

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

**TUESDAY, 22 MARCH 2022
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Uk Jung, Studio Hada
- David Orphanides, Esq., Orphanides + Toner
- Alex Davis, Trade Architects
- Katherine Treppendahl
- Zack Shapiro
- Devon Maley
- Hal Schirmer
- Justine Velasquez Martinez, Plato Studio
- Patricia Freeland
- Plato Marinakos Jr., Plato Studio
- Dennis Carlisle
- Jafar Maleki
- Justino Navarro
- Molly Ashenfelter

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2036 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rebecca Malcolm-Naib and Farid Naib

Applicant: Uk Jung, Studio Hada

History: 1868, Frederick Brown House; alterations, Furness & Hewitt, 1874

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for the removal of a non-historic garage and construction of a three-story addition with garages at the rear of this corner property at S. 21st Street and Delancey Place. The proposed addition would be clad in brick and would attach to the existing building through a glass and paneled connector utilizing existing openings.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept version of the application in December 2020, recommended denial, and offered suggestions. Following the Committee's review, the applicant revised the application to respond to the suggestions. At its January 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed and endorsed the revised in-concept application. The Historical Commission concluded that the revisions made between the Committee and Commission meetings responded to the Committee's comments. The Commission suggested that an existing iron gate that was shown in the plans but not in a rendering should be retained. The Commission also indicated that details such as the design of the garage doors should be developed before a final submission. The current application for final approval is consistent with the in-concept application that the Historical Commission endorsed in 2021.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing garage
- Construct three-story addition with garages

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 construction removes a non-historic element of the property. The new work is differentiated from the old and is generally compatible in massing, scale, and materials to the historic building. The application complies with Standard 9. The applicant should include historic gate in final plans as requested by Historical Commission. The applicant should confirm whether additional railings will be required by the building code around pool areas on the roof. If they are required, these railings should be incorporated into the design for the final review by the Historical Commission.
- *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 does not remove significant amounts of historic material and could be removed in the future without damaging the essential form and integrity of the historic property. The application complies with Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:44

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Uk Jung represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to describe the design for the entrance to the addition. She also asked where the mechanical equipment would be located and whether the proposed pilot house would be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - o Mr. Jung explained that the addition would be accessed from the interior of the existing house. He said that a door on the south side of the addition would provide access to a utility closet within the garage. However, the main entrance to the addition would be at the interior.
 - o Mr. Jung stated that the mechanical equipment would be located along the side of the roof closest to the alley. He said that the condensers would be placed on the roof of the pilot house, which is lower than the roof of the designated building. The applicant remarked that there are existing condenser units located on the roof of the designated building and they could consider locating the new equipment there since those units are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if the owners were planning to install any kind of pergola feature.
 - o Mr. Jung responded that his client may want to use an umbrella for shade. However, he had not designed any permanent shade protection. He pointed out that the deck was pushed back from the facades, which would help obscure the visibility of any deck furniture.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she was concerned about the visibility of objects on this deck, including the mechanical equipment on the roof of the pilot house.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with the concerns raised by Ms. Gutterman. He asked the applicant if the proposal was still conceptual.
 - o The applicant replied that they were seeking a final review and that the plans are only missing some very small details. He said that the design would only change based on the comments of the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Jung about the design of the garage doors and why there was such a large door head at the top of them. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that he did not think the design was compatible with the historic district.
 - o Mr. Jung responded that the feature was a terra cotta panel system that was entirely decorative and could be changed if the members of the Architectural Committee recommended.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the grey material on the elevation drawings.
 - o Mr. Jung replied that the proposed material is a dark painted wood panel system.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he was concerned about the amount of vegetation proposed for the addition. He explained to the applicant that the Architectural Committee typically recommends denial of such features as window boxes and

planters. However, because the vegetation is limited to the addition, he was not as opposed as he normally is.

- o Mr. Jung responded that the historic house currently has planters along the 21st Street side. He explained that some of the planters were proposed in order to obscure the view of some of the walls of the new addition and also because the greenery is important to his clients.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked how the planters and flower boxes would drain water and whether the solution was through the existing draining system or if the water would run off on to the side of the building.
 - o Mr. Jung responded that they would drain through the boxes and would not tie into any drainage system. The applicant pointed out that each planter or window box could be accessed from a window or from the deck which would facilitate their maintenance.
- Mr. McCoubrey remarked that he found the design of the addition to be successful, in particular how it connects to the historic building. He stated that the way the addition was recessed from the façade of the historic structure and tucked under the historic cornice was sensitive to the designated building. Mr. McCoubrey commented that, in this case, he was not opposed to the planters at the addition. He also stated he agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro's comments about reconsidering the dark terra cotta feature at the top of the garage doors. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the color of this area of the door be revised to fit in with the tones of the existing building. He also suggested that the architect remove the arched shape of the windows on the garage doors because it does not relate to the context. The openings are not arched. He agreed that the applicant must be sure that the mechanical equipment is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant to confirm that the existing metal gate was going to be used in the addition.
 - o Mr. Jung confirmed the existing metal gate would be used in the design.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicant to confirm that the structure of the addition would not tie into the designated structure.
 - o Mr. Jung confirmed that that was true.
- Ms. Gutterman asked what the idea behind the oval window at the addition was.
 - o Mr. Jung responded that this window would be in the client's study, and he wanted a unique window through which to look.
 - o Ms. Gutterman stated that she found the oval shaped window disconcerting.
 - o No one else objected to the shape of the window.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicant to explain how the railing will be installed.
 - o Mr. Jung confirmed that no historic fabric would be impacted by its installation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The plans reflect the revisions recommended by the Historical Commission during its in-concept review of January 2021.
- The addition would be structurally independent of the historic structure.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The new work is differentiated from the old and is generally compatible in massing, scale, and materials to the historic building, satisfying Standard 9.

- The proposed addition does not remove significant amounts of historic material and could be removed in the future without damaging the essential form and integrity of the historic property, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the mechanical equipment is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way; the oval window is reconsidered; the color of the material above the garage doors is revised; and the windows in the garage doors are not arched; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Historical Commission's 2021 in-concept approval.

ITEM: 2036 Delancey PI MOTION: Approval 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: 334 S 24TH ST

Proposal: Construct additions at the ground and fourth stories

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Zack Shapiro & Devon Maley

Applicant: Alex Davis, Trade Architects

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks an in-concept approval for ground-floor and fourth-floor additions. The building at 334 S. 24th Street was constructed circa 1870. The property is located at the northwest corner of S. 24th and Panama Streets and is visible from Fidler Square. Although minor changes have occurred to the exterior since 1870, such as the removal of the cornice, historic maps and photographs indicate that the building has retained a similar form and massing since its original construction.

The application proposes to remove the original gable roof and construct a fourth level. The new fourth floor would be slightly set back from the front elevations and would have a gable roof. The in-concept application shows two exterior cladding options, metal panel and stucco. Since the new roof would rise above the existing chimneys on the south elevation, the chimneys would be extended. At the rear of the property, two small, one-story additions would be constructed. The changes would be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing gable roof.
- Construct fourth-floor addition.
- Construct ground-floor 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 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 work would permanently remove the gable roof, which is highly visible from surrounding streets and Fitler Square. The fourth-floor addition would be incompatible with the building in terms of massing, size, and scale. Therefore, the fourth-floor addition does not meet Standard 9.
 - o The rear additions would not require the removal of any historic materials and would not alter the historic character of the property; therefore, this part of the project meets Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The fourth-floor addition would require the removal of the entire gable roof; therefore, the application does not satisfy Standard 10.
 - o The rear ground-floor additions are reversible and meet Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:29:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney David Orphanides and architect Alex Davis represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Orphanides described the location of the property and said he wanted to emphasize specific points about it. He pointed out that, although the property is visible from Fitler Square, there is a lot of vegetation that limits the views from within the park and from directly around the property. Mr. Orphanides noted that, in terms of vehicular traffic when traveling along S. 24th Street or along Panama between S. 24th and S. 25th, one does not get a good view of the property and your eyes are never drawn to the existing structure. Mr. Orphanides pointed to the aerial photographs in the application and noted adjacent buildings to the north, one with solar panels and another with a fourth-floor addition that is like their proposal. He said that, although the existing roof is a gable roof, it has a very low pitch and is not visible from any vantage point surrounding the property. Mr. Orphanides continued that, in terms of the Standards, the existing roofing material is obviously not historic, and that the application shows that the most important part of the roof, which is the profile, is being maintained. He said that if one looks at the proposed fourth-floor addition in a vacuum, it may seem more significant than it is, but when you look at it in the context

of its surroundings, you will see that it is quite different. Mr. Orphanides explained that he was involved with the 2121 Walnut Street project which was approved by the Historical Commission and is shown in the application. He noted that they are working to do something similar in terms of a roof addition at this property but acknowledges that the context is different with 334 S. 24th Street. Mr. Orphanides concluded that the team's goal was to propose a minimal addition in order to gain some additional habitable space in the building.

- Mr. Davis provided an overview of the proposed application. He described the two small rear additions and their limited physical intervention with the existing building. Mr. Davis noted that staff recommended approval for this part of the project. He said that he recognizes the main focus of the application is the roof addition. Mr. Davis said their team has taken great care to design a roof addition that would fit within the context and the style of the building. He stated that the defining feature of the roof is not so much the roof surface but the roofline itself as it is visible from the corner of Fitler Square. Mr. Davis explained that the geometries of the fourth-floor roof match the historic one and that they have incorporated a setback to maintain parts of the historic roofline. He pointed out that there are limited views of the roof and roofline from the public right-of-way and Fitler Square, owing to the location and the trees surrounding the building. Mr. Davis described the roofing material, which is proposed as a standing seam zinc material that fits well with the existing building and has been used on other additions in the district. He noted that, to raise the chimneys to code height with the addition, the chimneys will need to be extended and their team is thinking those would be custom metal work to reflect the metal cladding of the addition.
- Mr. Cluver said that he appreciated the explanation, but the proposal is really a fourth story on a three-story, corner building that extends from edge to edge. He stated that the addition would distract from the historic character of the building. Mr. Cluver pointed out that the relationship of the extended chimneys to the addition is inappropriate. He called the addition is aggressive. Mr. Cluver continued that the precedents cited appear to have different contexts than the prominent corner location of this building. He commented that, although there are trees masking the addition, this will change in winter and also trees die and can be removed. Mr. Cluver concluded that this will be a visible element and does not feel appropriate to the building.
 - o Mr. Davis and Mr. Orphanides noted and described other precedents shown in the application in response to Mr. Cluver's comments.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that it is more than the chimneys that are at issue. He pointed out that it is the whole addition and its high degree of visibility. He continued that the Committee would not even approve a roof deck on the main block of this house. Mr. McCoubrey said the fourth-floor addition unfortunately interferes with the nicest features of the house which is the double chimney and the parapet that is very visible from Fitler Square. He commented that he appreciated the directness with which the presentation has been made but it is a highly visible change that does not conform with the Standards.
- Ms. Stein said that, if the applicant was proposing a dormer, the Committee might respond differently. She noted, however, that there is not enough head height for a dormer. Ms. Stein said that it is important that they do not break the ridge line. She asked if there is enough space to place a dormer at the back of the gable that does not break the ridge line but does provide some additional usable space in the house.

- o Mr. Davis responded that, given the existing dimensions of the upper space and roofline, he does not believe they could add a rear dormer. He noted that they have tried to do the most discrete addition they could on the roof level. If the size is reduced, the addition may not be worth it.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he appreciates the effort put into the application and the materials are nice, but it is very visible and not consistent with the Roof Guidelines and the massing of the house in general.
- Mr. Orphanides inquired about the removal of the historic materials. He asked if the concern was the roof joists and the material under the roof that did not meet the Standards.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey replied that the addition would destroy the historic appearance of the roof. He added that the roof slope should be maintained. A dormer maintains the shape but allows additional usable space. Mr. McCoubrey noted that, in this case, a dormer will not work.
 - o Mr. Orphanides commented on the difference between the slopes on the front and the rear roofs. He noted that it is interesting that the front of the gable is almost flat, but the rear of the gable has a real slope.
- Mr. Davis inquired if they were to consider a rear addition, under the existing rear roofline, would that be something the Committee would consider approvable. He noted that the ell may not be original even though it is old. Mr. Davis provided some additional information about the rear of the property.
 - o Ms. Gutterman said she would need to see a proposal before making any comments on a rear addition.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey said it appears that the rear ell is most likely part of the original construction.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The addition of a fourth level would be highly visible from the surrounding streets and Fitler Square.
- The fourth-floor addition would require demolition of the existing gable roof, which is a character-defining feature.
- The proposed design would alter other character-defining features of the historic building, the double chimney and parapet.
- There is not enough space in the existing attic to install a rear dormer and create functional living space.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work would permanently remove the gable roof, which is highly visible from surrounding streets and Fitler Square. The fourth-floor addition would be incompatible with the building in terms of massing, size, architectural features, and scale. Therefore, the fourth-floor addition does not meet Standard 9.
- The fourth-floor addition would require the removal of the entire gable roof; therefore, the application does not satisfy Standard 10.
- The rear additions would meet Standards 9 and 10 as they would not require the removal of any historic materials and would not alter the historic character of the property. In addition, the rear ground-floor additions would be reversible.

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

ITEM: 334 S 24th St MOTION: 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

ADDRESS: 1601 MT VERNON ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Miguel Santiago, owner; Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, conservator

Applicant: Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio

History: 1859; Robert Purvis House

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 1601 Mount Vernon Street is significant in the Spring Garden Historic District, owing to its association with Robert Purvis, a Black anti-slavery activist, writer, and lecturer who resided at the property from c. 1875 to 1898. Over the last few decades, the property has languished and has been subject to multiple violations, Historical Commission reviews, and court hearings, culminating in the current conservatorship by the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation. A brief timeline follows:

10/11/2000	PHC designated the Spring Garden Historic District and classified 1601 Mt. Vernon Street as significant.
12/12/2003	PHC approved application for complete rehabilitation of building (main block and ell) and construction of rear addition with garage.
2006	The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) issued multiple violations for deteriorated, bulged, and fractured walls.
2/1/2007	PHC approved application for complete rehabilitation.
4/6/2009	PHC approved application for wall shoring and reconstruction.
6/24/2010	PHC approved application for new roof and windows, and to stabilize walls.
2/3/2011	PHC approved application for masonry repair and new windows.
2/24/2011	Court order to repair roof, windows, walls, and floors.
3/14/2012	PHC approved application for new windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MARCH 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

11/2/2012	Court order to demolish rear ell and reconstruct it within one year.
12/2012	City demolished rear ell; rear wall of main block remained temporarily sealed for several years; owner did not reconstruct ell.
1/7/2013	PHC approved rebuilding of cornice and gable wall.
4/13/2017	Court order to make building safe by sufficiently sealing rear wall of main block.
7/14/2017	PHC approved plans to stabilize building and rebuild rear wall.
11/19/2018	Court appointed Spring Garden CDC as conservator.
5/22/2019	PHC approved application for structural and masonry repair.
3/6/2020	PHC approved application to install star bolts to stabilize main block.

Despite numerous approvals of building permit applications by the Historical Commission and its staff since 2003, the property was never restored, and the City abated an imminently dangerous condition by demolishing the rear ell in 2012. The main block was stabilized and its masonry repaired under the conservatorship. This in-concept application, submitted by a developer seeking to purchase the property, proposes to rehabilitate the main block and to construct a rear addition. Two schemes for the rear have been submitted.

Work to the main block would include removing the existing storefront, which post-dates Purvis's ownership, and restoring the building's residential appearance. A new marble base, stoop, door surround, and lintels would be installed on the front façade. A new door, windows, and a cornice would be fabricated in wood to match the historic features.

At the rear, the application proposes to construct a new ell to replace the ell that was demolished a decade ago. Scheme A proposes a two-story ell with a garage that would connect the main block to a three-story addition at the rear of the lot. The rear portion of the addition would have a garage, roof deck, and pilot house. Scheme A is similar in massing, size, and scale to plans that were approved by the Historical Commission on 12 December 2003. At the time, the historic ell remained and those plans proposed to retain and rehabilitate the ell's masonry. Scheme B proposes the same two-story rear ell with a garage but does not include the additional three-story building at the rear of the lot.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate main block; and
- Construct rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The only remaining portion of the building, the main block, had a storefront installed c. 1920. That intervention removed the original entryway and marble base. Two large openings for storefront windows were cut into the masonry on the front façade and side wall at the first story, and a new corner entrance was constructed. Decades of neglect have also led to the loss of the cornice and have caused the masonry to deteriorate.
 - o The application proposes to rehabilitate the main block by replicating the lost features in their original materials. A marble base, stoop, door surround, and

lintels would be installed to reverse the storefront alteration. A wood cornice, door, and windows would also be installed. The work complies with 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 While neither scheme proposes to reconstruct the rear ell to its historic appearance, the construction of an addition would allow for the main block to be rehabilitated and permanently sealed, avoiding further deterioration. Both proposed additions are compatible in massing, size, and scale and comply with Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:54:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Plato Marinakos represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked why the application includes renderings of both a restoration of the main block to its residential appearance and the retention of the existing corner entrance and storefront.
 - o Ms. Keller responded that her understanding is the annotated image that shows the restoration of the residential entrance and openings was provided by the conservator and that the building would be returned to that appearance, despite the current condition shown in the renderings of the ell.
 - o Mr. Marinakos affirmed that the developer is open to eliminating the storefront and returning the building to its residential appearance.
- Mr. Cluver questioned whether the Committee is being asked to consider approving Schemes A and B to provide the developer with flexibility based on financing or other conditions.
 - o Mr. Marinakos answered that Mr. Cluver is correct, adding that the plans the Historical Commission approved in 2012 contemplated four units and included the rehabilitation of the rear ell. The rear ell, he continued, no longer exists, so the developer feels the highest and best use would be to create two residential structures with four apartments or condominium units.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the materials would be brick on the facades abutting the street and then siding at the setback portions.
 - o Mr. Marinakos replied that the materials are fluid and that the application is in-concept only. He added that he is proposing brick to relate to the historic main block. He further explained that the garages would be moved to the center to act as a dividing line between the front and rear buildings. He explained that he contemplated siding for the portion of the building representing the rear ell. The ell, he continued, would be set back like the historic rear ell to maintain the relationship between the main block and rear addition.
 - o Mr. Cluver contended that the brick looks applied when a different material is used on the side and asked that brick be used on the visible portion of the side

wall of the three-story addition. He added that the siding proposed at the wing could be considered a downgrading of materials for a building along a major street.

- o Mr. Marinakos agreed that the brick could turn the corner.
- o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the wing portion adjacent to the main block should be faced in brick to give it continuity and a sense of its historic appearance.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the garages, the height and visibility of the pilot house, and the entry doors into the proposed three-story structure. She opined that the details are not in keeping with the district.
- Mr. Cluver commented that in looking around the neighborhood, he does not see many garages, and the curb cuts reduce the available parking.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the style of the door is problematic.
 - o Mr. Marinakos replied that the previously approved plans included three garages set at the rear of the property.
 - o Ms. Gutterman argued that those garages were intended to be built within new construction, adding that a garage would never have been located in an ell.
 - o Mr. Marinakos clarified that the rear ell was intact at the time those plans were approved and that the garages were located within a proposed addition.
 - o Ms. Gutterman countered that she has never seen a garage lead into a rear ell and called it an unfortunate design element. She then commented that the design of the garage door is not sensitive to the district.
 - o Mr. Marinakos explained that the previous design accommodated three of the units in the building, clarifying that the residents would have to park their cars, exit the garage, and then enter the building. In this proposed scheme, he continued, one garage would allow direct access to the building at the north and the other would allow direct access to the building at the south.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey commented that he would prefer that the garage doors slide down and be encompassed entirely within the portion of the new construction not associated with the wing. He then stated that he has no issue with the application not proposing to replicate the historic rear ell and that conceptually either scheme could work. He agreed with Ms. Gutterman's comments about the garage door, adding his preference for the wing to be clad in brick. He also requested that the three-story portion of the proposed construction be reworked to more of a center hall plan to be more consistent with the placement of windows and doors within the district.
- Mr. Marinakos asked whether it would be preferable to create two parking spaces rather than garages all the way to the north on the property so that the curb cuts are further from the historic main block.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that it would be preferable not to have curb cuts but that it would have minimal impact on the building.
 - o Mr. Marinakos contended that he needs to incorporate parking into the design.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property has had numerous violations issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. While the Historical Commission reviewed numerous applications in the

past, the property languished for decades. In 2012, the City demolished the historic rear ell, owing to public safety concerns.

- In a 2018 court order, the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation was appointed as conservator of the property. The conservator has repaired and stabilized the masonry of the main block, though the rear ell has not been reconstructed and the property has not been further redeveloped.
- This application by a developer seeking to purchase the property proposes two design schemes. Scheme A proposes to construct a rear ell and an attached three-story building. Scheme B proposes only the construction of a rear ell. The applicant is seeking approval for both schemes to allow for flexibility in the redevelopment of the property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The garage at the proposed rear ell is inappropriate, though parking may be acceptable at the three-story portion of the proposed new construction.
- The rear wing proposed in place of the historic ell should be clad in brick rather than siding. The brick proposed on the three-story building should continue along the side wall.
- The entry door and the design of the garage doors should be reconsidered to better reflect the qualities of the district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

ITEM: 1601 Mt Vernon St MOTION: 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: 01:11:14

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:11 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.