

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

**TUESDAY, 22 NOVEMBER 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 9:00 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
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

Jan Baranski
George Poulin
Ori Feibush
Tony Dominick
Paul J. Lorenz, CANNO design
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Roger Wing
Bart Bajda, Toner Architects
Debra McCarty
Nancy Drye
Ian Toner, Toner Architects
Adam Bowen
Ethan J. Rhodes
Stuart Rosenberg, SgRA Architecture
Alexa Bachinsky, SgRA Architecture

Jay Farrell
Connie Lotz
Susan Wetherill
Kevin McMahon
Raymond Rola
Adam Zaken
Dennis Carlisle
Sam Katovitch, Toner Architects
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Derek Spencer, Gnome Architects LLC
Lawrence Biond
Mary McGettigan
David W. Feldman

AGENDA

ADDRESSES: 1703 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mira Properties

Applicant: Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition on the building at 1703 Walnut Street, which runs through to Moravian Street at the rear. This section of Moravian Street is a service alley. No work is proposed for the building's front façade. The only work proposed to the main block is the addition of a pilot house at the rear roof slope, which will not be visible from the public right-of-way. A portion of the existing third-floor rear addition, which is altered and not visible from the public right-of-way, will be demolished and the new addition will be constructed with roof decks for the new residential use of the upper floors. The existing rear addition that is visible from Moravian Street appears to date to alterations and additions made in 1994 according to zoning archive documents. Historic maps show a four-story building at the far rear of this site in 1860 which was demolished by 1910. The new rear façade will retain existing brickwork at the first floor, with vertical metal panels above and windows with small balconies.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish portion of third floor rear.
- Construct rear addition with pilot houses and roof decks for new residential units on upper floors.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed rear addition will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work visible from Moravian Street is differentiated yet compatible with the Moravian Street context, and is appropriate in massing, size, scale, and architectural features, satisfying Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Raymond Rola represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked about location and visibility of all mechanical equipment.
 - o Mr. Rola responded that most of the equipment will be located on the ground, but that he will provide a drawing to show the locations of the equipment for the Historical Commission's review. He confirmed that the existing equipment on the main roof is to remain.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the front pilot house could be shifted slightly towards the rear of the building. She acknowledged that this may pose an issue with windows on the adjacent building.
 - o Mr. Rola responded that he will have to study the possibility of shifting the location of the pilot house.
- Mr. Cluver asked that Mr. Rola provide an additional rendering showing the proposed west elevation at the rear.
 - o Mr. Rola responded that he will provide an additional rendering for the Historical Commission's review.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the glass element on the Moravian Street façade appears over-scaled compared to other openings. He stated that the materials are appropriate. He suggested retaining the sills and recessing the new brick infill approximately one inch at the two first-floor window openings, which are proposed to be infilled.
 - o Mr. Rola responded that he can update the drawings to indicate this change.
- Mr. McCoubrey recommended the addition of a transitional element between the metal panels and brick at the first floor.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This section of Moravian Street at the rear is a service alley.
- The existing rear addition that is visible from Moravian Street appears to date to alterations and additions made in 1994 and has no historical significance.

- No work is proposed for the building's front façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed rear addition will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work visible from Moravian Street is differentiated yet compatible with the Moravian Street context, and is appropriate in massing, size, scale, and architectural features, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the first-floor rear window openings are infilled with brick recessed approximately one inch, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1703 Walnut St.					
MOTION: Approval with condition					
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 Guterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 3401 HAMILTON ST

Proposal: Construct mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 3401 Hamilton LLC

Applicant: Derek Spencer, Gnome Architects LLC

History: Non-historic commercial structure and parking lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Powelton Village Historic District, Non-contributing, 11/10/2022

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story mixed-use masonry building on a non-contributing property at the corner of N. 34th and Hamilton Streets in the newly designated Powelton Village Historic District. The Historical Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over this proposal owing to the one-story, non-contributing building, which was on the site at the time of the designation of the historic district. The surrounding context is primarily three-story brick and stone twins and rows with set back from the streets with front yards.

The proposed building lacks any setback from the sidewalk. The fenestration and overall flatness of the facades lacks the rhythm typical of the surrounding residential context.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story mixed-use building with pilot houses and deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed construction is in keeping with the general materials and height of the district, but not the setbacks, size, scale, proportion, fenestration, or features of the district, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:20:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Derek Spencer represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Spencer provided an overview of the project. He stated that he chose red brick as the primary façade material to be contextual with the surrounding historic buildings. He explained that the property is zoned commercial but is surrounded by residential zoning, and that the commercial zoning does not require setbacks on the site. He stated that the Philadelphia City Planning Commission asked him to locate the commercial space along N. 34th Street, where there is more commercial use, and to locate the residential entrance on Hamilton Street, which is more residential in use.
- Ms. Gutterman observed that nearby buildings have various architectural elements that break up the massing, such as bays and porches. She stated that the proposed design has none of these same relief elements, making it appear too large of a building for the site. She suggested that the applicant look at ways of breaking up the façade and incorporating setbacks.
 - o Mr. Spencer responded that they tried to incorporate details to break up the mass of the masonry, but that they can consider introducing bays or even a mansard roof. He explained that his client needs to maintain the proposed footprint for financial reasons.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to show the location of mechanical equipment and perhaps to shift the roof deck back, if there is visibility of it from the street.
 - o Mr. Spencer responded that a 42-inch parapet is proposed for the entire roof, which will block any potential visibility of the deck, pilot house, or rooftop mechanical equipment.
 - o Others noted that the Standards recommend against conspicuous roof decks on historic buildings but make no such recommendation against conspicuous roof decks on non-historic buildings.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the fourth floor is very large and has a looming quality to it, whereas neighboring buildings have mansards or other changes at the upper

level. He suggested that the applicant investigate a mansard or other element to reduce the overall massing. He stated that an acknowledgment of abutting setbacks is important, and that there are ways to manipulate the massing to step back and then come forward. He asked if moving the retail entrance closer to the corner would be helpful.

- o Mr. Cluver noted that projecting elements such as bays are prominent architectural features of the historic district. He suggested considering incorporating this type of element if the floor area is not available to recess areas of the building.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the side elevations not shown in the renderings.
 - o Mr. Spencer responded that he will provide additional renderings showing these views for the Historical Commission's review.
- Ms. Stein noted that the adjacent setbacks will allow for greater visibility of the side elevations of the proposed building. She stated that the red brick needs to return on these elevations to at least the depth of the adjacent setbacks so that the material seen from the public right-of-way is red brick.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the projection of the canopy, and if it should be reduced to the entrance areas only.
 - o Mr. Spencer responded that the canopy has a three-foot projection, and the idea of continuing it was to visually connect the two entries to the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over this proposal owing to the one-story, non-contributing building, which was on the site at the time of the designation of the historic district.
- The surrounding context is primarily three-story brick and stone twins and rows set back from the streets with front yards.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed construction is in keeping with the general materials and height of the district, but not the setbacks, size, scale, proportion, fenestration, or features of the district, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 3401 Hamilton St. MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 3701-03 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 3701 North Broad LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, SgRA Architecture

History: 1927; National Bank of North Philadelphia, Beury Building; William Harold Lee, architect

Individual Designation: 11/27/1985

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for an eight-story addition at 3701-03 N. Broad Street. Constructed in 1927, the Art Deco Style building historically served as a bank and offices. After decades of vacancy, the building is currently undergoing conversion to a hotel. The original rehabilitation and conversion project was approved by the Historical Commission on 8 September 2017. A building permit was issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections in December 2021.

This proposed addition would be connected along the rear north wall of the historic building. The proposed addition would be open at the ground floor to provide vehicular access to a surface parking area. The addition would include seven levels of hotel rooms above the open parking access area. The exterior cladding materials would be masonry, with a mix of light-colored buff brick and stucco, and is intended to be compatible with the limestone, brick, and terra cotta of the historic building. The proposed window openings would be of a comparable size to the windows on the 1927 building.

The demolition on the north wall was previously approved by PHC staff in March 2022. This targeted demolition was also approved by the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission and National Park Service, as the overall project is seeking Historic Tax Incentives. It should be noted that this demolition was originally intended to accommodate the construction crane and create a fire stair.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct eight-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed addition is compatible in its massing, size, materials, and scale. The staff recommends adding more screening and architectural detail to the first level accessway to meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed addition could be removed from the historic building in the future, leaving the historic building 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: 00:39:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Stuart Rosenberg and Alexa Bachinsky represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver observed the application includes renderings of the rehabilitated historic building and future new construction on N. Broad Street but no renderings of the proposed addition that is the subject of this review.
 - o Ms. Bachinsky replied that renderings can be made available for the next review.
- Ms. Gutterman contended that the applicant is requesting final approval but many details have not been provided. She stated her concerns about the relationship of the top floor windows to the arches and the lightness of the color of the proposed masonry to the existing color of the historic building. Ms. Gutterman said she is also concerned about stucco at the ground level. She observed that the drawings do not indicate the material of the connector area between the historic building and addition. She said that, owing to the lack of detailing, it is not clear how the addition will look in the field when it is constructed.
- Mr. Cluver agreed that the application drawings must provide more detail. He noted as an example that the top of the parapet was not detailed. He said it looks like smooth stone or stucco and there is no sense of a projection or cornice. Mr. Cluver said that the upper arch shapes on the addition appear to be picking up on the arches on the side facade of the historic building but the distance between the arch and the cornice is very tight and should be greater. He inquired if the third-floor openings on the addition are intended to be windows or openings.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg replied they are intended to be windows.

- Mr. Rosenberg said the proposed design is a work in progress. He asked the Architectural Committee to consider reviewing the project in two phases. Mr. Rosenberg suggested the first phase of review would look at the idea of the addition itself, appropriateness, relationship to historic building, massing, and scale. He continued that the second part of the review could be the resolution of the architectural details. Mr. Rosenberg asked if the Committee could recommend approval for this application with the understanding that they would resubmit more developed drawings to the Committee that would include all of the required information and architectural details. He noted that the second phase would be for the final approval decision. Mr. Rosenberg explained that other aspects of the project, which the Historical Commission has already approved, are currently under construction and they are under time constraints regarding coordinating the construction with the new addition, so they would like to move the Historical Commission review forward as best they can with the current application.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey asked if Mr. Rosenberg is asking for conceptual approval.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg replied that he is requesting an approval in concept since it is clear that final approval does not seem possible at this time.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said he is concerned about the entry area being stucco given the proposed use for that area as a vehicular entryway.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg said he does not object to using a different masonry material in this area.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned whether it was possible to convert this to an in-concept review versus final approval.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey said that the Architectural Committee could recommend for conceptual approval, especially with the applicant's concurrence.
- Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed they are not comfortable giving any conceptual approval to the details shown in the current application. She said at most she is comfortable recommending approval to the height and width.
 - o Others responded that by definition an approval in concept is not an approval of the details, so they need not be concerned.
- Ms. Stein said her opinion is that this is an appropriate addition in height, scale, and volume for the site. She noted that it is hidden from N. Broad Street. Ms. Stein said her concern is that the building hovers over a driveway and she stated that she cannot understand why this is proposed. She asked why the driveway needs to run through the building when the parking lot is open to the street and accessible. Ms. Stein added that it would be a better building if it came all the way down to the grade level without a parking lot entrance.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg said there are many precedents for historic buildings with driveways in American architectural history. He commented that he believes the issue is the design of this area of the building. Mr. Rosenberg said the scale of the large opening and the way the building meets the ground is not definitive enough.
- Ms. Stein said she agreed. She stated that, if there was one archway on the first floor and then a solid corner, then it would be a very different architectural design. She said the linking element, the proposed four-foot area between the historic building and the addition, is also unsuccessful because it leaves a pastiche of infill brick on the historic building that no one wants to see. Ms. Stein said the linking element should come down and conceal removed brick that will probably look patchy when it

- is done. She said that perhaps it is not the opening on the first floor that is the issue but is instead the architectural handling of the first floor, which should be improved.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that right next to the addition is an existing vehicular opening with a ramp down.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg confirmed there is an existing garage door opening and ramp. He explained that this led to the basement level and was how armored vehicles would come into the building. Mr. Rosenberg said the vehicles would drive down the ramp into the basement and unload money into the bank's vaults that were located there.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein that the massing is appropriate, but the design of the ground level is problematic. He noted that other Committee members provided feedback on the materials and fenestration. Mr. McCoubrey said he also has questions about the arch heads and whether they are appropriate given the arched heads on the original building are used in a specific way. He commented that the arches could just as well be flat headed on the proposed addition.
 - Mr. Cluver asked if the proposed four arches shown on the historic north elevation will be restored. He noted that, if this is the case, the feature must be annotated on the drawings in the applicant's next submission for this project.
 - o Mr. Rosenberg confirmed this is their intention and they will add the notes to the drawings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission has already approved a project to rehabilitate the Beury Building and construction to implement that project is underway.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The height and scale of the proposed addition is appropriate for the historic building.
- The design of the addition's first level should appear more solid and connected to the ground, and less like a raised, vehicular traffic area.
- The application lacks a sufficient level of architectural detail for a final approval. Additional details about the design and materials must be provided for a final approval.
- The proposed addition is compatible in overall massing and scale but is not compatible in materials and details; therefore, it does meet Standard 9.
- The proposed addition could be removed from the historic building in the future; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application for final approval but approval in concept of the location, height, width, and massing of the addition, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 3701-03 N Broad St MOTION: Denial as presented MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1018-20 AND 1032 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Convert church complex to residential use

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 1031 Germantown Avenue OCF LLC, Pollard Allen OCF LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1870; Immaculate Conception Roman Catholic Church; Edwin Forrest Durang, architect; 1909, Rectory, George I. Lovatt Sr., architect

Individual Designation: 4/12/2019

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to convert the former Immaculate Conception church and rectory in Northern Liberties to residential use. The church, which officially closed in 2020, was designed by Edwin F. Durang and constructed in 1870, and the rectory by George I. Lovatt Sr. in 1909. In the church, the application proposes to insert additional floor levels and install a combination of casement and plate windows and metal spandrel panels in the existing window openings, and to install low shed dormers near the base of the steep gable roof on the east and west elevations. The stained glass rose window and transoms on the north elevation would remain. New synthetic slate roofing would replace the existing slate roofing. At the rear of the rectory, the application proposes to install windows in place of an existing garage opening and man door.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install floor levels
- Install windows and doors
- Replace roofing
- Alter openings

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 or pictorial evidence.

- o The proposed windows do not reflect the consistent horizontal rectangular proportions or divisions of the historic windows. The staff suggests that stacked awning or single-hung windows may more accurately approximate the visual qualities of the historic windows.
- o The existing rectangular grey slate roofing is in poor condition, and if original, is over 150 years old, having outlived the standard service life of slate roofing. A grey synthetic or asphalt shingle in a rectangular shape could approximate the historic appearance of the roofing.
- o The existing front door slabs are not original. The staff recommends that the design of the new doors be based off the drawings and historic photographs of the property.
- o The application partially complies with Standard 6.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The height and slope of the existing roof would make it difficult to reuse without the insertion of windows. The proposed shed dormers are small and low in relationship to the large sloping roof, which maintains its full slope at the front and rear of the roof. The application satisfies the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, provided the windows and doors more accurately reflect the historic appearance and proportions, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:03:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Sam Katovich, Bart Bajda, and Ian Toner, and developer Ori Feibush represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein stated that the architectural drawings are confusing; she stated that it is unclear what exists and what is proposed.
 - o Mr. Katovich responded that essentially all windows and doors not specifically called out on the drawings will be replaced in kind with aluminum-clad wood windows. He noted that, after speaking with the Historical Commission's staff, he will update the window portion of the application for the large windows of the sanctuary nave to propose a more appropriate window-pane configuration. Mr. Katovich stated that all existing metalwork will be repaired and repainted. The brick masonry exterior will be preserved. It will be repointed and cleaned as necessary.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the material in sanctuary nave windows where the new floor runs behind the windows should be a dark spandrel glass and should continue the proportions of the glazing.

- Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed slate roofing replacement was acceptable, provided the color and size of the synthetic slate was appropriate.
- The Committee members reviewed plans and a section of the third floor with the dormers, which were submitted after the application materials.
 - o Mr. Cluver stated that the dormers do not read like dormers in the interior.
 - o Mr. Katovich stated that they originally designed the units with their own individual dormers, but it felt “very choppy.”
 - o Mr. Cluver stated that some church roofs historically had dormers, but they were individual dormers, not continuous bands of dormers, as is proposed. He stated that the dormer materials could be altered to give the dormers a rhythm.
 - o Ms. Gutterman stated that the dormer sills will be too close to roof, which may result in problems with snow.
 - o Mr. Katovich stated that he wanted the dormer windows to be as large as possible, but they are not required to be egress windows. He stated that he would consider raising the sills.
 - o Ms. Gutterman suggested that they may be too large, and perhaps should be treated more like skylights.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the dormers looked “too industrial.”
 - o Mr. Katovich stated that he would investigate shifting to individual dormers.
- Ms. Gutterman shifted the discussion to the nave window configuration. She asked if they have considered hopper windows. She stated that the windows are “so choppy” with sliders. She stated that the window-pane geometry does not work.
 - o Mr. Katovich stated that the window configuration is not finalized. He stated that he will revise them to create a smoother approach that is not quite so choppy. He noted that awning and hopper windows are under consideration. He stated that he needs to investigate to determine the maximum feasible size for the windows. He stated that he will investigate single- and double-hung windows as well as integrating the top half-round windows into the top set of windows.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the masonry repairs and paint removal.
 - o Mr. Katovich stated that brick and stone will be cleaned, repaired, and repointed. He stated that he will work with the staff to determine that all work is done appropriately.
- Ms. Stein stated that the applicants need to clarify their architectural drawings to show which windows will be replaced, and where cornice repairs and replacement will be undertaken. She stated that they need to provide details.
 - o Mr. Katovich stated that he will update the drawings.
 - o Mr. Cluver noted that this is an in-concept application that was submitted primarily to get feedback on the proposed dormers. He suggested that the details could be provided in a later application for final approval.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the structure and how they will be accommodating new floors.
 - o Mr. Katovich stated that they are working on the structural details. He explained that the timber trusses fall on the piers of the nave. They are figuring out how they can support the weight of the new floor by distributing the loads to the trusses and piers.
 - o Mr. Katovich agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that breaking up dormers would obviate from need to cut any of the structural members.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the dimension of the exposure of the roofing shingles. He asked if the new roof would replicate the historic roof.

- o Mr. Katovich stated that the roof includes a subtle diamond pattern with rectangular shingles. They still need to confirm the sizes of the existing roofing shingles and will match them as closely as possible.
- o Others noted that the exposure of the roofing shingles is a detail that will be addressed in the application for final review. This is an in-concept application seeking guidance on the dormers and other main elements like the window configurations.
- Ms. Stein repeated the observation that the dormer sills need to be raised up so that they are not flat and allow water to sit. She stated that they need to shed water. She opined that the small size of the dormer is a positive, but the flat dormer sill is not.
 - o Mr. Bajda responded that the sills will be minimally sloped.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the dormers will cause maintenance problems.
 - o The applicants responded that they would design the dormers with care to avoid maintenance problems. This application seeks to determine whether dormers are acceptable, not to determine whether the details of the dormers, which have not yet been developed, are appropriate.
 - o Mr. Cluver suggested that they move the walls of dormers closer to exterior of the building or increase the floor to ceiling heights so that the sills can drain. Mr. Cluver again acknowledged that this application is an in-concept application that is seeking advice and is not a request for final approval. The applicants will have an opportunity to submit an application with all details included. Mr. Cluver concluded that he is comfortable with the concept of the dormers to allow for a third floor.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that it is great to see a church like this adaptively reused. He stated that it is a terrific project.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society stated that this is a great project. He stated that he appreciates a roofing material that will mimic the original slate. He stated that he applauds the retention rose windows. He stated that he can accept the dormers, but the ones that are proposed are “a little boxy.”

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The church building is no longer being used as a house of worship and must be adaptively reused.
- The slate roof has reached the end of its life and must be replaced.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Dormers can be added in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to facilitate the adaptive reuse of this church building.
- The original slate roofing material can be replaced with synthetic slate in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, provided the color and shape match.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs Guideline, provided that:

- the new windows and doors accurately reflect the historic windows and doors,
- the dormers are revised to have a better rhythm and to better integrate with the roof,

- the dormer sills are reduced, minimized, or eliminated, and
- the synthetic slate matches the historic slate.

ITEM: 1018-20 and 1032 N FRONT ST MOTION: Approval in concept with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 534 N 19TH ST

Proposal: Construct multi-family residential building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Waybar 534 LLC

Applicant: Paul J. Lorenz, Canno Design

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story, multi-family, masonry building on a vacant lot at the corner of N. 19th and Wilcox Streets in the Spring Garden Historic District. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction is limited to review-and-comment because the property was a surface parking lot at the time of the designation of the historic district. The context of the building along N. 19th Street is one of primarily three-story, red-brick, Italianate rowhouses on elevated basements with marble watertables. Adjacent to the property on Wilcox Street is a two-story carriage house. The majority of the Wilcox Street block is composed of the rear elevations of properties on Green Street.

The first floor of the proposed building is almost at grade, resulting in a lack of base like those found on the majority of properties in the district. The lack of a base alters the scale of the proposed building in relationship to the neighboring properties. The front or 19th Street façade features windows only; it does not include a door like every other front façade in the district. The paired windows on the Green Street elevation are out of keeping with the rhythm of the individual bays of windows found on most properties on the block and in the district. The four-story, eleven-bay-wide Wilcox elevation is out of keeping with the size and scale of the small street. The height of the parapet and lack of cornice are not in keeping with the scale, proportion, or features of properties that characterize the district.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story building with pilot houses and decks

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed new construction is compatible with the general materials and height of the district, but not the size, scale, proportion, or features of the historic district and the property's context.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed construction is in keeping with the general materials and height of the district, but not the size, scale, proportion, or features of the district, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:28:16

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Paul J. Lorenz represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Lorenz to respond to the staff's comments about scale.
 - o Mr. Lorenz stated that the building complies with the zoning height requirement of 38 feet. He stated that he attempted to break down the scale with the brick detailing around the windows as well as the groupings of windows. He stated that the smaller, more utilitarian scale of Wilcox Street, which was historically an alleyway, is reflected in the doorways to the building along that street.
 - o Mr. Lorenz addressed the staff's objection that the building lacks a cornice and explained that that was an attempt to relate to the more utilitarian buildings on Wilcox. He also noted that there is a repetition of the ornamental masonry motif at the top of the building, which is not a cornice but is a reference to ornament.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that the proposed building does not relate to any neighboring buildings. The pilot houses are too tall. There is no charm to building. It looks very institutional. It is not complementary to the historic district. She suggested that the ratio of solid to glass is wrong and the proportions are inappropriate. She concluded that it is too big and too solid.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that it was frustrating not to see the adjoining buildings drawn in or rendered. Without them, one cannot understand the relationship of this building to its neighbors. He asked why all the windows are exactly the same. He suggested that the ground-floor windows are not appropriate. He noted that elevating a building can lead to accessibility issues, but, unlike other buildings in the historic district, this building is very low to the ground. There is no distinction between the base and the upper floors. He added that the parapet is enormous.
 - o Mr. Lorenz stated that getting the requisite number of units within the 38-foot height limit forces the first floor down to grade.

- o Mr. Cluver observed that the zoning height regulation was probably intended for three stories. The proportions become distorted when four stories are forced into that height.
- Ms. Stein objected to the party wall clad in fiber cement siding and asserted that the brick façade is going to look like a false façade where it comes to the corner. She stated that the brick should turn back onto party wall so that it looks like a solid masonry corner.
- Mr. McCoubrey contended that the wood clapboard look is not appropriate for a building that has a masonry cladding. He suggested that the side and back walls should look more like a paneled or stucco system.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission's jurisdiction is limited to review and comment at this site.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is not compatible with the Spring Garden Historic District.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the proposed building is not compatible with the Spring Garden Historic District and the application does not satisfy Standard 9.

ITEM: 534 N 19TH ST COMMENT: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

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.