

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

**TUESDAY, 25 OCTOBER 2022
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
NAN GUTTERMAN, ACTING CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Acting Chair called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

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
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Kerrian France, Historical Commission intern

The following persons were present:

Charles Whitlock
Lindsey Glasgow
Melanie Lacey
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Pearse Walsh
Carolina Peña, Parallel Architecture Studio
Anabel Peña, Parallel Architecture Studio
Param Doshi
Matt Masterpasqua
Allison Weiss
Persefoni Kapotas
Nancy Pontone
Hsing-Yuan Chen, Sky Design Studio
Michael Mattioni, Esq.
Jay Farrell

AGENDA

ADDRESSES: 705, 711, 713, AND 717 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions, replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 705 717 Pine Street Associates

Applicant: Carolina Peña, Parallel Architecture Studio

History: 1835

Individual Designations: 4/30/1957

District Designations: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to construct rear additions, replace windows, and install new roofing at 705, 711, 713, and 717 Pine Street. The roofing scope can be approved by the staff. The staff can also approve window replacement, provided shop drawings accurately depict the new windows within the existing masonry openings. The front façade windows and any windows at the rears or sides that are visible from the public right-of-way should match the appearance of the historic windows.

At its 27 September 2022 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application for a similar scope and voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9. Recommendations were made to redesign the Delancey Street facades to appear more like fronts of homes rather than rears. The Committee also recommended removing the overbuild from the scope for 705 Pine Street. The applicant withdrew the application shortly after the Committee meeting so as to incorporate comments from the Committee in a revised design.

The application has since been revised in response to Committee comments. At 705 Pine Street, the massing of the addition at the rear has been entirely moved off of the existing historic rear ell and held to just the rear wall of the rear ell, which is landlocked and not visible from any public right-of-way.

At 711, 713, and 717 Pine Street, which run through to Delancey Street at the rear, the scope has been revised to provide for an improved pedestrian experience on the block, but still conform to zoning requirements, which are driving much of the massing and design. In the prior application, existing garage and roll-up doors fronting Delancey Street were retained. The application has been revised to instead use black steel gates in lieu of the existing solid garage doors, and red brick on the facades facing Delancey Street.

The staff notes that the Architectural Committee focused much of its recommendations on making these additions appear to be fronts of houses in order to be compatible with the residential streetscape. Since that time, the staff has walked the block and determined that the Committee may not have been provided with complete information as to the streetscape during the prior review. On the 700 block of Delancey Street, only one residential building fronts the block, which was constructed in the early 2000s. There are two very large parking structures for Pennsylvania Hospital, and several ancillary hospital buildings, which are residential in scale but do not read as fronts of houses. The remaining structures fronting Delancey Street are the one-story garages in question. The staff notes that, while the existing block is not residential in character, most of the structures are red brick and therefore the change to red brick in this revised application will help these additions to be contextual in materials. The staff suggests

that, given the existing streetscape of this block, it is appropriate for these additions to read as rear additions.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rear additions on four properties.
- Replace windows on four properties.
- Install new roofing on four properties.

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.*
 - Replacement of front façade features dating to a 1973 renovation, such as window sash to match the historic appearance, satisfies Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed rear additions are differentiated yet compatible with the historic properties and their environment in massing, size, scale, and architectural features, satisfying Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the applications to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carolina Peña and attorney Michael Mattioni represented the applications.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver commented that the fiber cement panel proposed for the sides of the additions is not appropriate and should be brick or red stucco to blend with the surrounding context.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that this material can be changed.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver. He suggested an elimination of the knife edge of the corners created by the change in materials.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the proposed gates are providing a view into a parking area. He suggested solid garage doors between brick piers.
 - o Ms. Stein disagreed, opining that the proposed gates are acceptable.
- Ms. Stein stated that the rear decks as proposed are not compatible with the historic district. She stated that the decks are too deep and create shadow lines. She recommended narrow Juliet balconies in lieu of decks with support posts.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that she would need to speak with the property owner about reducing the balconies, as the owner desired the light and outdoor space for tenants.

- o Ms. Stein noted that the Architectural Committee did not discuss the rear decks during the prior month's review.
- o Mr. Cluver commented that the posts supporting the decks stand out as atypical for the historic district.
- Mr. Peña asked if it would help to have solid garage doors in order to hide the support posts for the decks at the first floor.
 - o Ms. Stein reiterated that she prefers gates compared to solid garage doors.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about visibility of the proposed rear addition at 705 Pine Street. He suggested cladding the addition in red brick even if the addition is not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the Architectural Committee previously recommended a change from the solid garage doors and is now recommending a change from the steel gates.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that he would prefer solid garage doors to provide a carriage door appearance.
 - o Mr. Cluver commented that either option would be acceptable, and that the gates would provide relief along the street edge, but it all depends on what would be seen through the gates.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application has been revised in response to Architectural Committee's comments provided in September 2022. At 705 Pine Street, the massing of the addition at the rear has been entirely moved off the existing historic rear ell and held to just the rear wall of the rear ell. At 711, 713, and 717 Pine Street, the application has been revised to use black steel gates in lieu of the existing solid garage doors, and red brick on the facades facing Delancey Street.
- Decks with support columns are not in keeping with the character of the historic district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Replacement of front façade features dating to a 1973 renovation, such as window sash to match the historic appearance, satisfies Standard 6.
- The proposed rear additions are differentiated from, yet compatible in some ways with, the historic properties and their environment in massing, size, scale, and architectural features, satisfying Standard 9. Changes to the materials, decks, and garage openings as discussed will allow the proposal to fully satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the material on the side walls of the additions is changed to brick or red stucco, the decks are changed to Juliet balconies or roof terraces to eliminate support posts, and the gates are changed to solid garage doors set into brick walls to create the appearance of carriage house entries, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ITEM: 705, 711, 713, and 717 Pine St MOTION: Approval with conditions 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 832 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and detached rear structure

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Thelma Rachubinski

Applicant: Carolina Peña, Parallel Architecture

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This in-concept application proposes to construct a rear addition with deck on the historic building at 832 S. Front Street and construct a three-story detached structure at the rear fronting S. Howard Street. The application also proposes solar panels, roofing, and window replacement. The roofing scope can be approved by the staff. The staff can also approve window replacement, provided shop drawings accurately depict the new windows within the existing masonry openings. The front façade windows and any windows at the rear that are visible from the public right-of-way should match the appearance of the historic windows.

The existing building has a two-story rear addition. This application proposes an additional story with deck, using the existing rear dormer as the access to the new rear deck. There is currently a one-story non-historic parking structure at the rear on S. Howard Street, which would either be removed or built upon to create a three-story detached in-law suite with parking at the ground floor and living space above. This building would be clad in brick at the front and Hardi panels at the visible side.

The application proposes the addition of solar panels on both the front and rear gable of the existing building, and also on the flat roof of the new rear building. The Commission staff routinely approves solar panels which are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way or are not located on historic fabric.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct additional story on existing two-story rear addition, with deck.

- Construct three-story detached structure at rear.
- Install solar panels.
- Replace windows and roofing.

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.*
 - Replacement of front façade features such as windows and doors to match the historic appearance satisfies Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed additional story on the existing rear addition does not destroy historic materials which characterize the property and is compatible with the historic property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.
 - o The proposed detached three-story structure along S. Howard Street is differentiated from the old, and compatible with the massing, size, scale and materials of other three-story houses on this small block, satisfying Standard 9.
 - o Solar panels should be installed on rear slopes and/or other locations not easily visible from the public right-of-way. Panels should be installed flat and not alter the slope of the roof. The installation of panels must be reversible and not damage the historic integrity of the resource. As proposed, the solar panels on the rear roof slope and the flat roof of the new structure satisfy Standard 9. The solar panels proposed for the front roof slope will be highly visible and not compatible with the historic building.
- *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 rear addition and detached rear structure does not alter the essential form and integrity of the historic property, and could be removed in the future; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided solar panels are not installed on the front slope of the roof on the historic house, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:26:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carolina Peña represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver recommended that the material on the side of the rear structure be changed to brick or stucco rather than siding or panels.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested a stucco party wall.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the installation of the solar panels.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that the solar panels would follow the slope of the roof on the historic building, and will be hidden by a parapet on the new rear structure.
- Mr. Cluver commended Ms. Peña for designing to Passive House standards. He provided suggestions for the insulation.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that the building will be her own home, and she is working with a Passive House consultant who is experienced in working with historic buildings.
- Mr. Cluver asked about work to the front façade of the historic building.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that work to the front of the historic building will include window and roof replacement.
- Mr. Cluver recommended that Ms. Peña look at the size of neighboring windows at the rear in order to keep her window sizes to a similar scale.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the width of the brick piers at the first floor of the rear structure.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that the unequal and narrow width shown on the drawings is an error.
- Ms. Stein commented that the concept of the project is approvable.
- Ms. Stein agreed with the staff recommendation which called for no solar panels on the front slope of the historic roof. She asked if the removal of these solar panels will still allow the project to meet Passive House standards.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that the front solar panels can be omitted, but that net-zero will then not be achieved.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested putting additional solar panels in other locations to offset the removal of the solar panels on the front slope.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The roofing scope can be approved by the staff. The staff can also approve window replacement, provided shop drawings accurately depict the new windows within the existing masonry openings. The front façade windows and any windows at the rear that are visible from the public right-of-way should match the appearance of the historic windows.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Replacement of front façade features such as windows and doors to match the historic appearance satisfies Standard 6.
- The proposed additional story on the existing rear addition does not destroy historic materials which characterize the property and is compatible with the historic property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

- The proposed detached three-story structure along S. Howard Street is differentiated from the old, and compatible with the massing, size, and scale of other three-story houses on this small block, satisfying Standard 9.
- Solar panels should be installed on rear slopes and/or other locations not easily visible from the public right-of-way. Panels should be installed flat and not alter the slope of the roof. The installation of panels must be reversible and not damage the historic integrity of the resource. As proposed, the solar panels on the rear roof slope and the flat roof of the new structure satisfy Standard 9. The solar panels proposed for the front roof slope will be highly visible and not compatible with the historic building.
- The proposed rear addition and detached rear structure does not alter the essential form and integrity of the historic property, and could be removed in the future; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, provided the material on the side wall of the rear structure is changed to brick or stucco, the new window openings are similar in scale to adjacent buildings, the brick piers on the first floor of the rear structure are widened, solar panels are omitted from the front roof slope of the historic building, and the insulation in the historic building is reviewed for thermal properties to ensure it does not cause premature deterioration of historic brick, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 832 S Front St MOTION: Approval in-concept with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					X
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 108 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Demolish rear wall and piazza; construct rear addition with roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: CYF Realty LLC

Applicant: Carolina Pena, Parallel Architecture

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 1/14/1976

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to demolish the second and third floors of the rear ell and the full rear wall of this circa 1825 semi-detached house at the corner of Fairmount Avenue and Hope Street and to construct a full-width two-story addition with a roof deck. The proposed addition would be clad in brown metal panels and the parapet of the deck would intersect the roof of the main block. Additional decks would be accessed by a spiral staircase at the rear.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear ell
- Construct addition and decks

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 application proposes to destroy historic materials and alter spatial relationships that characterize the property and is incompatible in materials and massing to protect the property, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:40:39

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carolina Pena represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Pena noted that her clients wish to change the proposed cladding material from metal panels to brick.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked whether the massing would stay the same. He noted that the materials are a concern, but so are the massing, and particularly the way the addition extends up above the cornice line. He noted that additions typically fall below the roofline of the main block and opined that the intersection of the

addition with the main roof is not appropriate. He also noted that the window abutting the existing building on the proposed addition is discordant.

- Ms. Stein opined that, if the roof deck and spiral stair were removed, the addition might be more appropriate.
 - o Mr. Detwiler and Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed.
 - o Ms. Pena responded that the client might be willing to remove the roof deck and spiral staircase.
- Ms. Stein questioned where the mechanical units would go.
 - o Ms. Pena responded that they would likely be located on top of the garage.
 - o Ms. Stein replied that they should be shown in plan and should not be visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Detwiler explained that he is not in favor of demolishing the rear ell. He suggested retaining the three-story rear ell and rear wall of the main block, removing the second-story bump out of the ell and extending of that width for a new addition, and overbuilding the full depth of the parcel over the garage. He opined that the current proposal is highly visible and removes significant amounts of historic fabric.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the note on the drawings about existing windows being painted, repaired, or replaced as required is too vague and leaves too many opportunities for interpretation.
 - o Ms. Pena responded that the windows likely will all need to be replaced.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro replied that the application should include a window schedule.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the staff would condition a permit with the submission of window shop drawings for final approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property is located on a corner, and alterations to the rear would be highly visible from the public right-of-way.
- The rear wall of the main block and the three-story one-bay rear ell are historic.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project removes historic fabric, destroys spatial relationships that characterizes the property, and is incompatible in materials and massing to protect the historic property, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- The removal of the second-story bump out at the rear would be acceptable.
- Construction of an addition that extends to three stories, matching the height and width of the existing three-story ell, and the full width of the property over the garage would likely satisfy the Standards.

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

ITEM: 108 Fairmount Ave MOTION: Denial 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1717-19 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Alter rear ell; demolish garage; construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mount Vernon Holdings, LLC

Applicant: Matt Masterpasqua, Mass Architecture Studio, LLC

History: 1859; new façade added, 1890

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to modify and add to the property at 1717-19 Mount Vernon Street in the Spring Garden Historic District. The western half, or 1719 portion, of the double-width property features a three-story brick main block and rear ell constructed c. 1859 and refaced in 1890, and a one-story frame rear addition. The eastern half, or 1717 portion, has historically remained undeveloped except for a garage constructed between 1910 and 1916 at the rear of the lot and a historic iron fence at the front of the lot.

This application proposes to demolish the garage and selective portions of the rear ell and to construct additions. In August 2022, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application for this property that called for the complete demolition of the rear ell, garage, second and third floor side walls of the main block and removal of the historic fence along the eastern half of the property. At that time, the Architectural Committee found that the garage was a non-historic element of the property but encouraged the retention of the existing iron fence and rear ell. Since that time, the applicants have revised the design to incorporate the existing gate, to eliminate the previously proposed underground parking that would have necessitated a curb cut and removal of the fence, and to retain additional portions of the rear ell and main block walls. The southern addition that was previously proposed at street level has been set back 6 feet 4 inches from the existing fence. The applicants have also provided an additional engineer's report detailing the condition of the existing building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish garage and portions of rear ell

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 OCTOBER 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Construct additions

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o Although largely enveloped by the proposed additions, the plans retain much of the original fabric of the main block and rear ell. The height, materials, and punched window openings of the southern addition proposed along Mount Vernon Street are consistent with the scale, massing, materials, and features of the Spring Garden Historic District. However, the minimal 6-foot setback from the gate does not adequately convey the sense of a garden side yard, altering the spatial relationships that characterize the property. The application partially satisfies this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the southern addition is set back farther from Mount Vernon Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:57:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Matt Masterpasqua represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the applicants had a response to the staff recommendation.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua questioned the proposed dimensions of an greater setback of the addition from the sidewalk.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the façade materials of the existing building are historic and asked about the color and materials for the proposed addition.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale responded that the façade reconstruction and materials date to around 1890.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua explained that they are proposing to match red brick of majority of block for the addition, not the 1890's façade of the building at 1719 Mount Vernon, since it is anomalous on the block. He noted that they have selectively chosen elements from the existing building and other buildings on the block.
 - o Ms. Stein opined that the addition should be sympathetic to the existing tan building to which it attaches, not try to match the red brick of the rest of the block.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua asked whether the addition should match both the pebble-dashed stucco and brick, or just the brick.
 - o Ms. Stein responded that full brick would be preferable, in a color that is sympathetic to the existing building in a tan to brown range that recesses in a landscaped courtyard.

- o Mr. Detwiler agreed. He noted that pebble-dashed stucco came into vogue around the 1890s and is special, with few masons today knowing how to install it. He opined that, while it would be interesting to replicate, he would not make that a requirement.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the pebble-dashed stucco would be nice to replicate.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that it would be helpful to see the adjacent building on the right in elevation as well to understand the relationship, rhythm, and scale of the proposed elements of the proposed addition as they relate to the street.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the two first-floor windows should fall beneath the windows above, not be squeezed together.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that the first-floor windows have shifted owing to the need for an egress alley.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua asked whether the Committee would be open to a bay window at the first floor.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that that might look less awkward.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the existing alley is being retained.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that the iron gate and approximately 12 to 15 feet of the open alleyway will be retained, giving the perception of an alleyway, but the rear of the alley will be infilled.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that he appreciates that the applicants are proposing to preserve the bay window on the side of the rear ell but suggested that the northern addition be pulled back an additional 18 inches or so to allow the bay to read.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that they are tight on program, so he would likely want the rear wall to move back commensurately.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested that the living room size could be reduced slightly to give the bay more relief.
 - o Ms. Gutterman noted that the relationship between the proposed addition and bay window differs between floors on the plans and suggested that the drawings be revised so that they follow the plan shown for the first floor rather than the upper floors.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the Architectural Committee had not discussed how much more of a setback the addition should have.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua noted that the proposed setback is 6 foot 4 inches.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the applicants should further study the setback.
 - o Mr. Cluver noted that front yard setbacks vary from one zoning district to another.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that this property is zoned RM-1, in which setbacks are only required in adjacent properties having setback, but for which there is no depth requirement. He noted that the zoning should allow for a setback since there is a planter bed.
 - o Mr. Cluver suggested a setback of 10 feet or so, noting that the number is somewhat arbitrary, but would allow the setback to feel like an actual space.
 - o Mr. Detwiler noted that as the addition pushes back more, the more blank walls on either adjacent building will be exposed. He suggested that there should be a consistent treatment throughout, if possible. The addition should not just look like it has been slid back.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that the party wall to the right is exposed brick, and the side wall of the historic building at 1719 Mount Vernon facing the garden lot is stucco, but a smoother stucco than the pebble-dashed front façade.

- o Mr. Detwiler commented that it would be nice to see another rendering angle, looking from right to left, and how the exposed wall will be treated. He opined that it should appear as something planned.
- o Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the side wall had always been stuccoed.
- o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that he is not sure; the stucco looks newer than the front façade but is not synthetic.
- Mr. Cluver noted that owing to the proposed alleyway on the addition, there is a need to exit through historic gate and questioned the proposed alterations.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that they will provide a drawing of the retrofit for final approval.
 - o Ms. Stein suggested that it warranted further study, and that they should base the width of the gate on existing dimensions to the extent possible.
 - o Mr. Cluver noted that, if it is part of an egress route, there may be special hardware required and the final drawings should show how that is integrated into the fence.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the applicants will also need to show cornice details
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that the intent would be to match the existing building's cornice, but that they would need to add an end cap.
- Mr. Masterpasqua asked whether an eight-foot setback of the addition could work.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that it needs study, but that the proposed six feet is not enough.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rear ell, existing garden gate and side yard are character-defining features of the property. The garage is not a character-defining feature of the property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Additions that retain most of the existing rear ell and are set back from the existing fence to allow for a landscaped garden would be acceptable, but the proposed setback of 6 feet 4 inches is not sufficient and should be further studied. Ten feet may be a sufficient distance, but the applicants could study and provide renderings showing a shorter distance.
- The northern addition should allow space next to the existing bay window on the rear ell, not be directly against it.
- The cladding of the southern façade should be brick and in keeping with the color scheme of the existing historic façade rather than the neighboring red brick facades.
- The windows at the first floor of the southern addition should be redesigned.
- The locations of mechanical equipment should be noted on the plans and not be visible from the street.
- The proposed project retains most of the original fabric of the historic building, the height and massing are generally appropriate, and with additional setbacks and minor changes to materials and features, the proposed additions would be compatible with the historic property and historic district, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9, provided the following:

- The setback of the southern addition is increased to approximately ten feet;
- The color and material of the façade of the southern addition is compatible with the historic building to which it attaches;
- The first-floor windows of the southern addition are further studied;
- The northern addition is set back from the bay window of the rear ell;
- Details of the cornice and fence modification are submitted for final approval.

ITEM: 1717-19 Mount Vernon St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					X
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1939 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Alter side stair and add ADA life; legalize rear addition, windows, and paint

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Elevated Management LLC

Applicant: Hsing-Yuan Chen, Sky Design Studio

History: 1889; Willis Hale

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the current exterior appearance of the property at 1939 Diamond Street, and to install a wheelchair lift and modify the steps at an existing side entrance on N. 20th Street to accommodate the lift.

This building has been altered many times recently beyond the scope of and without building permits. Most recently, under the current ownership, the first-floor exterior stucco was painted blue, an existing rear addition was altered, and glass was inserted into historic openings at the upper floor. Prior to the current ownership, in early 2018, historic windows were removed, and inappropriate vinyl windows were installed without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. The Historical Commission's staff requested that the Department of Licenses and Inspections inspect owing to the window replacement, and a violation was issued in late September 2022.

SCOPE OF WORK:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 OCTOBER 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Legalize exterior work including rear addition alterations, painting, and window replacement.
- Install wheelchair lift and modify steps at side entrance.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - o The vinyl windows which replaced historic windows in 2018 do not match the old in appearance or materials.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The blue paint over stucco and alterations to the rear addition are incompatible with the architectural features of the property.
- *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 wheelchair lift and modifications to the steps will provide the required accessible entrance at the side of the property and will not impact character-defining features of the exterior.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the wheelchair lift and modification to side entrance steps, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline. Denial of the legalization of recent exterior work including window replacement, painting, and rear addition alterations, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:26:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Hsing-Yuan Chen and owners Patros and Persefoni Kapotas represented the applicants.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Kapotas said he purchased the building in the last couple years and intends to use the house for his home and office. He stated he was not aware that the building was historically designated until after the purchase, when he began working on it. Mr. Kapotas said he enclosed the top floor to protect it from the outside elements and prevent more weather-related deterioration.
- Ms. Lukachik asked if the top level was historically designed to be an open space.

- o Ms. Mehley replied that this is correct based on the design of the window moldings and the existence of a matching building on the opposite end of the block that maintains an open fourth level.
- Mr. Cluver said the Architectural Committee has five distinct items to discuss and these include the vinyl windows, the fourth-floor infilled windows, the proposed side entrance, the design of the addition, and the blue paint on the stucco. Mr. Cluver stated that, as a rule, the Architectural Committee does not recommend approval of vinyl windows, so he does not believe this requires additional discussion. He asked the Architectural Committee members for their comments on the fourth-floor openings that have been enclosed with glass.
- Ms. Lukachik said she would be fine enclosing these openings as long as the windows were architecturally compatible with the building's style. She commented that she can understand why one would want to make this usable space.
- The Architectural Committee members asked if the upper space is accessible.
 - o Mr. Kapotas replied there is an interior spiral stair.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the flooring in that upper space.
 - o Mr. Kapotas responded that it was a roof decking material when they first purchased the property. He noted that even though it was roofing material, it was in poor condition and allowing water infiltration into the building. Mr. Kapotas said he fixed up the space and it now has an interior type of floor. He explained it is now a finished space inside with flooring, lighting, heating, and a bathroom.
- Mr. Cluver said the Committee should determine if they believe the infill of the fourth-floor openings as windows is acceptable or not.
- Ms. Stein said that she prefers this area to be open. She opined that the openings are at the front facade and visible. She pointed out that the glass installed has created high glare windows. Ms. Stein said there may be a way to create windows that enclose the space that are sympathetic to the original design. Ms. Stein said she recognizes that buildings evolve, and she is not opposed to enclosure, but she thinks it was not done well. She said if the glass was non-glare and the windows were set back, so the openings read as portals and not as windows, there might be a way to do this successfully from her perspective. Ms. Stein said the way the windows were recently enclosed was not sympathetic to its original design as a sleeping porch or open living space.
- Mr. Cluver asked the Committee for feedback on the proposed accessible entry for the side elevation.
- Mr. Chen explained to the Committee that the owner plans to have an office in this area of the building and has requested an accessible entrance to this space. He continued that they believe that having a lift is preferable to having a ramp on the side of the historical building.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the railing would be wood and if the awning would be removed.
 - o Mr. Chen replied that the plan is for a metal railing and to match current materials. He explained that the entrance would have concrete stairs with a metal railing. Mr. Chen said they may want to have an awning in that location. He asked the Architectural Committee to provide some direction regarding an appropriate awning.
- Ms. Stein asked about the on-grade entrance door on the same elevation. She inquired if this could be used to access the interior rather than having a lift on the exterior.

- o Mr. Chen explained that the on-grade door goes into an apartment space that is not connected to the office space related to the stairs and lift area.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the rear addition and if it previously existed.
 - o Mr. Chen replied that it did exist when the current owner acquired the building. He added that it was likely a garage space at some point. Mr. Chen recognized that the current owner altered this area with the newer window and door.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if it was possible to flip the proposed side entrance stair. He said this would make only the side of the stairs visible from the corner of W. Diamond and N. 20th Street rather than the lift. He said this would be preferable.
 - o Mr. Chen said this may be possible but there is a basement window in this location. He said they can study the suggestion to see if it is possible.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if any original windows survive on the building.
- Mr. Kapotas responded that there are none. Mr. Chen pointed out that all vinyl windows were in place when Mr. Kapotas purchased the building.
- Mr. Cluver asked the Architectural Committee members to comment on the blue paint on the lower area of the building.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if it is painted brick or stucco.
 - o Mr. Kapotas stated that it is painted stucco. He asked the Committee if they had suggestions for a new paint color.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the exterior condition of the building down the street. She asked if it had a similar stone or stucco base as this building.
- Ms. Mehley said she believed historically the brick went to the base of the building and the stucco was a more recent addition. Mr. Detwiler confirmed the similar building on the block has brick all the way down to its water table.
- Ms. Stein said her preference was for the paint color to match the historic brick masonry. Mr. Cluver said since the original brick exists under the stucco and was historically visible, the paint color of the stucco should match the tone of the brick masonry.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- As a rule, the Architectural Committee does not recommend approval of vinyl windows for historically designated buildings.
- The vinyl windows, which replaced historic windows, were installed in 2018.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- To enclose the fourth-floor space in compliance with preservation standards, the glass should be non-glare and set back from the openings. The windows should appear as open portals, rather than openings with windows.
- The mechanical elements of the lift at the side entrance should be made less visible from the public right-of-way along Diamond Street. The side entrance stairs and mechanical lift should be redesigned so the stairs face the opposite direction, and the lift is less visible from Diamond Street.
- Since the original brick exists under the stucco and was historically visible, the paint color of the stucco should match the tone of the original brick masonry.

- The vinyl windows do not match the original windows in appearance or materials; therefore, the windows do not satisfy Standard 6.
- The blue paint over stucco and alterations to the rear addition are incompatible with the architectural features of the property; therefore, the paint and alterations to the rear addition do not meet Standard 9.
- The proposed wheelchair lift and modifications to the steps will provide the required accessible entrance at the side of the property and will not impact character-defining features of the exterior; therefore, if redesigned as suggested, the wheelchair lift and step modifications do meet the Accessibility Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the wheelchair lift and modification to side entrance steps, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline; denial of the legalization of recent exterior work including window replacement, painting, and rear addition alterations, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ITEM: 1939 Diamond Street					
MOTION: Approval of wheelchair lift and modify stairs; Denial of legalization of recent exterior work					
MOVED BY: D'Alessandro					
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					
Allison Lukachik	X				X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 2009-11 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct rear decks at second, third, and fourth floors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: A. Charles Peruto

Applicant: Lindsey Glasgow, Peruto Development LLC

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 1/16/1972

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct decks on the second, third, and fourth floors at the rear of 2009-11 Delancey Place. The building was constructed in 1870 and is four stories tall with a mansard roof. The mansard roof and dormers are visible at the front and rear facades. The

decks would be constructed of wood framing, wood decking, and metal railings. The new decks would be visible from the public right-of-way along Cypress Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six rear decks on the rear elevation of 2009-11 Delancey Pl.
- Install new rear stair.
- Re-roof mansard with a slate-like shingle.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - o The proposed rear decks at the second and third floors meets Standard 2.
 - o The proposed decks at the fourth floor, the mansard level, will obscure views of the mansard roof and dormers. The addition of decks at this level will also alter the existing rear mansard and cornice. Therefore, the fourth-floor decks do not meet Standard 2.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The installation of the proposed roofing material and new rear stair, meet Standard 9.
 - o The proposed decks at the second and third floor are compatible in terms of massing, size, and scale of the rear elevation and therefore meet Standard 9. The proposed metal picket railing should be simplified to meet Standard 9.
 - o The proposed decks at the fourth level are not compatible with the mansard roof and would adversely affect the building's rear elevation. Therefore, the fourth-level decks do not meet Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:57:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Lindsey Glasgow represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the existing rear fire stair.
 - o Ms. Glasgow responded that zoning records document that the fire stair was added around 1944.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the doors to the fire stair will be closed or removed as part of this project.
 - o Ms. Glasglow replied that it will remain as is and the doors will remain in place.
- The Architectural Committee members inquired about the current material on the rear mansard roof.

- o Ms. Glasglow replied that the mansard is currently asphalt shingles and said she could provide a better photo showing the existing condition.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the staff recommendation opposing decks at the fourth floor. He inquired if they would still need to provide egress if decks were not installed there. Mr. Cluver asked if the interior space was apartments.
 - o Ms. Glasglow replied that there is existing egress in place on the fourth floor and this would remain in place rather than replace it with decks. She confirmed that the interior is apartment space.
- Ms. Gutterman said the proposed decks are too big and not sympathetic to the historic building. Ms. Stein agreed.
 - o Ms. Glasglow pointed to existing decks and railings on adjacent and nearby buildings.
- Ms. Gutterman disagreed and said the nearby decks shown in photographs in the application documentation are on top of buildings and not freestanding. Ms. Stein pointed out that every example provided by applicant shows a building with a deck on top. She contended that the applicant is proposing to cantilever large decks off the side of the building with posts. Ms. Stein observed the proposed plan is to add a skeletal structure off a masonry wall that is big, and she does not believe it is compatible with the building. She noted that it alters the historic nature of the building.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the plans show an eight-foot-deep deck on one side and fourteen-foot-deep deck on the other side.
- Mr. Detwiler said that the proposed alterations convert the fire escapes into balconies or decks. He said that the proposed vocabulary is of a fire escape but, when the fire escapes are converted into larger decks, it creates deep, dark voids at the back of the building that are incompatible with the historic building. Mr. Detwiler reiterated that the depth of the decks to which the Architectural Committee is objecting.
- Ms. Gutterman recommended that the applicant verify if the plans are code compliant. She noted that placing furniture on something that is a fire escape and within a fire path may not be code compliant.
 - o Ms. Glasglow responded they would not be opposed to making the decks smaller.
- Mr. Detwiler said he is comfortable with the staff determining which new shingle is best for this mansard roof.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said the applicant should retain the cantilevered supports rather than propose new, larger ones.
- Ms. Stein asked what would have to be done at that for code compliance if the decks on the fourth floor are eliminated.
 - o Ms. Glasglow said they can keep it as it currently is. She noted that her goal was to provide these apartments with outdoor space.
- Committee members encouraged the applicant to confirm the fire code requirements for this area in the back of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Reviewing the replacement of the mansard roofing falls within the staff's authority.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed structure supporting the decks is not compatible with the historic character of the building and historic district. All decks are too large, especially in terms of depth. The proposed decks at the fourth floor, the mansard level, will obscure views of the mansard roof and dormers. The addition of decks at the mansard level will also alter the existing rear mansard and cornice. The proposed structural frame supporting the new decks is incompatible with the historic building. Therefore, the proposed decks do not meet Standard 2.
- The installations of the proposed roofing material and new rear stair satisfy Standard 9.
- The decks and structural supports are not compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the building; therefore, they do not meet Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ITEM: 2009-11 Delancey PI 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 7701 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ridge Avenue LLC

Applicant: Charles Whitlock, US Best Construction

History: 1790

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Avenue Roxborough Historic District, Contributing 10/12/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for a two-story addition at 7701 Ridge Avenue.

Constructed in 1790, the building is a contributing resource to the Ridge Avenue Roxborough

Thematic Historic District. The applicant is proposing to restore the front and south façades and construct a new rear addition. Vinyl siding is proposed for cladding on the addition. Window materials are not specified.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Restore front façade and south elevation.
- Rehabilitate interior for residential space.
- Construct two-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.*
 - The applicant plans to preserve and restore the features of the historic front façade and south elevation, meeting Standard 5. The staff will work with the applicant to approve new windows, doors, woodwork, and masonry repairs. The staff recommends that the applicant consider a stucco finish for south elevation.
- *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 massing, size, and scale of the proposed addition meets Standard 9. If the applicant agrees to revise the exterior cladding to wood or cement clapboard, window details to include framing and sill, and rear railing to be wood or composite material, the application can meet Standard 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.*
 - All demolition of historic fabric is limited to the rear roof and rear openings. In the future, if the addition was removed, the essential form and integrity of the property would remain; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the applicant revises the material as suggested, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:11:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Charles Whitlock represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler stated that he cannot tell from application photographs if the exposed south elevation of building was originally stucco. He asked the staff to look more closely at building, perhaps on a site visit, and make a recommendation about how this area of the building should be addressed by applicant. He noted that there is evidence, shown in the photographs of the south elevation, that there was originally

- a sixth window on the first floor. Mr. Detwiler said that the window should be restored. He also noted that the drawings show windows at different sizes.
- Ms. Stein said the drawings are inaccurate and will be challenging for a contractor to work from, especially when it comes time to order materials. She recommended revising the drawings for accuracy before any approval is granted.
 - Mr. Detwiler pointed out the building has very old windows, which may be deteriorated. He suggested restoring them but noted that that may not be feasible. Mr. Detwiler suggested that, if new windows are installed, they should replicate the historic windows.
 - Ms. Stein pointed out that the new addition has a strange window configuration on its south elevation. She said that the window plan should be reorganized and more in keeping with the historic windows. Ms. Stein said that the windows should be aligned, and their sizing determined in relation to the windows on the historic building. She remarked that the windows on the historic building are incorrectly drawn as different sizes. Ms. Stein stressed that the drawings of the historic building need to be accurate.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that the proposed massing of the addition is fine but there should be more windows on the addition's south elevation. He said he wished there was more of a setback of the south wall of the addition from the southeast corner of the historic building. He observed that that the setback is minimal, and he would like to see it be a larger set back, perhaps 12 inches. Mr. Detwiler said increasing setback is crucial to the success of the design.
 - Mr. Cluver said that the proposed cladding materials are not appropriate to the building. Several Architectural Committee members agreed, stating that using vinyl products on the addition is not appropriate for the historic building.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the details of the existing windows are important.
 - o Mr. Whitlock replied that the windows are deteriorated, and he would be surprised if they could be restored. He wants to make sure that the new windows are not only compatible with the historic building but function fully.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that she does not approve of the roof of the addition extending onto the roof of the historic building. She stated that, in general, the drawings do not accurately present what exists or what is proposed.
 - The Architectural Committee members provided guidance on how to match the details of the historic windows. They indicated that the staff could work directly with the applicant on replacing the deteriorated sash and, if necessary, other elements of the window units, in kind. They noted that specific contractors will know how to accurately restore or replace the existing windows. Mr. Detwiler encouraged the owner to seek out the right contractor for this type of work and to work with the staff.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked the owner if he would be open to restoring the window on the first floor of the historic building's south elevation. He explained that the Architectural Committee members believe that a window originally existed in that location.
 - o Mr. Whitlock expressed concern about the current condition of the building and said he would need to consult a structural engineer before deciding to cut an opening in the side wall of the building for a window.
 - o The Architectural Committee members concluded that the Mr. Whitlock should consult with a structural engineer and work with the staff to determine on whether the opening and window could be restored.
 - Mr. Whitlock asked for clarification as to whether the south elevation should be stucco or repointed.

- o Mr. Detwiler recommended meeting with the staff to determine the appropriate treatment for the side wall. He said that the staff should take a closer look at the building.
- o Ms. Gutterman encouraged him to review this part of the project carefully.
- Mr. Cluver reiterated how important the final application drawings are and that all notes on the drawings must be clearer.
- Mr. Whitlock asked what materials could be approved on the rear addition in place of the proposed vinyl siding.
 - o Mr. Cluver replied they can approve stucco or a wood clapboard type material.
- Ms. Stein stated that, when the drawings are revised, the front door and front yard area should be addressed. She commented that it appears the front stair may require replacement. Ms. Stein said she is not sure about this because it is not addressed in the drawings. She added that the elements in the front area of the building are missing from the application and should be included.
 - o Mr. Whitlock responded he is not sure of the age of the stair but noted that it is constructed of wood.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The architectural drawings do not accurately the existing conditions or the proposed construction.
- The applicant should consult with the staff to determine if the historic building's south elevation should be stuccoed or repointed.
- The south elevation of the historic building may have originally had a sixth window. The applicant should investigate to determine if a window once existed at the lower right corner of the south facade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The architectural drawings must be accurate with details and clear annotations. The documentation must be revised to document in detail the existing conditions of the historic building and the proposed new addition. Notes should be clear and concise to communicate rehabilitation details and materials.
- The proposed massing of the addition is compatible with historic building, but the addition should not extend onto the roof of the historic building.
- The setback of the addition from the southeast corner of the historic building should be increased.
- The cladding of the addition should be stucco or a clapboard type siding.
- The windows in the historic building should be restored if feasible. If not, the replacement windows should be wood with simulated divided lights and replicate historic window details. Windows in the addition should be wood with simulated divided lights.
- The south elevation of the historic building may have originally had a sixth window. This should be assessed by owner and considered for reopening and restoration.
- The new shutters should be attached correctly to windows with historically compatible window hardware.
- No vinyl railings or other similar material should not be used for the entry stairs.

- The applicant plans to preserve and restore the features of the historic front façade and south elevation. The current documentation and proposed materials do not meet Standard 5.
- The massing, size, and scale of the proposed addition meets Standard 9. The proposed details and materials, as currently presented, do not meet Standard 9.
- All demolition of historic fabric is limited to the rear roof and rear openings. In the future, if the addition were removed, the essential form and integrity of the property would remain; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 7701 Ridge Ave MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY:					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					X
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:46:50

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