

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

**TUESDAY, 25 JUNE 2024
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Aaron Miller, cbp Architects
Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design
Andrew Zakroff, Urban Conversions
Bart Bajda, Toner Architects
Benjamin Glassman
Chris Maguire
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Eric Leighton, cbp Architects
Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects
Gosia Primavera, 39N Architects
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Jacob Peck
Jay Farrell
John Hunter, Manayunk Neighborhood Council

Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Kristien Verbeke
Lee Elsey, LC Architecture LLC
Mary McClenaghan, 39N Architects
Michael Koep
Michael Ramos
Noah Ostroff
Nusaybah Estes
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Roy Aharonovich
Sam Katovitch, Toner Architects
Sue Patterson

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 208-12 VINE ST

Proposal: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Stortz

Applicant: Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design

History: Existing structures approved for demolition, 2023

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a six-story building with roof deck at 208-12 Vine Street. The Historical Commission previously approved the demolition of the complex of buildings on the site, finding that they could not be feasibly reused. The proposed building would include 35 residential units and a seven-car garage accessed from New Street. The exterior of the building would be clad in a mix of brick, vertical metal siding, and fiber cement siding, with metal bands and cornices. Windows would be metal-clad wood.

The Architectural Committee reviewed this project in concept in May 2024 and recommended denial, owing to incompleteness. The Historical Commission reviewed a supplemented version of the application, which had more information about the proposed materials as well as elevations and renderings showing the surrounding context of the site, and approved it in concept.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a six-story building with roof deck.

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 works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The massing of the proposed building is compatible in scale with the immediate surroundings, which is comprised primarily of newly constructed apartment buildings.
 - o The use of brick along Vine Street responds to the immediate surroundings as well as the historic district as a whole.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the cladding materials are refined, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:07

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Agata Reister of Landmark Architectural Design represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Historical Commission had expressed some concern about the corrugated metal system when it considered the in-concept application.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that he was also unsure about the corrugated metal cladding. He noted that the amount of brick on the New Street elevation was appropriate given the neighboring historic garage, but that he would prefer an alternative cladding material where the metal is currently proposed.
 - o Ms. Reister responded that the corrugation has made this particular system weather better than other types of metal cladding.
 - o Mr. Detwiler answered that he hoped that it could be something like stucco or brick.
- Mr. Cluver applauded the fact that the brick wrapped a couple of bays from the Vine Street elevation around to the side elevation but noted that the brick does not wrap as far on the third to fifth floors. He suggested that the line of brick be extended upward.
 - o Ms. Reister expressed openness to that change.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the window headers, with their two-step projections, are somewhat atypical, though he also complimented the intention to create articulation.
 - o Mr. Detwiler noted that on the second-floor window headers are very close to the cornice.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the proposed mortar should be a little lighter and that the corrugated metal and cementitious panels should be shifted to lighter colors as well.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the dark color of the metal was discussed during the Historical Commission's in-concept review as well and that it makes the building loom over the street. He further observed that a side effect of the corrugation is that it makes articulations of details more difficult. He suggested that a panel system would better achieve the level of detail.
- Ms. Reister asked the committee if they had comments about the addition of a second, non-functional, garage door on the New Street elevation.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed that breaking up the facade from an expanse of brick is commendable and suggested that there could be other options, including a window system similar to the neighboring historic garage.
 - o Ms. Reister noted that the developer preferred to have less transparency at pedestrian level into the garage.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested that a planter in front of the non-operational garage door might indicate to pedestrians that the door was not active.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposed significant articulation in its design, particularly in its use of brick, and that is to be commended.
- The brick wrapping at the Vine Street corners should extend another bay on the third to fifth floors to match the extent of brick at the second floor.
- The dark color of the metal siding causes the proposed building to loom over the street and should be softened to a lighter color.
- The corrugated metal siding is not ideal for the proposed building and another cladding should be considered.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The massing of the proposed building satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the brick wrap an additional bay at the third to fifth floors, that the metal cladding is a panel system rather than corrugated, and that the color palette of the metal and cement-board sidings is lightened, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 208-12 Vine St 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 1018-20 AND 1032 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Convert church complex to residential use; Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pollard Allen OCF LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1870; Immaculate Conception Roman Catholic Church; Edwin Forrest Durang, architect; 1909, Rectory, George I. Lovatt Sr., architect

Individual Designation: 4/12/2019

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes to convert the former Immaculate Conception church and rectory in Northern Liberties to residential use and construct an addition on the site.

The Historical Commission approved the rehabilitation in-concept at its January 2023 meeting. The updated plans largely reflect the 2023 in-concept approval. The application proposes to insert additional floor levels and install a combination of casement and plate windows and spandrels in the existing window openings, and construct shed dormers on the steep gable roof on the east and west elevations. The stained glass rose window and transoms on the north elevation will remain. Revisions to this application for final approval includes the proposed use of asphalt shingles instead of synthetic slate shingles on the church roof; a revised decorative roof shingle pattern to relate to the new dormers; a revised dormer configuration with wider window openings; and the demolition of a small garage on Pollard Street constructed after the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

rectory was completed, which will allow for access to a rear ADA ramp.

A three story, nine-unit, flat-roofed annex is proposed to the west of the church building. It does not physically attach to the designated buildings. Unlike the church rehabilitation, this proposal has not been considered by the Architectural Committee or Historical Commission previously. The primary visibility of the annex building is from W. Allen Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install additional floors in church
- Install windows and doors
- Replace roofing
- Alter openings
- Demolish small garage
- Construct three-story annex

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary or pictorial evidence.*
 - o The proposed windows reflect the consistent horizontal rectangular proportions and divisions of the historic windows.
 - o The existing rectangular grey slate roofing is in poor condition, and if original, is over 150 years old, having outlived the standard service life of slate roofing. The proposed asphalt shingle in a rectangular shape could approximate the historic appearance of the roofing.
 - o The existing front door slabs are not original. The staff recommends basing the design of the new doors on the drawings and historic photographs of the original doors.
 - o The application complies with Standard 6.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The height and slope of the existing roof would make it difficult to reuse without the insertion of windows. The proposed shed dormers are small and low in relationship to the large sloping roof, which maintains its full slope at the front and rear of the roof. The application satisfies the Roofs Guideline.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed annex building is not physically connected to the church or rectory.
 - o The proposed annex building is contemporary in style and includes design elements such as the brick cladding and vertical windows on the north and east facades that relate to the church and rectory.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

the Roofs Guideline, and the Historical Commission's 2023 in-concept approval.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:27:05

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Sam Katovitch and Bart Bajda and developer Michael Koep represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler, Mr. Cluver and Ms. Stein opined that the original decorative shingle pattern should be retained on the rehabilitated roof.
 - o Mr. Bajda committed to keeping the original pattern except for the lower decorative element, which would be disrupted by the installation of the dormers. In addition, he committed to supplying samples and a mock-up for the staff at the time of construction.
- Mr. Cluver asked about roof penetrations for plumbing.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested that roof penetrations should blend with the roof as much as possible.
 - o Mr. Katovitch stated that the flat roofed portion of the rectory is not visible from the street. He stated that plumbing vents will be colored to match the roof or ganged together in the bell tower where they will not be visible from the street.
- Mr. Cluver expressed concern regarding the six-foot-tall awning windows on the east and west elevations of the church. He suggested amending the design to include a three-foot-tall awning window, a three-foot-tall fixed window, a three-foot-tall awning window and three-foot-tall fixed window. He continued that this configuration would better reflect the historic pattern and be more functional as well.
 - o Mr. Katovich noted that this change will be considered.
- Mr. Detwiler concurred with Mr. Cluver and further stated that a single, fixed, rounded light of glass would be more appropriate than the proposed rounded transom windows.
 - o Mr. Katovitch identified cost saving as a reason for proposing a dormer window in two sections, instead of one.
- Ms. Stein expressed concern that the annex addition will obscure the view of the west façade of the church from W. Allen Street. She related that the density of the addition is not appropriate for the site.
 - o Mr. Katovitch noted that the adjacent townhouse development obscures the church from view already. The annex is set back from the church to preserve the view of the front portion of the church's west façade from the street.
 - o Mr. Cluver disagreed with Ms. Stein and opined that the setback of the annex building will allow for perception of the three-dimensionality of the historic west façade of the church.
 - o Ms. Stein inquired whether the annex will be taller than the gutter of the church. She suggested removing a floor from the annex.
 - o Mr. Katovitch said it would be taller, matching the height of the rectory.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein's concerns regarding the annex. He said he is not opposed to a new building but suggested reversing the angle of the annex at its north end so that it angles away from the church.
- Ms. Stein wondered why the configuration of units in the project changed.
 - o Mr. Koep stated they discovered that the first floor of the church needs a new

structure, which allowed for a reconfiguration of the plan and larger units in the church. The annex is needed to provide more units to offset the costs of the structural work and ensure the financial viability of the project. He expressed the desire to minimize the visual impact of the annex on the church.

- o Most of the members of the Committee concluded that the annex was acceptable as proposed.
- Mr. Cluver inquired regarding the design of the entry doors to the church.
 - o Mr. Katovitch responded that the existing doors will be reused with new hardware.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission approved in concept the rehabilitation of the former church and rectory.
- The plans submitted for final approval generally reflect the previous in-concept approval.
- The proposed changes to the decorative roof pattern are inconsistent with the church's historic design.
- The proposed annex addition does not have an adverse effect upon the historic church building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application would satisfy the Roofs Guidelines if the new roofing more faithfully replicating the original roof pattern.
- The proposed rehabilitation satisfies Standard 6
- The proposed new construction satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the original roofing pattern is better replicated; revising the window pattern on the east and west facades of the church is considered; and revising the dormer windows to a single, rounded light of glass is considered; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

ITEM: 1018-20 and 1032 N. Front St. MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Guttermann					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler		X			
Nan Guttermann	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein		X			
Total	4	2			1

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ADDRESS: 331 LAWRENCE CT

Proposal: Construct dormer and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kristien Verbeke

Applicant: Mary McClenaghan, 39' North Architects

History: 1812

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a historic rear dormer and construct a larger shed dormer with roof deck on the rear of this residence located at the intersection of Lawrence Court and Lawrence Court Walk in Society Hill. The Redevelopment Authority rehabilitated this building, along with the similar buildings at 327 and 329 Lawrence Court, in 1959. The matching rear additions at 331 and 329 Lawrence Court were constructed in 1977. The rear dormer and deck at 329 Lawrence Court were added in 1992; they were altered in 2020; the Historical Commission approved both projects. The rear dormer at 331 Lawrence Court, which would be removed with this project, appears to be original. This application also proposes restoring a front basement window which is currently infilled with glass block, which can be approved by the staff through the review of window shop drawings.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rear dormer and deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The removal of the original rear dormer does not satisfy Standard 2.
- *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 deck and shed dormer are located on a corner property and will be highly conspicuous when viewing the property from the side and rear, from the public right-of-way. This work does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:07:17

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Ms. McClenaghan represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver questioned the necessity of the two new roof slopes and asked if there were a reason the two slopes could not be the same.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- o Ms. McClenaghan responded that the upper flat roof was for headroom coming out onto the deck, but that they could try to make them the same.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the headroom.
 - o Ms. McClenaghan responded that the existing attic was much lower than the deck, so steps were needed to get out onto the deck.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the existing rear dormer was at the same elevation as the front dormer.
 - o Ms. McClenaghan responded that it was.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if it would be feasible to keep the existing rear dormer, move the start of the deck further to the back and add steps to start at the end of the main house block, which would keep the original dormer intact and only necessitate the alteration of the portion of the roof that is below the window sill of the dormer and the eave end.
 - o Ms. McClenaghan responded that they would have to modify the existing low sloped roof and expressed concern that the resulting roof could potentially hold water and cause leaking.
- Ms. Gutterman objected to the modification of the original historic dormer, especially in light of its visibility from the public walkway.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that, in the past, the Architectural Committee has reluctantly recommended approval of the removal of some rear original dormers when the accompanying construction was not visible from the public right-of-way. He explained that, in this application, the proposed new rear deck would be highly visible from the public right-of-way.
 - o Ms. McClenaghan asked if it would be more acceptable to the Architectural Committee if they moved the proposed deck to the far side of the existing dormer where it would not be visible from Lawrence Court Walk.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that that might be possible, but drawings would have to be submitted to demonstrate that it would work.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant if the dormer was tall enough for a person to stand.
 - o Ms. McClenaghan responded in the affirmative, that one could stand in the dormer but not to the right and left of it.
- Ms. Stein wondered if it would be possible to leave the dormer at its current height, come out of a door and modify the low roof to incorporate the deck so that the height of the dormer did not change.
 - o Ms. Gutterman added that she would not want to see the profile of the dormer change either.
 - o Ms. McClenaghan stated that they would need to modify the sloping section of roof between 331 and the next-door neighbor's property, which would be difficult or impossible.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that, if the deck was built on top of the rear roof, there would need to be steps from the dormer end to the deck. Such a change is difficult to visualize without drawings.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the necessity of the interior stair reconfiguration.
 - o Ms. McClenaghan explained that the existing box winder stair was exceedingly steep, and the reconfiguration would make the stairs much safer. She noted that they could look at moving the stair extension inward which would reduce the number of treads and alleviate the bump-out and then they would only be dealing with access to a potential deck.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the stairs from the first floor to the second floor were also being reconfigured.

- o Ms. McClenaghan responded in the affirmative.
- Mr. Cluver opined that he believed there was a need and a benefit to the proposal but that the design was not yet working with the historic building.
- Mr. McCoubrey added that the Architectural Committee typically liked to retain some of the original roof slope and make the change more dormer-like whereas this proposal was consuming the entire width of the house. He suggested making the proposal more dormer-like and somehow maintaining the rear roof slope, especially on the Lawrence Court side, would be much more in line with similar successful applications for alterations to rear roof slopes and dormers.
- Ms. Lukachik commented that she was in support of making the stairs safer but did not think the rear modifications had to be as extensive to make that happen.
 - o The applicant agreed that the rear could be modified in a way that was not visible from Lawrence Court Walk.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The design may be able to be revised so that the top and sides of the historic dormer could be retained.
- If the proposal was more dormer-like and maintained the rear roof slope, especially on the Lawrence Court side, the application would better satisfy the Standards.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2, owing to the removal of the original rear dormer.
- The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline because it would significantly change the appearance of the historic resource from the public right-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: Construct dormer and roof deck					
MOTION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and Roofs Guideline					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 336 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Construct three-story building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Roy Aharonovich

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes new construction at 336 N. Front Street, a non-contributing vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. This application proposes to construct a three-story building with a mezzanine and two decks. The four-unit building will be used for visitor accommodations. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction over this construction on an undeveloped site is review-and-comment only.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a three-story building with a mezzanine and two decks.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed building would be compatible with the Old City Historic District if the primary façade color is changed from gray to red to reflect the brick red in the area, and the over-scaled features like the very large windows are redesigned to better reflect the scale, rhythms, and features of the neighboring buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff comments that the proposed construction at 336 N. Front Street should be revised as suggested to be compatible with the Old City Historic District, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:24:38

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Mehley asked Mr. Deck to respond to the staff's comments provided in the overview.
- Mr. Deck said that the selection of tan brick was in response to a variety of facade colors on the block. He pointed out that the buildings directly adjacent have white, black, and brown tones on their facades. Mr. Deck said they could revisit the façade color and look at something more historical for the façade if that is th.
- Mr. Deck said that, in terms of window proportions, his client was interested in taking a more contemporary approach where the window rhythm was not in strict

- conformance with the adjacent buildings. He explained that they maximized the glazing openings but noted that, with the staff's comments in mind, they can revisit adjusting some of the openings to make them better conform with adjacent buildings.
- Mr. Cluver said revising the window proportions would make a real difference. He said he appreciated the applicant modeling the adjacent properties in the application to illustrate the differences between the new construction and the older buildings. Mr. Cluver observed that the front entrances at grade also throw off the rhythm of the openings along the row. He commented that it was the window opening size but also the lack of articulation that is contributing to the overdeveloped sense of scale.
 - o Mr. Deck acknowledged the comments and stated that it was a challenge to fit the program that the client was looking to put into the building. He said that scale, height, and massing were all considered and that the dormer and mansard features were intended to minimize those aspects and minimize the massing at above the third floor.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked why the first floor was on grade and the floor-to-ceiling height was shorter than that of the adjacent building.
 - o Mr. Deck replied that it is a four unit building and they needed to provide accessibility. He noted the ground floor of the proposed building has an accessible unit. Mr. Deck explained that the floor-to-floor heights are roughly 10 feet and noted that the first-floor height of adjacent and nearby commercial buildings tended to be greater.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that the design would disrupt the rhythm of the street, whether it is contemporary or traditional. He said that the first floor appears squat in comparison. With the strong vertical window elements on the upper floor, the proposed building appears to be visually fighting against everything around it.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked about the proposed board and batten siding. He noted the side elevation shows horizontal striping. He inquired about it and asked why it is not shown on the rear elevation.
 - o Mr. Deck responded that they are open for suggestions on the material at the side and rear of the building. He said that they were proposing a fiber cement board and batten siding in light color tone to minimize the presence of the building. He said the horizontal striping on the drawing indicates the interior floor level; it is not a visual feature of the exterior of the building. He noted the same marks could be added to drawings for the rear elevation for clarity. Mr. Deck confirmed that the exterior material would extend all the way down to grade. He pointed out that the brick on the front façade does return onto the side wall approximately 10 feet back to the second entry door.
 - Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the second front entrance shown set back from the street. He pointed out that, if a building is someday built next to this building, it will create a long alleyway to the entry door.
 - o Mr. Deck responded that this recessed entry provides an open area they are required by zoning.
 - Mr. McCoubrey observed that the choice of brick color was based on the immediate neighbor but pointed out that the neighboring building is an outlier on the block. He contended that most of the buildings on the block are red-brick buildings.
 - o Mr. Deck pointed to the images provided in the application showing the surrounding buildings, new and old. He said that the photographs show that a variety of colors exist on this block. However, if the Architectural Committee would prefer a red or brown brick, he can revisit the brick color.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey replied that the selection of a red brick would add to the

- consistency of this material on the block rather than adding to the inconsistency.
- Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about the appearance of the first-floor height. Mr. Cluver pointed out that one of the things adding to the appearance of a compressed first floor is the upper floors with full-floor-height windows, noting that these make the upper floors appear taller than the first floor.
 - o Mr. Deck agreed with Mr. Cluver's observations.
- Mr. McCoubrey said there is an opportunity to be both modern and contextually modern within the Old City Historic District. He said this should be explored more with the windows. Mr. McCoubrey also indicated that Mr. Deck should further explore the proportional relationships with the adjacent buildings and district.
 - o Mr. Deck replied that he can take that into consideration.
- Ms. Gutterman said she is concerned about the massing of the building and the deck. She noted that she is concerned about its scale and relationship to the neighboring buildings.
 - o Mr. Deck responded that it is a very small site and, given the program, they had to go vertical in the design.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the building is out of scale with the area.
- Ms. Stein contended that there are four-story buildings across the street, so the proposed building is not completely out of scale with the overall context of the block.
 - o Mr. Deck stated that the introduction of the mansard roof was an attempt to minimize the scale of the building. He said they are trying to keep everything as low to the ground, even with the four stories.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the roof deck.
 - o Mr. Deck responded that it is not a roof deck for use by occupants of the building but rather for rooftop mechanical equipment. He pointed out that there is a lower rear deck, but the roof deck will not be accessed by building occupants. Mr. Deck said they are required to have fall protection for the roof equipment, and this is the reason for the railing. He noted there is no pilot house but rather an exterior access stair. Mr. Deck acknowledged that the roof plan shown in their application was not correct.
- Ms. Gutterman said that the roof plan should be revised to show the new scheme with the equipment. Then the design team should determine whether the railing is necessary.
- Mr. Detwiler said that too much program is crammed onto this small site.
- Ms. Stein stated that the massing is acceptable, but the roof deck railing should be removed. She also noted the mansard could be reduced in height by perhaps four feet. She continued that the bay window on the mansard could also be reduced in scale.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jacob Peck supported the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The tan brick color should be revised to a red brick color for better compatibility with the historic district. The other exterior materials should be revised accordingly.
- The overall height of the building is considerably taller than the adjacent buildings but is not incompatible with taller buildings on the block.
- The proportions of the floor heights and front façade window openings should be revisited. Both should be revised for better compatibility with adjacent buildings and

- the historic district.
- The roof deck plan should be revised for accuracy. The applicant should confirm if the deck railing is a requirement or can be removed.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building does not meet Standard 9. It is not compatible with the Old City Historic District, owing to the proposed massing, size, scale, and architectural features.

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

ITEM: 336 N Front St MOTION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 4126-28 PARKSIDE AVE

Proposal: Construct multi-unit residential building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Beywatch Property Management LLC

Applicant: Lee Elsey, LC Architecture LLC

History: 1894

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Significant, 12/11/2009

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a four-story building at a property classified as significant in the Parkside Historic District. The new building will be located in the side yard of the lot and stand between three and 10 feet from the historic building. The entrance to the new building is located at the end of a narrow pathway that runs between the buildings. The existing building was constructed in 1894 and is four stories tall with a prominent porch and features distinctive late-Victorian decorative elements and a mansard roof. The new building will include a stucco and brick front façade and prominent fourth-floor balcony as well as a roof deck set on a flat roof. Both side elevations, including the large exposed east elevation will be clad in a combination of Hardie board panels and vinyl siding. The new building will stand beside the historic building and will be prominently visible from Parkside Avenue.

The Architectural reviewed and recommended denial of an earlier version of this project in February 2024. The application was withdrawn before the Historical Commission reviewed it.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a new four-story building adjacent to an existing historic building at 4126-28 Parkside Avenue.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed vinyl siding and Hardi board cladding materials for the east and west side elevations of the addition do not meet Standard 9. The materials are not compatible with the historic materials or features of the building. The cladding should be replaced with an alternate material that is more appropriate for the district such as brick or stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided more appropriate cladding materials are used on the east and west side elevations, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:48:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Lee Elsey represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Elsey provided a brief overview of the project. The site has an existing 17-unit historic building. He is proposing adding a new building with seven units beside the historic building. The site will provide some affordable housing units. He added that, since the previous application, they have adjusted the window proportions, altered the railing on the front-facing fourth-floor deck to include a parapet, and added an arched screening element to that deck area as well.
- Mr. Cluver asked if there were two decks on the proposed building
 - o Mr. Elsey responded that there are and added that the owner of the site intends to live on the top floor bi-level unit with the decks.
- Ms. Stein commented that the application described the proposed building as having four stories, but with an additional roof deck and pilot house it is really a five-story building. She asked if it was possible to redesign the pilot house so that it is less intrusive and described its current appearance as competing with the rest of the building and the adjacent historic building.
 - o Ms. Gutterman added that she also takes issue with the proposed arched colonnade on the front deck, which competes with the buildings on each side and looks out of place.
 - o Mr. Elsey asked for clarification about whether the overall height was the issue.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that it is both the overall height of the fourth floor in relation to the historic building as well as the arched design. The arches as well

- as the additional height from the pilot house above do not align with the design and proportions of the historic building. She added that she accepts the design of the three lower stories and understands that the upper stories are intended to be an owner's suite but suggested the applicant needs to adjust the design of both the arched screen and pilot house.
- o Mr. Elsey responded that they certainly could adjust the design of the arched elements and pointed out that the intent was to screen the glass behind them which was an issue that was brought up at the previous meeting. He added that he thinks the design looks a bit more balanced in the elevation drawings compared with the rendering and stated that the pilot house is set 47 feet back from the property line and the front deck is set 30 feet back. He stated that the distance combined with the landscaping will make the upper stories a lot less prominent from street level. He added that they could look into altering the stair design to make the pilot house smaller but is unsure whether that would be a good solution based on the interior design.
 - o Ms. Gutterman suggested that the stairs do not necessarily have to be altered, but the pilot house could be sloped differently, or the windows moved and the street facing wall redesigned to make it less obtrusive.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed that it is larger and taller than necessary.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey also agreed and suggested another option would be to make it look lighter by adding more glass and the height should be able to be reduced.
 - o Mr. Cluver added that every floor appears to be the same height floor to ceiling and the overall design appears top heavy. Historic buildings would generally have different floor heights as they go upward.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented on the proposed three-foot distance between the proposed building and the existing historic building on the site. He described that as "extremely tight" and pointed out that the new building would obscure the currently visible elaborate roofline on the historic building as viewed from the east. He explained that this would dramatically reduce the impact that the historic building has on the streetscape and while he admitted that the applicants have a need to maximize the space, that the small separation in this case is highly impactful.
 - o Mr. Elsey responded that they could potentially alter the mass of the upper stories and reduce the parapet wall to drop it below the height of the eaves on the historic building.
 - Ms. Stein suggested removing the top-floor pilot house and rear deck and pointed out that the owner's suite would still have a relatively large roof deck facing the park to the north. She added that the upper deck is rather large and essentially adds and fifth floor and "overscales" the building.
 - o Mr. Elsey responded that they have discussed removing that deck before and could continue to do so on their end. He also suggested pulling the deck back more to open up the view of the existing building.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that the amount of detail in the application is lacking, and it reads almost like an in-concept application. In particular, he pointed out that there is no information about the materials proposed and the lack of texture and color makes it difficult to properly review.
 - o Ms. Stein agreed and added that, with the richness of decorative elements on the historic building, the details for the new one are very important.
 - o Mr. Elsey responded that they could supplement the application by adding those details. He continued to describe the proposed brick as having a "natural tone" and intends to have it match with other buildings further along the street in the

- historic district. He described the other materials as having a “gray tone.”
- o Ms. Stein asked what “natural tone” meant to the applicant.
 - o Mr. Elsey responded that they intend to use a brick that is primarily red with a little brown in it.
 - Mr. Detwiler continued to emphasize that with the high level of architectural detail on the historic building on the site, the design of the new building needs to be very carefully thought out to ensure that it is complementary and not competing with it. He suggested that the applicants need to include much more detail on materials, colors, textures, and other decorative details in the application so that the staff and Commissioners may properly judge the relationship between the two buildings.
 - Mr. Cluver commented on the front facade materials and the sides. He pointed out that the stucco on the first floor continues around the corner to the west slightly, but the brick does not and neither material does on the east side. Not having the front facade elements turn the corners gives a flat appearance.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed and pointed out that the east facade is the largest and most visible on this building and is set directly against the historic building that will be seen behind it.
 - Mr. Cluver continued to comment on the front facade. He also highlighted a few other architectural details including the quoining on the east corner, the size and detailing of the windows, and the third-floor cornice. He emphasized that it is difficult to build so close to an elaborate historic building and that details like these need to be carefully executed in order for everything to work.
 - Mr. Detwiler added that the building does not need to be complex with expensive materials; it can be “clean and simple.” However, the details and colors and textures have to be right so that it does not compete with the historic building.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that parts of the building seem to align closely with the historic building and other parts seem to deviate from it, which is giving it an inconsistent appearance.
 - Mr. Detwiler added that it should be designed on its own in “360 degrees” and not try to copy various pieces of the historic buildings around it.
 - Ms. Stein commented that she would prefer to see the east facade clad in brick for the first three stories instead of the proposed Hardie board and vinyl siding.
 - o Mr. Elsey pointed out that the building to the east has a lot of stucco on it with some brick corner elements.
 - o Ms. Stein responded that that building is set further back and that the proposed building is much closer to an elaborate historic building and is overall more visible.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that the east facade of the proposed building is very visible and only partially screened by a few trees for part of the year. It is very blank and set against the background of the elaborate historic building, making it stand out.
 - o Mr. Elsey responded that they are building to the lot line so are limited with what types of finish and decoration they can add to the east facade.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey commented that he appreciates seeing some windows in the east facade.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked how they can build the new building within three feet of the historic building.
 - o Mr. Elsey responded that there will be no windows in the wall at the three-foot point and that the windows in the historic building in that spot will need to be closed up.
 - o Mr. Detwiler asked if the current application includes closing up those windows in

- o its scope.
- o Mr. Elsey replied that that would be proposed in a future application.
- o Ms. Stein and Ms. Gutterman commented that closing those windows should be in this application and not in a future one.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if a van in the renderings could be removed in future application so as not to obscure part of the design.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jacob Peck commented on the application. He agreed that using more brick may be an improvement and he added that he likes the arched colonnade elements on the fourth-floor deck area. He also asked about the power lines and the applicant responded that they do not interfere with the building.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented on the application. He suggested redesigning the window sizes and spacing to better match the historic building and to reduce the number of arches on the fourth floor to reflect the arched windows on the historic building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposed to construct a new building on a side yard on the property at 4126-28 Parkside Avenue.
- The property at 4126-28 Parkside Avenue is a significant resource in the Parkside Historic District.
- The proposed new building will have a prominent fourth-floor front deck as well as an upper roof deck and prominent pilot house at the rear.
- The materials proposed for the new building, particularly on the east and west sides, are not in keeping with the character of the historic district.
- The massing, proportions, and decorative detailing on the proposed new building are not coherent and interfere with the perception of the historic building and district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9. The proposed building is not compatible with the architectural features, materials, scale, or proportions of the historic building and district.

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

ITEM: 4126-28 Parkside Ave MOTION: Denial 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 4045-61 MAIN ST

Proposal: Construct multi-unit residential building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: GJ Littlewood & Sons Inc.

Applicant: Adam Laver, Esq., Blank Rome

History: 1869; Littlewood & Co., Dyers and Bleachers

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, Significant, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a multi-unit residential building at 4045-61 Main Street at the corner of Main Street and Shurs Lane in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. The site is in the floodplain and the proposed building is designed to be sufficiently resilient to survive occasional flooding. The proposed building would be seven stories tall and include 162 residential units, 160 parking spaces, residential amenities, and a loading dock. Occupied space and mechanical equipment would be located on and above the second floor, above the Design Flood Elevation. Walls from the mill complex along Main Street would be retained and incorporated into the new building. Windows and doors in the old walls would be restored. The new building would be clad in brick and corrugated metal.

A historic mill complex stands on the site at 4045-61 Main Street. At its 10 May 2024 meeting the Historical Commission determined that the mill complex at the site cannot be feasibly adaptively reused and approved its demolition. At the same time, the Historical Commission reviewed and denied an earlier version of the proposed multi-unit residential building, finding that the proposed building would be too large in size, scale, and massing for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. The current application proposes a revised design for the building that is intended to address the Historical Commission's concerns expressed in May. The cover letter with the application enumerates the revisions, which include additional setbacks and other features around the historic facades to give them more three-dimensionality, additional setbacks at the upper floors to reduce the height and size, and additional articulation of the facades to reduce the massing. The application materials include a series of comparisons of the original and revised design that show the setbacks, reductions in height, and other changes.

SCOPE OF WORK:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Construct a seven-story building, incorporating the retained facades.

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 construction of the proposed new building will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. It will be differentiated from the old. The size, scale, and massing of the proposed building have been adjusted from the previous iteration so that it will be compatible in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing with the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:23:15

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Eric Leighton and developer Andrew Zakroff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Leighton stated that he has focused his efforts since the last review on reducing the scale, size, massing, and proportions of the proposed building. He presented several introductory images, showing the location of the site, the existing mill complex, and the portion of the complex that they propose to retain and reuse. He showed with images that they have revised the new building to pull away from the remaining walls of the old buildings to give them more room and to allow them to be perceived as three-dimensional objects. During the previous review, the inclusion of the historic walls was criticized as “wallpaper.” The revised plan treats the historic walls as objects. Mr. Leighton showed in plan how the new building pulls back, away from the historic walls. He noted that they are proposing to preserve more depth at the historic gable. Mr. Leighton stated that they have reduced the size of the proposed building to make it more compatible with the historic district. He noted the reductions made in the massing along Shurs Lane and at the corner of Shurs Lane and Main Street. He stated that the building would be compatible with the building that could be constructed by right at 11 Shurs Lane, the adjacent parcel. He showed a plan comparing the sizes of units in various buildings and stated that the dwelling units in the proposed building are less deep than units in comparable buildings. The compact floor plate allows the building to be pulled back from the property line and have more windows. Mr. Leighton showed several floor plans to demonstrate that they had added several recesses in the facades to break down the mass of the building and give the appearance of several smaller buildings than one large building. He used floor plans and elevation drawings to show where they had introduced setbacks and lowered the height of the building, again to reduce the size, scale, and mass. They moved the amenity terrace to the west end of the building, which reduced the height at the corner of Main Street and Shurs Lane by one floor. He also noted that the entire seventh floor wall was set back from Main Street. He

- stated that the unit count was reduced by several units with the changes, down from 167 to 162 apartments. Mr. Leighton stated that the materials palette had not changed, but the use of materials has changed. More of the façade is recessed. Brick replaced metal panels between the windows. He displayed a series of images comparing the earlier design with the revised design to show where setbacks, height reductions, material changes, and other revisions had been made to reduce the size, scale, and massing and to allow the retained sections of the historic buildings to be better exposed and highlighted. He stated that the building now appears more as a series of smaller buildings in a row, as opposed to one long continuous building. The building now steps down at the west as it approaches the smaller-scale buildings on Main Street. Mr. Leighton presented a series of slides of historic mill buildings in Manayunk that were very tall. He stated that the proposed building is taller than one might expect in part because the second floor needs to be above the Design Flood Elevation and because the façade needs to accommodate the historic walls. He concluded with a series of images of rehabilitation projects that his architectural firm and his client's development firm have undertaken. He stated that this project will bring vitality to a block of Main Street that has been desolate for a long time. The building has many green elements and will bring people, lighting, and passive security to the block. It will be a gateway to Manayunk.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the changes that were made to the massing strengthened the design and made for a building that has a better sense of scale. He noted that the applicant did what the Architectural Committee asked him to do. Mr. Cluver stated that, in a way, the proposed building is consistent with the historic district, but it would change the historic district as well, in that it would be a large mass where there was not a large mass before. He noted that he is struggling with the appropriateness of putting this mass on this block, where, historically, it was a very low element. Mr. Cluver then indicated that he has brought himself around to accepting the idea of a large building on this site. He stated that this is an area where buildings have come and gone, and there has been a certain degree of change, and there was not a big building here before, and now there may be. He concluded that he would support a recommendation of approval.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked what will be located on the main roof, a deck, or just mechanical equipment.
 - o Mr. Leighton responded that the building would include terraces but no deck on the main roof. The mechanical equipment will be residential-scaled condenser units, which will not be visible from the street.
 - o Mr. Cluver noted that it will be a vegetated room.
 - Ms. Stein stated that the changes that have been made since the last review are positive. She opined, however, that the building is still too large for the site and the historic district.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed. The revisions are a step in the right direction, but the building should be pushed back onto the open area at the rear of the site. He added that the black material will not disappear but will loom over the street. He objected to the Main Street façade, that now shifts up and down to try to break the large mass into smaller masses. He stated that the building should be reduced in size.
 - Mr. Detwiler objected to the fact that there are no construction details of note in the application. He suggested that details should be added to the application.
 - Ms. Lukachik thanked the applicant for the revisions that allow the historic walls to read as three-dimensional, not "wallpaper." She stated, however, that the brick

sections of the new building seem to crowd the historic walls a little. Despite that concern, she stated that the revisions are “a dramatic improvement.”

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he appreciates the efforts to give more prominence to the historic facades and the whittling and winnowing at the corners and the changes to the windows, which all help. However, it is still a seven-story building in a three and four-story area. He asked how many units could be removed before the project becomes financially infeasible. Would it work with 130 units? He also asked if some of the new masonry above the historic walls could be converted to glass.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the main façade should be simpler and cleaner.
- Mr. McCoubrey thanked the applicant for the quality of the renderings, which show the project very clearly and without any pretense.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed that the application clearly demonstrated the revisions since the last review.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance commended the developer for its many adaptive reuse projects and noted that the Alliance awarded the developer a grand jury award this month for the Paper Factory Lofts in Kensington. He noted, however, that the proposed building is still too large. He pointed out that the regulations for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District indicate that new construction shall be designed to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture with contributing buildings in the historic district unquote. The revised proposal did address building materials and texture to some extent. However, the proposed building is still too large.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that the revised design is an improvement over the previous design but asserted that the building is still too large. He also objected to the vertical elements on the main façade.
- Jacob Peck commended the architect for the design. He stated that he liked the combination of brick and metal cladding. He asserted that the building should be taller, perhaps eight stories, to provide more housing, which Philadelphia desperately needs.
- Kevin Smith, the president of Manayunk Neighborhood Council, stated that the superficial revisions to the design are minimal, but in no way address “the profound and even absurd mismatch in size, scale, and massing” of the proposed building with the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. He suggested a building that is no taller than 38 feet or three stories above the Design Flood Elevation. He also objected to the fact that the proposed building does not include commercial professional office or hospitality uses. He urged the Architectural Committee to recommend denial.
- John Hunter of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council noted that the building would be 82 feet tall. He objected to the floor-to-floor heights. He claimed that the proposed building would be much taller than the one proposed for the adjacent site at 11 Shurs Lane. He objected to the historic mill buildings being treated like “wallpaper.” He discussed some zoning issues and then concluded that the Historical Commission should deny the proposal, which is too large.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The design for the proposed multi-unit residential building was revised since the last round of reviews.
- The revised design is an improvement over the original design.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is too large.

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

ITEM: 4045-61 Main 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	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:20:27

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:22 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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