

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

**TUESDAY, 24 AUGUST 2021
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		*left meeting at 11:01 a.m.
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP		X	

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Carolina Pena
Allison Weiss
Inga Saffron
S. Litvinović
Devon Beverly
German Yakubov
Matthew McCarty
Dan Kayser
Alex Canady
Matthew McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Jeremy Avellino
Brian Zoubek
Shimi Zakin

Gabriel Gottlieb
Dennis Carlisle
Jessica Radomski
Tim Lux
Jordan Mrazik
Erion Peshkepia
Sam Katovitch
Catherine Timko
Jackie Llewellyn, TierView Development
Sara Pochedly
Yoav Shiffman
Russell Fulton
Cassie Howard
Sara Chafi
Arielle Kerstein
Bujar Gjoka
Paige Jaffe
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Randy Baron

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1435-41 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Cut window sills; install new windows
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: ADR Drexel, L.P.
Applicant: Matthew McClure, Ballard Spahr
History: 1927; Drexel Co. Building; Day & Klauder
Individual Designation: 2/23/1971, 8/2/1973
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The building at 1435-41 Walnut Street was designed by the architectural firm of Day & Klauder and constructed in 1927 for Drexel & Company, a private banking house. The design for the building was drawn from the Renaissance palazzos of Florence, Italy. A once-grand banking hall occupies the first floor. The banking hall has been alternatively vacant and underutilized for many years. The application claims that the chronic vacancy of what should be prime commercial space on the Walnut Street shopping corridor results from the lack of visibility from the street into the space. The first-floor window sills are between 88 and 99 inches above the sidewalk, several feet above eye level. The application asserts that the windows must be enlarged to make the first-floor interior space attractive to retail tenants. The application includes architectural drawings as well as an analysis of the building and its leasing difficulties by an expert in the marketing of retail space. The report explains why the window sills must be lowered and how other jurisdictions have allowed for such changes to historic buildings.

The application proposes to remove the masonry panels below seven of the first-floor windows and install mullions and glazing in place of the panels to allow for views from the street into the interior space. The windows that would be changed are located on Walnut and 15th Streets. The Moravian Street windows would not be altered. The easternmost opening on Walnut Street is already altered; it was cut down for a doorway many years ago. After the stone panels below

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 AUGUST 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

the windows are removed, new pieces of matching stone would be inserted at the jambs and new sills to square the openings and then the new openings would be glazed, with the new window systems fitting below the decorative historic windows. Non-historic storm windows would also be removed.

Drexel & Co. opened its banking hall at 15th and Walnut Streets on 7 November 1927. Despite the Stock Market Crash and the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933, which separated commercial and investment banking, Drexel & Co. survived the Great Depression, albeit with several reorganizations. Drexel & Co. sold the property to 1435 Walnut Street Corporation in 1938, but continued to occupy the building under a lease. In 1943, when the First National Bank of Philadelphia purchased the property, Drexel & Co. removed from the building at 15th and Walnut. Interestingly, Drexel and First National swapped quarters, with Drexel & Co. moving to First National's former offices at 1500 Walnut Street and First National moving into the Florentine palace. First National merged with the First Pennsylvania Bank & Trust Co. and then sold the property to Bankers Securities Corporation, Albert M. Greenfield's parent company, in 1957. It appears that Bankers Securities Corp. never occupied the building and the main banking room remained vacant for decades, from 1957 to 1987. In 1979, developer Jay Nathan and partners obtained the property and set out to rehabilitate it with new retail and restaurant spaces in the banking hall and offices above. They inserted a series of freestanding mezzanines in the banking hall, while trying to maintain the historic features and finishes. At the time, while reporting on the rehabilitation, the *Inquirer* noted that "the building has long been a white elephant largely because its ornate main banking floor, with its 35-foot ceiling, has been considered difficult to use economically." While the offices rented, the banking floor remained vacant until 1987, when Dimensions, a men's clothing store, moved into the space. Murray Korn's Dimensions did not last long, declaring bankruptcy in 1991. In 1987, Nathan and his partners sold the property to a British investment company. Bally's Health and Tennis Corporation leased the banking hall in 1994 for use as a fitness center, which opened in 1995. Bally's sold to LA Fitness in 2011. LA Fitness closed its 1435 Walnut location in 2015, after the space was rented to another gym operator. However, the new fitness center scheduled for the space in 2015 defaulted on its lease and the banking hall has been vacant since that time. In summary, the first-floor space was used as a banking hall from 1927 to 1957, was vacant from 1957 to 1987, was used as a clothing store from 1987 to 1991, was vacant from 1991 to 1994, was used as a gym, albeit not the highest and best use for the historic interior on the city's premier shopping corridor, from 1994 to 2015, and has been vacant since.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Lower window sills and add glazing in seven openings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The removal of the stone panels and addition of glazing does not comply with a strict reading of Standard 9, but will have minimal impact on the historic integrity of the property and should be approved to ensure that the important historic building is self-sustaining and to allow for the restoration and public appreciation of the significant interior space.

- *Standard 10: New additions or adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be impaired.*
 - The work will comply with Standard 10, provided the stone panels are carefully removed and safely stored for potential reinstallation in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review window and stone shop drawings and stone samples, provided the stone panels are carefully removed and safely stored for potential reinstallation in the future.

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

RECUSALS:

- Messrs. Cluver and Detwiler recused owing to their firms' involvements with the property.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorneys Matthew McClure and Devon Beverly, architects Daniel Kayser and Matthew McCarty, and consultants Catherine Timko and Paige Jaffe, and owner's representative Arielle Kerstein represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McClure introduced the team. He noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines themselves indicate that the "Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility." Mr. McClure stated that the chronic difficulties of reusing this space are well documented and confirmed by the staff. He stated that the space is difficult to reuse for retail. Restaurant use is not feasible because the floor space is only about 5,000 sf and a conversion for restaurant use would cost \$12 million. Restaurateurs have looked at the space and passed on it. The owner of the property owns several other properties that house restaurants and is adept at attracting restaurant tenants, but has not been able to find one for this space. The architects have proposed minor changes to the windows. The proposed changes are driven by best practices and retail research by the Riddle Group. The owner's representative can address attempts to lease the space. The retail consultants can address the offers made to rent the space, which were below market rates.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked that the architects answer questions from the Committee rather than make a full presentation on the proposal.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the owner has a tenant for the space.
 - Mr. McClure responded that his client does not have a tenant for the space yet.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the Banana Republic at Broad and Walnut also had windows with high sills but managed to display its wares. She asked if the number of windows proposed for alteration could be reduced. She stated that she was under some time pressure today, and therefore the applicants should present their case quickly.
 - Mr. McClure stated that Ms. Timko could answer the question.
 - Ms. Timko stated that the Banana Republic window sills are lower than the Drexel building window sills and pedestrians can see into the windows. She also

noted that Broad Street is much wider and has two-way traffic, unlike 15th and Walnut Streets.

- Mr. McCoubrey asked if they could change the Walnut Street façade and leave the 15th Street façade unchanged. He suggested that they could add an entrance into the retail space from Walnut Street.
 - Ms. Timko stated that it would not be possible to add an entrance on Walnut because of the location of the floor plate.
 - Mr. McClure explained that the current entrance on Walnut, which was added in the 1980s, enters into an elevator lobby that is many feet below the level of the banking hall. The entrance could not be used to access the banking hall.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the sills could be left in place and windows inserted below them, where the panels are located.
 - The architects objected to the suggestion for several reasons including the inability to support the sills with the panels removed and the visual disruptions the sills would cause. They noted that the proposed mullions would maintain the lines of the sills.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that the mullion is slightly above the sill.
 - The architects stated that that could be adjusted, but they located it to preserve the historic pane size of the glass in the new windows.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that there are several restaurants in Philadelphia that do not have views from the outside in.
 - Mr. McClure responded that neither the current nor the former owners were successful in converting the space to a restaurant. It would be too expensive for the square footage of restaurant space that would result. He stated that his retail real estate expert can testify that they have not been able to lease the space because it is too expensive to use for a restaurant and lacks visibility in for a retail tenant. He stated that they can feasibly adapt the space for a retail tenant if they can alter the window openings. He concluded that he agrees that a great restaurant does not require visibility into the space.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if they needed the windows for the display of wares.
 - Mr. McClure responded that his consultants can explain why visibility into a retail space is important. He again asked if they could testify.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that the consultants already submitted materials and did not need to testify.
 - Mr. McClure disagreed and stated that they did not explain why a restaurant would be infeasible in their submitted materials.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that how the interior is used is irrelevant to the Historical Commission, which only has jurisdiction over the exterior.
 - Mr. McClure disagreed and stated that the Standards require reviewers to take into account technical feasibility and market conditions when considering rehabilitation proposals.
- Ms. Lukachik asked Mr. McClure's team to respond to the suggestion of modifying fewer windows. She asked if there is a middle ground.
 - Mr. McClure stated that his team had concluded that they needed additional visibility on both Walnut Street, the main shopping street, and 15th Street, where the entrance is located.
 - Ms. Gutterman injected that he should accept one window on Walnut and two on 15th Street.
 - Ms. Timko stated that she worked for the Commerce Department and the Center City District on retail attraction for more than 10 years and presented this site as

a premier retail site. She stated that retailers put this space on their short lists because of square footage and then rejected it when they saw it because of the lack of visibility into the space from the street. She offered examples and noted that Crate & Barrel rejected the space because of visibility and then located across the street, where they have very large storefront windows. She stated that storefront windows are critical. If a customer cannot see in, the retailer cannot advertise to them.

- Ms. Gutterman said that there is much vacant retail space along Walnut Street since the unrest last spring. She objected to approving this proposal, positing that the work would be done but no one would lease it anyway. They would go elsewhere, she contended.
 - Mr. McClure asserted that the shopping district will rebound. He stated that the difficulties leasing the space predate the events of the last year including the pandemic. He stated that the owner of the property has been discussing this alteration with the staff for a few years.
 - Ms. Timko stated that the 5,000 sf footprint is very desirable, but the lack of visibility is not.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicants to find a way to retain a few of the windows in their original condition, and only alter some of them. He stated that altering some but not all of the windows would be acceptable.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. He also suggested retain the sills and installing windows below the sills.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that he had originally made the suggestion to keep the sills, but had changed his mind.
- Mr. Farnham stated that he twice met on site to discuss this project with the owner and architects prior to the pandemic and the civil unrest. This project is not in response to either of those events.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization opposes the application. He stated that this application should be reviewed by the Committee on Financial Hardship. He called attention to his letter to the Architectural Committee. He stated that the building is important and should be treated as such. He said that historic buildings should not be altered based on anecdotal evidence. He offered stories about nearby buildings that have retail and restaurant tenants, some with little or no visibility into the space. He noted that no tenant has been secured. He asked the Committee to recommend denial of the application.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McClure rebutted Mr. Steinke's claims. He stated that he does, in fact, have evidence regarding tenants considering and rejecting the space owing to visibility. He stated that he is happy to produce that evidence, but the Committee has not given him an opportunity yet. Reacting to Mr. Steinke's anecdotes about restaurants, Mr. McClure stated that his team addressed the restaurant question and is happy to address it at the Historical Commission meeting. He rejected Mr. Steinke's call for a financial hardship application, saying that every alteration application has some financial aspect to it, and the Standards themselves tell reviewers to consider financial feasibility. He stated that, if Mr. Steinke's hardship standard was applied as he suggested, every application would be a hardship application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application can be reviewed as a standard alteration application. It does not need to be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship.
- The Secretary of the Interior's Standards indicate that the "Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility."
- The banking hall has been vacant and underutilized for decades.
- Visibility into the banking hall from the street would make the space more desirable to retail tenants.
- The windows are character-defining features.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application can satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, provided that the number of window openings that are modified is reduced from the seven proposed, the mullions or transom bars between the historic and new windows are aligned with the historic window sills, and the stone panels are carefully removed and stored for potential reinstallation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as submitted, with the suggestion of reducing the number of window openings proposed for alteration to maintain more historic fabric.

ITEM: 1435-41 WALNUT ST					
MOTION: Denial as proposed, with the suggestion to reduce the number of openings altered					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver				X	
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler				X	
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein					X
Total	4			2	1

ADDRESS: 3322 WILLITS RD

Proposal: Construct stairtower and elevator addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Shqipes E. Bijte

Applicant: Bujar Gjoka

History: 1794; Lower Dublin Academy

Individual Designation: 10/14/2016

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a stairtower and elevator addition on the rear of the former Lower Dublin Academy building, as well as to replace windows and doors. The building was under renovation when it was gutted by arson in 2006, and has subsequently sat vacant. The building has been at risk and renovating and occupying it is the best way to ensure that it survives. This application proposes to rehabilitate it for single-family use.

The addition for the stair and elevator would be constructed at the rear of the building, where a non-historic dormer has already disrupted the cornice and roofline. The addition would be clad in stucco.

The application also proposes to install several windows and doors, many of which are currently missing. The application also proposes to repair some existing windows. Vinyl windows installed recently in one of the wings should be removed and replaced. The application does not provide door or window schedules, but historic photographs offer a guide to the appropriate window configuration. While no details are provided for the windows and doors, but the staff can work with the applicant to ensure that appropriate units are specified and installed.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate building
- Construct rear addition
- Replace windows and doors

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The application calls for window and door replacement, but details of those elements are not provided. Numerous historic photographs exist showing the original configuration. To comply with this Standard, the windows and doors must replicate the appearances of the historic windows and doors. The staff can work with the applicant on the details.
- *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.*

- The proposed addition is compatible with the size, scale, proportion, massing, materials and features of the historic building. It will be differentiated from the old, and calls for minimal removal of historic fabric. It will be located at the rear, where a large non-historic dormer already impacts the cornice and roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the windows and doors approximate the historic appearance, with the staff to review details, especially window and door details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:39:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Bujar Gjoka and Erion Peshkepia represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. DiPasquale noted that the applicants had emailed some window and door information to her just prior to the meeting, indicating that the proposed windows would be Anderson 400 Series white vinyl with a six-over-six configuration.
- Mr. Gjoka explained that he is chairman of the Albanian American Association, which purchased the property in July 2018. He detailed the poor condition of the building, noting that it had been partially burned and heavily damaged when they purchased it, and that they conducted make-safe repairs to secure the property.
- The Committee members questioned the size of and need for the proposed addition.
 - Mr. Peshkepia responded they are planning to keep the existing windows in the house and to construct a stair in rear of the building. He noted that they are proposing to have an ADA elevator and 42 inch wide stair in order to provide access for elderly people.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked why a stair cannot be included on the interior of the building to reduce the size of the addition.
 - Mr. Peshkepia responded that they want the stair to go to the basement, but if it is located in the middle of the main block, the basement will lose functionality. He noted that the main idea was to create a hall and lobby, and to save the library, trim work, and other features.
 - Ms. Gutterman questioned whether a stair was originally located in the entrance hall.
 - Mr. Peshkepia responded affirmatively, but noted that it was damaged by the fire, and there is only a construction stair currently.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Gutterman's suggestion to locate the stair within the house, noting that moving the stair back into main block of house may be problematic from a plan layout in the basement, but that there are ways to work around it.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed concern over the size of the addition, noting that the application proposes a commercial-size ADA elevator for a single-family residence. He noted that the building code does not require the elevator to be as large as it is proposed. A smaller elevator will still be able to accommodate a wheel chair. He noted that the stair and elevator are designed for a commercial application, when they should be more residential and refined in scale and detail.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that a 42 inch wide stair is much wider than necessary.

- Mr. Peshkepia responded that they can reduce the stair and elevator.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that they could still have an outside stair to the basement but then limit addition to the elevator.
- Mr. Cluver questioned whether the pitch of the roof of the addition can be the same as the existing rear dormer.
 - Mr. Peshkepia responded that the height is the same but not the pitch.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that a more residential-scale stair and elevator may be able to more closely approximate the size of the existing dormer.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the relationship between the existing and proposed is not clear.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that several of the existing windows on the rear façade are not shown in the elevation drawings.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the long and linear addition is impacting the building to the maximum, and suggested that an addition extend out from the existing building but not across it. He suggested staying away from existing masonry as much as possible.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, suggesting that the applicants maintain as much of the rear elevation as possible, including preserving window locations. He agreed that a narrower but deeper addition would help. In general, he expressed concerns about the level of refined detail on all of the work, but noted that the staff can work with the applicants to make the application as sensitive and finely detailed as possible. He suggested that a building of this significance deserves the right windows and details.
- Mr. Cluver opined that stucco cladding for the addition would be okay but noted that it should be cement based, not acrylic, and should have texture to hold its own against the stone building. He noted he is ecstatic that the owners are putting this effort into this building.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed that the investment in this building is much appreciated, but also opined that it would also be appropriate to clad the addition in wood siding, which may be more affordable.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, suggesting that the addition should look like a frame construction rear wing, which is also less expensive and easier to achieve.
- Mr. Peshkepia addressed the windows. He noted that they are proposing to keep the existing light blue aluminum clad windows where they are present, and to install Andersen 400 series vinyl windows with the same configuration for the openings where no windows exist. He noted that they installed some windows on northeast side to protect the interior of the building. For the main door, they are proposing to install a system that resembles that seen in a 1975 photograph.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that the Historical Commission does not typically allow vinyl windows on primary or visible facades, and questioned whether the staff supported the installation of vinyl windows.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff supports the use of aluminum-clad, not not vinyl, windows that otherwise replicate the configuration of the historic windows. She noted that the material difference would not be noticeable from the public right-of-way since the building is set so far back from the street.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that the Historical Commission is usually less concerned about the color than the detailing and materials.
 - Mr. Peshkepia noted that approximately half of the windows are already existing, so they want to match the existing color.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron commended the applicants for working to restore the valuable building. He agreed with the staff recommendation, noting that it is an important eighteenth-century building, not many of which exist in the northeast, and was built as a school, so it is a larger scale than most eighteenth-century buildings. He opined that the staff's comments about the windows are important, noting that the 12-over-12 windows are what indicates it is an eighteenth-century building and not a Colonial Revival building. He argued that six-over-six vinyl clad windows should be rejected as a possibility. He noted that the elevation drawings of the rear show six-over-one windows, which is more Colonial Revival, but that there seems to be a lot of confusion over what is actually proposed. He suggested that, at least for the main façade, the windows should be 12-over-12 with plank frames, which would have been structural frames, and can be reproduced by many window companies. He opined that it would be important for the Architectural Committee's recommendation to support the staff in saying that, for the front façade, the windows should be historically accurate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building was in poor condition when the current owners purchased it.
- The front façade originally featured 12-over-12 wood windows with plank frames.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The existing aluminum-clad windows accurately reflect the historic configuration and details, but the proposed white vinyl six-over-six windows do not.
- A rear addition in the proposed location could be appropriate, but the proposed stair and elevator are overly large and should be reduced in scale and, if possible, oriented away from the building, rather than along the façade.
- The new addition could be clad in cement-based stucco or wood frame with clapboard siding of wood or fiber cement.
- The application materials are inconsistent, and the drawings do not accurately reflect all of the existing window openings.
- The applicants should work with the staff on window and door details.
- The application calls for window and door replacement, which has verbally confirmed to be six-over-six vinyl windows, which do not replicate the appearance of the historic windows, and therefore fails to satisfy Standard 6.
- The proposed addition is overly large and is not compatible with the size and scale of the historic building, therefore failing to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, owing to the size of addition and the use of vinyl windows, but approval of a revised application with a smaller addition and the appropriate windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ITEM: 3322 WILLITS RD MOTION: Denial as proposed, but approval of a revised application, with conditions 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: 862-72 N 41ST ST

Proposal: Construct buildings; demolish portion of site wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Friends Rehabilitation Center/41 BROWN LLC

Applicant: German Yakubov, Haverford Square Properties

History: 1899; Allen B. Rorke House

Individual Designation: 5/12/2017

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 862-72 N. 41st Street consists of what was historically a large single-family stone residence, known as the Allen B. Rorke Mansion, a side yard, and a rear carriage house. The rear carriage house that fronts Palm Street is non-contributing. When the property was designated in 2017, the mansion was exposed to the elements with large holes in the roof, a missing porch, and missing windows. It was in extreme disrepair from decades of neglect.

To enable the restoration of the historic mansion, this application proposes to construct two new buildings on the property. The first building would be constructed to replace the non-contributing carriage house at the rear and would have a frontage on Palm Street. The second building would be constructed on Ogden Street and would share a party wall with an existing, undesignated rowhouse. While the building would be constructed in the side yard, it would be located at the rear of the mansion and would not obstruct views of the historic house. Both buildings would be four stories in height with brick cladding at the front façade, and each with one pilot house and roof deck. A small portion of the stone wall would be demolished along Ogden Street to allow for the construction of the rowhouse.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story rowhouse with roof deck and pilot house in side yard fronting Ogden Street;
- Construct four-story building with roof deck and pilot house at rear of property fronting Palm Street; and
- Demolish portion of historic stone wall.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed buildings would be four stories in height and clad in brick where highly visible from the public right-of-way. The buildings would be compatible in massing, size, and scale. The application satisfies Standard 9.
 - The new building fronting Ogden Street would result in the select demolition of the historic stone wall. However, the applicant has provided plans to recreate the missing iron railings that once existed between the stone piers. The loss would be minor and would allow for the restoration of the remainder of the wall. The work complies with Standard 9.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - *Recommended: Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
 - The buildings would be differentiated from the historic building and would be compatible with the immediate context in material, massing, size, and scale.
 - The two buildings would be located on the periphery of the property. Neither building would obstruct the views of the historic building or intrude on the side yard, and a buffer would remain around the historic building. The work complies with this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Owner and developer German Yakubov represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Yakubov explained that he purchased the property early last week after being under contract for several months. During that time, he continued, the historic building received a new roof. He added that he is looking to maximize the current zoning, which allows for 22 units, and elaborated that he obtained zoning approval to convert the mansion into six units. The building's reconstruction, which includes reconstructing the porch and replacing windows, would be a huge investment, he added. He noted that the property is not in Center City and is instead in a historically economically depressed neighborhood. He stated that the design of the proposed

buildings would mimic the appearance of the adjacent Ogden Street rowhouses with brick, two-over-two windows, quoins, and a cornice. A portion of the stone wall, he continued, would need to be demolished to allow for the construction of the Ogden Street building, primarily because the building needs an ADA accessible entrance. He contended that the design allows for the easiest and most economical way to provide accessibility.

- Mr. Cluver commented that the Architectural Committee received renderings the previous day that are very different in character from the drawings that were provided as part of the application. He asked whether the Committee should comment on the renderings or drawings.
 - Mr. Yakubov answered that the Committee should comment on the renderings, explaining that he was under a deadline to submit the application and subsequently received feedback on the proposed designs. That feedback, he continued, resulted in the design represented in the renderings. He suggested that the plans could be modified before the Historical Commission meeting.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the renderings have no notes on materials like cladding. He questioned whether the cornice is intended to be brick or another material.
 - Mr. Yakubov responded that it would be a zinc or metal cornice to match the adjacent rowhouse.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the footprint remains the same as what is shown in plan.
 - Mr. Yakubov affirmed that the footprint, elevations, and schematics have not been changed from the initial submission, but that the material and window configurations would match what is presented in the renderings.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned why the first and second floors are so tight.
 - Mr. Yakubov clarified that the first floor is below grade and is at basement level, so the windows are higher to avoid installing window wells at the front façade. He added that the windows could be modified to allow for more equal spacing.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that the floor levels do not align with the adjacent rowhouse. He then commented that he would prefer that the basement windows be shorter and that the windows of the three upper stories be the same height. He then opined that the relationship of the cornice on the proposed building relative to the neighbor is problematic. He asked that the cornices either align or that the cornice of the new building be higher.
 - Mr. Cluver agreed, adding that his first preference would be to align the cornices but stated that adding a little height to the proposed building to separate the cornices would be acceptable.
- Mr. Cluver suggested introducing a water table, such as a stone base, and noted that it is a common feature of buildings that have high basement windows. A base, he continued, would distinguish the ground level from the upper floors and would be appropriate.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested relating the height of the base to the existing masonry wall.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how close the side of the proposed building is to the main house, noting that the basement stairs of the historic building intersect the new construction.
 - Mr. Yakubov answered that the stairs would be reconfigured, and there is approximately eight feet between the proposed and existing buildings. He elaborated that there are eight units in each building and that they are as small as they can be. The reason to have such small units, he continued, is to avoid butchering the mansion's interior by increasing the number of units inside.

- Ms. Lukachik questioned whether the restoration of the historic building is part of the application.
 - Mr. Yakubov stated that the staff has approved the restoration work and that that scope is underway.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification on the design of the Palm Street building's front elevation.
 - Mr. Yakubov responded that it will be identical to the Ogden Street elevation, though the first floor would be at grade, so an entryway would be located at the front façade. He then affirmed that there would be two windows per floor.
 - The Committee requested that the building have a base and the door have a surround.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the primary elevation would align with the neighboring building, despite the neighboring building having a porch, or whether the proposal is to extend the house to the property line. She noted that the site plan shows the building extending beyond the adjacent rowhouse, adding that there is a discrepancy between the rendering and plan.
 - Mr. Yakubov clarified that the rendering is incorrect and that the building would extend beyond the adjacent rowhouse, adding that the stone wall currently extends along the property line.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that the siting is problematic, contending that the building would be incompatible with the scale of the street. She added that the rendering is misleading.
 - Mr. Yakubov agreed, stating that the discrepancy was unintentional. He added that the site plan is accurate.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the Architectural Committee seems to agree with the general concept of the proposed new construction, but that there is enough inconsistency in the application that he is apprehensive in recommending approval.
 - Ms. Gutterman commented that she is also concerned about having the building extend beyond the row, adding that it would look like the first house in the row where the porch was enclosed.
 - Others agreed.
- Ms. Gutterman asked where the mechanical equipment would be located.
 - Mr. Yakubov answered that it would be on the roof and would be set back at least five feet, so it would not be visible from the street.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether there are railings for the roof decks or if the parapets are high enough to eliminate the need for railings.
 - Mr. Yakubov stated that the parapets on the sides are high enough that railings are not necessary and that the decks would be set back from the front so that the railings are not visible.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver that he finds the general concept to be acceptable but that the details and discrepancies in plans would prevent him from recommending approval.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he would recommend that the Ogden Street building align with the adjacent rowhouse.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the wall could remain in place if the building is set back.
 - Mr. Yakubov responded that the basement windows would look out to the wall. He then argued that there is no space at the rear to set back the building. He added that the initial plan was to keep as much of the wall as possible. He then noted that the adjacent rowhouses are not designated.

- Mr. Farnham stated that the Standards require that decks and other rooftop additions on historic buildings be inconspicuous, but that the Standards do not have any such requirements for decks or rooftop additions on new construction or non-historic buildings. Decks on non-historic buildings may be conspicuous from the street and still satisfy the Standards. He then commented that this property is individually designated and is not in a historic district. From a strictly legal standpoint, he continued, the Historical Commission would have a difficult time justifying in court its attempts to preserve nearby properties or streetscapes that are not designated. He stated that the Architectural Committee should concentrate its efforts on evaluating the effects of the proposed new construction on the designated resource, the historic house in this case, and not the effects of the new construction on nearby, but undesignated buildings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance supported the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The drawings and renderings provided include inconsistent information.
 - The site plans show that the Ogden Street building would be constructed to the property line where it fronts the street, while the renderings show the building setback and in line with the adjacent rowhouses.
- The Palm Street building would be constructed in the location of the existing non-contributing carriage house at the rear of the property.
- The Ogden Street building would be constructed in the side yard of the property and would attach to the party wall of a non-designated rowhouse.
 - The building would be constructed proud of the adjacent row of non-designated buildings and would not be set back to align with the row of buildings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed buildings are appropriate in massing, size, scale, and material. However, owing to discrepancies in the documentation provided, the plans and renderings should be revised to accurately reflect the proposed construction.
- The location of the proposed buildings is appropriate, and neither building would encroach on the historic property.
- The Ogden Street building should align with the non-designated rowhouses to preserve the streetscape, even if the rowhouses are not designated.

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

ITEM: 862-72 N 41ST ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein					X
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 7208-10 GERMANTOWN AVE AND 16 NIPPON ST

Proposal: Construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: TVC PA 7208 Germantown Avenue LLC/Tierview Development

Applicant: Jeremy Avelino

History: 1928; Mt. Airy National Bank; Norman Hulme

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: 7208-10 Germantown Ave, Central Mt Airy Historic District, Contributing, 7/9/2021; 16 Nippon St, not designated

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 7208-10 Germantown Avenue was designated as a contributing resource in the Central Mt. Airy Commercial Historic District in July 2021. The property was recently consolidated with a vacant lot at 16 Nippon Street, which is located outside the district boundary. The Central Mt. Airy Commercial Historic District does not include any properties on Nippon Street and was established to regulate proposed changes to the buildings fronting Germantown Avenue on the 7100 and 7200 blocks of the street. The Philadelphia City Planning Commission nominated the Central Mt. Airy Commercial Historic District at the same time it was working with City Council to upzone the area. The City Planning Commission's goal with the joint zoning and preservation program was to encourage greater density along the Germantown Avenue commercial corridor, to provide a customer base for businesses along the corridor, without encouraging the demolition of historic buildings.

This application proposes to construct a five-story building on the vacant Nippon Street parcel and a two-story addition at the rear of the historic building at 7208-10 Germantown Avenue. The addition would be located behind the gable of the historic structure and would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The addition would be clad in fiber cement lap siding and would connect to the Nippon Street building, which would be clad in fiber cement shingle siding. Removals of material from the historic building would be limited to a portion of the rear brick wall, part of the brick parapet, and three openings punched through the north wall. The application also proposes to replace windows and doors and to restore the stone facades and roof of the historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct five-story building on vacant Nippon Street parcel;
- Construct two-story addition behind gable of historic building;
- Replace windows and doors; and
- Restore stone façade and slate roof.

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.*
 - Most of the massing of the proposed addition would be located on the vacant, undesignated Nippon Street lot. The two-story addition on the historic structure would be set back from the gable roof and would not destroy any historic materials that characterize the property. The work is compatible in massing, size, and scale and complies with Standard 9.
 - The application proposes to install aluminum clad windows to match the historic windows. This work satisfies Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions or adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be impaired.*
 - The proposed additions would require minimal removals of materials from the historic structure. The removal that is proposed is limited to the brick walls at the side and rear of the building, facing Nippon Street. If the additions were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would be left unimpaired. The work complies with Standard 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:26:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Jeremy Avellino and Jordan Mrazik represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Mrazik stated that his team had been in contact with Historical Commission's staff months prior to the official designation of the historic district. He explained that the design intent is to respect the historic façade on Germantown Avenue, which is also the goal of the historic district.
- Mr. Cluver asked how the five stories relates to other buildings in the vicinity.
 - Mr. Mrazik responded that buildings along Germantown Avenue are typically three to five stories, and noted that the zoning for the project is by-right.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that five stories is too large for the surrounding context. He stated that Nippon Street has buildings that are two or three stories in height. He stated that he could support a one-story addition rather than a two-story addition. He

stated that this will appear to loom over other buildings in the district in terms of its size.

- Mr. Cluver commented that the scale of the Nippon Street windows is too large.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that all of the design choices for the Nippon Street addition make it appear large, including oversized windows, uninterrupted materials, lack of a cornice line, and flat facades.
- The staff again noted that Nippon Street is outside the historic district. The Central Mt. Airy Historic District was designated to protect the historic streetscape along Germantown Avenue.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that this addition will be visible from E. Mt. Airy Avenue.
 - Mr. Mrazik responded that they can provide a rendering of that view for review by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the windows on the historic building.
 - Mr. Mrazik responded that they are keeping all windows intact on the front façade, but will be fixing some in place rather than having the windows be operable. On the side façade, a few windows need to be modified to account for a floor infill. He explained that it is currently a double-height space, and the intent is to provide double-hung windows above that will look compatible, and then a large awning window below with spandrel infill between the two.
 - Mr. Detwiler observed that the lite pattern changes with the window modification. He suggested that the pane configuration and size be more similar.
 - Mr. Avellino asked about making the windows on the second floor smaller and infilling between top and bottom windows with Wissahickon schist.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that it is preferred to not change the masonry opening, but use dark windows and infill panels.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the structural support for the mezzanine.
 - Mr. Mrazik responded that this is actually a steel-frame building with columns embedded, and they are working with a structural engineer to calculate the capacity of the existing beams and add reinforcement as required.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron commented that it is important to retain the framework of the transom over the door on the front façade. He disagreed with the Architectural Committee's assertion that the pane size should be uniform.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Most of the massing of the proposed addition would be located on the vacant, Nippon Street lot, which is outside the historic district and not designated.
- A rendering of the building with the proposed addition as seen from E. Mount Airy Avenue should be provided to the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application proposes to install aluminum clad windows to match the historic windows. This work satisfies Standard 9.
- The addition on the vacant, undesignated Nippon Street lot will not be compatible with the buildings and streetscape along Nippon Street, which is outside the historic district.
- The two-story addition on the historic structure would be set back from the gable roof but may be conspicuous from E. Mt. Airy Avenue and other vantage points, and

therefore may be incompatible with the historic building frontage in massing, size, and scale, and therefore may not satisfy Standard 9. The Historical Commission should review a rendering of this view.

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

ITEM: 7208-10 GERMANTOWN AVE and 16 NIPPON ST 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: 415 S 17TH ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 415 S 17th St LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1865, The Disorderly House of Elizabeth Roberts

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 415 S. 17th Street is a contributing resource in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District situated at the corner of 17th and Waverly Streets. The district inventory states that this two-story Italianate-style building was constructed about 1865. This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition with a roof deck.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct one-story rooftop addition;
- Construct roof deck;
- Repair existing cornice as needed.

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.*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 AUGUST 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Conceptually, a third-story rooftop addition is acceptable for this building. The use of a mansard fits into the context of the historic district and the proposed use of synthetic slate roofing is also compatible. This aspect of the proposal satisfies Standard 9.
- The details of the windows proposed at the third-story addition should be reconsidered to better integrate into the design of the designated building.
- The proposed roof deck would be accessed by a highly visible metal spiral stair. The mansard roof is awkwardly interrupted by this spiral stair on the north or Waverly Street elevation. Owing to its corner location, a roof deck on this building will likely be highly visible from the public right-of-way. As currently designed, the stair to the roof deck or the deck itself are not inconspicuous. This aspect of the work does not satisfy Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions or adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be impaired.*
 - No demolition to any significant features is proposed with this application. One existing door on the north or Waverly Street elevation is proposed to be filled in and a new door opening is proposed. The work complies with Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the roof deck as proposed, and approval of the third-story addition, provided that the mansard roof extends the full length of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:46:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Sam Katovitch and Ian Toner represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver remarked that the spiral stair appeared too conspicuous. He asked if the applicant would consider extending the mansard to enclose the stair and make it less visible.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that, owing to the location of the property on a corner, she was concerned about the visibility of the roof deck and railing in addition to the stair. She added that there were some buildings that could not accommodate roof decks, owing to their locations and the subject property might be one of them.
 - The applicant responded that the railing was set back five feet from the edge of the roof.
- Ms. Gutterman said that she was concerned about the sizes of the windows at the mansard because they did not look right proportionally.
- Mr. Detwiler objected to the panels proposed underneath the mansard windows. He suggested that the applicant study some of the adjacent buildings for the appropriate relationship between a dormer and a mansard. Mr. Detwiler commented that the curve of the mansard was too dramatic and also required further study.
- Mr. Detwiler asked the applicant to speak to the scope of the window replacement in more detail.
 - The applicant said that the existing windows were double-hung windows with various pane configurations. He noted that they were open to using whatever pane configuration that the Historical Commission deemed appropriate. The

applicant also said that, in prior conversations with the staff, it was suggested that the window openings at the front façade be restored to a configuration closer to what would have been there in the past.

- Mr. Detwiler asked if the staff knew what the original pane configuration of the windows was.
 - o Ms. Schmitt responded that she did not have that information.
 - o Mr. Farnham told Mr. Detwiler that the staff had done extensive research to understand what the building looked like historically, but found no conclusive information. Mr. Farnham explained that the existing window and door openings resulted from many alterations over many years. The building was used as a tavern and likely had storefront windows at one time.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that he agreed that an addition using a mansard was appropriate for the subject property, owing to its context. However, a roof deck and stair was not appropriate on this corner site.
 - o The applicant asked whether a roof deck could be contemplated if the access stair was not visible from the public right-of-way or was the issue with the roof deck itself.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that the roof deck itself was a problem. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- The applicant asked if there was a specific mansard design they should consider.
 - o Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant look at neighboring examples. Mr. Cluver added that it was important for the applicants to show what they were referencing in the re-design of the mansard.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Detwiler agreed that the use of a mansard for the addition was the appropriate choice. However, some of the details needed to be refined.
 - o Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicants look at some of their previous approvals of mansards on Van Pelt Street.
 - o Ms. Gutterman said that she was concerned about the size of the windows at the mansard.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property is located at a street corner and two facades are highly visible from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Owing to the corner location of the building, any roof deck and access stair will be highly conspicuous and therefore is unlikely to satisfy Standard 9 or the Roofs Guideline.
- The design of the mansard, including the proportion of the dormers, the truncated length of the mansard, and its severe curve are not compatible with the surrounding context and fail to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 415 S 17TH ST MOTION: Deny MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein					X
Total	6				1

Mr. D'Alessandro excused himself from the meeting at 11:01 a.m.

ADDRESS: 223-25 MARKET ST

Proposal: Construct three-story addition on existing two-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: American Investment Associates, LP

Applicant: Snežana Litvinovi, Atrium Design Group

History: 1960; second story and rear added, 2001

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The two-story, two-bay, brick-clad building at 223-25 Market Street is non-contributing structure in the Old City Historic District. This application proposes to construct a three-story addition on top of the existing structure. The building fronts Market Street and has a secondary façade that fronts Church Street to the north. An extremely narrow private alley named W. Grishom Alley runs north – south between Market and Church Streets to the east of the subject property.

Earlier versions of the design were reviewed by the Architectural Committee in July and the Historical Commission in August 2021. After the July meeting of the Architectural Committee, the applicant revised the application to take into account the Committee's guidance. At its meeting on August 13, the Historical Commission reviewed and then denied the revised design. The Historical Commission directed the applicant to make two changes to the design reviewed and denied on August 13. First, the Commission directed the applicant to clad the Market Street façade of the addition in brick. Second, the Commission directed the applicant to reduce extent of the projection of the cornice at the top of the Market Street façade. The revised application implements the Commission's two directives.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story addition on existing two-story building:
 - Construct roof deck with pilot houses/roof access;

- At the Market Street or primary façade, new brick cladding to match existing will be used at the new, upper floors;
- A stone cornice, reduced in height and depth from previously proposed designs, is proposed for the Market Street façade;
- Metal cladding is proposed for the new floors at the secondary facades of Church Street and W. Grishom Alley; the existing first and second stories on Church Street will receive a brick cladding to match the brick seen on the Market Street façade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed three-story addition would not adversely impact any historically significant architectural features at the subject property because the subject property is classified as non-contributing, and therefore inherently has no significant features. The proposed addition will be differentiated from but compatible with the historic district in massing, size, scale, and architectural features and therefore satisfies Standard 9.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - *Recommended: Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
 - The massing, size and scale of the proposed addition are compatible with but differentiated from the buildings in the historic district.
 - The use of brick cladding at the Market Street façade helps the design to fit into the context of its surroundings, as does the stone cornice.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:01:54

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Shimi Zakin and Snežana Litvinovi of Atrium Design Group represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman told the applicant that the Architectural typically recommends denial of glass railings and asked whether metal railings had been considered for the balconies facing Market Street.
 - The applicants observed that the building is classified as non-contributing in the historic district and responded that, because the glass railing was located behind the planters at the second story, they would not be visible from the street.
- Ms. Gutterman disagreed with the applicants and said the glass railings would definitely be visible from the street. She asked the applicants if a glass railing was also proposed at the roof deck and if the deck would be set back five feet from the front façade.
 - The applicants responded that no glass railing was proposed for the roof deck and that the deck was already set back more than five feet from the front facade.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants if mechanical equipment would be located on the roof.
 - The applicants responded that there would be mechanical equipment located on the roof but the units were small and would not be visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that there was no rendering of the west elevation.
 - The applicants responded that the west elevation would be clad in the same material as the east elevation and said that there would not be any windows along it.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicants provide an elevation of the west façade to the Historical Commission because it may be important to see how the panels and joints are laid out.
- Mr. Detwiler asked the applicants for more information about the band seen in the rendering that ran along the top of the front façade, turning the corners on to the side elevations.
 - The applicants responded that this detail would be made of limestone and was intended to make a smoother transition between the brick at the front façade and the metal at the side elevations.
- Mr. Cluver asked for further information about the cornice details and the planes of the various decorative features.
 - The applicants responded that the same stone was proposed for several of the details on the front façade, including the window sills and headers, the Juliet balconies, and the planters. They stated that this stone would match the existing stone elements found at the ground floor.
- Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Detwiler asked for additional information about the joint pattern for the limestone band.
 - The applicants responded that they could clarify the location of the joints before the Historical Commission meeting.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicants study the width of the limestone band so that it does not end up appearing too narrow. Ms. Gutterman remarked that traditional quoins stagger up the side of a building.
 - The applicants responded that they did not want the limestone to stagger.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that, as designed, the limestone band looked like a poor attempt to cover up the fact that the brick façade was a veneer and that the brick did not turn the corner on to the side elevations, which she found inappropriate.
 - The applicants disagreed with the characterization and said that the limestone band was an architectural feature of the design.

- Mr. Cluver asked about material proposed for the side elevations.
 - o The applicants responded they were proposing standing seam metal.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the materials for the project needed to be noted on the application and the relationship between the brick façade, limestone band, and standing seam metal needed to be detailed. Mr. Detwiler added that architectural drawings with dimensions should also be created for the side elevations.
 - o The applicants agreed to provide more detail.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Additional details are needed about the dimensions and joint pattern of the limestone/cast stone band;
- Additional details are needed about the intersection of the the brick at the façade, the stone band, and the standing seam metal panes at the side, including colors and joint patterns.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The overall massing, size and scale of the proposed additional floors were appropriate to the context of the historic district, satisfying Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction;
- The glass railing proposed for the balcony should be changed to metal to be appropriate to the historic district;
- No significant architectural features of the existing building would be adversely impacted by the additional floors, satisfying Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the glass railing is changed to metal; and additional details are provided for the cast stone band, the materials proposed for the side elevations, and the patterning of the joints, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ITEM: 223-25 MARKET ST MOTION: Approve with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman		X			
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein					X
Total	4	1			2

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 AUGUST 2021

26

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ADDRESS: 1026 ARCH STREET

Proposal: Construct additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 1028 Arch LP

Applicant: Carolina Pena, Parallel Architecture Studio, LLC

History: 1879; Board of Church Extension of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Benjamin D. Price

Individual Designation: 7/14/2017

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson.Mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes the construction of a five-story building with mezzanine at 1026 and 1028 Arch Street. The property at 1026 Arch Street is designated. The property at 1028 Arch Street is not designated. Although not clear from the application materials, it appears that all but the front façade of the designated building at 1026 Arch Street would be demolished and the new five-story building constructed behind the historic façade. A rendering of the front from the northwest appears to show that the new building would emerge from directly behind the historic façade, with no setback. The rear elevation shows an entirely new façade, without a trace of the historic rear façade. A rendering from the southeast appears to show an entirely new building at the side and rear. Without a site plan, roof plan, demolition plan, section, or side elevation, it is impossible to determine how much of the old building would be retained and how much would be demolished. The application references a two-story addition on the historic building, but only calls out the retention of the front façade, indicating that the remainder of the historic building may be demolished and replaced with new construction.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct addition or new building behind front facade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance prohibits the Historical Commission from approving demolitions except in two narrow instances:

- *No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.*
 - The application materials appear to indicate that all but the front façade of the historic building will be razed and removed, which constitutes a demolition in the eyes of the preservation ordinance, and is therefore prohibited unless the Historical Commission finds that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or the building cannot be reasonably adapted. No such claims are made.

Section 7.2 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations define the submission requirements for in-concept applications.

- *Section 7.2.e: For applications proposing work to designated exteriors, a legible, dimensioned, accurately-scaled plot or site plan.*
 - No plot or site plan is provided.
- *Section 7.2.g: Legible, dimensioned, accurately-scaled drawings of the proposed alterations. If demolition is proposed, the area(s) of demolition must be clearly delineated on the drawings. Detailed drawings are not required, but the drawings must convey the concept.*
 - No demolition plan is provided. The submission is incomplete.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the demolition prohibition, and owing to incompleteness.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:21:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carolina Pena represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Pena stated that the intent is not to demolish the historic building. She explained they will be renovating the front of 1028 Arch Street. Ms. Pena explained that they will be adding to the top of 1026. In the rear, they are proposing to redo the facade but not completely demolish it. She said that, because the application is being presented as an in-concept review, they are open to hearing the Committee's comments and plan to revise the proposal after the meeting, once she talks to her client.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if they are proposing to feed new structure through the existing building to support the two-story addition on the historic building. She contended that it is difficult to understand what they are trying to do without any floor plans.
- Ms. Pena stated that the building is intended to be a hotel. She explained that the plan is to level off the floors of 1028 Arch Street to match the floors of 1026 Arch Street. Ms. Pena continued that they will basically leave the shell of all four walls in place and then add on the top. Ms. Pena said the floors and walls of 1026 Arch Street will remain in place.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if their proposal calls for the two-story addition on 1026 Arch Street to come all the way out to the front facade of the designated building.
 - Ms. Pena said the front wall of the two-story addition will be right behind the front façade.
- Ms. Lukachik said she assumes that there is some level of demolition to the existing historic building walls necessary in the current plan to tie the two buildings together at the new levels. Ms. Lukachik commented that having the demolition plans are important because it is hard to imagine what is going to happen. She continued that she cannot imagine the historic building's walls are going to stay intact.
 - Ms. Pena said that they can provide floor plans and demolition plans when they submit a revised application to the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the applicant is proposing a two-story overbuild for the entire building footprint. He noted that it is going to be right on top of 1026 Arch Street building and in the same plane as the building's front façade. Mr. Cluver stated that building an addition in the same plane as the front façade is not acceptable. Mr. McCoubrey said the front of the addition should be set back so that it is inconspicuous from across the street.
- Mr. Detwiler said that the overbuild should be set back. He added that he was not sure what the setback should be, but it should be at least six feet.
 - Mr. McCoubrey contended that it should be a bigger setback than six feet. Ms. Gutterman interjected that it should be more like a 26-foot set back.
- Mr. Cluver commented that, while this is being called a five-story building, he pointed out that there is a significant overbuild on the roof for stairs, elevators, and more. He

continued that this fact reinforces the importance of the floor plans and more information to help the Architectural Committee understand the proposal.

- Mr. Detwiler asked the Committee members to opine on the proposed rear facade.
 - Ms. Gutterman replied that entire proposal is incompatible with the historic building. She added that they need more information about the proposed materials and the detailing.
- Mr. Cluver opined that he cannot recommend approval of this in-concept application. Mr. McCoubrey agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the black color of the material used in the design. He noted the color makes the addition highly visible and is not appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey recommended a color that would have less contrast with its surroundings.
- Ms. Gutterman said the applicant should look at the design of the windows in relation to the other buildings in the neighborhood. She added that the elevation of the non-historic building as well as the overbuild is not in keeping with the sort of character defining features of the neighborhood, even if 1026 Arch Street is an individually listed property.
 - Ms. Pena responded that their intent was to avoid mimicking the existing façade, making the addition totally different. She commented that perhaps they went too far.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he would take issue with use of white as well as the black.
 - Ms. Pena asked if the Architectural Committee had color suggestions.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that it should be more harmonious with the surrounding buildings. Mr. Detwiler suggested looking around the neighborhood at the existing materials. He said that something in a lighter color like a sandstone or silvery tone is better than black.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicant should provide demolition plans and floor plans, which are necessary to assessing the full scope of the project.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application materials appear to indicate that all but the front façade of the historic building will be demolished and removed, which constitutes a demolition in the eyes of the preservation ordinance and is therefore prohibited unless the Historical Commission finds that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or the building cannot be reasonably adapted. As no such claims are made, the application does not satisfy Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.
- No plot or site plan is provided, therefore the application does not satisfy Section 7.2.e of the Historical Commission Rules & Regulations for in-concept applications.
- No demolition plan is provided, therefore the application does not satisfy Section 7.2.g of the Historical Commission Rules & Regulations for in-concept applications as the submission is incomplete.

- For an overbuild to satisfy the Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, it must be set back substantially from the front façade so that it is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- For an overbuild to satisfy the Standard 9, its materials and color scheme should be compatible with yet differentiated from the historic building, rather than merely contrasting with it.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the demolition prohibition, and owing to incompleteness.

ITEM: 1026 ARCH ST MOTION: Denial 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				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:32 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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