

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

**TUESDAY, 28 MARCH 2023
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 9:01 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

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

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

- Bryant Snyder
- Tyler Sarnoski
- Nunzio Terra, Renewal by Andersen
- Nancy Pontone
- Frank Ceraso
- Jose Hernandez, JKR Partners
- Greg Cauterucci
- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
- Susan Wetherill
- Meg Saligman
- Hanna Stark
- Rebecca Shaffer
- Max Polichuk
- Agata Reister

Jay Farrell
Seth Brown
Dennis Carlisle
Allison Weiss
Robert Gurmankin
Todd Curry, Emerald Window
Tracy D. Best
Sean Whalen, Esq., Vintage Law
Natt Heckendorn
Ori Feibush
Eileen Quigley, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Scott Woodruff

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 500 N CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS BLVD

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building, construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Seth Brown, 500 NCCB FEE LLC

Applicant: Jose Hernandez, JKRP Architects

History: 1891-1910; Philadelphia Warehousing & Cold Storage Company

Individual Designation: 1/8/2021

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for the construction of a seven-story building at 500 N. Christopher Columbus Boulevard. This complex of buildings, historically known as the Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, was constructed between 1891 and 1910. When the property was designated in 2021, the one-story building known as the Boiler House was deemed non-contributing. This building will be demolished but the brick stack will be retained, as it was designated as a contributing element to the historic property. The demolition of the existing non-contributing building can be approved without a hardship or public necessity finding. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

This proposed new building would be constructed on the area where the non-contributing building stood as well as some open land to the south and east, which was not included in the designation. The building would stand 83 feet tall and be located at the corner of N. Front and Noble Streets with a front entrance along Noble Street. The exterior cladding materials would be metal panel, metal screen, and brick. The proposed design intends to be compatible with the industrial context of the historic property.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct seven-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old but compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed addition is compatible in its massing, size, scale, and materials. It is differentiated from the historic building in its architectural features. The staff recommends reconsidering the detailing of the connection between the historic building and new building along Front Street as the new building's detailing stands proud of the adjacent historic building. In general, the proposed application meets Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed addition could be removed from the historic site in the future, leaving all surrounding contributing structures intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jose Hernandez, attorney Brett Feldman, and owner Seth Brown represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked about the visibility of the new building from Interstate 95. He said that the view from the highway is the classic view of the site and the smokestack. Mr. Detwiler recommended that, prior to the Historical Commission meeting, the architect provide an accurate rendering from that vantage point.
 - o Mr. Hernandez responded that this view will be at approximately the height of the new building's third and fourth floor.
- Mr. Detwiler said that the new building appears to be blocking the views of the smokestack, which is a historic feature of the site. He stated that he understands that any new building would block some views but noted that it would be important for the design to offer glimpses and views of this structure.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated it is important to be able to see the courtyard with the smokestack. He referenced the Ben Franklin Courtyard at 318 Market Street as a good example of visibility and accessibility into a courtyard. Mr. D'Alessandro said that the design of the parking area could be revised to allow views of the smokestack from the public right-of-way along Front Street.
- Ms. Stein stated that, from a massing and design point of view, the proposal is very compatible with the historic property. She stated that she appreciates that the owner is saving these massive brick warehouses, which are not easy to adaptively reuse. Ms. Stein continued that adding a living structure in this location is going to activate the site. She stated that the use of glass and steel appeals to her because it harmonizes with the surrounding brick structures. She said she is pleased that the historic smokestack is being retained but, like her colleagues, has questions about its

location within the overall design. Ms. Stein said she does recommend increasing the space around the smokestack as the building is very close to it. She added that pedestrian and public access to it could be increased.

- Ms. Stein inquired if a structural assessment of the smokestack has been undertaken. She pointed out that, given the construction activity that would be occurring around the smokestack, it is important to ensure the structural stability of the smokestack prior to construction. Ms. Stein asked if there is a plan to stabilize or protect the smokestack during construction.
 - o Mr. Brown replied that they had Ascent look at the buildings on the property including the smokestack. He said that Ascent's report showed that it is generally in good condition but the area around the top of the smokestack will need to be repointed. Mr. Brown said that the repointing work will be done before any excavation or other work is done around the smokestack.
- Mr. Brown responded to the Architectural Committee's comments about the visibility and public views of the smokestack. He said that, as part of their overall planning for the site, their intent is to activate Beach Street for pedestrians. Mr. Brown explained there will be a walkway between the new building and another building located behind it that will allow access to the smokestack. He also stated that the building behind the new building is planned as a commercial space that will also provide views and access to the smokestack.
- Mr. D'Alessandro again expressed concern about visibility of the smokestack from the public right-of-way.
 - o Mr. Detwiler encouraged the architect to reconsider the design with regard to the smokestack.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed to the application's N. Front Street elevation rendering and the side where the new building meets the adjacent historic warehouse. He noted that north edge of the new building is shown as a metal beam projecting out in front of the historic building. Mr. Detwiler said he would prefer not to see a perfect butt joint between the old and new but rather see the new building set back a bit, whether it is slot in the building or something else. Mr. Detwiler provided some examples of how this may be done.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro said he agreed with Mr. Detwiler's comments.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey said he agreed with Mr. Detwiler's general idea about the connection between the building and said there should be a detail that acknowledges the separation between the new and old.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he agrees with Ms. Stein's positive comments about the proposed new building's overall character and articulation of the design. He commented on the building's current penthouse design and said he is not sure about the stripped-down design of the penthouse floor versus the floors below.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that he did like the current design of the penthouse level and would like to see some detail or cap at the top of the building like a cornice or small projection.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro noted that he liked that the top level was a lighter color than the darker frame on the lower floors.
 - o Mr. Hernandez replied that they could look at adding some articulation of some of the banding at the top of the building.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey said this could work because the main issue is the width of the banding at the top. He added that some banding or similar detail would provide shadow that would break up the flatness.

- Mr. McCoubrey suggested providing more visual access to the smokestack. He recommended revising the application for the Historical Commission meeting and adding some plans and images that better show how the smokestack will be accessed and appreciated on the site.
- Mr. D'Alessandro repeated that the smokestack and courtyard should be more a feature and highlighted. He stressed that it should be addressed as a major historic object of the site.
 - o Mr. Detwiler added that it is a bit of walk to get to the smokestack and should feel less like a back alley to get there and more of a pedestrian experience.
 - o Mr. Hernandez and Mr. Brown said they do have renderings showing how the smokestack is incorporated into site, but these were not included in this application. Mr. Brown pointed out that the base of the smokestack, which is approximately 15 feet by 15 feet is fairly plain and is currently hidden inside a building. He pointed to a photograph that showed that the visual decoration and detail on the smokestack begins approximately 40 feet above the ground. Mr. Hernandez and Mr. Brown indicated that additional renderings could be added to the application for the Historical Commission meeting.
 - o Mr. Farnham pointed out that the smokestack base is currently enclosed by a one-story building and historically the lower portion of the smokestack was never visible from the public right-of-way. He observed that there was not a courtyard around the base of the smokestack historically and any assertion that the area around the base should look like Franklin Court is not based in history.
- Mr. Cluver stated that this is a sound development and that he is in support of the project. He agreed that the Committee's comments are relevant and should be considered by the project team.
- Ms. Stein commented on the design of the first floor. She pointed out that the first level floorplan, specifically the lobby, and noted this could be redesigned and potentially offer a view through this level to the smokestack.
 - o Mr. Hernandez replied that they can revisit this and potentially make some changes in this area of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The new multi-use building will add residential and retail space to a property currently occupied industrial buildings and related uses.
- The new building will obscure parts of the smokestack currently viewed from the right-of-way. Based on the current application, it is not clear what the visibility of the stack will be through the building and from the pedestrian walkway on Beach Street.
- The current design shows the corner details of the new building projecting out in front of the historic brick building along N. Front Street.
- The current design of the top floor/penthouse level should be better incorporated into the overall design of the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition is compatible in its massing, size, scale, and materials. It is differentiated from the historic building in its architectural features. The Committee recommends reconsidering the detailing of the connection between the historic

building and new building along N. Front Street, visibility and accessibility to the smokestack, and the design of the penthouse level. In general, the proposed application meets Standard 9.

- The proposed new building could be removed from the historic site in the future, leaving all surrounding contributing structures intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. D'Alessandro moved to deny the application. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion to allow for a vote. The motion failed by a vote of 1 to 6.

ITEM: 500 N CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS BLVD MOTION: Denial of application as presented 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			
Allison Lukachik		X			
Amy Stein		X			
Total	1	6			

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, with suggestion for larger scale setback between historic building on Front Street and new building for reveal making corner visible and encouraging owner to find more ways to celebrate historic smokestack either visible through lobby or through more exterior public access, make site more permeable; and to drop parapet so it does not have such strong presence at top to minimize parapet wall.

ITEM: 500 N CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS BLVD MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro		X			
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6	1			

ADDRESS: 244-58 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Substitute fiber-cement panels for approved brick cladding

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 244 North 2nd Street OCF LLC

Applicant: Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design LLC

History: 1950, gas station, demolished 2022

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to amend an application for the construction of townhouses on a property at 2nd, Vine, New, and Philip Streets in the Old City Historic District. Philip Street is a very narrow alley that is not a public right-of-way. The Historical Commission approved the original application in April 2021. That application included the demolition a non-contributing gas station and construction of 11 new townhouses, four stories in height with roof decks, pilot houses, and garages. The project is currently under construction.

In January 2023, the Historical Commission reviewed an application proposing to revise the cladding material along Philip and New Streets from brick to fiber-cement panels. At that time, the Historical Commission voted to deny the replacement of the brick with fiber cement on the New Street façade because it faces the public right-of-way but did approve the fiber-cement cladding on New Street, provided the brick wrapped the corners at New and Vine Streets.

The current application, the second application proposing to amend the approved cladding materials, requests approval for using fiber-cement panels instead of brick on the Philip Street façade at the corner with New Street and on the New Street façade above the first-floor level. The cover letter states that “due to the current economic changes the owner of the development is forced to modify the approved in the past Materials, in order to see the project to its completion.”

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Substitute fiber-cement panels for approved brick cladding on New and Philip Streets.

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 will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed new material is not compatible with the materials and features of the surrounding context of the Old City Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:58:42

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Sean Whalen, architect Agata Reister, and owner Ori Feibush represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Whalen provided background on the overall project. He noted that the building exterior would only be highly visible from cars traveling along N. Second and Vine Streets and noted the other two elevations along New Street and Philip Street were less visible. Mr. Whalen said that all four elevations were originally proposed with brick cladding, and this is different from most new townhouses being built in Philadelphia today. He summarized the proposed changes and noted that this application focuses on select areas of New Street and Philip Street only and they would only be visible to pedestrians walking in these areas. Mr. Whalen stated that the exterior of the project is on hold right now until the exterior materials are approved by the Historical Commission. He said that part of this request for a change in materials is related to cost but also the current design is a jumble of materials. Mr. Whalen pointed out recent challenges with material and labor costs and said there is value engineering going on with the project both on the interior and exterior. He said that at this point the project is not financially viable and cannot be finished with full brick at New Street and that it could be finished with the fiber cement panel on the New Street elevation and the corner of Philip Street to get the best possible outcome.
- Ms. Stein responded to Mr. Whalen stating the Architectural Committee is not the Committee on Financial Hardship. She pointed out the Architectural Committee works to ensure that new buildings constructed within historic districts meet preservation standards. Ms. Stein continued that pedestrians are just as important as people in cars when looking at buildings. She said that with construction comes financial risk and the burden should not be placed on the public; rather the burden is on the developer. Ms. Stein stated that, if construction costs go up, why should the public have to accept something that is not compatible with the historic district. She added that this building will be in this district for 50 years, so they are approving something for the long term not for some short-term capital cost. She reiterated that they are not a financial committee and cannot respond to that part of this application request. The Architectural Committee determines what is architecturally appropriate. Ms. Stein recalled that the original application for this project was barely approved, and the project really needed the brick for the approval, owing to the scale and massing of the complex. She said she does not know how the Architectural Committee could approve this downgrade of materials when it really needed the brick for the original approval.
- Ms. Reister spoke about different options and ideas for the brick and fiber cement panels.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the last time this application was presented to the Historical Commission, the Commission specifically requested brick on the full New Street façade and for the brick to wrap the corner from New Street to Philip Street. He added this was their requirement in order to approve the fiber cement panels on the Philip Street elevation.
- Mr. Detwiler said there is a danger in the Historical Commission approving a project initially and then with subsequent applications slowly chiseling away at the original design approval. He recalled Ms. Stein's comments about the original approval of the

project. Mr. Detwiler noted that they did not love the initial application and it was the brick that helped get the project approved. He concluded by stating that he agrees with what the Commissioners concluded and approved during their last review of this project.

- Mr. D'Alessandro commented on costs of labor materials in the context of the overall project costs.
 - o Mr. Whalen noted that the labor costs for the installation of brick are higher than for fiber-cement materials.
- Ms. Lukachik noted that, since this project is well into construction, the materials should already have been purchased. She stated that the financial aspect is not within the Architectural Committee's purview.
 - o Mr. Whalen said he provided the financial information to the Architectural Committee to offer a full explanation of the issues related to this request to amend the application. He pointed out other recent construction projects nearby in the historic district that use materials other than brick.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that the Committee needs to make its decisions based on the overall historic district and not based on individual buildings.
- Mr. Feibush stated they have not yet ordered the majority of the cladding materials for the exterior. He said they worked exhaustively to improve the design both in the scale of the project and the materials on the elevations. Mr. Feibush noted they have also worked exhaustively with the Historical Commission on this project. He said the reason they have come back so many times is that they are trying to get this right and have been designing in collaboration with the Historical Commission's staff. Mr. Feibush said the standards for the neighborhood have been set by nearby projects that were previously approved by the Historical Commission. He said that they will need to keep coming back to the Committee and Commission until they get it right.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Robert Gurmankin, president of Franklin Bridge North Neighbors, opposed the application. He advocated for retaining brick on the New Street and Philip Street facades.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The focus must be on the proposed design and whether or not it meets the Standards.
- This request to revise the approved materials was prompted by recent increases in construction materials and labor costs.
- The New Street elevation is a primary façade. It is highly visible along a public street and from the surrounding public right-of-way.
- The façade along Philip Street is visible from both Vine Street and New Street. It is visible for pedestrians as well as cars on the street.
- The brick façade material was a key reason the original application for this project was approved.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new material is not compatible with the materials and features of the surrounding context of the Old City Historic District; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 244-58 N 2nd ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Stein					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1700 CHRISTIAN ST

Proposal: Legalize cladding of bays

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PA Holding Trust

Applicant: Joseph Serratore, Jos. Serratore & Co. Architects Inc.

History: 1870; William Allmond Funeral Home; mansard added, 2015

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Christian Street/Black Doctors Row Historic District, Significant, 7/8/2022

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of aluminum-panel cladding on the front and side bays of this corner building in the Christian Street/Black Doctors Row Historic District. The property is classified as Significant in the historic district, owing to its former ownership and occupation by William Allmond, a prominent Black undertaker and politician who used the building for his funeral home business and residence.

In June 2022, the Historical Commission approved a building permit application for interior work. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction over the historic district began on 7 April 2022. The associated drawings included building elevations but showed the existing bays as they had been restored several years prior, with no new work called out for these bays. By September 2022, the Historical Commission had been alerted to the fact that the bays had been clad in aluminum panels. The Historical Commission requested that the Department of Licenses and Inspections issue a violation for work that exceeded the building permit. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued the violation in January 2023, prompting this application for legalization. Note that there were other alterations to the exterior, including windows and a mansard addition, which were permitted and completed in 2015, prior to the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over this property. The bays were restored to their historic appearance by a prior owner at that time.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize aluminum cladding over front and side bay.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MARCH 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The aluminum cladding over the two bays does not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:25:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- General contractor representative Max Polichuk represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Polichuk stated that he was participating on behalf of the general contractor. He stated that the building was in poor condition when work started, and the windows and bays were leaking. He stated that the cladding was done as an effort to preserve what was already there. He claimed that it was a decision made after speaking to the building inspector, who said it could be done.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the paneling was included as part of the approved building permit scope.
 - o Mr. Polichuk responded that it was not included, and that is why this application to legalize work was submitted.
- Mr. Detwiler noted the good condition observed in the photographs prior to the cladding being installed. He stated that the cladding likely will not improve any issues related to water infiltration.
 - o Mr. Polichuk responded that he understands, but that the cladding was the best way to preserve what was already there.
 - o Mr. Detwiler countered that there was no preservation here, only removal of historic fabric. He stated that the work does not comply with the Standards.
- Mr. Cluver commented that if this were an application for a proposed scope rather than work already completed, he would recommend denial of the application.
 - o Other Committee members agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- In June 2022, the Historical Commission approved a building permit application for interior-only work. While working under that permit, contractors covered the exterior bays with aluminum panels, which exceeded the approved building permit scope. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for work which exceeded the building permit.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The aluminum cladding over the two bays does not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 1700 CHRISTIAN ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 27-29 N 3RD ST

Proposal: Cut accessible entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 27-29 N. 3rd Assoc., Urban Investment

Applicant: Eileen Quigley, Ballard Spahr LLP

History: 1870; Fraser, Furness & Hewitt; Manufacturers' National Bank

Individual Designation: 11/6/1980

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut down a front façade window opening into a door to allow for ADA access and a second means of egress for the building's proposed new use. The building was designed by Fraser, Furness and Hewitt in 1870 as the Manufacturers' National Bank. The existing basement window, a portion of granite façade, and lower window sash will be removed beneath the top sash of the existing round-arched window. The building is landlocked, with no rear or side exits to a right-of-way which could suffice for an accessible entrance. The only entry from the street is through the front door, which is three steps above the sidewalk. The staff has discussed the installation of a ramp at the front, but the narrowness of the parcel has led to the conclusion that a ramp is not feasible and would cause greater disruption to the front façade than the proposed cut-down of a masonry opening. The applicant will preserve the stone elements that are removed so that the original configuration could be restored in the future.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Cut down window opening into door to allow for ADA entrance and second means of egress.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MARCH 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The applicant has committed to salvaging the stone elements on site that are removed so that the original configuration could be restored in the future, satisfying Standard 10.
- *Accessibility Guideline | Recommended: Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.*
 - o The proposed alteration provides ADA access and allows for a second means of egress as required by the new use, while maintaining the width of the original window opening and the top window sash, complying with the recommendations of the Accessibility Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 1:32:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Eileen Quigley, architects Matt Heckendorn and Bryant Snyder, and equitable owner Meg Saligman represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Quigley stated that the proposed building alterations are intended to address accessibility and life safety deficiencies. The proposed use is for an art gallery, exhibition space, artist studio and accessory office. The building code requires alterations for accessibility and a second means of egress. The building is vacant now, but the past use was as an office. The goal of the design was to retain as much of the building's original character as possible.
- Mr. Snyder noted that the proposal calls for the removal of the northern first floor window, stone below the window, and basement window and grate at the sidewalk. A new at-grade entry door will be installed in the newly enlarged opening. The design will retain the shape of the opening and a custom oversized door will be installed to access an interior landing. This would allow access to the basement and first floor with a stair and wheelchair lift.
- Ms. Stein asked if the proposal is based on the need for occupancy approval or accessibility.
 - o Mr. Snyder responded that it is due to the change in occupancy from business to assembly, and this triggers the enhanced egress to meet the building code and to ensure accessibility.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked for clarification on the property owner.
 - o Ms. Quigley explained that Your Agency Incorporated is the equitable owner. City records list the property owner as 27-29 North 3rd Street Associates.

- Mr. Cluver commented that the two issues to consider are the right way to provide an accessible entrance, and the design details. He agreed that there are no good alternatives for providing a secondary egress and accessible entrance.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the height of the proposed door.
 - o Mr. Snyder identified the door as being 9'10" tall. The height is due to the use of the meeting rail of the double-hung window as the top of the door.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested the bottom of the door might be painted to mimic the color of the stone.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the design does not have to literally incorporate the current configuration of the bay.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that a chair lift could be installed on the exterior.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that a chair lift would not solve the need for a fire exit and second means of egress.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the potential to locate the second means of egress at the rear of the property rather than at the front.
 - o Mr. Heckendorn explained that the rear of the property is landlocked.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the door design looks clumsy by trying to match the current configuration of the north bay. He suggested keeping the double-hung window and installing a door below that. He asked about the width of the north bay opening.
 - o Mr. Snyder noted that the opening on the north bay is 3'9" wide.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the existing front door would continue to be used for egress.
 - o Mr. Snyder clarified that the existing main door will still be used for entrance and egress.
- Ms. Saligman explained that it was not her goal to alter the building's front façade, but the rear of the property cannot be used for egress owing to a lack of cooperation from the owner of the property that adjoins the rear of the building. She expressed agreement with incorporating the comments from the Architectural Committee into the new door. She declared that the building is deceptively large and should be shared with the public, and her goal is to put the building back into use.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that limiting the number of people in the building could alleviate the need for the second means of egress.
 - o Ms. Lukachik countered that limiting the number of people in the building would not alleviate the need for a second means of egress.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the black or dark grey shown in the proposed design was too dark.
 - o Mr. Snyder responded that they had not conducted a paint analysis.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested retaining the existing granite paving by the new door and relating the flooring inside to the granite.
 - o Mr. Snyder committed to retaining the granite paving.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the granite sill should be retained.
 - o Mr. Quigley responded that it would be retained and integrated into the interior of the new opening.
- Mr. McCoubrey expressed support for bringing the building back into use.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Reuse of the building for the proposed purpose requires a second means of egress and an accessible entrance in addition to the existing front door.
- The only means of entry and egress from the property is at the front façade on S. 3rd Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The applicant has committed to salvaging the stone elements on site that are removed so that the original configuration could be restored in the future, satisfying Standard 10.
- The proposed alteration provides ADA access and allows for a second means of egress as required by the new use, while maintaining the width of the original window opening and the top window sash, complying with the recommendations of the Accessibility Guideline.
- The metal grill should be retained and displayed in the interior, and the new door should be contextual without literally replicating elements of the current façade design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ITEM: 27-29 N 3rd ST MOTION: Approval 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 Guttermann	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2200 PINE ST, UNIT 109

Proposal: Install Fibrex windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Betsy and Christopher Lee

Applicant: Frank Ceraso, Renewal by Andersen

History: 1895; Cope & Stewardson, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install Andersen Fibrex windows on the front and side façades of this corner property at 22nd and Pine Streets, designated as part of the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. Neither the frames nor the muntin pattern will match the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MARCH 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

original design. This is especially the case in the proposed “Circle Top” window above a double-hung window replacing the existing round-top window on the third floor. The application indicates a 6/6 muntin arrangement rather than the existing 6/1 of the five of the six windows to be replaced. Provided drawings do not include profiles of the proposed window frames in this “full tear” replacement.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace six windows with Fibrex replacement windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:00:28

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Contractor Frank Ceraso represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Ceraso asked for clarification on the appropriate window configuration.
 - o The Architectural Committee members responded that the windows should be 6-over-1, except for the arched 1-over-1 window.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the application does not have details on the frames of the proposed windows or how they will be installed.
- Mr. Ceraso noted that they are proposing a full replacement, not just an insert, and have some flexibility in terms of installation, and that a full frame replacement would allow them to more closely approximate the original details.
- Mr. Cluver explained that the application needs elevations, sections, and plans showing the profiles and dimensions of the proposed windows and how they fit in the openings as compared to the existing windows. He noted that there is a potential for these windows to create a condition that is in sharp contrast to the floors below.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale confirmed that the staff previously requested that documentation, but did not receive it.
- Mr. D’Alessandro noted that another consideration is the retention of existing fabric. He suggested that the windows be repaired rather than replaced and questioned whether documentation has been provided to attest to their condition.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that there are seven windows mentioned in the application but only six window openings called out.
 - o Mr. Ceraso responded that the seventh window is the arched transom being installed over a double-hung window in the opening where there is currently a single arched window.

- Mr. Ceraso opined that Fibrex has a wood look because it is comprised of 40% wood and noted that they are not proposing to install aluminum trim.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Todd Curry of Emerald Windows expressed concern about the proposed windows, explaining that the proposed window system cannot replicate the appearance of the historic windows or be made to look like a historic window. He noted that the full replacement will not present the same as a wood window, particularly if there is aluminum cladding around the frame.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The correct window configuration for the property is 6-over-1 for the rectangular window openings and 1-over-1 for the arched window opening, with no arched transom.
- The application lacks critical information including the dimensions and details of the various components of the proposed windows and frames versus the existing windows and how they will be installed within the openings.
- The applicant should consider repairing the existing windows instead of replacing them.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not demonstrate that the proposed windows will replicate the historic appearance in design, color, texture, or materials, failing to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 2200 PINE ST, UNIT 109 MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 772 S FRONT ST, UNIT 110

Proposal: Install Fibrex windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tracey Best

Applicant: Nunzio Terra, Renewal by Anderson

History: 1836-46; buildings reconstructed, 1970

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 3/31/1964

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing Anderson Fibrex windows on the front façade of this rowhouse fronting on Clymer Court, a gated private courtyard, in Queen Village. The new windows do not match the original design and will build down the openings. The application does not include drawings that show how the subframes of the Fibrex window would fit the existing frames. The existing plank frames should remain exposed as part of any window replacement and should not be capped over in aluminum. The new windows also feature between-glass grills in place of real muntins. Nine buildings on the south side of Clymer Court were all constructed in the early nineteenth century prior to 1846. Between 1968 and 1970, they were rehabilitated and converted into five larger homes; the front facades were demolished and rebuilt at that time. This particular unit, Unit 110, had an addition built on its right side during the conversion process. The current windows appear to date from the reconstruction period and feature a six-over-six pane configurations.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install Fibrex replacement windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:12:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Contractor Nunzio Terra and property owner Tracey Best represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked for clarification as to why there are two dates listed for designation.
 - o Mr. Till and Mr. Farnham explained that sometimes two dates are listed because the Historical Commission has either designated a property a second time due to

incomplete earlier documentation or in error. Mr. Farnham pointed out the early dates listed as additional evidence.

- Mr. Cluver explained that the Architectural Committee needs to understand how the new windows compare to the existing ones. He added that the application does not include actual elevations or details or a comparison of existing and proposed. He also added that the grilles-between-glass detail on the new windows is inappropriate.
- Mr. Terra commented that there is a misconception about the nature of Fibrex windows. He explained that they do not just finish windows with aluminum and that they are able to replicate the existing appearance. They can keep or rebuild existing frames and the Fibrex windows look identical to wood from a few feet away. He pointed out an older project at 2038 Wolf Street where the Commission approved these windows.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant to focus on the existing proposal since the Architectural Committee does not have the Wolf Street project information at hand. He added that they want to see how the new profiles and dimensions of the sash and frames affect the windows and to what extent the inserts will reduce the window openings. They also want to see sill head and jamb details for the proposed new windows.
 - o Mr. Cluver added that the dimensions and ratios of the individual panes of glass are also important. There are no drawings to show the comparison.
 - o Mr. Terra responded that he can submit drawings showing the comparison. He added there is no glass loss for the new windows. He also pointed out that this property is not visible from the street and that multiple neighbors have vinyl windows installed. He claimed that he can build the new windows however the Commission suggests.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicant ask the staff for details on the drawings that they need to submit and the guidelines that need to be followed for approval.
 - o Mr. Cluver added that the information submitted was not enough for the staff to review the application.
 - o Mr. Terra stated that they are not looking to change the appearance of the windows and want to abide by any guidelines that are required.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the work was needed in the first place. He questioned why the existing windows need replacement.
 - o Mr. Terra responded that the existing windows are single-pane wood windows which are rotting, inoperable, and coated with lead paint.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the entire windows do not need replacement. The sashes could be replaced in kind and storm windows could be added for insulation.
 - o Mr. Terra questioned if the Architectural Committee's recommendation is to replace with single pane windows and add exterior storm windows.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro responded that interior storm windows could be used.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey added that sash replacements with better insulated panes is something that the Architectural Committee could approve. He emphasized that if the applicant provides the proper documentation to the staff and he complies with the Standards, the staff may be able to approve the application.
 - o Mr. Detwiler emphasized that the applicant would need to provide a full detailed series of drawings to the staff showing the proposed new windows and the existing windows for comparison.

- Ms. Best asked if it would make sense for them to use the current windows as a template for measurements for the replacements.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the application would also have to show exterior muntins rather than grilles between glass.
 - o Mr. Terra confirmed that they could change the proposal to show simulated divided lite muntins. He added that he will contact the staff to obtain the information he needs to submit additional application materials.
- Ms. Stein pointed out that the historical photographs of the building show the windows on the ground floor might have had a different muntin arrangement in the past.
 - o Ms. Best explained that the current windows have been on the building for quite some time and match the wood windows on neighbors' homes.
 - o Mr. Till explained that the oldest photograph provided showing larger multi-lite windows was taken prior to the significant rehabilitation project in 1968-70. As part of that project, the facades of the row were reconstructed, and the current windows appear to date from that time period. That work was done after the property was designated.
 - o Ms. Best confirmed that her existing windows appear to match those that were installed during the rehabilitation project, and that this is the design which should be replicated for new windows.
 - o Ms. Stein asked the Architectural Committee to defer to the staff to make that determination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application submitted fails to provide the shop drawings and additional information needed to determine whether the new windows will appropriately replicate the historic appearance.
- The proposed grilles between glass are not an acceptable detail for the new windows.
- The applicant should submit revised and supplemented documentation to the staff for further guidance.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed windows do not match the historic windows in design or materials and therefore fail to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 772 S FRONT ST, UNIT 110 MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 27 DRUIM MOIR LN

Proposal: Replace small shed dormer with larger eyebrow dormer

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ori Feibush

Applicant: Scott Woodruff, Designblendz Architecture

History: Brinkwood, 1887, G.W. and W.D Hewitt, architects

Individual Designation: 6/5/1980

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace a small shed dormer with a larger eyebrow dormer to expand a third-floor pass-through space into a usable room at Brinkwood, a historic house on a large estate with several residences known as Druim Moir. The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier version of this proposal in January 2023 and the Historical Commission approved a much-revised version in February 2023. The dormer would be added to the rear of the building, opposite the main façade, which faces the garden. The roof that would be impacted has limited visibility from Druim Moir Lane, a private road.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish small dormer and portion of roof.
- Construct larger dormer to extend usable third-floor space.

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.*
 - o The proposed dormer is large in size and scale in comparison to other elements of the façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the dormer is reduced in size so as not to intersect with the chimney, and to be subordinate to the dominant gable on the façade, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:28:15

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Scott Woodruff and owner Ori Feibush represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked about the discussion of this project at the February meeting of the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. McCoubrey described the two-dormer arrangement proposed at that meeting and summarized the Commissioners' conversation, which resulted in approval of a single large dormer.
- Mr. Detwiler sought clarification from the applicant on the chimney location and size, which appears differently in the renderings.
 - Mr. Woodruff answered that the depiction of the larger chimney, which would intersect the proposed dormer, was correct.
 - Mr. Detwiler opined that the relationship between the dormer and the chimney is important and that the proposed dormer is oversized. He further commented that the shed dormer form would be more appropriate given that it is what currently exists, and that it would be better in relationship with other elements of the façade.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the "eyebrow" shape makes the dormer larger without adding interior space.
- Mr. Cluver and Mr. Detwiler opined that centering a dormer over the bays below would be preferable.
- Ms. Lukachik and Mr. D'Alessandro expressed aversion to the form of the dormer, the latter stating that it draws too much attention from the façade as a whole.
- Mr. Feibush stated that only his family and future owners would view this particular façade and that it is not visible to the general public.
 - Ms. Stein noted that the building is individually designated. The Historical Commission is tasked with preserving the integrity of the structure.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that he has worked on properties far from the public rights-of-way which were still required to retain historic features to satisfy the Standards.
- Mr. Detwiler reiterated that the Committee is open to the concept of a large dormer.
- Ms. Lukachik expressed that centering the dormer as proposed over the bays below would pull it away from the chimney.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed dormer is large in size and striking in form.
- The Architectural Committee was not provided with the elevations or plans reflecting the approved concept from the February meeting of the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- A larger dormer, while requiring removal of the existing shed dormer and roof material, is acceptable.
- The proposed dormer is out of balance with other features of the façade, owing to its distinctive form and overall scale.
- A shed dormer would be more appropriate in form on this façade.
- Design options reflecting the previous deliberation and approval by the Historical Commission in February should be provided to the Historical Commission in addition to these designs at the April meeting.

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

ITEM: 27 DRUIM MOIR LN					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:48:20

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:49 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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