

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

**TUESDAY, 25 AUGUST 2020
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	Arrived at 9:19 a.m.
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP		X	

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

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- John Mondlak
- Gabe Canuso
- Jennifer Wieclaw, Esq., Duane Morris
- Charles Long
- Sami Jarrah
- Christian Busch
- Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
- Marc Kittner
- Seth Cohen, VSBA
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Susan Wetherill
- Timothy Kerner
- Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos Architects
- Randy Baron

Andrew Zakroff
Jack McCarthy
Robert Smith, Coscia Moos Architects
Michelle Bard
Joseph Pyle, Scattergood Foundation
Alyson Ferguson, Scattergood Foundation
Chuck Long, Coscia Moos Architects

ADDRESS: 11 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Raymond J. Evers
Applicant: Larurits Schless, LHS Residential Design
History: 1775
Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish a non-historic two-story rear addition, and construct a three-story rear addition on a slightly larger footprint, and also construct a stair hall with deck on the existing two-story sloped rear addition. Visibility of the rear of the property is limited to the side when looking east on Queen Street.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish two-story rear addition; construct three-story rear addition.
- Construct stair hall with deck on existing rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed three-story rear addition, and stair hall with deck, are incompatible with the historic building in their features, size, scale, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Chantry reviewed the slides with the Architectural Committee.

- Mr. Cluver addressed the stair hall with deck on the sloped roof. He observed that a portion of the roof will remain. He stated that he was concerned about water management.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that he appreciated that a portion of the roof is being retained so that it reads the same from the visible side.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is not clear what is happening with the cut of the gambrel or the original rear wall.
- Mr. Cluver addressed the proposed three-story rear addition. He stated that it is not in keeping with the historic character and is a very visible element.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with concerns regarding the massing of the addition. He objected to the roof overhang with brackets, and observed that the addition is stylistically out of character with the surrounding context.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. He questioned if it would help if the addition was recessed.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that the addition appears to be offset slightly but that it is difficult to determine from the drawings.
 - Mr. McCoubrey objected to the massing in both height and width of the proposed addition. He stated that it results in a loss of the hierarchy between the front block of the house and the more typically-subservient rear block of the house. He suggested that the addition could be improved by being narrower, but agreed that the architectural embellishments are not appropriate and make the rear addition look more like a primary structure.
 - Mr. Cluver summarized that the massing is too large in height and width, and the articulation including the roof overhang and windows is inappropriate.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the drawing scans are very poor and much of the text is illegible. He asked for better quality scans for any future reviews.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that it is a small site, but opined that the proposed scope is too much for the site.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The removal of the non-historic two-story rear addition is acceptable.
- The proposed three-story addition would be visible from Queen Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed three-story rear addition, and stair hall with deck, are incompatible with the historic building in their features, size, scale, and massing, and therefore the proposed scope does not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 11 Queen St. MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Amy Stein					X
Total	4				2

ADDRESS: 1700-06 N HOWARD ST

Proposal: Demolish stable and shed addition buildings; alter and convert main building into mixed-use

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Urban Conversions LLC

Applicant: Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos Architecture

History: 1876; Gillinder & Sons' Franklin Flint Works Decorating Plant

Individual Designation: 7/10/2020

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application for final approval proposes to redevelop the historic property located 1700-06 N. Howard Street as part of a larger mixed-use development that will extend north along N. Howard Street and Waterloo Street. The structures on the site are the former decorating plant of Gillinder & Sons Franklin Flint Glass Works. The company occupied the property from 1876 to 1914 and was an important glass manufacturing company in Philadelphia. The property was designated last month, on 10 July 2020.

The historic property includes three connecting buildings: 1. Decorating Block (1872-1876), 2: Stable (1872-1876), and 3. Shed Addition (1895-1901). All three sections of the building are considered contributing with a Period of Significance of 1876-1914. The Committee on Historic Designation concluded during the review of the property's nomination that Building 3, the Shed Addition, was contributing although it appeared to have been significantly modified.

The application proposes to rehabilitate Building 1 and incorporate it into the overall new construction. As part of the Building 1's scope of work, plans include a two-story rooftop addition and the insertion of storefronts on the east and south elevations. Buildings 2 and 3 would be demolished and replaced with a seven-story infill section.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Rehabilitate Building 1 and create new commercial storefronts, install roof deck, and construct two-story rooftop addition.
- Demolish Buildings 2 and 3. Construct new seven-story infill building.

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 will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The removal of multiple window and door openings from the first floor at Building 1 and the replacement with oversized storefront systems does not meet Standard 2.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The incorporation of the historic property into a new development requires the demolition of two contributing sections, and the proposed replacement building is incompatible in height and massing, therefore does not meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The demolition of Building 2 and 3 would permanently alter the historic building and would be irreversible, and therefore does not meet Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:17:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sergio Coscia, architect Chuck Long, and Andrew Zakroff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver requested that Mr. Coscia explain why Buildings 2 and 3 needed to be demolished and how the proposed design fits within the historic character.
 - Mr. Coscia replied that Building 1 is the most prominent at three and a half stories and they felt this building was the best candidate for rehabilitation as all three buildings are in pretty bad shape. He said that their masonry and structural consultants looked at all buildings and this one seemed most favorable for this project. Mr. Coscia noted that most of these buildings have loading docks, with the first floor being at approximately three and a half feet above grade, and they need to lower the first floor down to grade. He said this would be best for retail and other commercial spaces, so this is why the larger openings are being created for Building 1. Mr. Coscia stated that the difficulty here is not only preserving and incorporating it into a new structure but getting the accessibility to work and all of the mechanical and everything else to fit together. He added that based on the condition of the Buildings 2 and 3, that they were going to be too much work to save and also the buildings have different floor heights, so it was going to be very difficult to incorporate all of the levels into the new complex. Mr. Coscia pointed out that they are using the roof of Building 1 as an amenity space with a roof deck,

noting that the addition was pushed back and clad with a different material to distinguish it and not mimic what is there. He added that they are trying to be as respectful as they can. Mr. Coscia stated they worked to weave the old and new together and that Building 1 will be fully rehabilitated with new windows and all brick repointed. He noted that all buildings have not been well maintained for the past 100 years but Building 1 seemed to be the least abused of the three.

- Mr. Cluver said that he knows this is an individual designation and not a historic district. He noted that this project proposes a substantial amount of demolition.
 - Mr. Coscia responded that as the original business grew they subsequently began adding new structures, mainly one and two-story brick buildings to the north. He explained that the inside of this complex is very confusing, with a lot of bearing walls broken through and opened up. He noted, as an example, that Building 2 has had its ground floor removed and its upper floors have been inaccessible for 50 years. Mr. Coscia said that cannot even get up there and are conjecturing on the condition of the upper levels. He noted there was a functioning business in there until recently, but it is moving. Mr. Coscia stated that the property is zoned RSA-5 so it is actually zoned to be townhouses. He pointed out that if they do not redevelop this complex, someone else will come in and want to raze the whole thing for townhouses. Mr. Coscia commented the zoning is not working in the property's favor.
- Mr. Cluver asked the staff about the designation of Buildings 2 and 3. He said he assumes it has to do with the evolution of the property and their original function. Mr. Cluver stated that, in terms of architectural character, they are not quite at the level of Building 1 but was curious if there was any other significance to Buildings 2 and 3.
 - Ms. DiPasquale confirmed that their designation as contributing has to do with the buildings' evolution noting that the Stable, Building 2, was constructed at the same time as Building 1. She pointed to the historic maps provided to the Committee that showed the evolution of the property.
- Mr. D'Alessandro pointed out that these types of buildings had dependency buildings to support the main building. He noted that the smaller buildings indicate they originally functioned, and they do have value.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro and viewed the three buildings as a campus of structures. Mr. Detwiler said that they may not be architecturally exciting, but he does not think this is as significant as their intended purpose to jointly serve an overall factory function. He said that all three buildings were designated and pointed out that none of the buildings to the north were designated. Mr. Detwiler stated that he recognizes that there are structural issues but in reading the structural engineering letter he did not come away with anything that could not be repaired or made right. He continued that it is obvious that floors are missing and things like that but there is creative reuse needed and these buildings can be reused as shells or something else. Mr. Detwiler said that the preservation and integration of Buildings 2 and 3 is something he would like to see as part of this project.
- Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Detwiler both noted that Buildings 2 and 3 are small in scale therefore repairing them is simpler. Mr. D'Alessandro said these historic features will be lost and buried within a much larger building.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Detwiler in that the architectural quality and character relates to several criteria used for designation and this was designated as an important example of glass manufacturing in

Kensington. He added that the complex is quite intact despite its condition. Mr. McCoubrey said that the proposed design as shown in the renderings, specifically looking at the view from N. Howard Street and Cecil B. Moore Avenue, has somehow removed the manufacturing quality of the building and it no longer looks like an industrial building anymore. He contended that the changes to Building 1 are significant and unsympathetic.

- Mr. Detwiler said he sympathizes with the floor-level issue and is not opposed to making alternations to Building 1. He commented that all of the changes, including the creation of the openings and demolition of Buildings 2 and 3, results in only two and a half floors of the complex being preserved. Mr. Detwiler added that the degree of change proposed for Building 1 is too much.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the project includes too much demolition.
- Ms. Gutterman stated the addition of the roof deck on top of Building 1 is unfortunate too. She said that the corner building should be left intact with no adjustments, no added objects on top of the roof and this is in addition to rethinking what happens at the street level.
 - Mr. Coscia stated he wants to make the argument for adaptive reuse. He said he understands that the larger openings are not in character with the historic building and noted that from an adaptive reuse standpoint they are trying to integrate the building into a modern context. Mr. Coscia said the argument is always for an economic feasibility to make possible spaces for retail, restaurant, or café. He continued that they did not want to put ramps, lifts, stairs in the front of a building that was never intended to address the public at all. Mr. Coscia stated that this building was not about interacting with street life when it was built but 100 years later they have a mandate to engage mixed-use buildings and engage the public. He added that in order to do this they need to open the building up and allow people to come directly off the street and make it attractive to potential tenants in whatever retail environment we have in the coming future. Mr. Coscia explained that all of the exposed heavy timber on the interior will be left in place so that the character of the interior will be visible as pedestrians walk by. He said that they have to resolve how to take a building that had a different function and incorporate it into a modern use. Mr. Coscia pointed out that on the proposed south elevation there is a step back where the historic building connects to the new, so they are not burying the building into the new construction. He said that, in terms of the roof deck, this is the beauty of the modern interpretation and this is how we use the building now. Mr. Coscia noted that the design shows the roof deck pulled back while still affording incredible views of the skyline. He added that it is celebrating the existing building and allowing people to occupy it in several different ways. Mr. Coscia concluded that he believes this is the best way possible to reuse, repurpose, and appreciate these buildings and not have them sit there as relics from the past.
- Ms. Gutterman said there is a balance between the applicant's intent, as Mr. Coscia explained, and maintaining the character-defining features of the building. She continued that it is a question of how large and how many openings are made in the ground level, not that you have made an opening at the ground level. Ms. Gutterman said that by adding the deck on top of the ridge of the roof, all of the deck structure will be visible and that is not going to be complementary to the historic building.
 - Mr. Coscia replied that he understood but noted that balance is subjective.

- Mr. Detwiler said that the project does not honor a building by deleting two-thirds of it and carving away of the one-third that remains. He continued that he would agree to new openings on the ground level but three is a lot and the slot on the south elevation between the historic building and new construction is pretty minor. Mr. Detwiler added that placing the historic building right next to a new taller building does not honor it.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the application proposes to demolish Building 2 and 3 and create newer openings and put on a roof deck. He stressed that all of these combined is just too much. He added that he could consider larger openings in Building 1 if Buildings 2 and 3 still existed.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that Building 1 has a gable roof at the front of the building and a flat roof at the rear. He inquired about the possibility of placing the roof deck at the rear of Building 1 but maintaining the front gable portion. He noted there are many examples of mill buildings that have been turned into commercial establishments that maintain the quality and character of the building. Mr. McCoubrey said this property is important to the history of this community but can also make a wonderful public and commercial space. He stressed that they do not have to be mutually exclusive.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that he agrees with the staff recommendation and a number of the comments offered by the Committee. Mr. Grossi encouraged the retention of all three buildings and noted the project may qualify for by-right zoning relief adopted in 2019 for historically designated properties.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property is a complex of interrelated buildings that reflect their historic function as a factory.
- The proposed changes to Building 1 are significant and substantially alter its historic character as an industrial building.
- Buildings 2 and 3 are designated as contributing buildings.
- The sum of all proposed changes would result in demolition and removal of more than two-thirds of the designated property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Owing to the scope of changes planned for Building 1 and the proposed full demolition of Buildings 2 and 3, the application does not meet Standards 2, 9, and 10.

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

ADDRESS: 329 LAWRENCE CT

Proposal: Remove roof deck; construct roof deck and access

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ashley L. Hulsey and Marc R. Kittner

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC

History: 1812

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to replace the existing roof deck and access structure at the rear of the property at 329 Lawrence Court. It also proposes to install new or relocate existing mechanical equipment. The rear slope of the roof of this building was significantly modified many years ago.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Reconstruct existing roof deck and access structure at the rear.
- Install mechanical equipment.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Roofs Guideline: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof (such as heating and air-conditioning units, elevator housing, or solar panels) when required for a new use so that they are inconspicuous on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The proposed location for the mechanical equipment is at the ridge of the main roof and the equipment may be visible from the public right-of-way in front of the house. The staff recommends that the applicant install this equipment in a less conspicuous location on the roof.
 - The proposed deck and access structure appear to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the mechanical equipment is installed so that it will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:44:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Timothy Kerner represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Kerner explained that the current access to the roof deck is through a window, which they want to change it to a door.
- Mr. D'Alessandro did not understand why the window access to the roof deck needed to be changed to a door.

- Mr. McCoubrey asked if there was any way to slide the mechanical equipment back away from the front of the house. Mr. Detwiler agreed that, if the proposed egress configuration was revised to be lower, the mechanical equipment could be pushed back towards the deck which would help minimize the visibility from the street.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the structure supporting the mechanical unit could be lowered, and Mr. Kerner said it could be lowered by four inches.
- Mr. Cluver asked how the location and height of the existing mechanical equipment compared to what was being proposed.
 - Mr. Kerner answered that it was slightly higher than what was being proposed but it was pushed back to the edge of the wall.
- Mr. Cluver said that their concern was really with the location of the mechanical unit at the front roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey remarked that it seemed like more effort was being made to screen the mechanical equipment from the rear of the house than from the front of the house. He also observed that the rhythm of the dormers and the chimneys was a character-defining feature of this street, and the visibility of the mechanical unit detracted from it.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant could reduce the size of the deck and locate the mechanical equipment there.
 - Mr. Kerner responded that there was some concern about concealing the equipment from the front and the back. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the deck railing would conceal the equipment if it was placed on the deck. She told Mr. Kerner that she wanted the mechanical equipment to be invisible from the front of the house. Others noted that the standard is inconspicuous.
 - Mr. Kerner commented that placing the equipment on the deck was not a favorable solution for his clients. He agreed that he could likely conceal the equipment better.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicant provide a section drawing across the dormer for the Historical Commission's review. Mr. D'Alessandro also suggested more existing conditions documentation.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The location of the mechanical equipment would be visible from the front of the house.
- The applicant needs to reconsider the location of the mechanical equipment to make it invisible from the right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The visibility of the mechanical equipment was not acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval, provided the mechanical equipment is invisible from the public right-of-way, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 329 Lawrence Ct MOTION: Denial as proposed, but approval with revisions MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein					X
Total	5				1

ADDRESS: 4641 E ROOSEVELT BLVD

Proposal: Remove building, construct health center

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Thomas Scattergood Foundation

Applicant: Joseph Pyle, Thomas Scattergood Foundation

History: 1813; Friends Hospital

Individual Designation: 1/14/1975

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes to demolish a historic building and construct a new municipal health center on the grounds of the historic Friends Hospital in the Frankford section of Philadelphia. Established by the Quakers in 1813 as the first private psychiatric hospital in the United States, the Friends Hospital complex is composed of numerous historic and modern buildings set on 99 acres. The local designation of Friends Hospital is largely undocumented and the buildings on the site were not classified as contributing or non-contributing. It appears that the hospital was designated in the early 1970s in response to the proposed Pulaski Expressway, a highway that would have connected the Betsy Ross Bridge to Route 309, cutting across the hospital grounds. In addition to its local designation, Friends Hospital is a National Historic Landmark. The building proposed for demolition, known as Lawnside, was constructed in 1859 as the superintendent's house and is classified as contributing in the National Register designation. Any state or federal funding or other involvement in the health center project may trigger a Section 106 review, a federal preservation review, which may preclude demolition.

The Department of Licenses and Inspections is prohibited by Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance from issuing a demolition permit for a locally designated building except in two cases. The section stipulates that "No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... 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 demolition of Lawnside is prohibited unless the Historical Commission finds that the demolition is necessary in the public interest and/or the building cannot be feasibly reused, the hardship exception.

The application documents the analyses the City's Department of Public Health has undertaken to select a site for Northeast Philadelphia Health Center. The City considered 44 sites and selected the Friends Hospital site. The application also includes analyses that the City, Scattergood Foundation, VSBA, and other consultants have undertaken to identify a site on the grounds of Friends Hospital that can accommodate the new health center. The project has very strict requirements for the new building and parking that involve security, ease of access by foot, mass transit, and car, drop off and pick up, parking, and flow through the building. The impact of the building on the historic site, especially potential impacts on view sheds, were also considered. The application presents three options for siting the new building, the preferred Option A as well as Options B and C. In order to accommodate a new 98 foot by 287 foot building and parking lot, the application proposes to demolish Lawnside. All three options include the demolition of Lawnside. The application claims that the project is necessary in the public interest; the area needs a new health center and this location and configuration is the best for that center.

The Historical Commission has been confronted with similar questions recently related to a church complex at 4th and Race Streets in Old City and the Lutheran Seminary in Mt. Airy. Both cases involve non-profit organizations seeking to construct new facilities. The church sought to construct a homeless shelter, but had an eighteen-century building standing within the construction zone. The Historical Commission ultimately approved a plan to move the historic building to create a space for the new facility. The seminary project is not as far along in the planning, but the Historical Commission did reject the seminary's suggestion when designating that the Commission list a house on the site as non-contributing so that it could be demolished for new construction. The Commission did conceptually support the plans for new construction, but suggested that the house could be integrated into the new project or relocated elsewhere on the large, open site.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish 1859 building known as "Lawnside"
- Construct health center

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The application proposes to demolish a historic structure, thereby failing to satisfy this Standard.
 - Without the demolition of Lawnside, the application would meet this Standard.
- *Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance: No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... 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.*
 - This application has demonstrated that the demolition of Lawnside for the construction of the health center is in the public interest, but it has not demonstrated that it is necessary in the public interest. It has likewise contended but has not demonstrated that Lawnside cannot be reasonably adapted for a new use. The feasibility of integrating Lawnside into the new construction or moving and rehabilitating Lawnside should be considered.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that additional analyses should be undertaken to determine whether it is feasible to reuse Lawnside in its current location or at a nearby, new location on the large site.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:11:33

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Seth Cohen, owner's representatives Joseph Pyle and Gabe Canuso, and Department of Health representative Sami Jarrah represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked how a proposal that demolishes a building designated as historic can be in the public interest.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that the preservation ordinance allows the demolition of historic buildings when the Historical Commission finds that the demolition is *necessary* in the public interest. The word "necessary" is key and implies that demolition is the only way of achieving the project. The task before the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission is to weigh the public's interest in this historic building versus the public's interest in a new health center in this precise location.
- Mr. Pyle introduced himself as the president of the Scattergood Foundation, the owner of the hospital, and explained that the Scattergood board takes the request very seriously and is excited to build a new health center, which is very much in need. He explained that Lawnside, the historic house, has been unoccupied for over 20 years, and that attempts to find tenants in the past have failed because of its poor physical condition and small rooms. He opined that the building is not serving the public good, but that a new health center would. In its mission to use the hospital as a therapeutic tool, the Board of the Scattergood Foundation, which has run the Hospital for 200 years, supports the demolition of Lawnside, Mr. Pyle explained. He went on to conjecture that the early Quaker founders of Friends Hospital would have supported the demolition as well. He argued that a health center is of greater public good than the historic building. The Scattergood Foundation has three areas of focus, one of which is advocacy around mental health, and integrating physical and behavioral health. He argued that in the interest of the public, taking a behavioral health campus with a community mental health center, and then adding a physical health center and integrating those programs would be in the best interest of Philadelphians.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that no one takes exception to the foundation's mission, but questioned whether analyses were done on the remaining areas of the site that would not require the demolition of Lawnside.
 - Mr. Cohen responded affirmatively, noting that they have looked at various locations on the site.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that the Committee accepts that the facility is a necessary facility, but the question remains why the new building must be constructed in this exact location on the property and demolish a historic building.
- Mr. Jarrah explained that the City's Department of Public Health operates eight primary care health centers that serve 70,000 patients each year. This health center

- would be the ninth. The need for the center is based on an analysis done in partnership with the University of Pennsylvania on the City's Safetynet System, ambulatory care services citywide, and analysis of current demands for City services. He explained that the current wait time for appointments in this part of the city is four months, which led to a search for a new location for a health center in the northeast, as detailed in the submission materials. This site was the most ideal. The key elements of the building are proximity to public transportation, access to Roosevelt Boulevard, and the need for disabled parking spots close to the entrance. Safe and proximate accessible services is a key public interest goal.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the Committee was provided with three site plans initially and then another two, and questioned what is wrong with the shifted building footprint option that retains Lawnside.
 - Mr. Cohen responded that the Option A (Revised) is the only preferred solution that meets both the programmatic needs of the Department of Health as well as the overall site goals of the Scattergood Foundation.
 - Mr. Cohen explained that Option A (Revised) is ideal for ease of access to public transit and foot traffic. This building would be the first building people see as they enter the campus, making it easy to find. The siting of the proposed building was also selected both to honor the viewsheds of the main historic hospital building. Pulling it away from the curve of the entry drive provides general safety and ease of vehicular drop off. The siting of the building is also such that it allows them to restore the line of trees on the entry drive and to be minimally visible from Roosevelt Boulevard. He further explained that the massing of the building is program driven and that the linear nature of the building plan is necessary to provide efficient services.
 - Mr. Cohen also clarified that they looked at multiple options for access, of which their submission presented a few, but they were not intended to be viable options.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that there is no need to discuss Options B or C if they are not viable and the impact on the historic building is the same.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro opined that Lawnside should be restored and incorporated into the new building, in the public interest.
 - Mr. Cohen responded that they feel the demolition is in the public interest. He noted that during their survey of Lawnside, they looked at potential programmatic elements that could be incorporated into the structure, but thinking of a modern health center with today's needs, they did not find an efficient reuse of the building. Over the past 15 years, Friends Hospital has had trouble finding uses for the building.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked why Lawnside has not been properly maintained.
 - Mr. Pyle responded that Lawnside has not been maintained because it no longer fits the hospital or the foundation's mission. In the current healthcare climate, behavioral health services are not paid at the cost that it takes to operate a campus like this. Dollars that have been generated by the hospital have gone to support the core mission of the hospital. Lawnside, the former superintendent's quarters, is not a core mission. In the past, they looked at options to adaptively reuse the building for medical practices, a daycare, and a school, but could not find anyone who would reuse the building that was not cost prohibitive. The new healthcare center, however, would fit the mission and be in the best interest of the community.

- Mr. Canuso explained that the programming is not just a strict programming based on one scenario and one simple need, it is the culmination of many converging needs and requirements for the new building. It takes into consideration the specific desire to locate the building on the campus after a regional survey, the many community needs, including accessibility, the specific siting requirements and details of the overall Friends campus, and the designation of the campus and relationship of the main hospital building and viewsheds of that building. He opined that there is no better way to execute the design and necessary services.
- Mr. Cluver asked to look at Shifted Building Footprint Option A, conceding for a moment the necessity of the site, footprint, program, and general location.
 - Mr. Cohen responded that Shifted Building Footprint Option A does not work because it significantly alters the drop off and drive lane, eliminates the handicap parking spaces immediately adjacent to the entrance, the location of the drop off is right on the curved entry drive making it unsafe, and reduces the view of the main hospital to from the curve of the driveway. Additionally, there are significant trees and landscape that Option A tries to maintain that this option does not allow, and it extends the travel distance from the Septa stop slightly. It also makes for an awkward relationship to Lawnside that takes it out of context.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that the retention of Lawnside is more important than an awkward relationship between it and a new building. He opined that the trees along the drive are worth thinking about and the viewshed of the main structure is important, but not at the cost of a significant nineteenth-century building on the site.
- Comparing Option A (Revised) and Shifted Building Footprint Option A, Mr. Cluver observed that if the applicants were to make the entrance drive more linear, and the entry and exit points were shifted to the right by 25 feet and the loop eliminated, the point of entry and exit would not be along the curve and the trees could be maintained.
 - Mr. Cohen disagreed, noting that in the shifted scheme, eliminating some of the pavement and drive lane traffic would not be enough to restore or preserve the landscape and would create undue traffic that results in everyone going through the central parking lot, which is something they are trying to avoid.
 - Mr. Jarrah added that they also have many patients with strollers and wheelchairs, so there is often queuing at the entrance as they wait for rides and paratransit.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that Lawnside be relocated on the campus.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the reason they are not proposing to locate the health center on the north side of the campus, where there appears to be plenty of space to do so, and where it would not require the demolition of any historic buildings, is because they do not want people driving through campus.
 - Mr. Cohen responded that the main entrance of the campus is at the corner of the proposed site, and the entry along Roosevelt Boulevard with regard to a major intersection and public transit is the safest way to enter the campus. The other end of campus is right along a bend in Roosevelt Boulevard, which is not ideal to enter and exit a health center. There are also issues related to contours and water on that part of the site, as well as utilities. He also noted that they looked at different configurations of buildings, including two and three-story buildings, and explored as many options as they could imagine.

- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the applicants are open to relocating Lawnside.
 - Mr. Pyle responded that, if they have not been able to have the funds to maintain the building in its current location, the cost of relocation and then upgrading the building seems to present a hardship. He opined that Scattergood has worked hard to maintain the campus in its historic state, but that he does not see the possibility of reusing Lawnside.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the proposed building could be flipped on its vertical axis in the shifted footprint to allow for drop off near Lawnside.
 - Mr. Pyle responded that the current circle is not utilized because Lawnside is not utilized, but it also represents a significant safety concern to have people pull in right off of Langdon Street and Roosevelt Boulevard and immediately have to turn and orient themselves very quickly.
 - Mr. Cohen noted that they looked at entrances on all four sides, but did not feel that three of the four options were achievable. In the shifted footprint, it would be difficult to carry the drive through to the center parking area in a safe and efficient manner.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the concessions being made for the automobile at the expense of a mid-nineteenth century building are unfortunate. He suggested that some slight modifications could be made to the proposed building program and siting—to shift the building slightly, carve away some of the green space, and create handicap spots along the triangle, while retaining or incorporating the historic building into the new design.
 - Mr. Cohen responded that he would think of it as the concession to the public health center that is so needed and the viewshed of the original hospital building.
- Mr. Detwiler explained that he respects the use of the building and the importance of it but questioned the lack of flexibility in its program and layout. He noted that he would prefer another story on it over the demolition of Lawnside. He noted that he remains unconvinced that finding a use for Lawnside has been overly explored.
 - Mr. Pyle responded that early on in the process, someone looking for a micro site for a health center deemed that Lawnside could not be used for those purposes. He noted that it would serve a tight niche since it is on a psychiatric hospital campus, and opined that it will not be a residence again. He opined that it does not support the elements of the mission of the hospital and it gets in the way of what is in the best interest of the public on this campus. He suggested that perhaps elements of the building, such as some of the stone of the façade, could be used elsewhere on the campus.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that there are many campuses that reuse small residential buildings for office space, or some even attach them to new buildings. He stated that he remains unconvinced that the complete demolition is necessary.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia explained that they have great respect and sympathy for the organization, but ultimately agree with the staff recommendation and encourage re-siting of the new construction, and if it is not possible, would further invite a full exploration of relocating Lawnside somewhere else on the campus or possibly off-site.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- A new health center on the Friends Hospital campus, with the general footprint, program, and location of the proposed building is in the public interest, but the demolition of Lawnside is not in the public interest.
- The proposed building should be shifted slightly or modified slightly in program to allow for the retention of Lawnside.
- The retention of Lawnside is more important than the preservation of certain views of the main historic building from the entrance drive, and more important than the addition of trees.
- The creation of an awkward relationship between Lawnside and the new building is more appropriate than the demolition of Lawnside.
- The relocation of Lawnside on the campus is more appropriate than its demolition and should be explored.
- Additional siting options, including the possible incorporation of Lawnside into the design of the new building, should be explored.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The concept of a new health center on the Friends Hospital campus, with the general footprint, program, and location is acceptable and in the public interest.
- The application does not demonstrate that the complete demolition of Lawnside is necessary in the public interest.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance, with the recommendation that additional analyses should be undertaken to determine whether it is feasible to reuse Lawnside in its current location or at a nearby, new location on the large site.

ITEM: 4641 Roosevelt Blvd					
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				
Amy Stein					X
Total	5				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:07:24

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:08 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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