

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

**TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2022
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

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

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

Jay Farrell
Robert Gurmankin
Jim King
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Anabel Pena
Nancy Pontone
Susan Wetherill
Cassidy Martin
Chinmay Nerurkar
Carolina Pena
Emanuel Kelly
Mark Travis
Ruth Brown, Brown Expediting

Suzanne Amrich, Archer & Buchanan Architecture
Daniel Russoniello, Archer & Buchanan Architecture
Steven Peitzman
Rebecca Ferris
Ryan Solimeo
Agata Reister
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Dan Bargas
Matt Masterpasqua
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Raymond Evers
Joseph Bongard
Carl Massara
Dennis Carlisle
Rustin Ohler
Nancy Goldenberg
Param Doshi

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 3704 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Rehabilitate gatehouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Laurel Hill Cemetery

Applicant: Suzanne Amrich, Archer & Buchanan Architecture

History: 1836; Laurel Hill Cemetery Gatehouse; John Notman

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 8/7/1980

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application seeks final approval for restoration and rehabilitation of the gatehouse building at Laurel Hill Cemetery. The gatehouse was designed by John Notman and constructed in 1836. The proposed project includes restoration of architectural features and construction of an accessible entrance and an addition for restrooms. The completed project will enable the Friends of Laurel Hill to better use the building and enhance the visitor experience to the historic cemetery.

The project is funded by a Save America's Treasures grant and multiple grants from the State of Pennsylvania. Owing to the funding sources, final project plans must be approved by National Park Service and the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office in addition to the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Restoration of architectural elements and materials.
- Selective demolition.
- Construct new addition for visitor restrooms.
- Enclose entryway area and construct accessible ramp.
- Create additional parking area.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - o The demolition on the south façade for the addition is selective and does not remove distinctive materials or features. The new accessible entryway is limited to the removal of a masonry step; therefore, the application meets Standard 2.
- *Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.*
 - o The majority of project scope focuses on preserving and restoring existing features of historic façade; therefore, the application meets Standard 5.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*

- o The restoration of historic features is based on historic research, documentation, and site assessment, meeting Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The addition is compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features, meeting Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The addition requires selective demolition on the south building. Existing windows, doors, trellis, and stairs will be removed to allow for the bathroom addition. In the future, if the addition were to be removed, the current configuration on the south elevation could be restored, therefore the application meets Standard 10.
- **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Suzanne Amrich and Daniel Russoniello represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Amrich presented a summary of the scope of work and plans for the project.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the chimneys proposed for removal.
 - o Ms. Amrich said a fireplace that was not part of the original construction is planned for removal from the south building. She noted this is in the location where they are restoring a niche. Ms. Amrich reiterated that because the chimney and fireplace were not original to the building, there is no longer a need for them, and they would require maintenance, they plan to remove them.
 - o Ms. Stein asked if the fireplace and chimney existed at the time of designation.
 - o Ms. Amrich confirmed that they did. She explained that the project scope includes the removal of two chimneys on the Ridge Avenue side of the building.
 - o Mr. Cluver observed that, even if the chimneys remained, the reconstructed balustrade would obscure them.
- Mr. Cluver addressed the reconstruction of the roof balustrade facing Ridge Avenue. He stated he appreciated the proposal but noted that there are aspects of it that are inconsistent with the historic photographs of the building. He encouraged the design team to take a closer look at the plans. Mr. Cluver stated that there are nine full balusters and two half balusters in each section in the historic photographs, but the proposed design shows seven full balusters and no halves. He added the proportions of the proposed piers look a little squarer when compared to those in the historic photographs. Mr. Cluver also commented on the center element and the proposed rhythm and asked them to reconsider it. He also asked about scrolls shown on the proposed design. Mr. Cluver reiterated his request for the design team

- review the historic photographs and other documentation again to be more faithful to the historic scale and proportions.
- o Ms. Stein asked if they had access to historic drawings for recreating the balustrade.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey asked if the design team is using historic photographs as their primary source for the proposed project.
 - o Ms. Amrich responded that there are no historic drawings. She explained that in the 1980s another architect did a restoration taking the building almost back to its original construction. She said that their team had access to that architect's drawings and the drawings proposed putting the balustrade and urn back on the building. Ms. Amrich said they are using these drawings from the 1980s and historic photographs as the basis for the proposed restoration components of this project. She said they would be happy to revisit the design elements raised by the Architectural Committee to make it more historically accurate.
 - Mr. Cluver asked about the addition of the ramp. He commented on the related steps and noted they stick out past the columns and asked if that area could be tightened up and coordinated with the architecture.
 - o Ms. Amrich said they could potentially tuck those stairs in as long as they have the required turn radius at the top.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey recommended sliding the stair to the left to allow the corner of the plinth to be expressed.
 - o Mr. Russoniello said he understands, and they will do what they can to address that suggestion. He noted that the site plan shows the context; there is a site wall and crypt in this location.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey also suggested that the railing should not connect to the column but should end just short of it.
 - o Mr. Cluver made additional suggestions for the start of the ramp.
 - o Mr. Russoniello pointed out they are contending with different elements on the site. He noted that he agrees architecturally with Mr. Cluver's comments, but they may not be able to make changes based on the site conditions.
 - Mr. Cluver said he wished to discuss the restroom addition on the south end of the building. He observed the current metal stair is somewhat hidden whereas the new metal stair is more of a visible object.
 - o Ms. Amrich confirmed it cannot be seen from Ridge Avenue.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked if it was hidden from the Ridge Avenue side. He asked the applicants if it is fully a metal stair with railings and riser being as light and minimal as they can possibly be.
 - o Ms. Amrich agreed with this observation.
 - Mr. Cluver inquired about the trellis work on the addition and asked about the reasoning behind the trellis details.
 - o Mr. Russoniello replied that it helps differentiate the addition from the original building. He continued that, more importantly, that set of bathroom doors opens into what is now a small walled off garden, and the trellis provides a sense of privacy from the outdoor public space. Mr. Russoniello reiterated that the trellis detail is intended to provide a sense of separation between the restrooms and the driveway, parking, and other outdoor activity on the site. Ms. Amrich added that it also speaks to the existing trellis area that was in place at the time of designation.

- Mr. Detwiler asked about the door to the basement on the proposed addition's west elevation. He noted that if the door swings out, the corner will hit the trellis. He commented that the west elevation includes a center bay that is ornate and wings that are much simpler. Mr. Detwiler continued that he recommends removing the trellis over the small square window on the west elevation but keeping it in place on the south elevation.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Detwiler's comments.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed to the cornice on the south end of the building. He recommended differentiated between the historic building and the new cornice.
 - o Ms. Amrich agreed with this comment and said that that was their intention.
- Mr. Cluver recommended some changes to the exterior stair to the second floor. He requested that the design team reconsider the design.
 - o Mr. Russoniello replied that they studied this part of the design carefully and considered several options. He conceded that they can review it again.
- Mr. Cluver requested that the applicants verify the number of penetrations in the roof and asked that they try to minimize the appearance of pipes and other roof elements as much as possible.
 - o Mr. Russoniello confirmed they would.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed new lighting for the project.
 - o Ms. Amrich said the new lighting is based on historic photographs. Ms. Amrich pointed out that the sconces for the bathrooms are shown on the elevation drawings.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if all the south elevation restroom windows were necessary. He said that there is a lot happening on the wall and perhaps it could be simpler. Mr. Detwiler stated that, if some of the elements were removed, such as the small windows, it would this improve the design.
 - o Mr. Cluver and Ms. Stein agreed with simplifying the south façade as well.
 - o Mr. Russoniello stated that the windows provide light to the interior of the bathrooms and provide a connection to the outdoor space. He asked the Committee to clarify which elements they thought should be potentially removed.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the wood windows and steel windows. He asked where the different materials would be installed.
 - o Ms. Amrich responded that the wood windows would be installed at the restroom addition and the steel windows would be placed in the storefront areas. She pointed out that the storefront areas had been altered over the years and much of the original fabric is lost. Ms. Amrich continued that they wanted to keep the thin mullions of the corner bays and felt steel reproductions would be appropriate there.
- Mr. Cluver commented on a window detail where stucco meets the head trim awkwardly. He recommended ensuring that the weeping of the drainage behind the stucco is proper and making sure it is not draining into the window.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the existing storm windows on the building and asked if they would go back on after the restoration work is completed. He recommended special attention be paid to the weather stripping if they are not going back on the building.
 - o Ms. Amrich replied that there are only a handful of storm windows left on the building and these will not be reinstalled after construction is complete. She acknowledged Mr. Cluver's concerns.

- Mr. McCoubrey commented about the proposed front rain gardens. He said historically this would have been a lawn and recommended that the design team look at the planting plans for this area. He noted that these changes to the landscape and the selection of planting should seek to maintain the appearance of a historic lawn. Mr. McCoubrey also asked if the design team could look at alternative locations for these rain gardens.
 - o Ms. Amrich responded they will coordinate with the civil engineer, who has not provided a plant list yet. She explained that Laurel Hill Cemetery has team of horticulturalists who prefer rain gardens. Ms. Amrich continued that the current system is tied into the existing city storm and septic systems, and rain gardens are an effort to do something else. She said they would revisit this and look at some alternate locations, but they are limited on the south side. Ms. Amrich said the new parking also must be incorporated.
- Ms. Stein recommended submitting the planting list with the project submissions to the National Park Service and Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Laurel Hill Gatehouse is an important historic resource and key entry point to the historic Laurel Hill Cemetery.
- This project is funded by National Park Service Save America's Treasures grant and grants from the State of Pennsylvania. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission assessments are one part of a multi-agency review for this project.
- Successful rehabilitation and restoration will enable the Friends of Laurel Hill to better use the building and enhance the visitor experience to the historic cemetery.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The demolition on the south façade for the addition is selective and does not remove distinctive materials or features. The new accessible entryway is limited to the removal of a masonry step; therefore, the application meets Standard 2.
- Most of the project scope focuses on preserving and restoring existing features of historic façade. The application meets Standard 5 with the following recommendation:
 - o Study and refine the plans for the rain gardens to limit their impact on the historic character of the building and site, specifically to maintain the sense of the historic lawn in front of gatehouse.
- The restoration of historic features is based on historic research, documentation, and site assessment; it meets Standard 6, with the following recommendation:
 - o Study the proposed reconstruction of the roof balustrade so that the design matches historic photographs.
- The additions are compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features and meet Standard 9 with the following recommendations:
 - o Remove the trellis above window on south addition's west elevation and increase size of window.
 - o Remove windows on south elevation of addition and adjust the size of the trellis accordingly.

- o Confirm that the basement door on south addition can open freely without touching the trellis.
- o Minimize all visible roof penetration on the south addition.
- o Further study the location, configuration, and width of proposed accessible ramp. Ideally it should not project past the plinth of column and would be centered on the column.
- The addition requires selective demolition on the south building. Existing windows, doors, trellis, and stairs will be removed to allow for the bathroom addition. In the future, if the addition were to be removed, the current configuration on the south elevation could be restored, therefore the application meets Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommendation of approval with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 3704 Ridge Ave MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 244-58 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Amend approved application with substitute materials

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 244 N 2nd Street OCF LLC

Applicant: Agata Reister, Landmark Architecture

History: 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to amend an application previously approved by the Historical Commission for a property in the Old City Historic District. The project is currently under construction and the applicant is requesting to amend approved materials. The original application, which was approved, included the demolition a non-contributing gas station and construction of 11 new townhouses, four stories in height with roof decks, pilot houses, and garages.

The original application was approved by the Historical Commission in April 2021. This application proposes revising the cladding materials along New Street and Philip Street from brick to vinyl siding and revising the details from cast stone and metal panel to composite board (Azek).

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Amend approval.

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.*
 - o The proposed new material is not compatible with the materials and features of the surrounding context of the Old City Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:43:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Agata Reister represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the reason for the requested change in materials.
 - o Ms. Mehley stated that the applicant is requesting this change for financial reasons.
 - o Ms. Reister confirmed that this is the primary reason that her client is requesting the change. She respectfully asked the Committee to consider the change as the project is experiencing financial hardship and is unable to be completed as originally designed. Ms. Reister said they have made modifications to retain as much brick as possible, especially for the properties viewed from Vine Street. She explained that the changes in material are proposed for the properties along Philip Street, which is a narrow street and not as visible to the public. Ms. Reister said that her client would like to reduce the amount of brick and increase the amount of vinyl siding. She explained that, on New Street, the corner will turn with brick and then will transition to vinyl siding. She pointed out the turn onto Philip Street will have a section of masonry as well.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if any material was considered other than vinyl.
 - o Ms. Reister said that the vinyl was chosen because it was the one most consistent with the cladding in the courtyard and they did not want to introduce more materials into the design.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the construction detailing. He asked how thick the brick veneer is that they are planning to use. Mr. Detwiler said that the windows would have to project further forward to receive the brick the way as it is currently shown in

- the construction photographs. He asked if the construction was done to receive the vinyl siding. Mr. Detwiler commented that he normally sets windows forward when designing new construction.
- o Ms. Reister replied that it will be a standard four-inch brick. Mr. Reister responded that the nailing flange is mounted onto the plywood in wood frame construction. She added the point where the brick terminates at the window is infilled with sealant. Ms. Reister explained that the windows remain recessed and noted that this is how they have designed windows on other projects in Old City.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that this is a massive complex of homes. He noted that the project was originally palatable owing to the proposed materials. He commented that the proposed materials blended the feel of an industrial building with a residential building, and it becomes a totally different project when the materials are changed. Mr. Detwiler concluded that he finds the use of vinyl completely inappropriate.
 - Mr. Cluver pointed out that, while the Philip Street and New Street facades are secondary facades, they are still highly visible.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed changes in materials are not appropriate for the Old City Historic District.
- Although the changes are proposed for secondary facades, the facades are still highly visible from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new material is not compatible with the materials and features of the surrounding context of the Old City Historic District.

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

ITEM: 244-58 N 2nd St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey		X			
John Cluver		X			
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler		X			
Nan Gutterman		X			
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein		X			
Total		5			2

ADDRESS: 11 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition; add windows and doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Raymond J. Evers

Applicant: Carl Massara, Carl Masarra, AIA

History: 1775

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to demolish a non-historic two-story rear addition and construct a three-story rear addition on a slightly larger footprint, and also construct a glass roof structure on the existing two-story sloped rear addition. Visibility of the rear of the property is limited to the side when looking east on Queen Street from the west. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviewed a similar application from a different architect in August and September 2020, and a revised design in January and February 2021. That scope involved a deck with stair house where the glass structure is now proposed. At that time, the Commission voted to approve the application for the similar scope, provided the new third-floor roof is at least one foot below the height of the existing gambrel roof, the third-floor deck is reduced in size or eliminated, the third-floor balcony is eliminated and the proposed door becomes a window, the bump-up at the third-floor rear door/window opening is eliminated, and the design of new windows at first-floor side of existing building is reconsidered. This application has removed several of those aspects from the scope. The height of the new third floor roof aligns with the height of the existing gambrel roof in this application rather than being at least one foot below it. The staff has included several pages from the prior applications for reference. This application also proposes new window and doors for the west side elevation, which was historically a shared party wall.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish two-story rear addition; construct three-story rear addition.
- Construct glass enclosure on existing rear addition.
- Insert new window and door openings into former party wall on west elevation.

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.*
 - o The proposed rear addition has been designed to be more compatible with the historic building's features, size, scale, and massing, satisfying Standard 9.
 - o The proposed glass structure can be pulled back so that it does not alter the spatial relationships that characterize the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the glass structure is pulled back so that it does not project out beyond the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval of February 2021.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:51:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carl Massara and property owner Raymond Evers represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked about changes made since the prior approval.
 - o Mr. Massara responded that the new design has a better flow in the interior and allows for more light into what is an otherwise dark building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about lowering the height of the rear addition so that it is not taller than or equal to the height of the gambrel roof.
 - o Mr. Massara responded that he would adjust the height of the rear addition so that it is lower than the gambrel roof.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the design of the rear addition in the prior approval had more of a residential appearance, and that adding windows back into the design of the third-floor rear addition would help this design to have that same appearance.
 - o Mr. Massara responded that he would investigate the addition of windows at this location.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the banks of doors proposed for the first-floor side of the existing building dissolves the former party wall too much. The Architectural Committee members offered suggestions to limit the doors to the rear addition or reduce the doors to one pair rather than two.
 - o Mr. Massara responded that he was trying to get light and air into the space, but that he will revisit the extent of openings on the first-floor side of the existing building.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that the glass structure on the roof is inappropriate.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey asked if the glass structure could be pulled back to align with the rear addition rather than projecting out from the building.
 - o Mr. Massara responded that it can be revised to be pulled back to align with the rear addition.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the front façade windows will be replaced as part of this project.
 - o Mr. Massara responded that there is no work proposed to the front façade, including windows.
- Mr. Massara asked that the Architectural Committee confirm his understanding of the comments received, which included limiting or changing to windows the first-floor doors on the side of the existing building, pulling back the glass roof structure, adjusting the rear addition so that it is lower than the gambrel roof, and inserting windows into the third-floor side of the rear addition.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey confirmed Mr. Massara's understanding of the Architectural Committee's comments. He thanked Mr. Massara for creating the model of the building, which was provided to the Committee through photographs of the model.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- In February 2021, the Historical Commission approved an application for this property that was similar in scope.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed rear addition should be lowered slightly and have additional windows to be compatible with the historic building's features, size, scale, and massing and satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed glass structure should be pulled back so that it does not alter the spatial relationships that characterize the property, to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed but approval if revised as suggested, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 11 QUEEN ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 425-29 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct three-story addition; cut window openings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Morgan Cat LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

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

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to convert the former St. Andrew's Byzantine Ukrainian Catholic Church and rectory to multi-unit residential complex, with a three-story addition to be constructed at the rear. The church building is the result of extensive alterations starting in 1946

to a mid-nineteenth-century structure used as the Willing Day Nursery. The rectory was built as an addition to the church in 1952.

The proposed scope includes many new window openings on the sides of the main building. Currently there are three historic windows each on the side facades, all in arched openings. The stained-glass windows on the front façade will be retained. At the rear, a three-story addition is proposed to be constructed on top and around the existing two-story rectory building. The addition rises higher than the church roof. The rear of the property is visible to the public from Lawrence Court.

SCOPE OF WORK:

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

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The new windows as proposed for the side facades of the church building remove the historic window openings and are not in keeping with the architectural features of the building.
 - o The three-story rear addition is not compatible with the massing, size, scale, proportions, and architectural features of the historic property and its environment. As designed, it overwhelms the historic church building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:06:45

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Travis explained that he intends to move into the former church building as his residence. He stated that he disagrees with the staff recommendation and that his proposal will turn the property, currently an eyesore, into the jewel of the neighborhood. He explained that a major problem with the building is that there is very little light getting into it, and so it is necessary to insert windows into the sides of the building to create a useable space. He opined that the building is not historic, but rather it is a building that the Historical Commission likes. He stated that the bricks are from the 1940s and 1950s. He stated that the building has suffered from years of deferred maintenance and that his project will allow for the building to be put back into use after many years of vacancy.

- Mr. Detwiler noted that there is no argument to be made about the building not being historic, because it is already designated as a contributing resource in the Society Hill Historic District.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant has a response to written comments received from Society Hill Civic Association about parking, the addition being too large, and removal of a heritage tree.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that he believes the zoning to be by-right but noted that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction does not extend to zoning matters regarding parking. Regarding the addition, Mr. Ohler stated that it was important to maintain the chapel but doing so requires the third floor of the addition and the number of units proposed to make the project viable. He stated that they are working to determine if an impacted tree at the rear is a heritage tree and if so, the necessary steps per the zoning code will be taken.
 - o Mr. Travis added that he is a graduate of W.B. Saul High School and is a gardener and will do everything possible to retain the landscaping and create a garden.
- Mr. Ohler explained the window changes proposed to the east and west side elevations of the church building for the purposes of allowing more light into the space. He explained that the current windows do not meet code requirements.
- Ms. Stein stated that she understands the need to fit a certain number of units into the rear addition, but that the third floor of the rear addition is problematic because it dominates the structure of the original church. She asked if the third floor could be omitted, and unit space added elsewhere, potentially the church basement or the courtyards.
 - o Mr. Ohler responded that the massing was driven by zoning requirements for side yards and also through conversations Mr. Travis had with near neighbors about maintaining their light and air.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he is not opposed to an overbuild at the rear, but that the current design with the parapet makes it feel too tall and boxy compared to the historic building at the front. He suggested that the roof line of the addition be lowered, sloped, or otherwise broken up with dormers to make it feel more in scale with the church building.
- Mr. Detwiler noted the existing louvers in the front façade that are proposed to be converted to windows. He suggested that the louvers should remain, as they provide the appearance of a bell tower element, and the interior use in those locations is only a closet and a staircase.
 - o Mr. Travis responded that the painted louvers are in very poor condition and present a maintenance issue if retained. He explained that on the west side, it is the top of the staircase where there is no light, so the louvered opening needs to be made into a window to allow for light into the stairway.
 - o Mr. Ohler added that the louvers are currently open to the elements.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested adding a window behind the louver or recreating the louvers out of a material that will not rot.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the reason for retaining the doors on the side elevations.
 - o Mr. Travis responded that the one door will allow for him to enter the building if he has driven and parked his car on the west side, and the other door will allow for him to enter the building if walking. He stated that the doors can be changed from metal slab doors to something more attractive.

- Mr. Detwiler commented that the banks of windows on the side elevations are too much for the building and suggested something more in keeping with the existing rhythm or pattern.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the two proposed skylights in the church roof and commented that it is too much with the side windows as proposed.
 - o Mr. Travis responded “it is a church, and God said, let there be light. So I am proposing light.” He reiterated that the building is very dark and needs window openings to allow for the building to work as a residence. He stated that there needs to be at least one skylight and suggested a location on the northernmost part of the sanctuary roof.
 - o Mr. Cluver stated that the location of skylights should be reviewed for visibility from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that there should be a differentiation between the windows on the new addition and the windows on the sides of the existing church building. He stated that it would be helpful to understand the visibility of the new side windows from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Stein stated that the cladding of the rear addition should be brick rather than metal panel, commenting that metal panel is completely out of character for Society Hill.
- Mr. Detwiler asked that a revised application show existing versus proposed elevations side-by-side on a page.
- Mr. Travis stated that he has heard the Architectural Committee’s objections and asked the Committee what it supports.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Architectural Committee supports the adaptive reuse of historic religious buildings.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that the Architectural Committee applies the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties when reviewing building permit applications. He stated that he supports the overbuild at the rear and additional openings in the side elevations, but that the design of those features needs to relate to the historic building and surrounding context.
- Mr. Travis suggested that he, the Architectural Committee, and the Civic Association should negotiate to get to an agreement on the design.
 - o Mr. Farnham commented that any discussions between the owner and the Civic Association should happen outside the auspices of the Architectural Committee’s meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented in opposition to the design as proposed. He suggested that the applicant look at the church conversion at South 17th and Fitzwater Streets, which has many large historic window openings. He suggested the addition of skylights in exchange for retaining the window openings. He commented that the design of the overbuild is not appropriate.
- Paul Boni, representing the Society Hill Civic Association, commented in opposition to the application. He stated that the Civic Association is opposed to the design of the overbuild and the new side windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Both the church and rectory buildings are classified as contributing to the Society Hill Historic District.
- The rear of the property is visible to the public from Lawrence Court.
- The Historical Commission encourages adaptive reuse of special-purpose buildings such as former religious structures.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The new windows as proposed for the side facades of the church building remove the historic window openings and are not in keeping with the architectural features of the building.
- The three-story rear addition is not compatible with the massing, size, scale, proportions, and architectural features of the historic property and its environment. As designed, it overwhelms the historic church building, and does not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 425-29 PINE ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 832 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate to passive house standards; demolish garage; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Carolina Peña and Christopher Yasiejko

Applicant: Carolina Peña, Parallel Architecture Studio

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to rehabilitate a historic building to passive house standards, install solar panels, construct a rear addition, and demolish a non-historic garage. An in-concept application for a similar scope, but which also included the new construction of a detached house at the rear fronting S. Howard Street, was reviewed and approved in-concept by the

Historical Commission in November 2022. This application for final approval has removed the new construction at the rear from the scope and omits solar panels from the front roof slope. The proposed rear addition is now completely new construction rather than an extra story on the existing rear addition. Specifications for passive house windows are included with the application, which appear as double-hung windows from the exterior, but function as casements in the bottom sash.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate building to passive house standards.
- Construct three-story rear addition with deck.
- Install solar panels.
- Replace windows and roofing.
- Demolish non-historic garage at rear; install gate.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o Replacement of front façade features such as windows and doors to match the historic appearance satisfies Standard 6. Commission staff will work closely with applicant and window manufacturer to ensure details which match historic appearance.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The removal and construction of a rear addition with three stories does not destroy historic materials which characterize the property and is compatible with the historic property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9. The existing two-story rear addition to be removed is not original to the building.
 - o Installation of solar panels only on the rear roof slope satisfies Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:55:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carolina Peña represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked about prior passive house rehabilitation projects and the windows approved for those. She noted that the windows proposed for this project are aluminum. She asked about the muntin details.

- o Ms. Chantry responded that the Historical Commission has not reviewed many passive house projects yet, but the proposed windows are a type approved by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission.
- o Ms. Peña commented that she can correct the front windows to be six-over-six in pane configuration, and that she will submit a muntin detail to the staff as part of the shop drawing submission process. She stated that the windows appear as double-hung from the exterior, but have a fixed sash at the top, and a tilt-and-turn window at the bottom which opens in. She explained that this window is passive house certified owing to its insulating qualities. She confirmed that the muntin is on the exterior of the glass.
- Ms. Stein noted that the material proposed for new shutters is vinyl and stated that the Historical Commission typically approves wood shutters.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that she thought vinyl would be better in terms of maintenance, but that she can change the material if necessary.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the design of the new shutters. She asked if the design is based on historic documentation, and if there is evidence of shutter hardware.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that she has been unable to find photographs of the building with shutters, but that there is evidence of shutter hardware. She agreed to work closely with the staff on the design of new shutters.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about moisture studies for the brick walls.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that she is working with a passive house consultant who has experience working on historic buildings, especially in New York, and that the details have been worked out and can be shared with the staff. She outlined the design of the interior walls to prevent moisture from entering.
 - o Ms. Gutterman expressed concern about sealing the walls on the inside and the impact it will have on moisture escaping and the bricks not being able to dry out.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the design of the new front door.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that it will be a standard six-panel Colonial-style door with no glazing.
- Mr. Cluver voiced opposition to the windows being black in color. He stated that, since they are aluminum and not painted wood, the color is permanent and black is not a common color for historic windows.
 - o Ms. Peña asked the Committee to suggest colors that would be appropriate.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey suggested a lighter color so that the muntins are more visible.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the rear addition is acceptable as proposed. He noted that the scope includes demolition of the non-historic garage at the rear.
 - o Ms. Peña explained that she will likely apply in one year for construction of a new building fronting S. Howard Street as shown in her prior in-concept application, but that she wants to focus on the historic building at this time.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested that the brick for the rear addition be a molded brick and not wire cut.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that her intention is to match the existing brick, and that she will work with the staff on the selection of the new brick.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This application proposes to rehabilitate a historic building to passive house standards.
- An in-concept application for a similar scope was reviewed and approved in-concept by the Historical Commission in November 2022.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Replacement of front façade features such as windows and doors to match the historic appearance satisfies Standard 6. The Historical Commission's staff will work closely with the applicant and window manufacturer to ensure details that match the historic appearance in design.
- The removal and construction of a rear addition with three stories does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property and is compatible with the historic property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9. The existing two-story rear addition to be removed is not original to the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a thermal analysis of the interior masonry wall is submitted for staff review, the front window lite pattern is revised to be six-over-six and the windows are lighter in color, a muntin profile drawing is submitted for staff review, and the shutter design is revised based on historic documentation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ITEM: 832 S FRONT ST MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 108 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: CFY Realty LLC

Applicant: Carolina Peña, Parallel Architecture Studio

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 1/14/1976

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to remove an existing second-story addition at the rear of the historic piazza of this circa 1825 building and to construct a two-story addition on top of the existing first floor. The proposed addition would be clad in brick and match the height of the main block of the historic building. The parapet of the existing garage would be raised to conceal mechanical equipment and a new deck.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a proposal for alterations and additions to this property in October 2022, which was withdrawn before the Historical Commission meeting. At that time, the Committee supported the removal of the second-story bump out of the ell and the construction of an addition that extends to three stories, matching the height and width of the existing three-story ell, and the full width of the property over the garage.

The staff notes that the muntin configuration of the windows shown in the drawings depicts 9-over-9 windows, when the existing windows are 6-over-6.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove second-floor bump out
- Construct addition and deck

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 will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed addition does not remove significant historic materials and maintains the spatial relationship of the main block and piazza that characterize the property. The addition would be compatible with the historic materials, features, size and scale and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property, satisfying Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the window pattern is amended, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:12:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the applications to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carolina Peña represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked whether the applicant intended for the brick of the addition to match the existing historic building and whether they had had success in sourcing a matching brick.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that they have not yet looked.
 - o Mr. Cluver noted there would and should be a subtle distinction between the old and new brick.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that it is easier to match some bricks than others. He suggested adding a beltcourse or other logical break between the existing and new brick where the addition meets the historic building.
 - o Mr. Detwiler noted that cleaning the existing brick will help get a better, or at least complementary, brick match.
- Ms. Stein noted that the notch of brick that sits next to the new addition will need a coping or capstone, which could be a precast or other stone material, and could carry across and become a beltcourse between the existing building and addition above. She also noted that the windows of the proposed addition will need some sort of capstone sill to shed water.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that it might be a rendering issue, but the cornice of the addition appears overly bulky. He opined that it should match the dimensions of the cornice on the historic building.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that that is the intent.
- Mr. Cluver noted that he appreciates the attempt to screen the condensing units over the garage, but that the use of a brick parapet results in an odd, top-heavy appearance.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed, suggesting that a wood screen or fence would give a lighter appearance, while still shielding the view of the condensing units and also allowing airflow.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that they can certainly do that.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that he finds the massing of the proposed addition acceptable, and an improvement to the previous proposal as it retains considerably more historic fabric.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the garage projects beyond the rest of the existing building.
 - o Ms. Peña responded affirmatively.
 - o Mr. Cluver replied that the parapet or screen should not project beyond the existing upper wall of the garage.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the existing brick is a hodgepodge.
- Ms. Stein asked whether the whole structure will be cleaned and repointed, noting that part of the visual issue with the existing building might be various campaigns of spot pointing.
 - o Ms. Peña responded affirmatively.
- Mr. Cluver noted that there is a broad note about the garage door is either to remain, be repaired, or be replaced, and questioned the actual intent.

- o Ms. Peña responded that the existing garage door works, but it will probably be replaced. She noted that they can work with the staff on an appropriate replacement door.
- Mr. Cluver noted that all the windows show muntins except the two next to the garage, which the notes say will be replaced.
 - o Ms. Peña noted that the existing windows in those openings are one-over-one, but that they can revise to match the other windows.
- Mr. Cluver noted that there are two existing light fixtures next to the garage and asked about the intent for those fixtures.
 - o Ms. Peña responded that they plan to remove the light fixtures.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that they do not appear historic and do not need to be retained.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing windows are six-over-six but are rendered as nine-over-nine in the drawings, which should be updated.
- The existing brick should be cleaned prior to finding a matching or complementary brick for the addition.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The overall massing of the proposed project is acceptable and an improvement to the previous proposal.
- The proposed brick parapet screen over the garage is overly heavy and a light material, such as a wood screen or fence, should be used to screen the condensing units instead.
- A beltcourse or other break between the existing and new brick should be added.
- Heads and sills should be added to the windows of the proposed addition to match those of the existing windows.
- The cornice of the proposed addition is overly large and should match the details and dimensions of that of the existing building.
- The proposed addition does not remove significant historic materials and maintains the spatial relationship of the main block and piazza that characterize the property. The addition would be compatible with the historic materials, features, size and scale and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following conditions:

- The brick wall over the garage is changed to a wood screen to keep the mechanical equipment out of view;
- The windows receive a similar head and sill treatment to the existing windows;
- All eave trim dimensions match those of the existing house in terms of height and overhang;
- Any brick seam between the new and existing has a beltcourse or other detail that differentiates it from below.

ITEM: 108 Fairmount Ave MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 1717-19 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Alter rear ell; demolish garage; construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mount Vernon Holdings, LLC

Applicant: Matt Masterpasqua, Mass Architecture Studio, LLC

History: 1859; new façade added, 1890

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to modify and add to the property at 1717-19 Mount Vernon Street in the Spring Garden Historic District. The western half, or 1719 portion, of the double-width property features a three-story brick main block and rear ell constructed c. 1859 and refaced in 1890, and a one-story frame rear addition. The eastern half, or 1717 portion, has historically remained undeveloped except for a garage constructed between 1910 and 1916 at the rear of the lot and a historic iron fence at the front of the lot.

This application proposes to demolish the garage and selective portions of the rear ell and to construct additions. In Fall 2022, the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviewed in-concept applications for this project. The Committee recommended approval in-concept, provided: the southern addition was set back approximately 10 feet; the color and material of the façade of the southern addition is compatible with the historic building to which it attaches; the first-floor windows of the southern addition are further studied; the northern addition is set back from the bay window of the rear ell; and details of the cornice and fence modification are submitted for final approval. The applicants revised following that meeting, increasing the setback of the southern addition from 6 feet 4 inches to 8 feet; revising the façade color of the addition to be more in keeping with the existing building and altering the window configuration of the first floor of the addition; and setting the northern addition back an additional 10 inches from the existing rear ell bay. The Historical Commission found that an eight-foot setback from the sidewalk line to the façade of the addition is acceptable, and

that additional study and details of the exposed side wall of the historic building are needed to show how the proposed cladding and capping connect the historic building and addition.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish garage and portions of rear ell
- 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 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.*
 - o Although largely enveloped by the proposed additions, the plans retain much of the original fabric of the main block and rear ell. The height, materials, and punched window openings of the southern addition proposed along Mount Vernon Street are consistent with the scale, massing, materials, and features of the Spring Garden Historic District. The application satisfies this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's November 2022 approval in-concept.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:25:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Matt Masterpasqua represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver observed that the notes on the cornice details on page 14 of the application materials show up as gibberish and asked the applicant to explain the intent of the details as they relate to the proposed cornice.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale attempted to provide a clear version of the drawings but was unable to do so.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua explained that the detail on sheet D635 shows the recreation of the cornice on the left side, and the neighboring cornice on the right side where it steps down. He noted that the top left photograph is of the existing cornice, the details of which they are planning to recreate.
 - o Mr. Cluver clarified that the intent is that the new addition has an identical cornice to the existing building and is aligned and carries through.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that that is the intent, but noted that he is not sure they could recreate the finial at the top of the end cap.
 - o Mr. Cluver commented that, since the addition steps back, he wonders whether the brackets at the ends of the cornice are the appropriate treatment, suggesting that the cornice of the addition be a lesser element to that of the historic building, and that a simplified version wrap down the side and continue across the front of the façade of the addition.

- o Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that there is an awkward sense of how the two buildings come together. He noted that the cornice of the addition either wants to go all the way to the left, or that they create a bridge between the existing building and addition that sits back a few inches because the windows are centered not between the two buildings but between the two cornice finials. He questioned whether those could go away.
- o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that his office produced a few different schemes for the new façade. The issue becomes that the existing alley has a small pitched roof, and the transition is challenging. He noted that knowing that at least some of the Architectural Committee members support bringing the cornice line the full width side to side might help eliminate the offset feeling.
- o Mr. Detwiler responded that the simplest way to make it look correct is to make the sliver of the connection back a few inches, or to slide it all the way to the existing building, and then center the windows on something.
- Mr. Detilwer noted that the intersection of the brick and stucco of the addition and the alley roof are awkward. He noted that if there was a logical recess in the façade, it would make sense, but if the wall stays flat like it is shown, the brick should extend all the way over to the existing house.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the application is successful in its use of appropriate materials and picking up on details of the existing building, such as the pebbledash stucco, but they should be simpler and more contemporary. He noted that he is fine with the window on the first floor.
 - o Ms. Stein agreed that the overall design has a nice sense of resolution.
- Ms. Stein noted that the first-floor arched window is not centered with windows above and asked whether it could be shifted.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that that question came up at the previous meeting and explained that they must provide egress alley on the right side of the elevation, so they have to offset the window. He noted that shifting the upper left windows might create better balance.
 - o Mr. Cluver noted that there is a long and noble history of historic buildings having first-floor window patterns that differ from the floors above, as evident in the rendering of the addition in the context of the block. He noted that the applicants previously presented two standard windows at the in-concept review, and that the Architectural Committee had suggested a bay window at the first floor.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that they chose a flat and simpler window over a bay window because there is an egress window below and the egress alley to the side and he did not want to have to work around a bay. He noted that the only bay on the block is the one building to the right, while the rest of block has flat facades.
 - o Mr. Detwiler noted that there is a long tradition of picture windows with elliptical transoms, which were often leaded, and that their position relative to the windows above were always planned and orderly. He noted that whether the window centers above or aligns on the left like shown, that relationship is important, and should be considered as elements are shifted on the facade.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that they can adjust the windows.
 - o Mr. Cluver opined that there is something about the elliptical arch that he is not sold on.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that Mr. Cluver is a classicist, and that the window is a little too tall for its width based on classical proportions. He noted that the spring

point where the arch begins should not have any vertical below it and should be clipped.

- o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that it is a true three-centered arch, but that they can modify the centers to adjust the proportions. He noted that the perspective of the rendering is off, but that they are trying to align the apex of the transom with the door heads of the adjacent buildings.
- Mr. Cluver addressed the proposed cladding materials of the addition, as shown on sheet A200, expressing concern about the scale and color of the brick and mortar joints. He asked whether the scale shown on the drawings is a true one-to-one scale.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua responded that he does not believe that the scale of the brick is a true one-to-one and they can adjust that detail for the submission to the Historical Commission. He explained that the existing brick is unique and historic, so it is difficult to source an exact match. He noted that they have also been discussing whether to lean into the difference, go darker or lighter, or try to get as close a match as they can.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that the contrast is too stark, and a lot of that is coming from the mortar color and width of the mortar joint.
 - o Mr. Masterpasqua replied that the intent is that the mortar be more blended with the color of the brick, and that they can work with the mason to get as tight of a joint as possible. He noted that few present-day masons can get as tight of a joint as that the historic building owing to the tiebacks that will be required.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested that if they cannot match the color, go a little bit darker, more towards the speckles of the iron spots.
- Mr. Detwiler called attention to the rendering error on sheet A200 with the floating ironwork.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission approved the project in concept in November 2022.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The overall massing and details of the proposed addition are sympathetic to the historic property.
- The cornice of the proposed addition should be simplified and pulled all the way across the façade or a break should be created between the existing building and the addition.
- The transition of materials at the first and second floor where the addition meets the historic building is awkward and should be adjusted.
- The proportions of the elliptical transom of the first-floor window of the proposed addition should be modified to be more in keeping with historic proportions.
- The color of the proposed brick and mortar shown in sheet A200 create too stark of a contrast with the existing brick and mortar. The mortar joint should be narrower and darker.
- With minor adjustments to the design, the new addition and exterior alterations will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with

the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided the following details are refined as discussed:

- The treatment of the cornice of the addition and its transition to the existing building is improved;
- The transition between the existing and new first and second-floor materials is improved;
- The first-floor window is adjusted so that it is centered below the windows above, if possible, and so that the elliptical transom has better proportions;
- The brick and mortar colors and mortar joint are a more compatible complement to the existing materials.

ITEM: 1717-19 Mount Vernon St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 4513 REGENT ST

Proposal: Replace slate mansard and roof shingles with asphalt shingles

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Emanuel Kelly and Diane T. Doughty

Applicant: Emanuel Kelly

History: 1889; Willis G. Hale

Individual Designation: none

District Designation: Chester-Regent Historic District, Contributing, 5/10/2019

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to replace the original slate mansard and roof shingles at 4513 Regent Street with asphalt shingles that approximate the color of the existing slate. The building at 4513 Regent Street comprises half of a three-story historic twin located in the Chester-Regent Historic District of West Philadelphia. Apart from intermittent patch replacing of shingles by the owner, the slate shingles are original to the house and approximately 132 years old. Only one additional half-twin retains its older slate roof on the 4500 block of Regent; the rest have been replaced with asphalt shingles. Another detail to note is the ornamental patterning of

original slate on the mansard of 4513 Regent Street, a feature that would be lost with the replacement as proposed.

The applicant has provided the cost for the proposed scope using GAF Timberline HDZ Dimensional asphalt shingles, and two additional quotes for replacement with synthetic slate and real slate, to demonstrate the much higher cost of synthetic and real slate replacement.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Replace original patterned slate on mansard with GAF Timberline HDZ Dimensional asphalt shingles in slate color.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The proposed asphalt shingle approximates the original color of the historic slate but does not approximate the original slate in design, texture, shape, or pattern.
- *Section 6.10.c.4 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations: "The staff shall review and may approve without referral to the Architectural Committee and the Commission permit applications proposing...the replacement of slate roofing materials, with the exception of mansards, turrets, and other character-defining features, provided the severity of deterioration requires replacement and the substitute materials closely approximate the color and shape of the historic slate roofing materials."*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial as proposed, but approval of an asphalt shingle that approximates the color, shape, and pattern of the historic slate roofing material, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and Section 6.10.c.4 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:43:28

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Emanuel Kelly, property owner and architect by trade, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked if the staff had an example of acceptable asphalt shingles on this block to use as precedent.
 - o Ms. Hendrickson responded that the staff does not have an example, as it appears that no mansards on the block have asphalt shingles that still replicate the approximate size, shape, color, and pattern of the original slate.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if any of the mansards replaced with asphalt maintain the pattern of the original slate.
 - o Ms. Hendrickson replied that 4513 Regent Street is one of only two properties which retains the original slate. She stated that no mansards on the block have

asphalt shingles that still replicate the pattern of the original slate. She noted that the Chester-Regent Historic District was designated in 2019, and as such, the Historical Commission has not reviewed any mansard slate replacement applications prior to now.

- Mr. Kelly stated that he has lived at 4513 Regent Street for 44 years. In the beginning of his tenure, he replaced a few roof slates a year, but in the past few years the need for replacement has accelerated. He asked the Architectural Committee to consider replacement with GAF Slateline shingles, which differs from the shingle proposed in his application, the GAF Timberline HDZ dimensional asphalt shingle. He stated that other twins on the block have replaced their original slate with Slateline shingles. He opined that the Slateline shingle provides the sense of the twin roofs as one unit. He acknowledged his original slate roof does not match his neighbors' asphalt shingle roof and that replacement with Slateline shingles will allow the mansard to appear as originally intended with the twin.
- Mr. Cluver commented that Mr. Kelly had an interesting approach and rhetorically questioned which was more historic in character: the nature of the semblance of a twin, or the nature of the individual roof pattern. He acknowledged it was unfortunate that slate roofs are expensive to replace but noted that they last a long time and that it would be less expensive to replace one roof with slate to last 125 years compared to asphalt which would be replaced every 25 years. He asserted that replacing the slate in-kind would be the Architectural Committee's first choice and would be a fantastic addition of value for future owners.
 - o Mr. Kelly agreed in theory.
 - o Mr. Cluver acknowledged the financial burden of that request.
- Mr. Kelly explained that at the back of the house, the rear mansard roof has running slate without the special patterning of the front or the side mansard.
- Ms. Stein asked for clarification regarding the existing copper finials and detailing in the scope of work provided by Henkel Roofing.
 - o Mr. Kelly assured the Architectural Committee that the finials and the ridgeline would be maintained and painted green. He clarified that the material is not copper, but sheet metal.
- Mr. Cluver returned to the discussion of the proposed GAF Timberline HDZ asphalt shingle, noting that its shape is not similar to the historic slate.
 - o Mr. Kelly remarked that the Timberline shingle submission was made in haste, and he is now proposing the Slateline shingle in Antique Slate or another color. He suggested obtaining color samples to see which matched his neighbor's roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if there are any manufacturers making a scalloped or chisel point asphalt shingle.
 - o Mr. Kelly responded that he is not aware of any available asphalt shingle options in that shape.
- Mr. Kelly explained the quote provided to him for reroofing, noting that the cost of asphalt shingle replacement as proposed is \$18,420 without accounting for any decking which may need to be replaced.
- Mr. Cluver brought the discussion back to the shape of the replacement shingles, stating that an asphalt shingle that replicates the existing pattern of the slate would be a good compromise.
 - o Mr. Kelly reiterated that no other mansards on the block have asphalt shingles which replicate the original pattern.

- o Mr. Cluver observed that the other mansards were reroofed before the designation of the historic district, and 4513 Regent Street is one of only two survivors.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if Commission staff was aware of an asphalt shingle option available in the scalloped or chisel point shape.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that these shingles used to be available, but that many manufacturers have temporarily suspended the manufacturing of shingles in colors and shapes that are less popular or are less in demand since the start of the pandemic. Mr. Farnham continued, noting there are supply chain and staffing issues at manufacturing facilities, so even though there are shingles of various shapes and colors on major manufacturers' websites, obtaining those products has been very difficult for roofers. Mr. Farnham further explained that he has had conversations with several roofers who have said that until supply chain problems are sorted out, they cannot get anything but basic shapes and colors. He suggested that the staff could perform research into what, if any, shingle options are available.
 - o Mr. Kelly noted that his architectural firm recently researched this for a project and came to the conclusion that the unique shapes and colors are not currently available in asphalt.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed with replicating the patterning, if possible, in an asphalt shingle.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes to replace the original slate mansard shingles at 4513 Regent Street with GAF Slateline asphalt shingles which closely match the color of the neighboring roof shingles at 4515 Regent Street.
- The proposal of the GAF Slateline shingles differs from the initial proposal by the applicant which proposed replacement with GAF Timberline HDZ Dimensional asphalt shingles.
- CertainTeed Carriage House shingles or other similar asphalt shingles in a scalloped shape may not be available due to widespread supply-chain issues.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Replacement of the historic slate with GAF Timberline HDZ Dimensional asphalt shingles does not satisfy Standards 5 and 6, and Section 6.10.c.4 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, because the proposed replacement shingle will not mimic the original slate in material, color, shape, and pattern.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval of an asphalt shingle that approximates the color, shape, and pattern of the historic slate roof materials pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and Section 6.10.c.4 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. If there is a proven supply-chain issue with obtaining an asphalt shingle in a scalloped or chisel edge shape, the Architectural Committee recommended that the Historical Commission authorize the staff to use its discretion.

ITEM: 4513 REGENT ST MOTION: Denial as proposed, but approval of asphalt shingle that approximates the color, shape, and pattern of the historic slate roof materials. MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 324 N 13TH ST

Proposal: Install signage
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Roman Catholic High School
Applicant: Ruth Brown, Brown Expediting Services
History: 1929; City Morgue; Philip H. Johnson
Individual Designation: 7/10/2020
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install six banners on mounting poles on Roman Catholic High School Annex, formerly the City Morgue, located along North 13th Street between Carlton Street and Wood Street. This property was added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places on July 10, 2020 as the result of an individual nomination. The immediate architectural context is primarily large mixed-use structures with some residential properties to the immediate North of the site.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install six (6) banners (30" by 105" in size) on mounting poles on the Carlton Street, 13th Street, and Wood Street façades.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed mounting locations compromise distinctive quoins and the size, scale, and number of banners detracts from the building's historic appearance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:04:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Permit expeditor Ruth Brown and Roman Catholic High School President Joseph Bongard represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Brown opened the discussion by stating that the proposed banners offer recognition to the building above and beyond the existing small plaques flanking the 13th Street entrance which currently identify it.
 - o Ms. Gutterman replied that the issue is more about the mounting location into the limestone quoins as well as the size and quantity of banners. She asked if there could be fewer banners, in different locations than proposed, which are smaller in size.
- Mr. Bongard provided context, explaining that the Roman Catholic High School Annex is walking distance from Roman Catholic High School's other buildings and that both students and parents have difficulty recognizing the Annex building, especially since they predominantly use the unmarked Wood Street entrance. He further added that the locations of banners along Wood Street were chosen because of the natural breaks between banks of windows.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that banners should be located near both entrances but nowhere else.
 - o Mr. Bongard noted that the 13th Street doorway contains ornamentation in the form of an angel and that banners may detract from this historic detailing.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the banners be installed into brick mortar joints rather than limestone quoins. He suggested locating the banners between the windows along 13th Street so that the entrance location is communicated without detracting from the ornamentation. He opined that placing multiple banners along the length of the facades creates more confusion as to where entrances are located.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the corners of the building be identified by four banners, two on each corner, but set into the brick mortar joints.
- Ms. Brown asked about the recommended quantity of banners.
 - o Ms. Gutterman suggested one banner by each of the two entrances.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested one banner to the right of the Wood Street entrance, and two banners by the entrance on 13th Street.
- Ms. Brown asked if the Committee would support inclusion of a single banner on Carlton Street.
 - o The Architectural Committee members suggested that Carlton Street should not have a banner because there is no entrance to the building on Carlton Street.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that people would find the building with fewer banners and that it is important to draw attention to entrances rather than just the building overall.
- Mr. Bongard asked that the two banners on 13th Street be located near the corners to declutter the entrance.
- Ms. Gutterman recommended that the application be revised to show a total of three banners anchored into brick mortar joints, with one near the student entrance on Wood Street, and two at the corner of 13th and Wood Streets.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Banners are important way-finding aids when used in appropriate quantities.
- The limestone detailing on 324 N. 13th Street, including quoins and the main entrance surround, are character-defining features and should be avoided when mounting signage on the façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed quantity and location of banners as presented does not meet Standard 9.
- A limited number of banners could fulfill the goal of directing students, families, and other school community members to the entrances of the Annex building.
- These banners should be mounted in mortar joints of the brick façade rather than on limestone features.

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

ITEM: 324 N 13TH ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:22:50

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:24 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.