be eliminated and the roofline carried straight across.

- Mr. Detwiler suggested holding back the third-floor deck to allow more of the roof to read.
 - Mr. Schless responded that the deck is more apparent in plan view, but not from the public right-of-way. He stated that he does not believe that the deck will be visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the depth of the balconies on the rear of the addition.
 - Mr. Schless stated that they extend past the rear of the neighboring property.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the horizontal nature of the new windows proposed for the side of the existing house.
 - Mr. Schless explained that he wanted to relate to the existing second-floor window, but also have the windows centered in the dining room if possible. He explained that they are drawn as operable awning transoms to keep them modest compared to the historic windows.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he has no objection to the three-story addition, and that efforts have been made to keep it minimal. He stated that every effort should be made to protect and preserve as much of the sloped rear roof which would mean changing or eliminating the small deck that is in the middle. He stated that the way the connector roof hits the half gambrel needs to be detailed carefully and not interrupt the simple rear cornice. He noted that most of the scope is minimally visible, with the exception of the new windows in the side wall. He explained that, as proposed, they look out of place. He suggested one window that is more vertical as a possible solution.
 - Mr. Schless explained that he is trying to get light into the dining room, but that he can revise it for review by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Evers responded to Committee comments and explained his history of caring for the property and the need for additional living space.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Visibility of the rear of the property is limited to the side when looking east on Queen Street.
- The existing two-story rear addition is non-historic and may be removed.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed rear addition and stair hall with deck have been redesigned to be more compatible with the historic building's features, size, scale, and massing, but that additional modifications are required to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, but approval, with the staff to review details, with the following revisions:

- The third-floor roof is at least one foot below the height of the gambrel roof;
- The third-floor deck is reduced in size or eliminated;
- The third-floor balcony is eliminated and proposed door becomes a window;
- The bump-up at third-floor rear door/window opening is eliminated;
- The design of new windows at first-floor side of existing building is reconsidered.

ITEM: 11 QUEEN ST MOTION: Denial as presented 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				
Amy Stein					X
Total	5				1

ADDRESS: 113-29 BERKLEY ST

Proposal: Demolish building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Wayne Junction Properties

Applicant: Angie Williamson, Philly Office Retail

History: 1884; Keystone Dry Plate & Film Works; Moore Push Pin

Individual Designation: 12/12/2014

District Designation: Wayne Junction Historic District, Contributing, 7/13/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish the former industrial building at 113-29 Berkley Street in the Germantown section of the city. It claims that the building cannot be feasibly reused, that requiring its preservation would impose a financial hardship on the property owner. The financial hardship application will be reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship as well as the Historical Commission.

The building at 113-29 Berkley Street is a two-story plus basement former light-manufacturing building constructed in 1884 for the Keystone Dry Plate & Film Works. It is 13,320 square feet in size. The property was purchased by Wayne Junction Properties in 2018. Its last use was by Recovery King, an addiction treatment center. The Historical Commission individually designated the property as historic in 2014, and again in 2018 as a contributing building to the Wayne Junction Historic District. Both nominations were authored by Historical Commission staff. The nominations argued that the building was significant under Criteria for Designation A, G, and J. Satisfying Criterion A, John Carbutt, founder of the Keystone Dry Plate & Film Works, was a pioneer of mass-market dry plates for photography, and produced the first commercial x-ray plates in the world in his Wayne Junction factory. Edwin Moore, who operated out of the factory beginning in 1912, was the inventor of push-pins. He went on to patent picture hangers and map tacks, also manufactured out of the Wayne Junction factory. Satisfying Criteria G and J, Wayne Junction Station was the locus of mills and factories that capitalized on rail transportation to move in raw goods and send out finished products. Other industries soon followed the lead of John Carbutt, and Berkley Street between Germantown Avenue and Wayne Avenue became an industrial headquarters.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance prohibits the Historical Commission from approving the complete demolition of a historic building 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 cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted in order to justify a demolition, 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. This application claims that the condition of the building and the cost to repair it prohibit a sale or reuse of the building.

Philly Office Retail, LLC is the management company of Wayne Junction Properties, with Ken Weinstein as the owner of both. The application includes a cover letter from Mr. Weinstein that explains that he is seeking a finding of financial hardship owing to four main reasons: 1) the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is, or may be, reasonably adapted, owing to years of deferred maintenance under prior ownership which requires immediate and costly repairs of critical elements; 2) the building cannot provide a reasonable rate of return as is, and cannot be renovated to provide a reasonable rate of return; 3) the inability to obtain state and/or federal tax credits further increases the projected losses of a renovation; and 4) the blighted property negatively impacts ongoing redevelopment efforts in the Wayne Junction area. The cover letter concludes that:

“the rehabilitation of 113 Berkley Street is impractical and infeasible due to the significant cost of necessary repairs compared to the after renovated value of the property. This creates a financial hardship for the owner which would result in a substantial financial loss both in terms of overall value and ongoing cash flow. We respectfully request that the Philadelphia Historical Commission grant this application for financial hardship.”

The application includes an affidavit from Mr. Weinstein, and multiple exhibits. Exhibit “A” provides a financial expense report for 2019 and 2020 for the property. In those two years, Philly Office Retail spent \$544,518 on the property. Of that, \$290,000 was for removing accessory structures, site clearing and environmental remediation, and \$78,000 was for architectural and engineering costs associated with the planned redevelopment of the remaining structure. Exhibit “B” provides an appraisal for the property. The cost of buying and renovating the property is \$2.147 million more than the as-completed appraised market value, \$3.9 million versus \$1.8 million. Exhibit “C” provides a structural engineering report. The report concludes that the preservation of the building may not be economically feasible owing to its structural condition and the significant work required to stabilize and upgrade it to meet code requirements. Exhibit “D” shows the original plans for adaptive reuse. The Historical Commission staff confirms that iterations of these plans were reviewed and approved over the past two years. Exhibit “E” provides financial projections including proposed renovation budgets, pro formas, and projected rent rolls. Even with anticipated rents for all three floors, the analysis predicts a negative cash flow through its first decade with a net present value of negative \$349,189. Incorporating historic tax credits results in negative cash flows every year and a net present value of negative \$437,292. The analysis adjusting for a light-industrial tenant predicts negative cash flows every year and a net present value of negative \$2,274,642. The owner acknowledges that Philly Office Retail has been willing to take a loss on initial value of historic properties in the past, but states that this loss is more than can be reasonably absorbed. Exhibit “F” includes letters of support for the application from immediate neighboring businesses. Exhibit “G” provides interior and exterior photographs of the subject building. The application

concludes with meeting minutes from the designation of the property, and a copy of the Wayne Junction Historic District nomination.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that:

- The complete demolition of the designated resource triggers the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. For the Historical Commission to approve the complete demolition, the applicant must demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The construction cost estimate relative to the appraised value indicates that it is unlikely the building can be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The construction cost estimate relative to the appraised value indicates that it is likely that a sale of the building for reuse purposes is impracticable without a substantial financial loss.
- The financial analysis demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The Historical Commission may approve the application, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:31:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Ken Weinstein and his staff at Philly Office Retail, Angie Williamson, Jaime Rodriguez, and Kate Schoener, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Weinstein provided background on Philly Office Retail and its history of reusing historic buildings. He stated that the building is too structurally unsound to save, that most of the foundation is not in place, and that it appears that footings were never put in. He stated that the estimated cost to renovate the building is close to \$4 million, but the appraised value would be \$1.8 million. He concluded that the loss is more than can be absorbed.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the various rehabilitation costs provided in the application.
 - Ms. Schoener explained that they explored three different options. Option One was the scope approved by the Historical Commission's staff that included rebuilding the rear wall with an alternative material rather than brick. This was \$267 per square foot. Option Two was for a light industrial use, which was \$238 per square foot. Option Three utilized historic preservation tax credits, and was \$341 per square foot. The primary driving cost of all options was restoration and structural work.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the higher cost of utilizing historic tax credits.
 - Ms. Schoener responded that the main driving factor is the restoration of the brick. The handmade brick was approximately \$115 per square foot for replacement. The rear wall would also have to be rebuilt to strict historic standards, and required interior finishes also increased the square foot cost.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the cost of new construction on the site compared to the \$267 per square foot rehabilitation cost.
 - Ms. Schoener responded that it is a difficult comparison, because any new construction project on the site would be grander in size and therefore the cost

would be reduced when compared to the 11,000 square foot building. She stated that, depending on size, a new construction cost would be closer to \$150 per square foot.

- Mr. Weinstein added that it is also an economic question, noting that if this building were located in Center City, it would command higher rents, and this would be a very different discussion. He explained that, while he is trying to improve Wayne Junction, the rents are not there to justify a rehabilitation cost of \$267 per square foot.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the Wayne Junction Historic District contains very few buildings, and therefore the demolition of this building would be a significant loss. Mr. Detwiler added that it is the only property in the historic district that is also individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
 - Mr. Weinstein agreed that it is a significant loss, and noted that his company owns most of the remainder of the properties in the historic district, and is able to save those.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the development plans for the site.
 - Mr. Weinstein responded that it will likely be some combination of new construction and parking, but that they do not yet know. He stressed that it will not remain simply a surface parking lot.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the possibility of maintaining the building as a shell or a facadectomy with an overbuild. He stated that the structural analysis says that the roof structure is in good condition but the flooring is not. He suggested using the shell and incorporating it into something new, or mothballing the building until something can be done.
 - Mr. Weinstein responded that the Department of Licenses and Inspections has found the building to be unsound. It cannot be used for any purpose at this point without major structural work, which is a significant amount of the square foot rehabilitation cost. He added that the building is also a blight. He explained that his company is trying to improve Wayne Junction, and the building is a blight on the community and a blighted building needs to either be reused or removed, if there is no future purpose. He stated that they cannot just leave it standing and hope for a better day. He stated that he is not clear what the long-term plan would be for mothballing it.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that maintaining the façade is important. He stated that there are ways to structurally stabilize it, and the front facade could be saved to serve as a sign, a sort of gateway into the historic district and represent the industrial nature of Wayne Junction.
 - Mr. Weinstein responded that cannot afford to keep this building as a sign that does not produce revenue. He stated that he has already put \$45,000 into stabilization so that the building did not continue to deteriorate while plans were being made. That stabilization did not reverse the deterioration.
 - Mr. Rodriguez discussed the condition of the façade brick. He explained that it was painted decades ago with an oil-based primer and paint, likely to cover up water damage that existed then. He explained that the condition of the brick is poor owing to years of deferred maintenance under prior ownership.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that incorporating the existing building into a larger development would be ideal. He suggested that the area is improving in part due to Mr. Weinstein's efforts, and there is future potential at this location.
 - Mr. Weinstein responded that he does not improve communities to try to gentrify them and cause rents to double or triple, but that is exactly what it would take to

develop this building down the road. He stated that if rents were to double years from now, then a rehabilitation of this building may work, but that is not what he is setting out to do in Wayne Junction, because it would change the fabric of the community.

- Ms. Gutterman asked about constructing an additional building to provide some of the needed funds to rehabilitate this building.
 - Mr. Weinstein responded that rents are not high enough that new construction could provide a profit to address the \$2.2 million needed to keep this building.
- Mr. Farnham cautioned the Architectural Committee regarding several of its recommendations thus far. He explained that the hardship provision is a key component of the historic preservation ordinance. The Historical Commission can regulate private property legally as long as the property owner is still able to obtain a reasonable rate of return from the property while the property is being regulated. The hardship provision is intended to prevent the Commission from acting in an unconstitutional manner, by compelling a private property owner to spend private money solely for public benefit, when that private property owner stops receiving a private benefit and is only providing a public benefit, that benefit being the preservation benefit to the public. He stated that he is concerned about suggestions of mothballing, or using this property as a sign or symbol for the district, in a way that cannot provide a reasonable rate of return on the property owner's investment, or predicated the recommendation today based on what might happen at the property in the future. He stated that the Historical Commission has to make a decision about whether or not it believes that this property can be reasonably adapted for a new use that will provide a reasonable rate of return. The courts would find it to be an unreasonable burden on a private property owner to require the construction of an adjacent building to subsidize this property. He acknowledged that the questions asked during this review are important, but the Architectural Committee must confine itself to whether or not this particular building can be reasonably adapted for a new use which would provide a reasonable rate of return for the property owner. Compelling a property owner to mothball a building with the hope of a reasonable rate of return in 10 or 20 years is not legal. Compelling a property owner to turn the building into a symbol of the industrial area that does not provide a reasonable rate of return is not legal. Compelling the property owner to develop an adjacent property to subsidize this property is not legal. The Historical Commission must reach a decision that is legally enforceable. He reiterated that the Commission staff has been working closely with Mr. Weinstein and his colleagues on this building for a long time, trying to find ways to preserve the building, but no solution has been found.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the applicant has clearly demonstrated that, given the potential income stream, there really is no way that the building can provide a reasonable rate of return for the property owner. He noted that Mr. Weinstein has a long track record of restoring and preserving historic buildings. He observed that there are fundamental structural issues which significantly add to the cost of preserving the building and also making the building fundamentally unstable. He referenced the designs produced to restore the building, but acknowledged that the financial analyses provided document that the rehabilitation costs far exceed the rate of return. He noted that there has already been a significant investment on the part of the owner.
 - Mr. Weinstein stated that all comments made during this review were the same as internal discussions where his team was attempting to have a different outcome for this building.

- Ms. Chantry noted that all written public comment received was provided to the Architectural Committee in advance of the meeting, and was made available on the Historical Commission's website.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested adopting the staff recommendation, but then decided to recommend denial of the application. She stated that she understands the financial component, but cannot vote to recommend demolition of a building that is a historic resource for the City of Philadelphia.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The complete demolition of the designated resource triggers the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. For the Historical Commission to approve the complete demolition, the applicant must demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The construction cost estimate relative to the appraised value indicates that it is unlikely the building can be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Demolition of a building listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial by a vote of 3 to 2.

ITEM: 113-29 BERKLEY ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey		X			
John Cluver		X			
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein					X
Total	3	2			1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 05:07:05

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 02:08 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.