

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

**TUESDAY, 24 JANUARY 2023
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 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		

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

Jeffrey Pond
Gabriel Deck
Jay Farrell
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Mac Van Horn
Rustin Ohler
Scott Woodruff
Ori Feibush
Alex Balloon
George Poulin
Michael Phillips
Herb Schultz
Brian Zoubek
Susan Wetherill
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance

Ben She
Chris Johnson
Andrew Laboz
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Paul Schwedelson
Doug Mooney
Paul J. Lorenz
Shirley Hanson
Mark Travis
Cameron Moon
Michael Rodgers
Eric Quick
Paul Boni, Esq.
David Landskroner
Guy Laren
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
Devon Loney
Keith Lamont
Suzanne Ponsen
Cassidy Martin
Chwen-Ping Wang
Kristene Whitmore
Ryan Solimeo
Khan Shibly
Rebecca Shaffer

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 700-02 AND 704 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish building; reconstruct façade; construct addition

Review Requested: Final for demolition; In Concept for addition

Owner: 700 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Michael Phillips, Klehr Harrison Harbey Branzberg LLP

History: 700-02: 1922; Washington Square Building; Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris, architects

704: 1853; new façade and other modifications, 1896; G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Chestnut Street East Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2021

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street and the construction of an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street, which would extend onto the parcel at 704 Chestnut Street. The application has requested final approval for the demolition and reconstruction of the historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street and in-concept approval of the addition. The historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street would be reconstructed based on photographs as part of the addition. Currently, only the lower three stories of the original five-story façade at 704 Chestnut Street survives. The application claims that the demolition is necessary in the public interest, that the public has an interest in the improvement of this section of Chestnut Street and in the reconstruction of the historic façade, and that demolition and reconstruction is the only feasible way to restore the historic facade.

Both buildings, 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street, are classified as contributing to the Chestnut Street East Historic District. The applicant had requested that the Historical Commission reclassify the building at 704 Chestnut Street as non-contributing, but the Commission denied that request at its August 2022 meeting. At the same meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for an earlier version of the demolition and addition and commented that the proposed demolition did not comply with the preservation ordinance and the proposed addition was too tall for its context. At the October 2022 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed a revised in-concept application for the demolition and new construction and offered positive comments but took no formal action.

The application contends that the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street and the reconstruction of its historic façade to its c. 1896 appearance as part of the larger construction project is necessary in the public interest. The application claims that the public has an interest in both the “continued and further growth and development of properties located within the City’s most dense and permissive CMX-5 zoning district” and in “the restoration and recreation of the original five-story façade from c. 1896.” The application includes an engineer’s report as well as a construction cost estimate that support the contention that the only feasible way to restore the historic façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street is to demolish and reconstruct the façade.

The application also includes a revised design for the addition to the existing building at 700-02 Chestnut Street, which would incorporate the reconstruction of the historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish the three-story building at 704 Chestnut Street.
- Construct an addition on and adjacent to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street with a reconstruction of the historic facade at 704 Chestnut Street.

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 The demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street will destroy historic materials and features, even if the façade is reconstructed, and therefore will not satisfy Standard 9. It cannot be approved without a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest.
 - o The addition will not be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street or the historic district as a whole and therefore will not protect the integrity of the property and its environment, and will not satisfy Standard 9.
- *Section 14-1005(6)(d): Restrictions on Demolition No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... or of a building ... located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission’s opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.*

- o The demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street cannot be approved in satisfaction of Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. The application asserts that the issuance of the demolition permit is necessary in the public interest and provides supporting documentation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends final approval of the demolition and faithful reconstruction of the historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street, as necessary in the public interest, conditioned on the Historical Commission's approval of an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street that is compatible with the historic district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code; but denial of the in-concept application for the addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:21

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Michael Phillips and architect Herb Schultz represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham reported that the Historical Commission received a letter from the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum regarding this project. The letter was emailed yesterday, after the close of business, after the Historical Commission's submission deadline for public comment. Mr. Farnham noted that the letter was forwarded to the Architectural Committee. It suggests that the Historical Commission require an archaeological investigation of the site as part of this project. Mr. Farnham explained that this application is designed to address a legal and technical demolition question as well as to obtain feedback on the latest design iteration. Because the new-construction portion of the application requests an in-concept approval, it cannot be the Historical Commission's final review of this project. The question of archaeology will have to be addressed by the Historical Commission but will be better addressed during the application for final approval of the new construction. This application is primarily directed at addressing the threshold question of demolition.
- Mr. Phillips introduced himself and stated that his client is seeking final approval of the demolition and reconstruction of the front façade at 704 Chestnut Street and in-concept approval of the new construction. He stated that they acknowledge that the two parts of the application would be contingent on one another. The demolition and reconstruction would be tied to the new construction and one would not proceed without the other. He stated that they would take all steps to ensure that the reconstruction was as faithful as possible. He also stated that his client would place a marker at the site explaining that the front façade had been reconstructed. He asserted that the reconstruction of the 1896 façade would significantly benefit the historic district by restoring the appearance of this building to its original 1896 appearance. Mr. Phillips stated that the architect had revised the design of the overbuild to ensure that the reconstructed façade at 704 Chestnut Street would have its independence. He noted the additional setbacks that were incorporated into the overbuild.

- Mr. Schultz, the architect, stated that he added a setback to the design of the overbuild between the historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street and the projecting portion of the overbuild above, as the Architectural Committee had suggested. He noted that the seventh floor sets back from between 6'-3" and 12'-2" from the parapets of the existing buildings. The 12th floor sets back about 46 feet from the parapet. The bulk of the building over the reconstructed façade at 704 Chestnut Street sets back about 10 feet, and then it sets back about just under 30 feet on the 12th floor. He stated that the previous version of the design was a 157-foot tall, 13-story building. He explained that they eliminated one floor from the building, which is now 146 feet tall and 12 stories. He stated that they tried to distinguish the overbuild above 704 Chestnut Street from the overbuild above 700-02 Chestnut Street by bringing the line of the party wall up and noting it with setbacks and materials. He stated that he reduced the material palette as the Architectural Committee recommended. He discussed the revised elevation drawings as they were displayed. He stated that the façade of 704 Chestnut Street would be faithfully reconstructed to its 1896 appearance. The overbuild would be set back above the façade. Mr. Schultz noted that a member of the public had suggested bringing the bulk of the overbuild out to the corner of 7th and Chestnut Streets. He reported that he studied that suggestion but found that it did not comply with the zoning regulations.
- Mr. Phillips stated that they would salvage and reuse as much material from the 704 Chestnut façade as they could during the demolition and reconstruction.
 - o Mr. Schultz added that they would laser scan the front façade to aid in its reconstruction.
- Ms. Gutterman objected to the height and design of the overbuild. She stated that it is "too much." She stated that the overbuild on 704 Chestnut Street needs to be reduced in size and set back farther.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed and stated that the overbuild does not "defer" to the historic buildings. The overbuild is "chaotic." He stated that he appreciates the addition of the setback glass floor above the historic buildings as well as the setback at the corner. He remarked that the design of the overbuild should be simplified, to correspond to the simplicity of the historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street. The historic building is clean and crisp and straightforward. He pointed to the punched windows of the historic building. He stated that the overbuild should not grab the viewer's attention but should be deferential.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the storefronts.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that they would not propose work to the storefronts until tenants are obtained.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the reconstructed building at 704 Chestnut Street should read as an independent building.
 - o Mr. Phillips stated that the design of the overbuild is intended to give the historic façade of 704 Chestnut Street its independence.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that the setback helps but other the design needs additional revision. He suggested changes to the windows and materials above 704 Chestnut Street.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey objected to the white color of the overbuild at 704 Chestnut Street. He also objected to the contrasts of colors. He also objected to the projecting bay at the party wall between 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that he had attempted to differentiate the overbuild on 700-02 Chestnut Street and that on 704 to give the historic building at 704 more

independence. The projecting bay, color changes, and setbacks were all designed to give 704 its independence.

- o Ms. Gutterman responded that “it sticks out too far.”
- o Mr. McCoubrey suggested removing the bay and changing to a color other than a pure white.
- o Mr. Schultz cautioned the Architectural Committee that the colors in the renderings may not be entirely accurate. He suggested that they look at the materials samples page, which indicates that what is being called pure white is actually a stone rain screen that is tan or off white in color and what has been called brown is in fact charcoal.
- Ms. Stein stated that she finds that the latest revision includes many improvements such as the glass floor separating the new from old and the limestone bands that break down the scale. She agreed with Mr. McCoubrey, suggesting that the colors should be simplified along Chestnut Street and the bay on the overbuild between 700-02 and 704 should be removed. She also suggested additional setbacks. Ms. Stein asked about the trees being planted at the cornice level of the historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street.
 - o Mr. Schultz responded that they are not trees, they are plants on the terrace level of the overbuild.
 - o Ms. Stein asked if the parapet of the historic building will be changed.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that it will not be changed.
 - o Ms. Stein asked if the terrace would require railings.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that it will not be occupiable space.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the Architectural Committee now consider the demolition and reconstruction portion of the application.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if they would obtain an approval for the demolition and then demolish the building at 704 Chestnut Street without undertaking the remainder of the project.
 - o The applicants responded that they have already committed to linking all phases of the project. The demolition would only occur when the reconstruction and new construction was ready to proceed.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that the applicants should laser scan the building and salvage and reuse materials.
 - o The applicants responded that they have already agreed to a laser scan and to salvage and reuse materials.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that they would need to use a textured brick like that in place and also recreate the chamfer of the projecting windows.
 - o The applicants responded that they have already committed to a faithful reconstruction of the historic façade.
- Ms. Stein stated that she would support a faithful reconstruction.
 - o Mr. Phillips stated that they have already committed to rebuilding the front façade of 704 Chestnut Street to its original, 1896 appearance.
- Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the engineer's report indicated that the front façade would collapse if the roof and floors are removed. He stated that that is not the appropriate way to demolish this building, to just let it collapse.
 - o Mr. Phillips assured him that they had no intention of letting the building collapse.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the building remnant at 704 Chestnut Street could be saved without demolishing it.
 - o Mr. Schultz acknowledged that the remnant of the building could be maintained, but they could not maintain it and construct the overbuild. He stated that they

- need to demolish and reconstruct the building to construct the overbuild and noted that that path provides the benefit of rebuilding the historic building to its original appearance.
- o Mr. Phillips stated that it is financially infeasible to save the façade in place. It would add \$2 million in costs and would be unpredictable and uncertain.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the costs do not matter. It is possible to save the remnant of the building.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that the two historic buildings seemed to be pitted against one another.
 - Ms. Lukachik, the structural engineer on the Architectural Committee, stated that she initially pushed the applicants to save and reuse the building at 704 Chestnut Street during earlier reviews, but now, after reviewing the structural report and construction cost estimates, believes that demolishing and reconstructing is the better option. She stated that the public would benefit more from the reconstruction of the façade than it would from the preservation of the remnant of the façade.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Lukachik. He stated that the remnant of the building has little value. He stated that he is convinced by the applicants' argument when he considers regaining the lost façade as well as the costs, logistics, and uncertainties of trying to retain the remnant in place. He concluded that the reconstructed five-story façade would augment the historic district. The existing remnant does not provide much for the district. He noted that the applicants have agreed to salvage and reuse any reusable fabric on the façade.
 - Ms. Lukachik agreed with Mr. McCoubrey and noted that their position is predicated on a compatible design for the overbuild.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro objected to approving the demolition before approving the overbuild.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that the demolition would be conditioned on the faithful reconstruction of the front façade and the construction of a compatible overbuild. The applicants are not simply asking the Historical Commission to approve the demolition independent of the reconstruction and construction.
 - o Mr. Detwiler asked if there was any danger with approving the demolition before finalizing the other details.
 - o Mr. Phillips stated that they have clearly and expressly stated that any approval of the demolition would be conditioned on the approvals of the faithful reconstruction and a compatible overbuild.
 - o Ms. Gutterman stated that exactly what she and others are fearing occurred just a few blocks away on Jewelers' Row. The Historical Commission approved demolition and new construction, and the demolition was undertaken but the new construction was not. She stated that she would hate to see that occur here as well.
 - o Mr. Farnham interrupted Ms. Gutterman and stated that she was incorrect regarding the Jewelers' Row case. The demolition permit was obtained for the Jewelers' Row buildings before the Historical Commission had any jurisdiction over the site. The Historical Commission never approved the demolition as a condition of the new construction. The Historical Commission approved the new construction but was not involved in the demolition.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that he is not comfortable approving the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street without first approving the reconstruction and new construction.

- o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the demolition could and would be conditioned on approving the reconstruction and new construction. The conditioning matters, not the timing of the approvals.
- o Mr. Phillips reminded Mr. Detwiler that he is not approving or denying anything. The Architectural Committee does not grant approvals; it makes non-binding recommendations. The Historical Commission grants approvals.
- o Mr. Detwiler stated that he is concerned that the project could change in the future for budgetary reasons, or the property could be sold, or the economy could change, and then the building would be demolished without any reconstruction or construction.
- o Others responded that the same thing could happen if all the approvals were granted simultaneously. Something could always interrupt the project. If the Historical Commission denied projects simply because something might go wrong in the future, it would never approve another project again. No demolition would be allowed until all approvals were in place. That is the best protection that can be offered, but it is still not foolproof.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that elements must be salvaged from the historic building before any demolition.
 - o It was again noted that the applicants had already agreed to salvaging and reusing materials wherever feasible.
- Mr. Detwiler and Mr. D'Alessandro opined that reconstructed buildings never look like historic buildings.
 - o Other noted that the alternative is to accept the remnant of the building that survives, but that is not the preferred alternative. The public would benefit from the reconstructed building.
 - o Ms. Stein asserted that any reconstruction must be a faithful reconstruction.
 - o The applicants noted that they have already agreed to a faithful reconstruction.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that the building at 704 Chestnut Street is “not a Mona Lisa” but it is a contributing building and should be preserved. He opposed the demolition and reconstruction and asserted that it would set a bad precedent. He stated that the use of the public interest provision is troubling. He stated that demolishing and reconstructing is in the developer’s interest but only preserving the existing remnant of the building is in the public’s interest. He added that demolition is a waste of materials and the energy they embody. He stated that the Preservation Alliance is concerned by this application.
- Ben She introduced himself as an advocate for housing. He stated that the Historical Commission needs to rethink its understanding of public interest. Not all buildings can be reused because of their conditions and other factors. He asserted that the public would benefit from the reconstruction of this historic façade. He stated that this is a good faith effort to reconstruct this building, which will benefit the city. He pointed to a similar project at 11th and Locust Streets, where Cecil Baker & Partners constructed an overbuild on the Western Union building. He asserted that that was an excellent project that benefitted the city. He asked the Architectural Committee to recommend approval of this project and asked the developer to continue to refine the design for the overbuild.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The properties at 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street are classified as contributing to the Chestnut Street East Commercial Historic District.
- The building at 704 Chestnut Street was constructed c. 1896 and was cut down from five stories to three c. 1930. The storefront area has been extensively modified and retains no historic fabric. The current façade is a remnant of the historic façade.
- An engineer's report and construction cost estimate indicate that the building at 704 Chestnut Street cannot be feasibly incorporated into a new development project without demolishing and reconstructing the front façade.
- The demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street cannot be approved in satisfaction of Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. The application asserts that the issuance of the demolition permit is necessary in the public interest and provides supporting documentation.
- The applicant has agreed to undertake a laser scan of the front façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street.
- The applicant has agreed to faithfully reconstruct the front façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street.
- The applicant has agreed to salvage and reuse materials for the reconstruction of the front façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The public will benefit from the faithful reconstruction of the historic façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street with salvaged and new material. The reconstruction of the façade will enhance the historic district.
- The building at 704 Chestnut Street cannot be feasibly incorporated into a new development project without demolishing and reconstructing the front façade.
- The demolition of the remnant façade at 704 Chestnut Street is necessary in the public interest because the historic facade cannot be feasibly reconstructed in place; the demolition will allow the reconstruction of the historic façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street.
- The addition as currently proposed will not be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street or the historic district as a whole and therefore will not protect the integrity of the property and its environment. It does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The addition could satisfy Standard 9 if it is refined as recommended by the Architectural Committee. The addition should defer to the historic buildings. Its design should be simplified, the color contrasts should be reduced, the bay above the party wall line between 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street should be eliminated, and the historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street should be separated more from the overbuild above with additional setbacks and/or other architectural devices.
- No demolition of the front façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street should be permitted until the Historical Commission has approved and the Department of Licenses and Inspections has issued a building permit for the new construction project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend final approval of the demolition and faithful reconstruction of the historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street, as necessary in the public interest, conditioned on the Historical

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Commission's approval of an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street that is compatible with the historic district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code; but denial of the in-concept application for the addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 700-02 and 704 Chestnut St					
MOTION: Final approval of demolition/reconstruction; denial of in-concept application					
Moved BY: Gutterman					
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: 27 DRUIM MOIR LN

Proposal: Construct dormer to extend stair to third floor

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ori Feibush

Applicant: Designblendz Architecture, LLP

History: 1887; Brinkwood at Druim Moir; G.W and W.D. Hewitt, architects

Individual Designation: 6/5/1980

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace a smaller dormer with a large dormer to create a more usable room on the third floor. The design of the dormer's two windows is based on the extant windows below. The façade where the alterations would take place is a secondary façade facing the driveway. The primary façade with the large porch is on the opposite side of the building and faces the gardens. The property and building have limited visibility from Druim Moir Lane, a private road, and no visibility from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish small dormer and portion of roof;
- Construct larger dormer to create a usable room out of an existing passageway.

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 The proposed dormer is large in size and scale.

- o The dormer windows replicate the historic windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval provided the dormer is reduced in size and pulled back slightly from the cornice to maintain the cornice line, and the dormer windows are subtly differentiated from the historic windows, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:14:04

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked if the architect would be willing to pull back the dormer in accordance with the staff recommendation.
 - o Mr. Woodruff replied that they had tried pulling it back but that with this design, emulating the windows below, it only made sense at the edge of the roof.
 - o Ms. Stein commented that this is a significant addition above the roofline to an individually designated property, which blurs the old and new. She voiced support for the staff's recommendation.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the new room is oversized for the roof and the elevation.
- Ms. Lukachik opined that the design of the addition should not match the windows below.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the existing shed dormer was a thoughtful choice in the original design and should be the inspiration for a larger dormer in that space.
 - o Mr. Feibush volunteered that they looked at over 40 versions of the dormer before settling on this one.
- Mr. Feibush stated that the plans call for replacement of the asphalt roof shingles with slate.
 - o Mr. Detwiler asked if the historic roofing material was in fact slate.
 - o Mr. Feibush responded that it is unknown if it was slate or cedar shake.
 - o Ms. Stein observed that the sidewalls of the existing shed dormer, which use wood shingles, suggest that the roof was also wood.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the existing windows are character defining and that replicating them in a dormer diminishes their impact and their relationship to the façade. He commented that the cornice line is very pronounced. He expressed support for the staff's recommendation.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the proposed dormer has no slope and should remain looking like a roof space. He asked to see more options, plans, and details.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property is individually listed on the Philadelphia Register. Alterations should honor character-defining features of the original design.

- Extending the second-floor windows blurs old and new and diminishes the impact of the existing windows, which are character defining.
- It is not known if the roof was historically slate.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9. The dormer is out of proportion with other features of the façade and destroys or diminishes character-defining features, including the extant shed dormer and second floor windows.

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

ITEM: 27 Druim Moir Ln 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: 647 N 16TH ST

Proposal: Construct four-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mike Rodgers

Applicant: Devon Loney, Loney Engineering and Consulting, LLC

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for a four-story rear addition with roof deck and pilot house at 647 N. 16th St. The building was constructed circa 1875 as a three-story row home with rear ell. The applicant is proposing to rehabilitate the building and add the addition for future use as a four-family residential property. As part of the scope of work, the rear ell's roof and select areas of the back wall will be demolished. Elements of the proposed scope such as the cleaning and repointing of masonry can be approved administratively by staff.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story addition with roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

- *Standard 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 The massing and scale of the addition is not compatible with the original main block of the building. The new fourth floor rises six feet above the main block to accommodate the new floor of the rear section of the building. Therefore, the proposed new addition does not 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 permanently removes the original ell's roof and does not appropriately detail the transition between the historic roofline and the additional new wall; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 10.
- *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 pilot house is partially located on the front block of the building and is approximately 12 feet in height. If the applicant moves the pilot house back to the rear ell area of the building and lowers the pilot house height, it can meet the Roof Guidelines. If the pilot house is set back further and lowered in height, the deck and pilot house will not be visible from N. 16th Street and will be minimally visible from North Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and Roof Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:34:29

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Chris Johnson, engineer Devon Loney, and property owner Michael Rodgers represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman said that, while the rear of the property is not highly visible, the application does propose to construct an overbuild over the rear ell and a large rear addition. She noted that this is a large addition on a historic property that includes constructing a pilot house on the main block.
 - o Mr. Johnson pointed out that the pilot house will only partially be on the main roof, but the other portion will be on the rear ell and addition.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that ideally there would be no modification to the main block even if the overbuild is allowed. She said that even if the overbuild is minimally visible, she is concerned whether the historic rear ell can support the overbuild.
 - o Mr. Loney responded that he is the structural engineer on the project and has reviewed the existing foundations. He said that, based on the foundation width,

they concluded that it could handle the new load of the addition. Mr. Loney stated they are using lightweight construction in the rear with typical lumber, so there will not a lot of dead load added. He continued that the half story being added is bedroom area and is 30 PSF; therefore, it is not adding much to the existing structure.

- Ms. Gutterman observed a roof deck is also proposed for the new addition.
 - o Mr. Loney responded that it will be private roof deck for the building owner. He said a private deck, as opposed to a shared deck, only requires a 40 PSF loading rather than a 100 PSF loading.
- Ms. Lukachik asked if they would be performing or having any soils investigation performed to determine what the existing foundations can support, given that they are relying on existing foundations.
 - o Mr. Loney said they have not. He stated that the Department of Licenses and Inspections requires soil testing when an addition is larger than 2000 square feet and since this one is not, they have not done that testing for this permit application. Mr. Loney explained that his firm is the special inspector on this project and, once excavation begins, he plans to complete a soil test before any foundations are poured. He stated that they designed the addition for a 1500 PSF soil bearing load.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed concern about the visibility of the pilot house. He pointed out that the pilot house design is much taller than it needs to be. Mr. Detwiler asked that the height of the pilot house be reduced to be less visible. He also asked that the staff review an onsite mockup.
 - o Mr. Loney said that they can reduce the height of the pilot house and also conduct a mock-up review.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the rooftop access and the section showing stair access. He observed that it appears that other units would have access to the roof deck.
 - o Mr. Loney said the section does not show walls and access doors around stairs. He confirmed that only the owner has access to the roof deck.
- Mr. Rodgers pointed out that surrounding homes have similar pilot houses. He said that none of the nearby pilot houses can be seen from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman responded that these changes to surrounding properties may have been done prior to the designation of the historic district.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired if Mr. Rodgers had received the letter from the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum expressing concern about the early cemeteries on land where his house stands.
 - o Mr. Rodgers said he has not seen the letter but pointed out the extensive new construction in the area around his property. He stated that he does have concerns about the former cemetery, given the amount of new construction that has occurred in the area.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated he is concerned about the fourth-story overbuild. He said it is one thing to add or extend the wing, but this completely envelops the ell with an overbuild. He observed that the flanking properties still have their original rear ells with three stories. Mr. McCoubrey said he realizes that it is not visible. He expressed concern that it is packing a lot onto this relatively small building and the addition also directly abuts the main block of the house.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed.
 - o Mr. Rodgers pointed out the height of the nearby new construction.

- o Mr. Loney explained the increase in height and restated the lack of visibility of the addition from the public right-of-way.
- o Mr. Detwiler noted that historically designated buildings are viewed differently than new construction.
- Mr. Detwiler said the addition's parapet adds height to the addition.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the parapet was acting as a guardrail for the roof deck.
 - o Mr. Loney confirmed that it is acting as a guardrail. He said they can remove the parapet and provide a different type of rail as required by building code.
- Ms. Gutterman asked where the mechanical equipment would be located.
 - o Mr. Loney replied that each unit will have its own internal equipment and all exterior condensers will be in the side yard.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the mezzanine area.
 - o Mr. Loney responded the mezzanine is part of the owner's unit and this would be a bi-level apartment on the upper floors.
- Ms. Stein inquired if the pilot house can be moved back so that it is not on the main block. She noted the drawings appear to indicate this would be possible. She stated that multiple Committee members are concerned about the pilot house.
 - o Mr. Loney said they can look at this and work to move it back off the main block.
- Mr. Rodgers questioned Mr. Mooney's concern about the potential for archaeological remains on the property.
 - o Mr. Farnham advised that the Architectural Committee and attendees that the Spring Garden Historic District was not designated under Criterion I. Therefore, the Historical Commission would not have jurisdiction over any subsurface remains or artifacts located on the property. He explained that the property owner may have an obligation to handle any human remains found at the site in an appropriate manner and seek court approval to disinter and reinter, but that is something that is not within the purview of the Historical Commission. Mr. Farnham expressed appreciation to Mr. Mooney for raising this issue and alerting the property owner. He concluded, stating that the property owner should certainly take precautions regarding the potential for human remains at the site, but regulating the treatment of any remains is outside the authority of the Historical Commission and its Architectural Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Doug Mooney of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum said that this property stands within the boundaries of two nineteenth-century cemeteries. He explained that his organization has not done extensive research on these cemeteries, but the cemeteries existed prior to the construction of this building. Mr. Mooney said it is often assumed that past efforts to relocate burials from these grounds would have removed all remains, but, as other experiences in Philadelphia have shown, relocation efforts do not always result in 100% of the remains. He noted his personal experience with similar cases and expressed his concerns about construction work planned for this parcel. He asked the design team and owner to be aware that the area in the backyard may be fill and this should be factored into this project and soil testing. Mr. Mooney stated that his comments were conveyed to the Historical Commission in a letter dated 23 January 2023.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The pilot house would be partially located on the historic main block.

- The addition would cover the historic rear ell and would raise the rear height of the building to four stories. The rear of the building is proposed to be higher than the historic main block of the building.
- The applicant will be completing testing to confirm that the rear ell can accommodate the load of the addition.
- Although the addition and pilot house will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way, the proposed alterations will impact the historic character of the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to meet Standard 9. The massing and scale of the addition is not compatible with the original main block of the building. The new fourth floor rises above the main block to accommodate the new floor of the rear section of the building and covers the historic rear ell.
- The application fails to meet Standard 10. The proposed addition permanently removes the original ell's roof and fully covers the original roof with an additional level.
- The application could meet the Roof Guidelines if the pilot house is set back to the rear ell area of the building and the height of the pilot house is reduced.
-

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

ITEM: 647 N 16th St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1914 WILCOX ST

Proposal: Replace historic carriage house doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Waybar 534 LLC

Applicant: Paul J. Lorenz, CANNO design

History: 1880

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval to replace the original carriage house doors at 1914 Wilcox Street. The building was originally constructed as a carriage house in 1880 to

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

serve nearby residences. An application was approved by the Historical Commission in July 2022 to construct a roof addition, roof deck, and rehabilitate exterior. As part of the scope of work, these doors were to be refurbished and altered to an automated door.

The building is under construction and the contractor has determined that the existing doors cannot be altered to roll up into the ceiling space above the garage area. The applicant is proposing a replacement door that is compatible with the historic building and the general appearance of the original door but can be operated as a roll up door.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace original carriage house doors with a new garage door.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - o The original doors are a distinctive feature of this carriage house building and an example of the craftsmanship of the period it was constructed. Few original carriage house doors survive in the Spring Garden Historic District. Replacement of the doors would not meet Standard 5.
- *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 features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The existing doors are in fair condition. Small sections of the door have been altered over time, but the majority of the original materials and configuration remain in place. The doors are not deteriorated to the point where they require replacement. The doors are not proposed for replacement owing to their condition but rather for a change in operability, therefore the application does not meet Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:07:56

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the functionality of the existing doors. She asked how the doors historically operated.
 - o Mr. Lorenz responded that they operated on internal overhead slides and slid horizontally back inside the building. He explained that the original slides are no longer functional. Mr. Lorenz continued that, in the proposed configuration of the ground floor, the space the doors would slide into is occupied by a bedroom and an entryway. He said that it would not be feasible to have this work again as a sliding element and the doors as currently configured cannot be reworked to operate as an overhead door. Mr. Lorenz added that they were hoping to retain

the doors, but they have not been able to find a contractor or fabricator that can do this approach with the design. He concluded that they are proposing a newly fabricated garage door that matches as closely as possible the existing carriage house doors in material, color, and scale.

- Mr. Detwiler noted the panel configuring is changing. Ms. Gutterman observed that it is completely different.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out that the window size and proportions are changing.
 - o Mr. Lorenz replied that this is due to the change required of overhead garage door. He asked the manufacturer of the proposed replacement door if it could create a window that matches the historic one in size, but the dimensions would not work as a roll up door. Mr. Lorenz said their goal was to match the historic window size, but this was not feasible.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if they have consulted other manufacturers. He explained that he has designed several custom and semi-custom garage doors and he understands this dilemma.
 - o Mr. Lorenz responded that the contractor has put this project proposal out to several door manufacturers.
- Mr. Detwiler said he is concerned that the top window is getting much smaller. He said that if the new design could be divided into four panels rather than five, the size of the windows could be increased. Mr. Detwiler stated that he is not personally opposed to modifying the design in some way but what is currently proposed is out of proportion with the look of the historic doors currently in place. He contended there are plenty of high-quality historic garage door/carriage door reproduction companies out there that can come at this in a slightly different way and from a more of a custom construction capacity. Mr. Detwiler said it seems like the Architectural Committee is being picky about this door but there is not much to this façade and this door is an important character-defining element of it. He reiterated his concern about the proposed change in the size of the windows and said he could recommend approval for some change but not to the extent shown in the proposed design.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said he does not agree with the approach of going with an overhead door. He asked why the applicant does not have plans to accommodate the existing doors or at least show the layout of the first floor.
 - o Mr. Lorenz pointed to the first-floor plan showing the interior plans. He noted a sliding door would block a window and door associated with a first-floor bedroom. Mr. Lorenz said that, in order to meet energy efficiency code, they would need to build an additional permanent wall behind the pocket that would permanently block the existing window.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the building has a basement. He said that he worked on a project where they designed a garage door that opened by dropping it into the basement.
 - o Mr. Lorenz replied this is built on slab and there is no basement.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the existing doors could swing out.
 - o Mr. Lorenz said they could not because of the cast iron historic corner guards in place.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro asserted that the historic corner guards must be retained.
- Ms. Stein asked if the applicant had considered eliminating the garage. She noted that the square footage is only 2200 square feet and was curious if eliminating the garage is a possibility.
- Ms. Stein asked if they could use a clamshell to preserve the door. She said industrial clamshell designs might work with the carriage protectors at the bottom.

Ms. Stein said they are high powered and can lift glass and metal doors. She agreed that the historic doors would likely need to be altered to accommodate this change but contended that the Architectural Committee would like to see the doors preserved. Ms. Stein emphasized that the historic doors are the main event on the primary façade. She encouraged creativity to preserve the doors.

- Mr. Detwiler said he is not convinced that there is not a hardware or mechanized company out there that could modify these doors to operate. He mentioned that he has included very heavy carriage doors on his projects, and these included single-slab doors that utilized heavy motors to lift them up. He encouraged the applicant to do more research to find a solution. Mr. Detwiler said he believes there is a mechanized solution out there that can automate the existing doors.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said he objects to removing or significantly altering the historic doors.
- Mr. Detwiler said he wonders if there is way to connect the two doors into one leaf and finding heavy duty hardware that can lift both up. He contended that something can be engineered to solve this problem.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The carriage house doors are the most prominent, character-defining feature on the front façade of this building.
- The design of the proposed replacement door is different in detail, dimensions, and proportions from the historic doors.
- Further research should be done to determine ways the historic doors can be retained either as an operational garage door or as a fixed door.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to meet Standard 5. The original doors are a distinctive feature of this carriage house building and an example of the craftsmanship of its construction period. Few original carriage house doors survive in the Spring Garden Historic District. As the building's façade has a simple design with only a few key features, the historic doors serve as the most prominent original character-defining feature and replacement of the doors would not meet this standard.
- The application fails to meet Standard 6. The existing doors are in fair condition and additional solutions should be explored for retaining them. Small sections of the door have been altered over time, but most of the original materials and configuration remain in place. The doors are not deteriorated to the point where they require replacement. The doors are not proposed for replacement, owing to their condition but rather for a change in operability.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

ITEM: 1914 Wilcox St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 130 N 3RD ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building; construct five-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 130 N. 3RD LLC

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects, LLC

History: 1950

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-historic, non-contributing, one-story, two-bay, vernacular building and construct a new five-story plus cellar mixed use structure. This proposed building would contain four family dwellings plus vacant commercial space, a roof deck, walk-out rear decks starting at the second floor, and interior recessed balconies from the second to fourth floor. Some proposed materials include dark gray cast stone with matching mortar, dark iron-spot velour brick veneer, aluminum storefront with black frames, frameless glass guardrails for the interior balconies, black picket guardrails for exterior balconies, and black solid paneled garage doors. Currently, the existing small structure only partially occupies the long lot, with parking spaces at the rear on the Cherry Street side. The applicant has provided a packet containing historical maps, site photographs, sections, elevations, and detailed renderings of the proposed new construction.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish one story non-contributing building and construct new five-story mixed use building to occupy entire lot.

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 The proposed demolition of the extant building satisfies Standard 9 because the property is classified as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. The proposed new building does not satisfy Standard 9; the inset balconies and other features would not be compatible with the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:23:37

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gabriel Deck represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asserted that he was not opposed to the site being built nor the number of floors, but stated he believed if refined and one foot was taken off each story, it would still fit into the context of the street and this small difference would matter. He noted the brightness and openness of Cherry Street and argued the very dark materials of the proposed construction would loom over the street. Mr. Detwiler suggested to lighten up the dark palette and added that the front recessed balconies create black shadow voids on the front façade. He stated that he believed it possible to keep the contemporary detailing while switching to a lighter brick, which would not necessarily need to be red brick even though the red brick color is a character-defining feature of the neighborhood. Mr. Detwiler commented on the size of the windows which he believed to be too tall and could be lowered slightly. He stated that all these subtle adjustments in height would add up to a more contextual building while still being contemporary.
 - o Mr. Deck, applicant, explained that multiple iterations of color schemes were discussed, with the goal being to let the building stand as a new addition to the neighborhood instead of replicating the neighborhood's materiality. Applicant assured Mr. Detwiler his comments will be taken into consideration.
- Mr. McCoubrey also commented on the color scheme and explicated that the modernity the applicant is seeking can come in a subtle way, and the building can be differentiated without being oppositional to the neighborhood. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Detwiler's suggestion to diminish floor heights. He added that the cornice and parapet were high and thick which contributed to the looming effect. He suggested the parapet be brought down and the mass of the cornice be diminished. Lastly, Mr. McCoubrey drew attention to the front balconies, which he contended were problematic and not within the character of the district. He concluded that a lighter color and more contrasting in the brick would make this building a friendlier member of the district.
- Mr. Detwiler drew attention to Page 24 in the applicant's packet, which he said demonstrated how the proposed new construction related to the facades of the street. He reiterated that tightening up the building, bringing down the cornice, taking inches off the first-floor height will bring it down in line with the neighbors.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicant if the proposed construction will be a steel-framed building.
 - o Mr. Deck responded that there will likely be some steel incorporated, but it would primarily be wood framed.

- Mr. D'Alessandro contended that it should look like a masonry building with masonry proportions, punched openings compatible with a masonry building, and right now it looks incompatible with the district.
 - o Mr. Deck explained they pulled cues from the rhythms of consistent window openings in the neighborhood.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro interjected that he did not agree the openings were consistent.
- Mr. Detwiler commented on the use of positive and negative space between the windows and suggested that, if everything were shortened, it could help make that space read better.
- Ms. Stein pointed to the proportions in Old City which include the first floor as the tallest floor, progressively coming down as you go up in a building. She remarked that the proposed construction has the inverse effect, which makes it feel unsympathetic to the neighborhood. She suggested the first and second floor keep their height and the third and fourth floor lose some height. Ms. Stein remarked that there is precedent in Old City for one recessed balcony on the façade which commonly serves as open fire stairs. She said she would not be opposed to pushing the facades out for three of the window bays and leaving an open bay which could be a balcony. According to Ms. Stein the cantilevered balconies in the back are overbearing. She recommended their removal.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed and added that if they were half the width of the building they could read as a fire escape. He also commented on the lack of definition for the first floor and urged the applicant to wrap the first-floor skin around the west side of the building as well. He also highlighted that the balconies will eventually “have stuff on them,” which will feel incompatible with the neighborhood.
 - o Applicant responded they would take all comments into consideration.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed her concern for the visibility of the “stuff” on the roof deck from the street based upon the 32-inch parapet wall. She suggested pulling the roof deck back, allowing for a hidden railing which could then allow the parapet height to be lower.
 - o Applicant explained the roof deck is currently set back 5 feet from the street frontages.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested lowering the parapet since it is not being used for fall protection.
 - o Applicant agreed it could probably be lowered without making any part of the roof deck visible.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggesting glazing the top panel of the garage doors.
 - o Applicant explained the top panels are infill panels to mitigate height issues, which match the infill panels that flank the residential entry located in the center of the Cherry Street elevation. Mr. Deck stated they would consider glazing the panels.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the garage doors could be narrowed to appear as industrial carriage doors.
 - o Mr. Deck explained that was something they were trying to do but ran into issues due to utility equipment located on Cherry Street. He specified each garage door is two cars wide. He assured the Committee they would make them look more friendly.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested three paneled telescoping doors with the upper panel reading as a transom to reduce the looming feel of the garage. He noted the symmetry of the building, which is thrown off by the garage doors and suggested adding more

masonry, another window, and shifting the garage doors so that the west bay feels like it's sitting above masonry.

- o Mr. Deck responded that he can already envision some refinement based on the feedback.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the need for four lanes.
 - o Mr. Deck responded each apartment is allowed one car space.
- Mr. Detwiler clarified that behind the garage doors are parking spots as opposed to a parking garage you drive down into.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if other alternatives had been considered which would allow smaller garage doors.
 - o Mr. Deck responded affirmatively but noted constraints due to lot width.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked the width of the parking spaces.
 - o Mr. Deck responded 8.5 feet wide, with a curb cut reduced to 33.5 feet.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented the garage doors look more like a loading dock for an industrial building as opposed to parking spaces which he believes to be incompatible to the district.
 - o Mr. Deck again assured the Committee that the feedback will be used to downplay the feel and size of the doors.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Alex Balloon echoed the comments made about color palate and said there are no black buildings on this section of N. 3rd Street. He highlighted the variability of the color palate: red brick, orange-gold brick, and brownstone. He encouraged the developer to look to the existing color palate. He stated he did not agree with the opposition to added height, as the district is commercial with buildings of various heights. He noted his support of Ms. Stein's comments about windows getting smaller as the floors progress up.
- Ben She stated he would like to see more articulation in the fenestration perhaps with mullions, especially for the ground floor. He stated that he would also like to see something that reflects the industrial building across the street; it could be a nice nod. He argued that Old City is characterized by loft apartments, which were previously industrial. He believed that, with the vestiges of previous industrial use, the garage doors may not look out of place for the context of Old City. He pointed to 56 N. 2nd Street, which also has a similar grayscale palate.
- Job Itzkowitz, Executive Director of Old City District, provided additional context on the project, which did require a zoning variance and came before his RCO committee. He noted that there were no objections, although the project was not being reviewed in the same context as this Committee. He stated that his RCO does not limit the height of first floors because, when the first floor is shortened, the opportunity to lease to a long-term tenant diminishes, thus affecting the commercial corridor. He urged the Architectural Committee to avoid recommending shortening the first floor. He pointed to a new build on S. 2nd Street that is also top heavy and stated the new buildings are meant to be of their place and time. He also pointed to the variety of balconies in the district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The dark color palate, recessed front balconies, and full width back balconies add a looming and imposing character to the proposed new construction, which is not compatible with the Old City Historic District.

- The dark paneled garage doors on Cherry Street throw off the symmetry of the proposed new construction and could be mistaken for an industrial loading dock.
- The floor heights and punched window openings should resemble a masonry building.
- One of the four front bays could be used as a balcony to imitate exposed fire stairs, which are common in Old City.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed demolition of the extant building satisfies Standard 9 because the property is classified as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District.
- The proposed new construction fails to satisfy Standard 9; the inset balconies and other features would not be compatible with the historic district.

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

ITEM: 130 N 3rd St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein 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: 3408 RACE ST

Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct three-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Constellar Corp.

Applicant: Chwen-Ping Wang, Ping Design LLC

History: 1872; John Shedwick, builder

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Powelton Village Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/2022

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the majority of the two-story rear ell along with a one story non-historic shed addition at a Contributing property in the Powelton Village Historic District. It further proposes to construct a three-story addition in place of the rear ell. The building was constructed in 1872 and is three stories tall with a mansard roof. The mansard roof and dormers are visible at the front and rear facades. The two-story ell to be demolished dates to the time of construction. The application proposes to demolish all of it except a one-story portion of the west exterior wall. The new addition will cut into and block the rear portion of

the mansard roof and be clad in vinyl siding. The new addition will be visible from the public right-of-way on N. Shedwick Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish two-story rear ell and one-story shed addition of building;
- Construct new three-story addition in place of rear ell.

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 demolition of the rear ell does not meet Standard 2. The rear ell is an original part of the building.
 - o The proposed three-story addition does not meet Standard 2. It will cut into and obscure the mansard roof and dormers.
- *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 The proposed demolition of the rear ell does not meet Standard 9. It is itself part of the historic fabric of the building.
 - o The proposed three-story addition does not meet Standard 9. It would destroy portions of the existing mansard roof. Furthermore, it will be clad in vinyl siding.
- *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 would be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed three-story addition does not meet Standard 10. It necessitates the demolition of the historic form of the building and would not be removable in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:57:35

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chwen-Ping Wang represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Wang presented a summary for the scope of work for the project, emphasizing that the addition is being added to the rear of the building and will not be visible from the front on Race Street. He mentioned that they are open to hearing remarks from the Architectural Committee.
- Ms. Gutterman clarified that the rear of the building is also visible from a public right-of-way on Shedwick Street, and that the proposed addition “overwhelms” the historic block and impacts the mansard roof. She added that reconstructing the rear bay is

- not an acceptable solution. She suggested scaling down the addition to two stories and finding a way to better integrate it into the rest of the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey added that the nature of the mansard on the main block of the house makes designing an addition difficult. He questioned whether an overbuild was feasible. He added that the rear wing is well preserved and highly visible and that he is reluctant to see it demolished.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and opined against the demolition of the rear wing.
 - o Mr. Wang responded by asking for clarification. If he is not able to cover the mansard, that would imply that only a two-story addition would be possible. Additionally, if he is not able to demolish the rear wing, he would not be able to move the massing of the addition. He asked if he would be able to change the building at all.
 - Ms. Stein responded that an addition could be possible at the rear, but she pointed out that the shape of the property line is different than the rest of the lots on the block and is the reason why this house does not have the same proportions as its neighbors. This makes an addition difficult. She added that the Architectural Committee is not saying that they are not able to put any addition on, but that the proposed addition is too large, dominant, and visible to proceed with as is. She would want to see what a smaller addition would look like, one that does not go up as high or interfere with the mansard.
 - o Mr. Wang responded that they could push back the addition and not overbuild on top of the ell.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked how visible the rear is from Shedwick Street and pointed out the prominent rear bay window.
 - Ms. Gutterman hypothesized that a one-story block addition may be possible.
 - Mr. Detwiler questioned if there was a way to fill in beside the current rear ell, perhaps by demolishing the small one-story shed addition. He added that would be a less visible change. He and Ms. Gutterman emphasized that they would have to watch the property line to do so. He admitted that it was a difficult site to work with.
 - o Mr. Wang asked if widening the rear ell could be a possible solution.
 - Ms. Gutterman answered that the Architectural Committee would have to make sure whatever was proposed would not overwhelm the historic fabric. She added that, given the property line and setbacks, the size of an addition is likely limited. The current proposal is so large and has such an impact that it does not work within the historic district.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro added that the applicant may be able to check to see if they were allowed to build right up to the property line. If so, it might make the addition easier to design. He added that they might be able to incorporate more square footage if they use an unusual shape.
 - Mr. Wang proposed keeping the ell but pushing back the rear wing and building a new bay window on it.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro answered that he would want to keep the original bay. He further clarified that he would want that particular style of design to be maintained. He added that he is less concerned with the total impact of the height of an addition if the bay is kept. He questioned the possibility of only partially covering the mansard.
 - Mr. Detwiler added that he would not be opposed to a third floor being added to the ell if it interacted better with the mansard. There are a lot of options that might work but he would need to see a new design to decide what could be done. He emphasized being sensitive and careful about how any new addition would interact

- with the older elements. He mentioned that there are ways to build more around the ell, but that the design as presented is not the way to go about it.
- Mr. D'Alessandro recommended working with the building and not trying to change it to fit a new design.
 - Mr. Wang asked that if he were to build a third story that worked with the mansard in some way if that would be acceptable.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro replied that they would need to see options for designs that worked this way to make a final decision.
 - o Ms. Gutterman added that they would not be able to approve anything without seeing new designs.
 - o Mr. Detwiler added that the applicant could work with the staff on new design ideas and go through different options that would have less impact on the historic fabric of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- George Poulin commented that agreed with the Architectural Committee and added that the presentation did not address the current condition of the front of the property and that the sides of the building have had some “unfortunate” window alterations and it would be nice to see a future presentation address some of those alterations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property is listed as a contributing resource to the Powelton Village Historic District. Alternations and additions should honor character-defining features of the original construction.
- Demolishing the majority of the original rear ell of the property would remove an overly large portion of original materials and design and destroy character-defining features such as the rear bay window.
- Constructing a large three-story addition on the back of the building as presented would obstruct and potentially destroy character-defining features such as the mansard roof and dormers.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2. The rear ell is an original part of the building, and the proposed three-story addition will cut into and obscure the mansard roof and dormers.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9. The proposed demolition of the rear ell is itself part of the historic fabric of the building and the proposed three-story addition destroy portions of the existing mansard roof and will be clad in vinyl siding.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 10. The proposed three-story addition necessitates the demolition of the historic form of the building and would not be removable in the future.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 3408 Race St MOTION: MOVED BY: 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

ADDRESS: 425-29 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct three-story addition; cut window openings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Morgan Cat LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: 1850; St. Andrew's Byzantine Ukrainian Catholic Church; extensively altered for church, 1946; rectory added, 1952

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This revised application proposes to convert the former St. Andrew's Byzantine Ukrainian Catholic Church and rectory to multi-unit residential complex, with a three-story addition to be constructed at the rear. The church building is the result of extensive alterations starting in 1946 to a mid-nineteenth-century structure used as the Willing Day Nursery. The rectory was built as an addition to the church in 1952.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar scope in December 2022, at which time it voted to recommend denial, concluding that the new windows as proposed for the side facades of the church building are not in keeping with the architectural features of the building, and that the three-story rear addition is not compatible with the massing, size, scale, proportions, and architectural features of the historic property and its environment. The application was revised based on the Committee's comments and was reviewed by the Historical Commission at its January 2023 meeting, at which time it denied the application as proposed, and suggested resubmission to the Architectural Committee with revisions.

This current revised application responds to comments from both the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission, although some recommendations were conflicting, particularly as they pertained to the third floor of the rear addition. The applicant had revised the rear addition after the Committee's review to be more like a mansard but received comments from the Historical Commission that it would be more appropriate as a true third floor. The Commission acknowledged the difficulty in adaptively reusing the church building. The proposed scope includes new window openings on the sides of the main building, which have been revised to be more in keeping with the design of the historic window openings. The stained-glass windows on

the front façade will be retained. The rear of the property is visible to the public from Lawrence Court.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert former church and rectory buildings to residential use.
- Construct three-story rear addition.
- Cut new window openings into sides of church.

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 The new windows as proposed for the side facades of the church building have been revised to be more in keeping with the architectural features of the building.
 - o The three-story rear addition has been revised in terms of materials and proportions to respond to the surrounding context at both front and rear. While the addition is large, it has been redesigned to not overwhelm the historic building as was initially proposed.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:15:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rustin Ohler and property owner Mark Travis represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the windows and the material of the third floor of the rear addition.
 - o Mr. Ohler replied that the design for the windows and the gray metal panel material is in response to the context of Lawrence Court Walk.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about visibility from the public right-of-way of the rooftop mechanical equipment.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that he can provide sightline studies to show that it will not be visible or can work with the staff on screening the equipment.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the skylights on the church roof.
 - o Mr. Ohler explained that skylights have been shown on every version of the design, including the version reviewed by the Architectural Committee in December 2022. He explained that the skylights have been relocated slightly to align with the windows below. He clarified that they are flat skylights which protrude approximately four inches above the roof surface.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that red brick on the rear addition is not appropriate. Others disagreed.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey explained that the rear ell is red brick, but is currently painted, and therefore red brick is appropriate.

- o Ms. Stein agreed that red brick is appropriate and has precedence in this location and will be compatible with the context of Lawrence Court Walk.
- o Mr. Ohler stated that the proposed red brick is not a thin brick, but rather is a four-inch nominal brick.
- o Mr. Detwiler stated that the staff should review a brick sample.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that the louvered openings in the towers are still being shown as windows despite the Architectural Committee's opposition to this change during the December 2022 review.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that members of the Historical Commission were not opposed to the windows replacing louvers. Those Commissioners had appreciated that the masonry openings were not being altered, that louvers could be reinstalled at any time in the future, and that the change to windows was one modification which enabled the reuse of the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the crown of the arch on the new side windows is too close to the cornice. He asked if the side windows could be narrower.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that these were able to be lowered by about four inches from the cornice. He explained that the windows below are the minimum size needed to meet building code requirements for egress, and that they are sitting on the floor of the second floor, so those cannot be lowered.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested a second band of windows instead of the wide openings as shown.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the side doors are being widened.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that they are remaining the same size and are currently solid steel doors.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the black color proposed for the sash and spandrel panels is too dark.
 - o Mr. Ohler noted that the original sash is painted wood and confirmed that this proposal is for black window trim and sash.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the material choice for the third floor of the rear addition. He stated that he is not opposed to metal in this location, but asked if it could have more detail or refinement. He suggested a standing seam.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that the Historical Commission had recommended squaring off the third floor and had asked that the materials respond to Lawrence Court Walk. He stated that he can change this material from composite panels to standing seam.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Detwiler, suggesting a texture or jointing system for the third floor of the rear addition.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Ben She commented about the significance of the roof features and stained glass, both of which will be preserved as part of this adaptive reuse project. He noted that the design has been adjusted several times owing to comments from the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. He commented in support of the application.
- Paul Boni, representing Society Hill Civic Association, asked the Architectural Committee members to refer to the report by Powers & Company, which he submitted as public comment in advance of the meeting. He commented in opposition to most aspects of the project scope, including the size of the rear addition, the new window cuts on the sides of the building, and the material choices and colors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The current application is the third revision to the design, based on December 2022 comments from the Architectural Committee and January 2023 comments from the Historical Commission.
- Additional recommendations were made during this review to further refine the design in advance of the review by the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The three-story rear addition has been revised in terms of materials and proportions to respond to the surrounding context at both front and rear. While the addition is large, it has been redesigned to not overwhelm the historic building as it did when initially proposed. The new windows as proposed for the side facades of the church building have been revised to be more in keeping with the architectural features of the building. Further refinement of the third-floor addition shape and materials, and side window sizes, will allow for satisfaction of Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 425-29 Pine St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X (left at 12:42 p.m.)
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 117 S BEECHWOOD ST

Proposal: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Duncan and Partners REI

Applicant: Emmanuel Duncan

History: 1922; Sansom Gardens; William Koelle, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows at the first and third floor front and entire rear of this Significant building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

District. The historic window and French door remain on the second-floor front of the building. In 2014 and again in 2020, Historical Commission staff approved shop drawings for new wood windows for the front and rear of this building. These approved shop drawings showed six-over-six double-hung wood windows for the first and third floor front and a three-pane basement window, and a mix of six-over-six double-hung wood windows and double casements for the rear. It is unclear if these windows were ever purchased and installed. The property was sold in 2021. Later that year, Historical Commission staff received a complaint from a neighbor about the installation of vinyl windows with grilles-between-glass and aluminum panning. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the vinyl windows at the request of the Historical Commission's staff, prompting this request for legalization of the vinyl windows from the property owner.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize vinyl windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:54:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked about the second-floor front façade windows.
 - o Ms. Chantry confirmed that the historic window and French doors remain at the second-floor front façade.
 - o Mr. Detwiler observed that these openings, which include French doors and elliptical windows, are the most complicated and therefore most expensive to replace, so it is fortunate that these remain.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the Architectural Committee cannot recommend approval of the vinyl windows and aluminum panning. He noted that the Historical Commission staff twice approved historically appropriate wood windows for this property, yet vinyl windows are now installed.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the windows to be replaced are typical in design and should be straightforward to replace with appropriate windows.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the historic frames may survive behind the aluminum panning.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about visibility of the rear of the building from the public right-of-way.

- o Ms. Chantry displayed a photograph showing the rear of the building and the vinyl windows, taken from the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The historic window and French doors remain on the second-floor front of the building.
- Vinyl windows were installed in 2021 at the first and third-floor front and entire rear of the building.
- The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the vinyl windows.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The vinyl windows and aluminum panning do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 117 S Beechwood St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:00:28

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:01 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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