

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

**TUESDAY, 15 DECEMBER 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		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

- Karen Arnold, Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission
- Harrison Haas, Esq.
- Jay Bills, Olson Kundig
- Dominic Folino
- Sam Little
- Tom Kundig, Olson Kundig
- Sean Narcum, PZ Architects
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
- Michael Forman
- Uk Jung, Studio Hada
- Elizabeth Armour
- Monserrate Gonzalez
- Doug Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architects
- Nicolas Charbonneau

Stephanie Boggs, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Philip Rakita
Ming Lee Yuan, Olson Kundig
Randal Baron
John Hunter
Paul Boni, Esq.
Mike Katra
Susan Wetherill
Grace Flisser
Michael Eiland
Chris Carickhoff
Steve Olszewski
Celeste Hardester
Kim Seff
George Poulin
Kirsti Bracali
Charlie Moleski
Sylvia Bastani
John Carpenter
Rich Pavoni, Girard College
Derek Spencer
Henry Bailey, United Makers
Jim McAuliffe, AIA
Clinton Walters
Louise Fischer
Alexander Fidrych
Robert Piasecki
Val Nehez
Matt Ulassin
Karl Recktenwald
Bruce Laverty
Hillary Wittich
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.

ADDRESS: 230, 232, 234-36 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Remove rear ells and additions; construct additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 234 S. 4th St. LP and Forman Family Realty Trust

Applicant: Ming-Lee Yuan, Olson Kundig

History: 1805

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to combine two historic rowhouses and construct large additions at the rear and on an adjacent vacant lot to create one large residence. The Historical Commission approved the application in concept in November 2019. The applicant now requests final approval.

The application proposes work to a site that consists of three parcels and includes two historic rowhouses at 230 and 232 S. 4th Street and a lot surrounded by a non-historic brick wall with fence. The rowhouses face S. 4th Street and open onto Leithgow at the rear. The open lot runs west from 4th Street to Leithgow Street along Locust Street. The application proposes to combine the parcels, join the historic rowhouses, remove the rear ells of the two rowhouses as well as later garage and dining room additions, and construct additions to create one large dwelling. At its November 2019 meeting, when the Historical Commission granted approval in concept to the proposal, it determined that the removal of the rear ells would constitute an alteration, not a demolition, in the legal sense. The new additions would be clad in brick with metal windows. The additions would be in the style of nearby mid twentieth-century Modernist houses.

Since the approval in concept, the architects have refined the design, but have not deviated from the conceptual design that was approved. The overall square footage and footprint have been reduced slightly and more of the existing garden space at the corner of 4th and Locust will be retained, but otherwise the design is unchanged.

The November 2019 in-concept application and associated documents can be found at this link: <https://www.phila.gov/media/20191101124632/232-236-S-4th-St.pdf>

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove rear sections of the buildings at 230 and 232 S. 4th Street.
- Construct additions.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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 Historical Commission has already determined that the rear ells to be removed are not "historic materials that characterize the property." The proposed

additions are differentiated from the old and are compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. Therefore, this application satisfies 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 would be unimpaired.*
 - The Historical Commission has already determined that the rear ells and additions are not considered part of “the essential form and integrity of the historic property.” Therefore, this application leaves in place the essential form and integrity of the historic property and satisfies Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Historical Commission’s approval in concept of November 2019.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:22

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Michael Forman and architect Ming Lee Yuan represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Forman stated that the project was paused when the pandemic hit. He explained that they have restarted owing to their confidence in the City of Philadelphia. He stated that the plan is nearly identical to the plan that was approved in concept. He stated that the plan for rear ells is unchanged. He noted that they reduced the scope of the additions slightly and increased the green space at the corner of 4th and Locust.
- Ms. Yuan stated that they will fully document the rear sections of 230 and 232 S. 4th Street as required by the approval in concept.
- Mr. D’Alessandro objected to the proposed replacement windows. He claimed that the one-inch-wide muntin is incorrect. He stated that the existing wood windows should not be replaced, but should be restored.
 - Ms. Yuan stated that the windows in the historic buildings will be replaced in kind. She suggested that perhaps Mr. D’Alessandro was confusing the replacement windows in the historic sections with the new windows in the additions.
 - Mr. D’Alessandro stated that the windows should not be replaced. They should be restored.
 - Mr. Forman stated that he renovated the houses next door at 226 and 228 S. 4th Street and replaced the windows in kind with the Historical Commission’s approval. He stated that the windows at 230 and 232 S. 4th Street are in very poor condition and must be replaced. They cannot be restored. The buildings were not maintained before he purchased them.
 - Mr. D’Alessandro stated again that the proposed replacement window is not compatible. The muntin is too wide. The proposed muntin is 7/8 inches wide and is too wide.
 - Mr. Farnham stated that the proposed muntin, which is shown as 7/8 inches wide in the application, is the correct muntin for these buildings. He observed that the

staff recommendation includes the provision that the staff will review all details. The staff routinely reviews details such as doors, windows, cornices, and other features. He noted that the staff reviews and approves hundreds of window applications annually. He noted that the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations permit the staff to approve replacement windows, provided the windows being replaced are deteriorated. He stated that the staff would approve the proposed windows administratively. He concluded that the proposed window is the correct window, the staff will verify that the details are correct using shop drawings, and the staff will then approve the windows. He implored the Committee to focus on the aspects of the proposal that exceed the staff's authority to review and to leave the minor details, which are in fact already correct, to the staff.

- Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the Committee is not approving any replacement windows. The windows must be restored. He asserted that the window replacement must be removed from the application
- Mr. Cluver disagreed and stated that the staff can address the window replacement. He contended that the staff should address the windows in this application as they do in all other applications.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he has thought about the "sparseness" of the details on the addition, especially the section that extends out to Locust Street. He noted that the addition has steel windows, no cornice, and few details. He observed that, after considering the design decision, he has accepted it, but wanted to make sure that the Committee had an opportunity to discuss it.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that he respects the holistic design approach for the addition, but wanted the Committee to discuss it.
- Ms. Stein stated that she appreciates the design refinements and thinks that the design has improved. She asked if the roof structure would be retained or replaced.
 - Ms. Yuan stated that a structural engineer will determine whether the roof structure can be reinforced and must be replaced.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the chimney that will be added to the historic building.
 - Ms. Stein stated that the new chimney should be similar in size, materials, and location to the historic chimneys.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed and noted that the staff could review those details.
 - Ms. Yuan stated that the new chimney could replicate the historic chimneys.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how the piazza section of the rear ell that is being retained at 230 will meet the back of the main block.
 - Ms. Yuan responded that the piazza will meet the main block as it did historically. Nothing will change.
- Mr. D'Alessandro complained about the roofline of the section of the addition facing 4th Street. He said that it is "too flat and thin" and suggested that it should be a sloped roof. He rejected the notion of a flat roof, stating that it was not compatible with the neighborhood. He added that there was too much glazing.
 - Mr. Cluver, one of the architects on the Committee, disagreed, noting that the section in question is set back from the street and screened by vegetation.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro argued that the big, flat piece of glass was inappropriate. He stated: "I don't like it."

- Ms. Yuan explained that the design is reacting to Bingham Court, directly across the street, the Modernist housing development by world-renowned architect I.M. Pei. Like this design, Bingham Court has large glazed areas and flat roofs.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that "something is wrong with that elevation."
- The architects on the Committee disagreed with him. Responding to Mr. D'Alessandro, Mr. McCoubrey stated that "this is a contemporary design and the juxtaposition here is actually appropriate, between the glass of the new and the masonry of the old."
- Mr. Cluver stated that he appreciates the design of the corner at 4th and Locust Streets. He stated that he usually likes to buildings located at the sidewalk, but the "soft" corner works in this instance.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission received a letter of support for the project from the Society Hill Civic Association, which was shared with the Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that this project is good for the neighborhood and the city. Mr. Steinke stated that this project is not a preservation project from the standpoint of the interior. He noted that the interior is not under the Commission's jurisdiction. He observed that the interiors will not be preserved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes a design that complies with the Historical Commission's approval in concept of November 2019.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application proposes a design that satisfies Standards 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of November 2019, provided the following:

- the rear sections being removed are documented and a copy of the documentation is provided to the Historical Commission,
- the window replacement complies with the Historical Commission's review criteria and policies,
- the new chimney is clad in brick and compatible with the historic chimneys,
- the connections between the additions and historic buildings are carefully designed, and
- the roof framing is retained or the structure is stabilized before it is removed and replaced.

ITEM: 230, 232, 234-36 S 4TH ST MOTION: Approval, with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro		X			
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5	1			

ADDRESS: 3433, 3435, 3437, AND 3439 LANCASTER AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kalidave Limited Partners

Applicant: George Poulin, Strada LLC

History: 1875; John Shedwick Development Houses

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to rehabilitate four rowhouses and construct a three-story rear addition with roof deck, elevator, and stair access. The applicant will work with the staff on the approval of restoration work to the front facades.

An application for a larger rear addition was submitted for review last month. After the staff provided the applicant with its recommendation of denial and the reasons for it, the applicant withdrew the initial application before a public meeting review and revised it based on the feedback. This current application presents those revisions, but also includes the original and now proposed design as renderings on the final two pages of the application so that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission can see how the design has evolved to-date in an effort to make the rear addition, which is visible from the east side, compatible with and deferential to the historic row.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Restore front facades of historic rowhouses.
- Construct three-story rear addition with roof deck and pilot houses for stair and elevator.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 15 DECEMBER 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *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 addition connects to secondary elevations at the rear and will not impact the character-defining front facades of this row. The new addition is differentiated from yet compatible with the historic row.
- *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 proposed scope includes minimal demolition at the rear, and the addition could theoretically be removed in the future and the historic rear ells would remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:42:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect George Poulin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Poulin explained that the buildings are currently in poor condition owing to occupancy by student tenants and years of deferred maintenance. He confirmed that the design presented reflects revisions owing to initial feedback from the staff.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the elevator overrun and roof trellis are very visible from the east side and from the rear.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, and recommended that the trellis be removed.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed that the massing of the elevator pilot house should be minimized. He asked if it is necessary for the elevator to go to the roof.
 - Mr. Poulin responded that the trellis can be revised. The zoning code limits the height of the elevator overrun to ten feet. It is not required by code for the elevator to go to the roof, but there are accessible units in the building so the desire was to make the roof terrace accessible as well. If it is not able to be approved, the elevator can extend only to the third floor.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if it is possible to reduce the height of the visible pilot house and leave the pilot house at the far end that is not visible.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that the height appears to be driven by the elevator, and if the elevator is removed, the other stair house can be reduced in height and the trellis can be reduced in height to reduce visibility.
- Ms. Gutterman commented on the starkness of the rear elevation in comparison to the side elevation and suggested that the large wall of white stucco is out of character for the neighborhood.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that the rear elevation would benefit from being broken up a bit to create some shadow lines.

- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the brick could continue to wrap around the rear, which would help with visually breaking up the rear elevation.
- Mr. Poulin responded that stucco is a material used in Powelton Village but the color and texture can be revised, and the idea to break it up can be explored. He noted that the view from the tennis court in the application is a little deceiving because it is a view from private property.
- Mr. McCoubrey thanked the applicant for the retention of the rear ells and the care with which the addition is attached to the historic buildings. Other Committee members agreed.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the alignment of the existing building with the addition, and asked if the addition could tuck under the existing cornice.
 - Mr. Poulin responded that he could explore dropping the height of the addition by several inches but it is dependent upon the roof slope and ceiling heights in the rear ells.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested that it could be done at the connecting corner and then the addition could pop back up.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the location and visibility of mechanical units, and suggested that they are shown in plan for review by the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. Poulin responded that there are condensers planned for the roofs of the existing rear ells, and he will work with the staff to ensure they are not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the railing and roof deck on top of the existing rear ell at 3433 Lancaster Avenue, observing that it is visible from the public right-of-way. He voiced opposition to this deck, and questioned if it would require cutting into the roof.
 - Mr. McCoubrey opined that the deck on the rear ell is acceptable, because it is set back and located on a part of the building that is generally considered acceptable to have decks that are visible.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that the deck on the rear ell is acceptable.
- Mr. Cluver asked about window replacement.
 - Mr. Poulin clarified that the window replacement is limited to three vinyl windows that were previously replaced without permits.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, expressed support for the project and noted that it will include restoration of the facades which have been badly neglected for many years. He commented that the continuing reduction in massing of the rear addition will lead to a compatible design with the historic buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed elevator pilot house and trellis are highly visible from the public right-of-way at the east side and rear.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition connects to secondary elevations at the rear and will not impact the character-defining front facades of this row. The new addition is differentiated from yet compatible with the historic row, satisfying Standard 9.

- The proposed scope includes minimal demolition at the rear, and the addition could theoretically be removed in the future and the historic rear ells would remain, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 2 to recommend approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, with the following conditions:

- The elevator pilot house is eliminated by not having the elevator extend to the roof;
- Alternatives are considered for the color of the stucco and the flatness of the wall on the rear elevation;
- Consideration is given to the alignment of the mansard cornice with the addition;
- Mechanical units are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way; and
- The deck on the existing rear ell is eliminated.

Messrs. McCoubrey and Detwiler dissented, asserting that the deck on the rear ell at 3433 Lancaster Avenue was acceptable and could remain as part of the approved scope.

ITEM: 3433, 3435, 3437, and 3439 LANCASTER AVE					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey		X			
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler		X			
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4	2			

ADDRESS: 250 S 20TH ST

Proposal: Construct ADA entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Saint Patrick Parish

Applicant: Nicholas Leo Charbonneau, Harrison Design

History: 1913; Saint Patrick's Roman Catholic Church; LaFarge & Morris, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to install an ADA entrance between the church building and the rectory at Saint Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, which will provide ADA access to the upper church, the lower church, the rectory, and two accessible restrooms each for the upper and lower church levels. The proposed scope requires the removal of the existing connector bridge

between the church and rectory in order to construct the new elevator shaft. The existing connector bridge was not included in the original architectural drawings of the church, but was built at the same time or soon after the church was completed, based on historic photographs. The new ADA connector will incorporate salvaged copper paneling and mouldings from the historic connector into the new design.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Remove existing connector bridge.
- Construct ADA-compliant entrance addition in same location, using some salvaged materials.

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 addition is highly compatible with the historic church and rectory, and allows for their continued use. It is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the historic buildings and the environment.
- *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 proposed addition could be removed in the future, and the essential form and integrity of both the church and rectory would be unimpaired.
- *Accessibility Guidelines: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the user while preserving significant historic features. Finding solutions to meet accessibility requirements that minimize the impact of any necessary alteration on the historic building, its site, and setting, such as compatible ramps, paths, and lifts.*
 - The proposed addition would provide barrier-free access while preserving significant historic features. The proposed addition would provide accessibility while minimizing the impact on the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the Accessibility Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:09:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Nicholas Leo Charbonneau represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver commented that this is a well-considered and well-detailed proposal for a very appropriate ADA solution for the buildings. Other Committee members agreed.

- Mr. Cluver suggested that the interior door proposed for the sanctuary restroom area swing in the direction of the restrooms rather than into the sanctuary. Ms. Gutterman agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the existing double-doors on the exterior.
 - Mr. Charbonneau responded that reusing those doors was considered, but each leaf is only approximately two-feet six-inches wide, so it would not meet accessibility requirements if used in the new entrance.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested reusing them with an automatic door opener that opens both doors to allow for the required width.
 - Mr. Charbonneau responded that it was the desire of the parish to salvage the doors so this may be a good solution.
- Ms. Stein asked about the proposal to reuse existing copper panels and incorporate with new copper. She opined that it may be more successful to use only new copper.
 - Mr. Charbonneau responded that there is a painted patina on the existing copper so the old and the new could be matched in that way. He explained that the approach taken is to have a seamless connection between old and new material.
 - Mr. Detwiler opined that the new copper should have a different patination than the old so that there is a slight distinction between old and new fabric.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the old and new material should match as proposed.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed addition will provide ADA access to the upper church, the lower church, the rectory, and two accessible restrooms each for the upper and lower church levels.
- The existing double-doors merit consideration for reuse in the new entrance.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition is highly compatible with the historic church and rectory, and allows for their continued use. It is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the historic buildings and the environment, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed addition could be removed in the future, and the essential form and integrity of both the church and rectory would be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.
- The proposed addition would provide barrier-free access while preserving significant historic features. The proposed addition would provide accessibility while minimizing the impact on the historic building, satisfying the recommended Accessibility Guidelines.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, and with the recommendation that consideration be given to reusing the existing doors at the new entrance with an automatic operator, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the Accessibility Guidelines.

ITEM: 250 S 20TH ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 2035 S COLLEGE AVE

Proposal: Install mechanical equipment; modify openings; provide ADA accessibility

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Trustees of the Estate of Stephen Girard

Applicant: Doug Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architecture

History: 1833; Founder's Hall, Girard College; Thomas U. Walter, architect

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to make a series of upgrades to Founder's Hall, in part so Girard College can return the building to its original use as an educational facility. Founder's Hall has long been used to host events, many of which generate income for the school. The proposed work addresses current issues the building has with heating and cooling, ventilation, and interior space configuration. The application also addresses ADA accessibility.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install mechanical equipment.
- Modify openings.
- Provide ADA accessibility.
- Remove existing ceiling panels and replace with louvers.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.*
 - The proposed changes are motivated, in part, by Girard College's decision to return Founder's Hall to its original use as an educational facility, as well as to

address issues that currently negatively impact the interior spaces used for events, including heating, cooling and ventilation.

- *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 application proposes to pin back the front doors at the north and south entrances to create interior vestibules with frameless glass doors. The doors are important details of the exterior of the building. However, the modification still allows visitors to see the doors upon entering the building and is also reversible.
 - The application proposes to convert two windows into doors by removing and storing the existing windows and stone spandrels and installing doors in the openings. There is a need to permit an easier flow between the indoor and outdoor spaces but the applicant should explore whether the programmatic needs could be met by limiting this alteration to one opening rather than two.
 - The application proposes to remove an existing window and replace it with a new window and louver as required for HVAC function. The applicant should investigate retaining the existing window sash and installing the louver behind it rather than removing the window.
 - Modifications to improve ADA accessibility are proposed at the north, south and east sides of the building. At the north and south entrances, new ADA ramps are proposed to increase accessibility into these main entrances.
 - An ADA accessible wheelchair lift is proposed at the east elevation that would replace the existing lift.
 - When fasteners are required for loading or ADA ramps, existing holes in the masonry should be reused to the greatest extent possible.
 - The application includes a future scope of work that proposes to remove six original cast iron ceiling panels at the north side of the building and install louvers as required for the new HVAC system. The panels would be saved on site. The louvers should be finished in a color that matches the adjacent ceiling panels as closely as possible.
- *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.*
 - If all removed elements like windows, stone sills and panels, and ceiling panels are securely stored on site, the proposed alterations could be reversed in the future, and the essential form and integrity of the building would be unimpaired.
- *Accessibility Guidelines: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the user while preserving significant historic features. Finding solutions to meet accessibility requirements that minimize the impact of any necessary alteration on the historic building, its site, and setting, such as compatible ramps, paths, and lifts.*
 - The proposed ramps would provide barrier-free access while preserving significant historic features. The proposed ramps would provide accessibility while minimizing the impact on the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 9, and 10 and the Accessibility Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:22:20

RECUSAL:

- Ms. Gutterman recused from the review of the application.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Doug Seiler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Seiler explained that the goal of these modifications is to turn Founder's Hall into an amenity for the city, return the building to an educational use, and create an event space that could be used by both Girard College and the public.
- Mr. Seiler explained that the majority of the work is interior; however, there is an exterior scope happening at the same time that is being handled by a different firm. He provided a brief overview to the members of the Architectural Committee, at which point Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were any general questions before they began looking at each aspect in more detail.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if it is correct that they are proposing three different ADA accessible entrances.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that there are two primary ADA accessible entrances and other areas that are accessible to comply with egress requirements.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that they begin by reviewing the inclined ADA lift scope. Mr. Seiler began to explain the scope. Ms. Stein interjected that she has a general comment. She stated that everyone is familiar with what a beautiful and significant building this is, and therefore the success of any of the proposed interventions being proposed is going to be in how the work is detailed. Ms. Stein remarked that she did not see the level of detail necessary for a building of such significance and wondered if this is more of an in-concept application rather than a final approval application. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Ms. Stein.
- Mr. Cluver asked why the location of the new lift for the southeast corner is situated nine and a half feet off the centerline of the column.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that it would place the lift at the center of the columns.
 - Mr. Cluver argued that by placing the lift closer to one of the columns, the original space between the columns would be retained.
 - Mr. Seiler agreed and remarked that this is not a custom lift; however, the location of installation can be adjusted according to what is most appropriate.
- Mr. Cluver asked why the lift is being installed on this particular façade of the building.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that the south circle is where visitors arriving by vehicle are dropped off, adding this would likely be the most common arrival point for those in need of an accessible path coming from outside of Girard College. He added that it allows visitors to enter through the main entrance of the building, providing equal access.
- Mr. Cluver asked if this lift would serve a fundamentally different purpose than the proposed loading ramp. He said that his understanding was the proposed equipment ramp was removeable and would only be in place when needed.
 - Mr. Seiler confirmed that the functions of the two pieces of equipment are different. He explained that the equipment ramp is removeable in the sense that

- it would have no adverse impact on historic fabric should it be removed; however, the school is not intending on disassembling it after each use.
- Ms. Stein asked if this equipment ramp would essentially serve as a loading dock for catering trucks and event-associated equipment that would be dropped off at the building daily.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that the events would more likely occur a few times a week, rather than every day. He explained that the equipment ramp would be set flush into the bluestone walk so that people could walk around the base of the steps.
 - Ms. Stein asked what the school is currently using to load equipment into the building.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that they have a temporary ramp made of plywood. He acknowledged that while their proposal is not intended to be removeable on a daily basis, it is intended to be reversible.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if this piece of equipment is an off-the-shelf item.
 - Mr. Seiler replied that it is something they would fabricate, likely out of aluminum. He explained that the two-stage lift is a bought item, and the controls would be located in the basement of the building, underneath the stairs.
 - Mr. Cluver asked for confirmation that this ramp would only be used for equipment and not for people.
 - Mr. Seiler confirmed this is accurate.
 - Mr. Cluver explained that his reason for wanting to review the previously discussed ADA lift and this equipment ramp together was because he wanted to see if there is a solution that would allow these two functions to be combined, resulting in single point on the building requiring equipment.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that he believes the execution of such a ramp would end up being quite intrusive, whereas their solutions are being proposed with the most minimal adverse effects to the building, per the recommended Accessibility Guidelines. He also explained that the location of the proposed equipment ramp was chosen because of its proximity to an access road, whereas the location of the previously discussed ADA lift was chosen because of its proximity to the circle most frequently used by vehicles dropping off visitors arriving from outside of the campus. He remarked that part of the motivation for their proposed design of the equipment ramp is to prevent it from extending out beyond the bottom step the way the existing ramp does.
 - The Committee and applicant generally discussed the scale of the building and the challenges of working with it, in particular when trying to design ramps.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that he believes that the building deserves more than the noted modular walkway, and while he agrees that a simple design is appropriate, he wants to see something more refined.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that he considered using aluminum with bars rather than tubing with braces.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that his inclination is to design the ramp to be as light as possible. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Cluver.
 - Mr. Detwiler remarked that he has the same comment about the railings for the ramps at the doors, in keeping them light and transparent, and using materials and detailing that is in keeping with the quality of Founder's Hall.
 - Mr. Cluver asked why they did not consider sloped walkways at the doors instead of ramps, which would minimize the impact to the entrance.

- Mr. Seiler responded that the intent is to build a solution that will sit on top of the stone.
- Mr. Detwiler asked for confirmation that the stone at this location is historic.
 - Mr. Seiler confirmed that it is.
- Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about placing one-and-one-half inch paving on top of a steel support which could end up feeling hollow.
 - Mr. Seiler agreed and explained that sand would be used as fill to prevent a hollow sound.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether curbs would be required in this case, and if not, that it would be better to minimize or eliminate them.
- Ms. Stein commented that she wants to see details that are just as beautiful and elegant as the building. She added that perhaps her opinion differs from her fellow Committee members, but she does not oppose these interventions being more permanent, because accessibility always needs to be a part of this building. Ms. Stein suggested that perhaps more permanent solutions could be more beautiful, which was extremely important. Mr. Detwiler agreed that this building will always need to be accessible.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that his team needs some certainty that the application can move forward. He explained that they met with representatives of the Preservation Alliance and the Design Advocacy Committee, including Bruce Lavery. He noted that his team was also meeting regularly with the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. He stated that he also reached out to Kathy Dowdell and asked if his team could review the details discussed today with some of these individuals or groups.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he believed they are getting close to being on the same page. He stated that this building is all about symmetry, so the ramps at the north and south entrances should be treated with the same symmetry.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the team needs to develop details and options.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the glass door enclosure and Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the doors will be activated with mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that the doors will be hand operated.
- Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the push bars on the doors should be as minimally visible as possible.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that the proposed door configuration addresses egress requirements and attempts to minimize the wear and tear to the historic doors. He requested to review the proposal to convert two windows into two doors for egress purposes.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that it is important to minimize demolition and therefore he did not see how two historic windows could be converted into doors, regardless of the egress needs.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that compositionally, since this is a grouping of four, it makes sense to convert the doors on both ends of the grouping.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. Cluver that converting both windows would look better than converting only one window.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the spandrel panels are very beautiful, and he believes that only one of the windows should be converted into a door. He recognized that the symmetry of converting both windows is a better alternative in terms of design; however, it is more important to protect the historic fabric of the building.

- Mr. Cluver stated that the question has become whether it is appropriate to create any doors, adding that he believes that if doors are going to be approved, they should be approved in the location proposed here by the applicant. Mr. Cluver stated that his main objection is the proposed landing extension and wondered if there is a more sympathetic approach. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that an extension was not preferable.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that the reason for the extensions is due to the grates that are in front of the windows. Mr. Cluver stated that he would rather see some sort of plate placed over the grate instead of the proposed extensions.
- Ms. Stein asked whether the applicant had actually met with the Department of Licenses and Inspections to determine if all of these egress options are required.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that they had spoken with someone, however additional questions remain.
- Ms. Stein asked if one of the single windows on the south façade would be a more appropriate location for an additional door.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the applicant could look at making more changes at the interior of the building to help address egress issues.
 - Mr. Seiler noted that there is a covenant with the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission that protects the entire interior of the building.
- Ms. Stein asked if one of the single windows at the south façade was converted into a door, if it could also be used for ADA accessibility.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the Committee discuss the proposed louver. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if it would be possible to tie into one of the vents at the floor rather than install the proposed louver.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that is not an option due to the construction of the vaults.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the staff had suggested leaving the window in place, removing the glazing, and installing a louver behind the sash.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that this could be a good idea.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant if he wanted to return to the Architectural Committee in the future with more details to review.
 - Mr. Seiler responded affirmatively.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the application is withdrawn.
 - Mr. Seiler started to respond with a question.
 - Mr. Cluver and Mr. Detwiler recommended that the applicant withdraw the application and resubmit it with additional details and revisions that reflect the comments of the Architectural Committee members. Mr. Cluver stated that, owing to the lack of details, he would have to recommend denial of the application if the Committee were to vote on the matter.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the focus of the revisions should be on keeping the historic fabric, and wherever it is removed, it is done minimally and with a very particular purpose.
- Mr. Seiler asked for additional guidance on the Board Room where they are proposing to convert two windows into doors.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that they could not alter the windows at all and find another solution. He suggested that another option would be to convert the windows to doors but without the proposed extensions. He then stated that once the door treatment was decided upon, it could be determined whether one window or both windows should be converted.

- Committee members thanked Mr. Seiler for the thoughtful application and discussion. They agreed that it was productive and will lead to a more detailed proposal which will allow for a greater use of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application did not provide sufficient detail about the execution of the proposed interventions.
- The design of all proposed details, including but not limited to railings, louvers, ramps, and door handles must be highly compatible with this significant building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application will be supplemented with additional details and resubmitted for review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee made no recommendation, owing to the expectation that the application will be supplemented and resubmitted.

ADDRESS: 2017 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct addition; widen garage entrance and increase parking

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Blue Ink, LLC

Applicant: Sean Narcum, Peter Zimmerman Architects, Inc.

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to reconstruct an existing, post-1950 kitchen annex and roof deck and construct a one-story addition and terrace at the rear of the property. The annex is proposed to be rebuilt at the same location in order to accommodate a new dining room. A section of the existing rear bay window at the first and lower (parking) levels is proposed for demolition as part of this proposal, however the second story and roof deck of the bay are to remain. The existing garage and parking pad will both be expanded to fit two vehicles. The existing garage door that faces Cypress Street is to be replaced so that the masonry opening can be widened in order to accommodate the proposed double-width parking. A new roll-up metal garage door is proposed.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct addition.
- Widen garage entrance.
- Expand existing garage to fit two vehicles; expand existing parking pad to accommodate two vehicles.

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 new addition proposes to partially demolish and alter non-historic fabric that appears to have been constructed after 1950. There is no proposal to demolish or alter historic fabric.
 - The new construction is in keeping with the mass and scale of the existing bay.
 - The brick and mortar proposed for the rear addition are compatible with the original materials used.
 - The new garage door should be finished in a manner that does not draw unnecessary attention to it. In addition, no mechanical components of the garage door should be visible from Cypress Street.
- *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 proposed addition would alter non-historic building fabric that dates from the 1950s. Any changes or future removal of the current proposal would not compromise the integrity of the historic property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:18:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sean Narcum and attorney Harrison Haas represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked the applicant to confirm that the design of the proposed addition essentially replicates what is existing.
 - Mr. Narcum confirmed this is correct.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the only substantive change that he noted is the elimination of the man-door at the garage facing Cypress Street.
 - Mr. Narcum confirmed this is accurate. He explained that the two main goals of the project are to increase parking and to increase the size of the kitchen, neither of which will be visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if there are any changes proposed to the original bay.
 - Mr. Narcum responded that no alterations are proposed to the original bay at the second floor.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application does not propose the demolition or alteration to any historic fabric.
- The proposed alterations will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
- The materials proposed for the reconstructed rear addition are compatible with the historic fabric.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standards 9 and 10.

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

ITEM: 2017 DELANCEY PL MOTION: Approval 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: 2036 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Rebecca Malcolm-Naib and Farid Naib

Applicant: Uk Jung, Studio Hada

History: 1880

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks in-concept approval for the removal of a non-historic garage and construction of a three-story addition with garages at the rear of this corner property at S. 21st Street and Delancey Place. Historically, a one-story glass conservatory appended the rear of the building. The proposed addition would attach to the existing building through a glass connector, and would utilize existing openings to provide access to the new addition. The staff notes that although the floor plans and elevations do not seem to entirely correspond, additional elevation drawings and details of the connection would need to be provided in the review for final approval.

SCOPE OF WORK:

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

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed construction removes a non-historic element of the property. The new work is differentiated from the old and is generally compatible in massing, scale, and materials to the historic building. Architectural features such as window sizes and infill materials should be further explored. The application mostly complies with this standard.
- *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.*
 - The proposed addition does not remove significant amounts of historic material and be removed in the future without damaging the essential form and integrity of the historic property. The application complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval in-concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:24:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the in-concept application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Uk Jung represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Jung explained that there is an existing three-car garage and they are proposing to add a three-story addition with a roof deck. The intent is that the addition be lower in hierarchy, in scale, and in detailing to the historic building, and that the intent of the glass connector is to maintain a separation between the new and old.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the massing and use of dark, solid wood elements that make the building appear taller and less respectful of the historic house.
- Ms. Stein expressed concern with the size and scale of the masonry openings along the side elevation, noting that they seem out of scale with the neighborhood and opining that they had a warehouse as opposed to a residential aesthetic. She opined that the limestone base is awkward, noting that many of the buildings in the area have lower waterables, and that the limestone base puts emphasis on its material in a way that feels out of scale with the character of the neighborhood. She opined that the design of the addition should relate more to the historic building.
 - Mr. Jung responded that they could revise the first-floor cladding to show more brick.

- Mr. McCoubrey questioned the elevated portion of the building shown in dark wood.
 - Mr. Jung responded that the area clad in dark wood is set back approximately five feet, eight inches from the street edge and is a parapet. He noted that they could lower it and asked whether a different or more muted material would be appropriate.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that the Architectural Committee typically does not approve solid wood railings because they are too opaque and look like another mass and object.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned the material connecting the historic building and the proposed addition, noting that the details of the flashing and how it joins and connects with the historic building will be important.
 - Mr. Jung responded that they are proposing a glass connection between the buildings, and will be reusing existing openings, with little impact on the existing building. He noted that there is an existing door at the second floor that they are planning to reuse.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested maintaining a separation between the historic building and the proposed addition.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that section drawings would be helpful to understand the connection between the buildings.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the railings at the second floor and mezzanine seem superfluous.
- Mr. Jung clarified the floor levels, noting that the first floor of existing house has a very high ceiling, and the addition will not align with that of the historic building owing to the garages, but the floor line and windows at the second floor of the existing house will align with the third floor of the addition.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested lowering the height of all elements of the proposed addition to keep it below the major cornice line at the base of the mansard.
 - Mr. Jung responded that they can lower the addition, and can lower the tall wood wall to be below the cornice line.
- Mr. Cluver suggested carrying the recess of the entrance vestibule the full height of the addition to maintain a separation at all levels of the addition and provide a cleaner transition between the existing building and addition.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The height of the proposed addition is too tall and should be reduced to align with or sit below the major cornice line at the base of the mansard of the existing historic building.
- The use of solid railings, parapets, or screen walls adds unnecessary mass to the proposed addition.
- The size and scale of the masonry openings on the proposed addition are out of scale with the residential neighborhood.
- The use of a lighter material for the full first floor of the proposed addition is out of keeping with the features of the historic building. A watertable that aligns with that of the historic building would be more appropriate.

- The applicants should limit the connection to the historic building, and explore creating a separation between the existing building and proposed addition by carrying the recessed alcove of the proposed entrance the full height of the addition.
- The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As proposed, the addition is not compatible with the features, size, scale, proportion, and massing of the historic building owing to its connection, height, and materials.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2036 DELANCEY PL MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 348 GREEN LN

Proposal: Subdivide property; construct townhouses

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Stone Door LLC

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects LLC

History: 1872; Lepton Terrace; S.S. Keeley, builder

Individual Designation: 11/9/2018

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Located in the Roxborough neighborhood, 348 Green Lane, known historically as Lepton Terrace, features a three-story mansarded main block and rear ell, flat and hipped-roof two-story rear additions, and a large rear yard that currently extends the full depth of the block along Manayunk Avenue to Dupont Street. A historic stone retaining wall encloses the property, and extends onto the neighboring property. Originally, the parcel at 348 Green Lane extended 160 feet along Manayunk Avenue. Historic maps show the undeveloped land at the corner of Dupont Street and Manayunk Avenue both as a separate parcel and as part of the existing parcel. Historic deeds indicate that the parcels were not legally consolidated until 1944, extending the

property 65.5 feet to Dupont Street. The current proposal would subdivide the property near the line of consolidation and build a pair of three-story townhouses with 20 foot by 40 foot footprints on the undeveloped rear portion. The twins would be set in approximately 12 feet Manayunk Avenue, and would be accessed by a new driveway cut out of the existing historic retaining wall. The yard, which is on a steep slope, would be excavated to create a sunken driveway access to partially below-ground parking. A new retaining wall of unspecified material would be installed along the new property line at the rear of 348 Green Lane. The new structure would feature a steeply pitched gable roof with large dormers. Various cladding materials are depicted in the application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Subdivide property,
- Modify retaining wall, and
- Construct townhouses.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed construction removes a portion of the historic retaining wall, which is one of the character-defining features of the property identified in the nomination, but the removal is limited to a portion of the wall not originally part of 348 Green Lane. The new construction would be differentiated from the old, but modifications could be made to its massing, size, and architectural features to make it more compatible with the historic property. The application partially complies with this standard.
- *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.*
 - The new construction does not impact the historic building, and could be removed in the future without damaging the essential form and integrity of the historic property. The application complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval in-concept of a new building that reads as a secondary structure, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, but suggests that the massing be reduced and simplified, and the fenestration be of a residential scale. The staff notes that replacing the gabled roof with a mansard and hipped roof may help reduce the height of the structure without sacrificing interior space, and would be compatible with the historic building. Additional details of the treatment of the historic retaining wall, new gate, and new retaining wall along the driveway should be provided for final review.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:37:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the in-concept application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Derek Spencer and owner Henry Bailey represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Spencer noted that they had conversations with the Registered Community Organization (RCO) about building orientation, form, and features, and would like to elicit the Historical Commission's feedback before returning to the RCO. He noted that the form, roof slope, dormers, and other features will be important as they go through the zoning process.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that the overall form is acceptable, but the materials are not appropriate. She questioned the inspiration for the proposed colors, noting that the existing building has rich earthy tones, but the proposed colors are monotone and devoid of richness.
 - Mr. Spencer responded that the stone cladding relates to the existing structure, which is a light grey and beige schist, but has a different cut than what they are proposing. He stated that they do not want to match the existing stone exactly. He noted there is a darker mansard roof on the historic building, which is where they drew inspiration for the darker colors, but they are not tied to any color scheme or cladding material.
 - Ms. Stein agreed, noting that the materials do not need to match those of the Green Lane house, but should be compatible with it and mediate the historic home and Dupont Street, and that the proposal does not seem to do that.
- Ms. Stein opined that the scale, massing, form, and materiality do not seem appropriate for the historic property or neighborhood, opining that it would look more appropriate in a Colorado ski town. While the site wall helps to conceal the lower portion of the building, the mass of the building and roofline would be highly visible.
- Mr. Cluver agreed with Ms. Stein, noting that the steep pitch of the roof and atypical massing are inappropriate for the historic property and its context. He suggested that a simpler two-story building with dormers would be more appropriate.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that a two-story masonry building with a shallower pitched third floor may be acceptable.
 - Mr. Spencer noted that the spring point and roof pitch came from the RCO's desire to minimize the height of the building.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that the applicants have to mediate between competing comments of review agencies.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that there are schist buildings in the neighborhood and stated that he is not opposed to stone and stucco cladding, provided the color is appropriate. He opined that this does not feel like a nice house for the neighborhood. He noted that the giant gable roof is particularly incompatible with the character of the historic property and its context.
- Mr. Detwiler explained that the applicants should evaluate the ceiling heights, which should be compatible in scale to the historic property and surrounding context.
- Mr. Bailey commented that at the RCO meeting, they had been encouraged to conceive of the building as a carriage house, the archetype being a square with a triangle on top.
 - Mr. Cluver replied that the concept of the carriage house has merit, but opined that the proposed building is too large to be a carriage house.
- Ms. Stein opined that the footprint of the building is respectful of the historic property, but the roofline, materiality, and fenestration do not speak to the character of the property or the neighborhood.
- Mr. D'Alessandro objected to cutting into the stone wall at both ends.

- Mr. Spencer clarified that they are proposing a dead-end driveway and that the wall would only be cut along the Manayunk Avenue side for vehicular entrance.
- Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the new opening should be treated appropriately and should not be saw cut.
- Mr. Bailey responded that there is a pier treatment of the wall on Dupont Street that they are planning to replicate.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the property is individually designated, not in a historic district, so the arguments that the design should relate to the historic building have merit.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- John Carpenter, a near neighbor and board member of both neighborhood RCOs that have jurisdiction over the property, spoke in opposition to the application. He commented that members of the community sought the designation of the property in 2018 to protect the property, the historic building, and the historic retaining wall from damage or modification owing to increased development pressure. The building at 348 Green Lane is extraordinary and occupies a prominent position at Green Lane and Manayunk Avenue, and is visible from many angles, a prominent landmark welcoming people to the neighborhood. Mr. Carpenter commented that the proposed development compromises the historic integrity of the property, and that the proposal does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. He objected to assertions in the staff overview that the property did not historically extend the full depth from Green Lane to Dupont Street, noting that the 1911 E.V. Smith atlas in the nomination shows the property as a single parcel extending the full depth of the block, and suggested that the proposed subdivision does not have historic precedence. If the argument is to be made for the open land to be maintained, he opined that its size merits a single-family home with a smaller footprint, and that even that would require a variance. He noted that Standard 9 requires additions and related new construction to be compatible with and not in extreme contrast to the historic property and its context, and should be sized to be subordinate to the historic structures. He noted that the proposed construction is just as tall and as large in footprint as the historic building. He explained that in repeated civic design meetings with the developer, they have suggested scaling down the proposed construction to the size and scale of a carriage house that might have been more plausibly constructed on that portion of the property. The design itself with its huge gable roof is jarring in relationship to the historic building and to the older homes in the surrounding area. The proposed construction will also obscure views of the historic property from the approach along Manayunk Avenue and Dupont Street. He argued that the demolition of two sections of the historic retaining wall make it impossible to satisfy Standard 10, which requires that modifications and related new construction be removable in the future while leaving the essential form and integrity of the property unimpaired, without extensive effort. He suggested that the roofline be limited to a hip or gambrel roof, as modern interpretations of mansard roofs are often unsuccessful. With the understanding that the Historical Commission does not have purview over zoning matters, he noted that the property is zoned RSD-3, a designation that makes subdivision and development in compliance with zoning very difficult, and certainly not allowable at the scale proposed. This zoning is designed to protect existing structures and viewsheds and open space in a way that this proposal does not respect. He explained that the neighborhood is relying on a combination of zoning, conservation overlays, and

historic designation to protect the community's valuable architectural assets, and it needs the Historical Commission to do its part in this process. He urged the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission to reject the proposal and for the developer to return with a new plan more in keeping with the massing, scale, and design of this important site. Mr. Carpenter also noted that there has been one informal public meeting at which many near neighbors resoundingly rejected the proposed development as inappropriate.

- Allison Goby, a near neighbor, agreed with Mr. Carpenter's comments.
- Celeste Hardester, president of the Central Roxborough Civic Association, supported Mr. Carpenter's comments. She noted that they met with the owner and architects to try to find an appropriate resolution that would allow Mr. Bailey to achieve his stated need of building in the rear of the property to allow him to maintain and rehabilitate the historic house. She noted that the sensitive rehabilitation of the historic house has been RCO's primary reason for being open to the idea of new construction on the rear of the property, but they have not heard full plans for what he would like to do with the house and what the costs in the restoration might be. She commented that they have not been provided with the financial picture that legitimizes the construction of a new building on the parcel to offset the costs of the rehabilitation of the historic house. She explained that they need the Historical Commission's response to help all parties understand what is appropriate and what is not on this site.
- Louise Fischer, owner of the adjacent property, commented that she and her husband are devastated by the renderings of the proposed building and the lengthy discussions the owner has had with members of the neighborhood. She commented that she has not seen the owner do much to maintain 348 Green Lane. She thanked Ms. Hardester and Mr. Carpenter for their work in overseeing the community process for the proposed construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the proposed subdivision, but does assert plenary jurisdiction over the proposed new construction.
- The concept of a two-story building is acceptable, and the proposed footprint may be acceptable, but the massing, form, and features are not compatible with the historic property and its context.
- The steeply gabled roof is incompatible with the historic property and its context.
- Floor levels should be minimized so they are in keeping with the scale of the historic building, and the overall height of the roof should be reduced.
- The existing building has rich, earthy tones, and the materials proposed are not compatible.
- The treatment of the historic retaining wall should be carefully addressed so that it is not saw cut.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed construction is not compatible with the historic property and its context in massing, scale, fenestration, material, and architectural features, and therefore fails to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 348 GREEN LN					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 2313 MADISON SQ

Proposal: Construct roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robert Piasecki and Kelly Gibb Piasecki

Applicant: Robert Piasecki

History: 1872; Madison Square; Charles Leslie, developer

Individual Designation: 9/28/1971

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 2313 Madison Square is individually designated, along with nearly every property on the street's two garden blocks. The buildings are largely two stories in height with brick facades, though several, including the building at 2313 Madison Square, have mansard roofs which provide an additional story. None of the buildings on the two blocks currently have roof decks. This application proposes to demolish the rear portion of the roof, including a rear chimney, and to construct a roof deck with a pilot house.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear roof;
- Demolish rear chimney; and
- Construct roof deck with pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

- The proposed alterations would result in the demolition of the rear half of the roof and a rear chimney. The proposed work does not comply with this standard.
- *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.*
 - The proposed roof deck and pilot house would not be visible from Madison Square but would be visible from Kauffman Street, which functions as a service alley. Where appropriate, roof decks are typically approved at the rear ends of buildings and not on the main block. This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house on the main block of the building. The work does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Owner and architect Robert Piasecki represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Keller noted that the application was revised in response to the staff recommendation to include a second option that retains the roof.
- Mr. Piasecki offered a history of the block, explaining that five three-story buildings, including his, were later redeveloped by the Chichester Chemical Company. He also indicated that one of those buildings has a pilot house dating to that period. In his current proposal, he stated that he intends to locate the roof deck and pilot house at the rear portion of the house. He further commented that he plans to keep the pilot house opposite the adjacent two-story building. He stated that he is open to the Architectural Committee's recommendations and already adjusted the design by presenting a second option that builds on top of the existing roof. He added that retaining the roof causes the deck to get slightly higher, so he also pulled back the railing from the east side. He commented that the rear street functions as a service alley and that the cladding materials at this location consist of aluminum and vinyl siding, stucco, and brick, among others. Mr. Piasecki then discussed the roof decks approved at a similar block of St. Albans Street.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Piasecki which option he wants the Committee to consider.
 - Mr. Piasecki replied that the Committee should consider Option 2. He stated that Option 1 cut down the roof to minimize the visual impact of the roof deck, though he appreciates the desire to preserve the existing structure.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the deck could be pulled back further to start behind the ridge.
 - Mr. Piasecki answered that the buildings are very small and that the roof is only 22-feet wide. He elaborated that he is attempting to hold the deck and pilot house back from the sightline while maximizing the amount of space.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that decks are a luxury, and if the goal is to minimize the deck's impact on the historic building, then setting it behind the ridge may eliminate 18-inches of deck space but it would be more appropriate.

- Mr. Piasecki replied that he could evaluate that option.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she is concerned about the precedent that would be set in adding a roof deck to the Madison Square buildings, though she added that she understands the desire for outdoor space. She contended that the deck would alter the building's character-defining features.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the design and materials of the railings.
 - Mr. Piasecki answered that the north and west sides would be a thin metal railing, while the south and east would be more solid. He reiterated that he is open to revising the railings according to the Committee's recommendation.
- Mr. Cluver asked for a plan and further explanation of the stair leading to the pilot house.
 - Mr. Piasecki explained that the stair would be located under the roof, making three turns.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired whether there could be an exterior stair where there is currently a rear deck at the second story.
 - Mr. Piasecki responded that he considered that option but found the proposed stair and pilot house to be more user-friendly.
 - Mr. Detwiler contended that an exterior stair would eliminate the need for an overbuild or pilot house, though he questioned how it would work in plan.
 - Mr. Piasecki noted that a small amount of interior space would also be gained with an enclosed stair.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the mechanical equipment would be visible once it is relocated from the rear to the front roof.
 - Mr. Piasecki replied that the units would not be visible and that there are other Madison Square properties with mechanical equipment in the same location as proposed.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that mechanical equipment is not typically permitted on the front portion of the roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the potential visibility of the deck from the east, where a two-story building abuts 2313 Madison Square. He added that the chimney and a small portion of the rear slope are visible in one of the photographs in the application.
 - Mr. Piasecki responded that the photo was taken from 23rd Street and that there is minimal visibility. He stated that the pilot house was purposely placed on the opposite end of the roof to avoid visibility from that location. He added that the deck railing would also be setback slightly, though there could be room for some revision of the railing at that side.
- Mr. Cluver stated that it comes down to whether every house is entitled to a roof deck. The principle in the past, he continued, was to approve roof decks on the rear ells, though he acknowledged that not every building has an ell.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that the owners have a small roof deck, so this proposal would be to create more outdoor space than what is currently offered.
- Ms. Gutterman referenced the proposed ban on roof decks in Strawberry Mansion, which is a pending bill introduced by Council President Darrell Clarke for a different neighborhood that is facing development pressure. She then commented that her preference would be to recommend denial of this application.
 - Mr. Piasecki noted that portions of the roof decks at two St. Albans properties were approved on the main block within the past few years. He also noted that a roof deck was approved on the main block of 2215 Locust Street just one month ago. He stated that there is precedent.

- Ms. Gutterman countered that 2215 Locust Street is a different type of building.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he is not averse to a roof deck, though he is not in favor of the deck as presented. He contended that a smaller deck with an exterior stair may be more appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application presents two options. Option 1 would cause the demolition of the rear roof slope to accommodate a roof deck and pilot house with reduced visibility. Option 2 retains the entire roof and builds a deck and pilot house above.
- The property is located mid-block on Madison Square. No other building on the street's two garden blocks currently has a roof deck.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The scale of the proposed roof deck, which would be located on the building's main block, would negatively impact the historic resource. The proposed work does not comply with Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.
- A smaller roof deck may be acceptable, and an exterior stair located at the existing second-story deck should be considered as an alternative to the enclosed stair and pilot house. Reducing the scale and visibility of the roof deck would allow the work to comply with Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 2313 MADISON SQ MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 6830-32 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Rehabilitate existing building and construct four-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Baker Street Partners LLC Applicant: Christopher Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture LLC

History: 1850; Porch removed; brick applied to first floor front

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes the development of 6830 and 6832 Ridge Avenue. The two properties are being consolidated into a single lot. While 6832 Ridge Avenue is a contributing resource to the Ridge Avenue Thematic Historic District, 6830 Ridge Avenue is not part of the district. For the purposes of this review, the one-story building at 6830 Ridge Avenue should be considered non-contributing.

Constructed circa 1850, a three-story, single-family, masonry building stands at the front of the property at 6832 Ridge Avenue. A map (Figure 1) from the late nineteenth century indicates that it was historically configured as a main block with a rear ell, and that two smaller additions at the rear of the property were added during the twentieth century. A historic photo from the district inventory shows that the building originally had a front porch.

This application proposes to rehabilitate the contributing historic building and construct a four-story rear addition. While the new construction appears connected on the exterior with the historic building, there are no interior connections between the two. The first-story area of the addition will be used for parking and the three upper stories will contain 12 residential units. The interior of the historic building will be converted to three residential units.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate three-story historic building.
- Construct four-story new addition at rear of historic building.
- Demolish non-historic building at 6830 Ridge Ave and construct new three-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed new construction should be separate from the historic building and the tower reduced in height (or removed from design) to meet Standard 9.
 - Screening around parking area should be created to meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - If the new construction is separated from the historic building, application would meet Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, with the following conditions:

- The addition is separated from the historic building.
- The parking area is screened.
- The “tower” is removed or the height of four-story building is otherwise reduced.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:18:06

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chris Carickhoff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Carickhoff if they would be agreeable to removing the fourth story of this building so that it is a smaller structure in comparison to the historic building, rather than towering above it.
 - Mr. Carickhoff replied that their preference would be to remove the stair tower but keep the fourth floor. He noted that there is a two-story section behind the historic building acting as a hyphen. Mr. Carickhoff contended that it sets the new construction back and helps visually reduce the 38-foot height limit.
 - Ms. Gutterman opined that the addition is not compatible with the historic building and it is towering above it. She stated that the arched triple window on the front façade of the addition is not compatible with the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the new building as it is shown looks like it wants to drop down to grade. He suggested that it is inappropriate for the site and the district in its current configuration.
 - Mr. Carickhoff asked if it would be preferable to substitute the first-floor columns with a wall and drive opening.
 - Ms. Gutterman replied that they would have to see that proposal to evaluate it. She reiterated that the tower and addition is not in keeping with the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the tower and fourth story are inappropriate and should be removed so as to reduce the height.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that the intention was to raise the addition up on posts to minimize the first story, and the darker fourth story with dormers was done to minimize the height visually.
 - Ms. Gutterman replied that it is not working.
- Mr. Cluver asked if there is a precedent for the gambrel roof elsewhere in the thematic historic district.
 - Mr. Carickhoff replied that he is unaware if there is a precedent for the gambrel roof. He referenced the turret on the neighboring building and explained that the idea of the tower was inspired by the turret. He explained that the gambrel roof was used to minimize the height of the space and make it feel like a subordinate carriage house structure next to the historic building.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that a carriage house would not be taller than a main house. He inquired about the precedent for the four-over-one window configuration in the neighborhood.

- Mr. Carickhoff responded that he would look into this, and could work with the staff on window details.
- Mr. Cluver stated that this design was conceived to maximize the development potential of the site without looking to precedents in the historic district.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the design will improve by looking more carefully at the buildings which are designated as historic in this thematic historic district.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern about the material selection and compatibility of the addition with the existing context.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the application does not show mechanical equipment on the roof.
 - Mr. Carickhoff referenced the aerial rendering on the last page of the presentation that would address Ms. Gutterman's inquiry.
 - Ms. Stein noted that it is an excellent image to look at because it shows how the addition completely overwhelms the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler reiterated his earlier comments and stated that the addition needs to be smaller and less complicated. He added that he understands the desire to maximize this site, but the proposed design is well beyond the line of compatibility.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that he would rather see the addition try to cover more of the site instead of rising in height, if zoning regulations will allow for that. He suggested that the black and white color scheme is not in keeping with the typical colors of the historic buildings in the district.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The height of the addition overwhelms the historic building.
- The addition should be reduced to three stories to be compatible with the historic building and district.
- The neighborhood and historic district should be referenced for existing style and detail for rehabilitation of the historic building and for compatibility of new construction.
- The color scheme should reflect a more historically sensitive color palette.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed design is incompatible with the historic property and thematic historic district.

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

ITEM: 6830-32 RIDGE AVE 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				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 253 QUINCE ST

Proposal: Construct additions and decks; alter openings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: LeRon McCoy

Applicant: James Luke, Morning Companies, LLC

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes exterior alterations to the building at 253 Quince Street that include additions at the first and third floor, two exterior balconies, and alterations to openings at the rear of building. The building was constructed circa 1830 and has undergone changes over time including a small front addition connected along the south elevation, a two-story rear addition, and alterations to window and door openings.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct one-story addition at the first floor along the south elevation
- Construct rear addition with balcony at the third floor
- Add balcony at the second floor on the front elevation
- Rehabilitate the interior

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

- The scale and proportions of the proposed third-floor addition and front balcony are incompatible with the historic character of the building therefore the application 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.*
 - A large section of the south wall of the main block is proposed for removal as part of the first-floor addition, therefore the application does not meet Standard 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:28:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Matthew Ulassin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman stated she is concerned by the third-floor overbuild and is troubled by its potential impact. She voiced opposition to the proposed balcony on the front façade, noting that it is projecting over the street and does not reflect the historic context of Quince Street. She acknowledged that the house has been modified over time, but stated that the proposed additions are not appropriate for the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Gutterman, and observed that the gable end is visible from the public right-of-way, and any changes to this decorative bargeboard would be highly visible.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the application included existing elevation drawings.
 - Mr. Ulassin responded that the application does not include existing elevation drawings.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that he is trying to understand the existing versus proposed. He noted that it appears that they are removing the triangular roof shape for the addition, and everything that is stucco will remain.
 - Mr. Ulassin confirmed this. He explained that their intent was to build off the existing modification on the building and to present a delineation between historic fabric and new additions.
- Mr. Detwiler sympathized with the attempt to use as much of the space as possible, but suggested the applicant should revise the design to something like a cross gable across the back that ties into the existing roof. He stated that this would be more in keeping with the design of the historic building, but that this is just one suggestion.
 - Mr. Ulassin referenced the building section in the application that shows the floor height on the third floor. He stated that there is not much height on this level and that it is more like a half level.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she understands there may not be much room, but contended that the proposed modifications to the house will have a major impact on what is original.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that every building has its limitations.
- Ms. Stein suggested the addition of a rear dormer instead of the proposed addition. She referenced the front dormer, and noted that a similar dormer on the rear would

- allow one to walk into the space of the dormer. Ms. Stein continued that the difference between what the applicant has proposed versus a rear dormer is that the roof line comes down and holds the edge along the sightline of the street. Ms. Stein noted that the current design is so large in scale that it takes away from the existing roofline. Ms. Stein stated that a smaller walk-out dormer could provide the height needed in the room to make it more functional. She acknowledged that it would not be the same size as what is proposed, but it would involve only removal of roof joists where the dormer would exist, thus making for a simpler construction project as well.
- Mr. Detwiler referenced the section drawing, and suggested that the front dormer could simply be mirrored on the rear roof slope.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested that a rear dormer may be appropriate, but it could perhaps span across three-quarters of the width of the back. He commented that this would allow for a corridor into the bedroom and a balcony on the back.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed that a dormer is a way to increase room within the gable roof.
 - Mr. Ulassin asked the Committee to clarify their direction on the third floor. He asked if the Committee would be opposed to stepping back on the facade inward and not having a symmetrical relationship over the roof.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that it could be acceptable to not be symmetrical in this case.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that she would have to see an elevation drawing to determine the impact before opining on it.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated the Committee did not have enough supporting documentation to make a clear recommendation on this question.
 - Mr. Ulassin observed that the neighboring house has a dormer built up on the third floor. He suggested that they could mimic that dormer, with the goal to give back more space on the south facade and less on the side of the adjacent house to the north.
 - Committee members repeated their request to see revised drawings and elevations for what Mr. Ulassin is proposing for the rear dormer.
 - Ms. Stein stated that she is not opposed to the one-story addition along the side of the house. She explained that it seems appropriate, provided the right materials are chosen for the wall because it is visible from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Ulassin explained that a low slope roof for the one-story addition is shown in the application, to minimize the visibility on the existing stucco wall, and asked about having a greater slope with a standing seam roof instead of the low slope. He stated that the roof height is currently shown as seven and one-half feet. He referenced the existing CMU wall on the property line, and explained that there would be a minimal amount of building on top of it to obtain useful height within the first floor. The change in the roof slope would not reduce the height of the CMU wall, but rather would change the amount of impact on the stucco wall. He confirmed that the existing wood lattice on the CMU wall is proposed for removal, and an additional two feet of height is proposed on top of the existing CMU wall.
 - Ms. Gutterman commented that the one-story addition would ideally be minimal in height, but still allows for a roof that drains.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that he would not object to a sloped metal roof if it helps with drainage, and suggested a cross-section of the area with the slope. He noted that this work would not be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that starting at seven feet and sloping up slightly would likely be acceptable.

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the location of mechanical equipment. She stated that one way to screen the roof and mechanical unit is to put back a lattice fence.
 - Mr. Ulassin confirmed that the condenser would not be visible from Quince Street or Jessup Street, and would only be visible from within the private parking lot adjacent to the property.
- Mr. Ulassin referenced the proposed balcony on the front façade. He stated that the opening would need a security rail to prevent a fall hazard, if a balcony is not installed.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested a Juliet balcony, which is a railing attached to the masonry wall with no space to walk out. It would be attached within the masonry reveal.
- Mr. Ulassin referenced the proposed new window openings on the rear of the first floor and asked for comments from the Committee. He stated there is minimal visibility of the first-floor rear from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Cluver noted they do not have existing condition drawings to compare to.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that he believes the Committee is open to a modification at the rear of the building, but that it needs to be shown in existing and proposed side-by-side elevation drawings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron provided comments on the proposed application. He recommended restoring the window configuration to reflect its original Greek Revival character and maintaining the decorative bargeboard. Mr. Baron expressed concern about the upward slope of the rear roof addition and suggested that any new rear dormer slope downward, possibly with a similar slope as the front dormer.
- Elizabeth Armour, owner of 251 Quince Street, spoke in opposition to the application. She outlined her objections about the proposed changes to the building, which were provided in advance to the Committee in a letter dated 9 December 2020 from Ms. Armour and other immediate surrounding property owners.
- Philip Rakita, owner of 251 Quince Street, spoke in opposition to the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The size and roof slope of the proposed third floor rear overbuild negatively impacts the building's historic character. The Committee agreed that a rear dormer is a more compatible solution for gaining headroom on the third floor.
- The proposed balcony does not reflect the historic character of the property and environment of Quince Street. The Committee agreed that a Juliet balcony is more compatible with the building.
- The first-floor side addition is acceptable, but the detailing of the roof and side wall should be revised to ensure limited visibility from the public right-of-way and proper drainage.
- Existing elevation drawings should be provided to better communicate the proposed changes.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- This application proposes changes to the rear roof and front façade that are incompatible with the historic character of the building and Quince Street, therefore the application does not satisfy Standards 9 and 10.

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

ITEM: 253 QUINCE 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				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:56:30

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:57 p.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.