

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

**TUESDAY, 27 AUGUST 2019
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-031
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:03 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		
Suzanne Pentz		X	
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

- Sean Whalen, Esq., Vintage Law
- Jose Hernandez, JKRP Architects
- Kathleen Harleman
- Jessica Radomski, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
- Jack Steketee, Solar States
- Charles Dombrowski
- Stuart Udis, PA Realty Advisors
- Lindsey Glasgow, Peruto Development
- Andrew Miller, Esq., Law Office of Andrew L. Miller & Associates, PC
- Molly Gallagher
- Ramy Shraim
- Hyon Kang
- Rich DeMarco, Esq.
- Shaleia Quarles, Solar States
- Andrew Kaplin

Marc Kaplin
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Chwen-Ping Wang, Sky Design
Bo Meng Lin
Kate McGlinchey, Old City District
Brett Peanasky, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Frank Swift
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
Paul Boni, Esq., Society Hill Civic Association
Ming-Lee Yuan, Olson Kundig
Michael Forman
Kevin O'Neill, KJO Architecture

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2122 KIMBALL ST

Proposal: Construct 40 townhouses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2101 Washington Avenue LLC

Applicant: Atiya Groomes, OCF Realty

History: 1865; Howell & Brother Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory; additions, 1883, 1912; most structures demolished in 2018

Individual Designation: Under consideration

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct 40 townhouses at the rear of the property known as 2101 Washington Avenue, which has been subdivided off as 2122 Kimball Street. The Washington Avenue property is under consideration for designation but has not yet been designated. The Kimball Street portion of the property is a vacant lot.

The property at 2101 Washington Avenue was nominated for designation on 12 December 2017 and the Historical Commission notified the property owner that it would consider the nomination on 2 January 2018. When the Committee on Historic Designation met in February 2018 to review the nomination, the nominator announced his intention to withdraw the nomination. At its March 2018 meeting, the Historical Commission rejected the nominator's request to withdraw the nomination and remanded it to the Committee on Historic Designation for its April 2018 meeting. At about the same time, the Department of Licenses & Inspections determined that the buildings on the site were imminently dangerous and issued a permit to demolish all but the structures at the southwest corner of the site. After demolition began, the Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination and recommended that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. At its May 2018 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed the nomination and decided to table it until the demolition that was currently underway was completed and the Department of Licenses & Inspections had closed out the demolition permit. In October 2018, the Historical Commission approved an application proposing to remove the smokestack at the southwest corner of the site. An engineer had inspected the smokestack and suggested its demolition owing to its poor condition. The smokestack and all other structures except those at the southwest corner of the site have been demolished. However, because the demolition permit remains open, the Historical Commission has not reconsidered the tabled nomination.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The current application proposes to build 40 townhouses at the northern half of the site, which has been subdivided off as 2122 Kimball Street. All structures on the Kimball Street site have been demolished; the site is vacant. The property is not located in a historic district and none of the adjacent properties are designated as historic.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct 40 townhouses on vacant land.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.*
 - With the demolition of most of the historic structures on the site, no historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property survive. There is no basis under Standard 9 for judging the compatibility of the new construction with the site because the site has lost all historic character.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Sean Whalen and architect Jose Hernandez represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham explained that the site has been proposed for designation but is not yet designated. He noted that the nominator sought to withdraw the nomination but the Historical Commission declined that request and continued with the review of the nomination. He stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the structures on the property Imminently Dangerous and issued a demolition permit for most of the structures. That demolition has been completed and the Kimball Street portion of the property is now a vacant lot. He asserted that, with the demolition of most of the historic structures on the site, the entire site has lost all historic character. There is no basis under Standard 9 for judging the compatibility of the new construction with the nominated site because the site has no historic character. The Kimball Street portion of the site is a vacant lot. He stated that the staff recommends the approval of the application. Standard 9 requires compatibility with historic materials and features; there are no historic materials or features at this property; there is nothing with which to be compatible. The property is not within a historic district. He informed the Committee that the Historical Commission would consider the nomination for the property at the same time it considers this application. He noted that the staff will recommend that the Historical Commission decline to designate the property because no historically significant features survive.
- Ms. Stein asked if the pending designation prohibited the subdivision of the lot.

- Mr. Whalen explained that the Kimball Street lot has always existed under a separate deed. The larger tax parcel is made up of two deeded parcels. Mr. Whalen pointed the Committee to a site plan in the application showing the location of the two lots.
- Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over consolidation, subdivision, ownership, or property lines. If a designated property is subdivided, all pieces of the property remain on the Register, but the Historical Commission does not have the authority to approve or deny subdivisions. Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission has jurisdiction over the entire block bounded by 21st, Washington, 22nd, and Kimball.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about League Street, which is shown on the site plan. Mr. Whalen responded that the 2100-block of League Street does not exist yet. It is proposed as a walkable path across the property, not a public street.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he does not want to review anything until then proposal for the entire block, both the Washington Avenue and Kimball Street portions, is presented.
 - Mr. Whalen stated that the owners of the Kimball Street property are not the owners of the Washington Avenue property. They are different entities. The projects are proceeding on different schedules. He stated that the proposal today is for the Kimball Street property only, which the City has assigned its own tax account.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the structures that once stood on Kimball Street.
 - Mr. Whalen explained that a non-historic, CMU, loading dock structure stood along Kimball Street. The nomination classified it as non-contributing. There was an open area sometimes used for parking at the western end of the property at Kimball and 22nd Streets. The historic factory building was south of the non-historic structure. Mr. Farnham added that there was a one-story concrete structure built in 1912 between the loading dock and historic factory building. The concrete structure was constructed when the building was used as a furniture warehouse. Mr. Hernandez added that six or seven structures stood on the block. They were built over many decades. The section along Kimball was a later, CMU building without historical significance. It had a blank wall along Kimball. Mr. Farnham confirmed that the nomination classified the Kimball Street structure as non-contributing. Mr. Farnham noted that rowhouses had stood on the south side of the 2100-block of Kimball, where the townhouses are proposed, but were demolished to expand the factory building to the north to Kimball Street. Mr. Hernandez pointed the Committee members to a photograph in the application materials of the CMU loading structure that is now demolished.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the project requires any zoning variances.
 - Mr. Hernandez responded that the project has been presented at numerous community meetings and has been reviewed by the Civic Design Review Committee (CDR). The project was originally conceived as 44 townhouses but was reduced to 40 based on community feedback. Also, the number of parking spaces was increased. The project required a zoning variance, which has been approved. The variance related to the change in use from industrial to residential.
- Ms. Gutterman acknowledged that there is no historic fabric on the site in question but claimed that there is historic fabric on the north side of Kimball Street. She

asserted that the proposed townhouses are not compatible with the historic rowhouses on the north side of the street. She stated that the proposed buildings do not fit with the “vocabulary of the neighborhood.”

- Mr. Hernandez responded that none of the buildings on the north side of Kimball Street are designated as historic. Moreover, most of the buildings on the north side are either new construction or significantly altered from their original conditions. Mr. Hernandez contended, nonetheless, that his design for the townhouses does fit into the context and responds to the former industrial use of the site.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she does “not understand the wood” or the “eyebrow thing.” She asserted that the “vocabulary” does not match the neighborhood. The proposed buildings do not “blend” with the neighborhood.
- Mr. D’Alessandro stated that the zoning application for this project should have included documentation of the neighboring buildings such as photographs of the neighborhood. He stated that a complete zoning application should have been provided to the Architectural Committee.
 - Mr. Hernandez stated that they have successfully completed the zoning and CDR processes.
 - Mr. D’Alessandro asserted that the application to the Architectural Committee is incomplete without a full accounting of the buildings in the neighborhood.
 - Mr. Whalen disagreed with Mr. D’Alessandro. He confirmed that the project has its zoning approvals. He stated that the Historical Commission’s purview is different than that of the Zoning Board and CDR. He stated that the proposed townhouses must be judged against historic resources at the site, not against the neighborhood generally, which is not designated as historic. The property is not located in a historic district and, in fact, is not even individually designated as historic, but is merely being considered for designation. The question before the Committee is whether the proposed townhouses are compatible with the 2100 Washington Avenue property, not whether they are compatible with neighboring properties. Mr. D’Alessandro disagreed and asserted that the application must include detailed information about the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Gutterman disagreed with Mr. D’Alessandro but opined that the application should include some documentation of the surrounding built fabric. The applicants pointed the Committee to a photograph in the application of the buildings on the north side of Kimball Street. Mr. Cluver reminded his fellow Committee members that the property at 2100 Washington Avenue, including the now subdivided 2122 Kimball Street, is under consideration for individual designation but is not in a historic district. Mr. D’Alessandro stated that that was irrelevant; he asserted that the proposed townhouses must be judged against the buildings in the surrounding neighborhood, regardless of their designation status. Mr. Cluver disagreed and stated that the Committee should be considering the impact of the proposed design on the designated or nominated resource, which is now primarily a vacant lot.
 - Mr. Hernandez stated that, as a 20-year resident of the neighborhood, he can attest to the fact that the neighborhood does not have an overriding character. It is comprised of buildings of various ages and types. He discussed each of the buildings on the north side of Kimball Street and concluded that there is no one specific style or type.

- Mr. Whalen again stated that the surrounding buildings are not designated as historic. The property in question is not in a historic district. He advised the Committee that it should judge the proposal based on its compatibility with the nominated historic site, not the surrounding, undesignated neighborhood. He reminded the Committee of the staff's advice offered at the start of the review that there is no basis under Standard 9 for judging the compatibility of the new construction with the site because the site has lost all historic character; it is a vacant lot.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he appreciates that this project will return the south side of the 2100-block of Kimball Street to a residential use and will repair the block. He observed that the blank, CMU wall of the loading dock, which was demolished, had an extremely adverse effect on the block. He questioned the use of an industrial aesthetic at the townhouses and suggested that it should be reserved for the construction on the southern half of the block. He questioned the use of wood on the facades as well as the "eyebrows." He stated that he appreciates that the end buildings address the side streets. He stated that he found the height and scale of the three-story townhouses appropriate.
- Ms. Stein stated that she agreed with the staff and found that the size, scale, and proportion of the proposed townhouses was compatible with the neighborhood. She too objected to the "eyebrows."
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the locations of the mechanical equipment. She asserted that it must not be able to be seen.
 - Mr. Hernandez responded that the equipment would be located behind the pilot houses and would not be visible from the street. Ms. Gutterman stated that the pilot houses, decks, and railings must not be visible.
- Ms. Gutterman concluded that the proposed townhouses should be "more contextual with the neighborhood" and the wood and metal elements, especially the "eyebrows," should be removed from the townhouses.
 - Mr. Cluver objected, stating that the site in question had lost all historic character and the Architectural Committee had no basis for judging the proposal against an undefined, undesignated set of neighboring buildings.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that, if the applicants disagreed with the Committee's decision to judge the proposal against the character of the neighborhood, they could raise the matter with the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application should but does not include documentation of the buildings in the surrounding neighborhood. Such documentation would define the neighborhood's character and allow the proposal to be judged against that character.
- The proposed project must be compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, even if that neighborhood is not designated as historic and that character has not been formally defined.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed townhouses are not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

- The proposed townhouses should be “more contextual with the neighborhood” and the wood and metal elements, especially the “eyebrows,” should be removed from the townhouses.

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

ITEM: 2122 Kimball Street MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver		x			
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein		x			
Total	3	2			2

ADDRESS: 2079-85 AND 2095-97 N 63RD ST

Proposal: Construct 5-story mixed-use building, rehabilitate garage building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: North 63rd Street Association

Applicant: Nathan Torok, Rock Construction & Development

History: 1910; Overbrook Garage

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Contributing, under consideration

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a five-story, mixed use building on 63rd Street in Overbrook Farms.

The Historical Commission initiated the designation of the Overbrook Farms Historic District in 2011 but tabled the review of the nomination in 2012. The nomination has been on hold for more than seven years. On 14 August 2019, after the submission of this application, the Historical Commission restarted the Overbrook Farms Historic District process, when the Commission notified all property owners in the district that it would consider whether to designate the proposed district at public meetings in October and November 2019. The Historical Commission may consider this application while the district is under consideration, but the application will be automatically approved if the district designation process is not finalized within 90 days of the submission of the application.

The site in question includes several buildings classified as non-contributing in the proposed district and one classified as contributing. The staff has already approved the demolitions of the non-contributing buildings but they have not yet been demolished. The contributing building will be retained and reused.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The new, five-story, mixed use building will include four ground-floor commercial spaces, 111 dwelling units, and 43 parking spaces. Parking and loading will be located in the rear, accessed by a side driveway. The building will have a brick veneer façade and GFRC, limestone-like accent elements. The existing brick building, which is utilitarian, will be repaired and repointed, and new windows and doors will be installed. The site of the proposed building is near the Septa Regional Rail Station along 63rd Street, where many of the neighborhood's commercial and large multi-family buildings are located.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct a five-story, mixed use building; rehabilitate garage building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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.*
 - The new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. It 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 the proposed Overbrook Farms Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:25:15

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Judy Robinson, attorney Brett Feldman, and developer Nathan Torok represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham stated that the staff contends that the proposed building is compatible with the proposed historic district. He noted that, while most of the district is comprised of detached and semi-detached single-family houses, this stretch along 63rd Street is lined with multi-family and commercial buildings. He also noted that, if the Historical Commission does not conclude its review of the historic district within 90 days of the submission of this application, the application will be automatically approved.
- Mr. Feldman stated that, even though the historic district nomination has been in limbo for eight or nine years, his client has worked proactively with the Historical Commission's staff, City Planning Commission, Civic Design Review, and the community for more than one year to develop this project. He stated that they are within a "grey area" in the Historical Commission's jurisdiction but are following through on the process in good faith.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the reuse of the historic building.

- Ms. Robinson stated that the building is two stories in height. Both floors will be used as amenity spaces for the residents. The first floor will be used as a flex space. The second floor will house a gym and lounge. The historic building will be accessed at the second floor from the new building. The historic building will not have an elevator. There will be no deck or elevator override at the historic building.
- Mr. Cluver suggested a metal railing instead of a glass railing at the arched storefronts.
 - Ms. Robinson stated that she preferred the glass railings but would consider metal.
- Mr. Cluver suggested a full, 180-degree arch, not a truncated arch, at the arched storefronts
 - Ms. Robinson agreed to consider his suggestion.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the choice of the blue color for the windows.
 - Ms. Robinson responded that they chose blue to give the building a touch of the modern.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the choice of the pattern for the siding on the back of the building. He asked about the material. He asked why they had devised a siding plan with "one gagillion billion joints."
 - Ms. Robinson responded that the product is a four to six-inch-wide cementitious board. They used the pattern to give the wall some visual interest.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the siding would give the wall the appearance of frame, not masonry, construction.
 - Mr. Torok noted that the wall faces the rear of the property and will only be visible from the railroad tracks. He asked if a revision to the design for the wall could be reviewed as a detail by the staff. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the design of the wall exceeded the staff's capacity to review. He said that it is "too many pieces." The applicants noted again that it is a rear wall that is not visible from any public right-of-way. The wall, which is entirely new construction, will have no impact on the historic district.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he believes that the building will fit well in the district. He suggested reconsidering the location of one exterior light fixture. He also suggested adding an architrave-like trim piece below the raised cornice at the entrance to the courtyard.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The construction of the proposed building will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property or historic district.
- The proposed building 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 Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building will be compatible with the historic district and comply with Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided metal railings are used at the arched storefronts, an architrave is added at the raised cornice, and the rear wall siding is revised, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2079-85 and 2095-97 N. 63rd Street MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 6626 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Construct 3 townhouses with rear parking

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Hebron Tabernacle of America

Applicant: Stuart Udis, PA Realty Advisors LLC

History: 1905; Pelham Pharmacy; David Knickerbocker Boyd, architect

Individual Designation: 3/8/2019

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes to construct three townhouses at the rear of the former Pelham Pharmacy building. The historic building is situated at the corner of Germantown Avenue and W. Phil Ellena Street, and contains an area of undeveloped land at the rear along W. Phil Ellena Street. The property was designated in March 2019 for significance related to its architect and for exemplifying the historical heritage of the planned Pelham development. The designation includes the entire tax parcel which encompasses both the historic building and the undeveloped land at the rear. The proposed townhouses are four stories in height and include pilot houses and roof decks with parapets. Materials are not specified in this in-concept application. Parking is located at the rear of the townhouses.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct three townhouses fronting W. Phil Ellena Street on undeveloped land at rear.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.*
 - The proposed massing, scale, and materials are not compatible with the historic property, and negatively impact the spatial relationships that characterize the historic property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:43:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Equitable owner Stuart Udis and architect Kevin O'Neill represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee commented that the choice of materials and colors is not in keeping with the historic character of the area.
 - The applicants responded that the proposed materials are a combination of white brick and HardiePlank siding.
- The Committee observed that the proposed building lacks the typical setback of the building from the street. The Committee commented that the proposed building is too close to the sidewalk and is at odds with the pattern of development on W. Phil Ellena Street.
 - The applicants responded that many of the parcels on W. Phil Ellena are very deep, whereas the subject lot is much shallower, resulting in a more difficult lot to develop while including a substantial setback.
- The Committee asked about the grade change on the site and requested that it be clarified on a revised application.
- The Committee commented that the proposed height is not of concern, but that the perceived height could be visually reduced by redesigning the strong mansard element.
 - The applicants confirmed that the roofline is serving to obscure the roof decks.
- The Committee commented that the proposed porches are too shallow and are not grand like the other porches on the street.
 - The applicants responded that they will consider removal of the porches to assist with improving the concern over spatial relationships.
- The Committee summarized that the proposed project is an overdevelopment of the site, and that the setback is not acceptable as presented. The Committee suggested that any proposed building needs to be pushed back further on the site, which will result in a loss of rear parking.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed project is located on open land at the rear of a historically designated property.
- No work is proposed to the historic building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project does not comply with Standard 9 because the massing, scale, materials, and spatial relationships are not compatible with the historic property.

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

ITEM: 6626 Germantown Ave. MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 2000 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct 4-story building with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2000 Spring Garden LLC

Applicant: Andy Miller, Law Office of Andrew L. Miller & Associates, PC

History: 1964; Office of Dr. Stanley Dorman; Alkon & Vanderwerff, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a four-story, multi-family building on the southwest corner of 20th and Spring Garden Streets in the Spring Garden Historic District. The demolition of the existing building, which is listed as non-contributing in the district, was approved by the staff. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction. In May 2019, the Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept application to construct a five-story building on this site. The application was subsequently withdrawn and never reviewed by the Historical Commission.

The building proposed in the current application would feature a cast stone base and brick first through third floors. The fourth floor would feature a mansard-roofed "main block," aligning with that of the adjacent property. The rear portion of the fourth floor would be set in from 20th Street and be clad in standing-seam metal and feature a cantilevering deck with glass railing accessed by a pilot house. The front façade along Spring Garden Street would approximate the details of

the neighboring property, but with squared openings rather than arched. The side elevation would be broken up by a series of double-hung windows, a prominent central stair, two fiber-cement-clad bay windows, and Juliette balconies. The rear of the building would be stepped, with balconies on the second, third, and fourth floors. Parking would be accessed from the rear of the building and concealed behind a gate.

The building currently proposed was designed in response to the Architectural Committee's suggestions provided at the May 2019 in-concept review. At that time, the Architectural Committee suggested that:

- the new construction should be limited to four stories in height,
- the garage openings on the 20th Street elevation should be removed,
- the cantilevering planes of the upper floors at the front of the building should be removed,
- the front façade should not try to replicate the exact details of the historic property to the west, and,
- the front and side elevations of the proposed construction should have a more cohesive appearance.

The applicants have implemented these suggestions and are willing to make additional revisions if requested.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a four-story, multi-family building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials 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 floor and window heights of the proposed new construction align with the neighboring property, while the details, including squared window openings, a simplified cornice, and metal-roofed mansard differentiate the new from the old. The proposed materials of brick and cast stone are compatible with the environment of the district. The height and depth of the proposed construction are likewise appropriate. Historically, corner buildings were often longer and taller than their mid-block counterparts.
 - The proposed project complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:55:52

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Andrew Miller, architect Hyon Kang, and owner Ramy Shraim represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- The Architectural Committee members questioned the transition at the fourth floor between the mansarded front portion and the linear rear section.
 - Mr. Kang responded that they were not trying to match the historic configuration precisely, but rather took a hard line of ending the mansard at the end of the neighboring main block and transitioning to a more modern design for what is intended to look more like a modern rooftop addition. He noted that the standing seam metal material would carry across from the mansard to the flat portion of the fourth floor.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that the change at the fourth floor is not reflected in the lower floors.
 - Mr. Kang responded that they had a starker transition in previous iterations of the design, but through discussions with the staff and neighbors, and from the comments at the previous Architectural Committee review, feel that the current design is more compatible and cohesive.
 - Ms. DiPasquale noted that the Committee had objected to the transition between the historicized front façade and modern side elevation during the previous in-concept review, so the current application tries to address that feedback.
- Mr. Cluver noted that a glass railing is proposed for the fourth-floor roof deck.
 - Mr. Kang responded that a glass railing is his client's preference, but it could be changed if necessary. He noted that a metal picket railing is proposed on the other floors.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned access to the roof deck.
 - Mr. Kang responded that there would be one pilot house along the party wall, and the other means of egress would be a skylight/hatch sort of structure to minimize its visibility and impact.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the placement of any mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Kang responded that it could be split between the rear yard and the roof.
 - Ms. Gutterman opined that the rear yard looks like it is occupied by a driveway.
 - Mr. Kang responded that the rear yard is 30 feet deep, and a 30-foot curb cut would not be allowed, so only a portion of the rear yard would not be occupied by the driveway.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the element that jumps out to him on what would otherwise appear to be a recessive fourth-floor “addition” is the overhang and vertical element at the transition between the mansarded front and setback rear portion of the fourth floor. He suggested that those elements be removed and that all aspects of the setback portion of the fourth floor be located in the same plane, with glazing.
 - Mr. Kang agreed to investigate the suggestion and adjust accordingly.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned the bay windows and balconies on the 20th Street elevation.
 - Mr. Kang noted that both balconies and Juliet balconies are prohibited by zoning because they are not covered, but that they may seek a variance for the balconies.
 - Mr. Kang explained that the bay windows would be clad in metal or wood. He noted that they would like a stamped metal bay appearance.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the 20th Street elevation is big and questioned whether there was a way to break down the massing of the elevation further.

- Mr. Kang responded that this is a corner property, and corner buildings are typically treated differently than mid-block buildings. He noted that they have attempted to reduce the massing by setting each floor back as they go up.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the zoning issues around the property raised in the Spring Garden Civic Association's letter.
 - Mr. Kang responded that by-right zoning would allow for a 38-foot tall, vanilla box structure of three or four stories, with seven units. He opined that such a project would not meet historic preservation standards. He noted that the only zoning variance they plan to seek is for height and possibly for the Juliette balconies.
 - Ms. Stein questioned what height they are proposing for the new building.
 - Mr. Kang responded that they would need a variance to match the height of the adjacent property, which at the front is approximately 46 feet 6 inches.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned why the flat portion of the fourth floor is higher than the mansard-roofed portion.
 - Mr. Kang responded that the additional height is primarily due to a parapet wall that surrounds the roof deck. He noted that they could push the parapet further back or to reduce it to a knee-wall or curb. He explained that, as-proposed, the parapet is higher than a knee-wall and is a two-step system with the railing set behind the parapet.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the height of the parapet be reduced as much as possible.
 - Ms. Stein opined that the railing should be pushed back to the point that it is inconspicuous.
- Mr. Cluver struggled to understand the proposed project as it relates to the district overall and suggested that additional photographs would be helpful.
 - Mr. Kang responded that this building is located on the southern edge of the district, and beyond it on 20th Street is very tall modern building. He noted that the buildings along Spring Garden Street in the district are primarily three and four stories, but that further down Spring Garden there are much taller buildings.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned how the building relates to other properties on 20th Street in the district, noting that the building across 20th Street seems to be three stories with a distinct main block and rear ell.
 - Mr. Kang responded that the surrounding buildings feature a mix of styles and massing, so it is difficult to compare the massing just to its immediate neighbors.
 - Ms. DiPasquale reiterated that the district boundary ends with this property and there are no designated properties along 20th Street south of it that are part of the district. The houses that face Spring Garden Street are at the southern edge of the district. She noted that the district is characterized by a mix of three and four-story Italianate residential properties, many of which feature mansard roofs that were later, but historic additions.
 - Mr. Cluver reiterated that the massing feels too large to him, but that he cannot truly tell from the context images provided.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that the building that occupied this site historically was full-width and did not have a rear-ell, as is the case with many corner properties.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned the scale and placement of the basement windows, noting that they do not appear to align with the windows above.

- Mr. Kang responded that the intention is for them to align with the width of the windows above.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that some of the 20th Street windows appear to be dragging on the ground and suggested reevaluating the height of those windows.
- Mr. Kang noted that some of the windows along 20th Street need to be larger for egress purposes.
- Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting that the grade change along 20th Street allows for larger windows.
- The Architectural Committee members agreed that the basement windows all appear too high.
- Ms. Stein noted that she feels uncomfortable recommending approval despite the numerous small issues raised.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- The Spring Garden Civic Association submitted a letter of opposition to the project.
- Attorney Rich DeMarco represented Molly Gallagher and Charles Dombrowski, the adjacent property owners at 2002 Spring Garden, and spoke in opposition of the project. Mr. DeMarco asserted that the Historical Commission is bound by the preservation ordinance and its criteria of review for an alteration. He opined that the Historical Commission is required to consider the existing building, which is two stories in height with no deck and allows views of his client's building at 2002 Spring Garden. He noted that his clients worked with the Historical Commission's staff on the rehabilitation of their property, including a meticulous and expensive recladding of their rear bay window. He stated that, if the Historical Commission approves this building, it will destroy views of that bay window. He opined that the ordinance is far more explicit than the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and quoted Section 14-1006(e)(.4) under Review Criteria, stating that the Historical Commission is required to consider "the compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district or with the compatibility of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape." He reiterated that this proposal does not do that because the massing would destroy the views of the rear of his client's property and impact her light and air. He addressed the earlier discussion of zoning, noting that the applicants have a zoning permit for a 38-foot tall structure, but an application for such a building would also need to go through the full Historical Commission process. Mr. DeMarco opined that the current proposal includes up to 55 feet in height, and suggested that the drawings are misleading. He stated that his client's house is 49 feet in height.
- Ms. Gallagher stated that she is proud of the work they have done on their property, which was all approved at the staff level. She noted that there are other restoration projects happening along the street as well. She asked the Architectural Committee not to give up on Spring Garden Street.
- Neighbor Kathleen Harleman asserted that she represents 15 other residents who are in opposition to the project. She explained that their opposition is based on the massing and form of the proposed building, which she claimed is located on a narrow lot on a narrow street (20th Street). She noted that Spring Garden is characterized by distinguished brick, brownstone, and limestone buildings with exquisite architectural details, and that the properties along this block feature open yards at the rear. She opined that the proposed project would violate the aesthetics

of the block and fill the yard with a driveway and that the fourth floor of the proposed project would be an eyesore.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the proposed construction.
- It is unclear from the application how the proposed construction relates to other buildings along 20th Street.
- The fourth-floor beyond the mansarded portion should be in one continuous, set-back plane.
- The roof deck above the fourth floor should not cantilever, the parapet around it should be reduced, and the railing should be pulled back from the edge so that it is inconspicuous.
- The proposed basement windows are too high and do not align with the windows above.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The design needs some additional revisions before it can warrant a recommendation of approval.

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

ITEM: 2000 Spring Garden St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 2016 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Construct third-story addition and garages

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Charles Peruto

Applicant: Lindsey Glasgow, Peruto Development LLC

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This three-story double-wide brownstone at 2016 Spruce Street is a contributing structure in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. It was constructed c. 1870.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct a third story on the existing two-story addition at the rear.
- Construct a one-car garage.
- Construct a four-car garage with deck.
- Rebuild existing sun room at rear of house.
- Replace all windows at rear of house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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.*
 - The proposed new third story at the existing two-story rear addition involves the demolition of historic fabric, including brick walls and windows. The amount of demolition should be reduced to satisfy the standard.
 - Brick is proposed for the new third-story addition to match the other existing floors. The proposal to match the new third-story cornice with the existing may not sufficiently differentiate the new floor from the original. The staff recommends that the applicant consider a mansard roof at the new addition instead.
 - The applicant proposes composite windows at the rear of the house that appear to be appropriate for use on this secondary facade. Two new masonry openings are proposed for the southern façade of the existing two-story addition in order to accommodate access to the proposed deck. Three existing windows at the ground floor of the addition are to be filled in.
 - The proposed garage doors facing Cypress Street would not detract from this service alley which is already comprised of other garage doors along the block.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The construction off the proposed third story at the existing two-story rear building involves the demolition of historic fabric, including brick walls and windows. The amount of demolition should be reduced to satisfy the standard.

- The new third story appears to connect to the rear wall of the existing main house sensitively.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the amount of demolition proposed at the two-story rear building is reduced, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:29:33

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Lindsey Glasgow of Peruto Development LLC represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Architectural Committee asked if the application was in concept or final review.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that it was a final review.
- The Architectural Committee asked the applicant to address the staff's concern about the amount of demolition proposed.
 - Ms. Glasgow responded that the demolition was limited to the southern wall of the existing addition in order to accommodate a new garage door, and would not be visible from Cypress Street.
- The Architectural Committee asked that the applicant confirm that only the wall at the ground floor of the addition would be demolished.
 - The applicant responded that this was correct, adding that the width of the existing addition would remain as is.
- The Architectural Committee asked the staff if this amount of demolition was acceptable.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that she understood that three existing windows on the east wall of the existing addition were going to be removed.
 - Ms. Glasgow confirmed that this was correct, in order to accommodate the other garage. She reiterated that this alteration would not be visible from Cypress Street when the garage door was down.
 - The Architectural Committee commented that it was the loss of the historic fabric that was the cause for concern. The Architectural Committee asked if there was any way to reduce the amount of demolition at this wall.
 - Ms. Glasgow responded that they could retain the top half of the windows instead of removing them entirely.
- The Architectural Committee asked what was planned for the space that the light from the windows was going to be infilled.
 - The applicant responded that it would be the garage.
- The Architectural Committee said that they did not understand why this amount of demolition was necessary if what was being proposed were two garage doors that could be located between the corners of the existing walls. They explained that they would prefer to see more of the existing brick retained.
- The Architectural Committee asked about the height of the proposed addition, remarking that the floor heights appeared unusually tall. The Architectural Committee recommended that the applicant explore ways to push the height of the third story down.
- The Committee asked whether there were any drawings that showed the proposed third-story addition relative to the main house block, commenting that it was difficult

- to understand how the addition connected to the main house. The Committee asked whether work was being proposed to the main block.
- The applicant responded that the addition only connected to the main house block at a very small section of the back wall.
 - The applicant explained that the work proposed to the main block was limited to window replacement at the rear.
 - The Architectural Committee asked how the cornice of the new addition related to the main house block. The Committee commented that there was no elevation of the rear façade of the main block included in the packet. The Committee said that the use of a mansard roof at the proposed third story could be helpful in preventing the appearance of the addition from extending higher than the main block. However, without any drawings that showed the main block's cornice and roofline, it was difficult to tell whether the addition was too tall or too large.
 - The applicant responded that their concern with a mansard roof was that it would make the already small interior space smaller. Ms. Glasgow said that they were proposing to match the existing cornice at the addition's second floor on the proposed third story. She added that they could remove the existing second-story cornice and reinstall it at the new third floor.
 - The Architectural Committee responded that this would alter even more historic fabric and would not be advisable.
 - The Architectural Committee asked how much taller than the main house and the neighboring properties the proposed third story would be.
 - The applicant responded that she would have to confirm but she did not think that it was taller than the main block.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application did not provide drawings about the relationship of the proposed third-story addition to the main block, making many details about the proposal difficult to evaluate.
- The application lacked an elevation drawing of the main house's rear façade, which was needed in order to understand what windows were going to be impacted and how.
- The proposed alterations to the existing walls at the addition involved more demolition than the applicant had indicated and therefore the amount of demolition required further review.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project does not comply with Standards 9 and 10 because of the amount of demolition of historic fabric and because of concerns with the height, cornice and roofline of the proposed third-story addition.
- The application was incomplete.

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

ITEM: 2016 Spruce Street MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 109 BAINBRIDGE ST

Proposal: Install fourteen solar panels

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ann E. Moyer

Applicant: Solar States LLC

History: 1830; new front façade, windows, and doors, 1974

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This three-story home was constructed about 1830 and was individually designated in 1958.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install fourteen solar panels on the roof of the main block and rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- Roofs Guideline: *Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof (such as heating and air conditioning units, elevator housing, or solar panels) when required for a new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*
 - The proposed location of the solar panels is on the roof of the main block and rear addition. Because of the low roofline of the adjacent property to the east, the solar panels at the front of the roof of the main block will likely be visible from Bainbridge Street, looking west. A mock up should be constructed to demonstrate whether the solar panels will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The design should be modified if the mock up demonstrates that the solar panels would be conspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that a mock up demonstrates that the solar panels are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:44:51

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Shaleia Quarles and Jack Steketee of Solar States represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Architectural Committee asked if there was any way to relocate all of the solar panels onto the rear roof.
 - Mr. Steketee responded that there was not sufficient sun exposure at the rear roofs to serve their purpose, adding that the project only made economic sense if the panels were located at the front gable of the main house.
- The Architectural Committee asked how far off the roof the panels stood.
 - The applicant responded that the distance from the roof surface to the top of the panel would be four inches or less.
- The Architectural Committee asked how close to the edge of the roof the panels would be located.
 - The applicant responded that there would be approximately four inches between the edge of the roof and the first row of panels.
- The Architectural Committee asked whether the arrangement of the panels as proposed in the application could be changed, for example by pushing everything back from the cornice and to the west of the roof of the main house.
 - The applicant responded that they could consider removing the three panels on the first row closest to the cornice or redistributing them to other locations on the roof of the main house.
- The Architectural Committee commented that the proximity of the row of panels so close to the cornice was quite clearly going to be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - The applicant asked whether orienting the panels on the bottom row in landscape rather than portrait would create enough space between them and the edge of the roof.
 - The Architectural Committee responded that using a landscape orientation might help.
- The Architectural Committee commented that solar panels were often most distracting when they were arranged in an irregular pattern. They recommended laying out the panels in as simple and symmetrical an arrangement as possible.
 - The applicant responded that only the profile of the eastern-most array would be visible from Bainbridge Street, adding that at no time would the face of any panel be visible from the public right-of-way.
- The Architectural Committee asked if any of the associated electrical equipment would be located on the exterior.
 - The applicant responded that all of the electrical equipment would be located on the interior of the house.
- The Architectural Committee asked whether the plans showed the accurate location of the chimneys.
 - The applicant responded that the actual location of the chimneys was reflected on their plan.
- The Architectural Committee asked whether the panels had to be black or whether they could be a color more compatible with the existing roofing on the house. The Architectural Committee asked whether the color of the panels could be customized.
 - The applicant responded that the edge of the solar panel had to be either black or silver because they were only manufactured in large batches.

- The Architectural Committee asked how the applicant made sure that the points where the arrays were anchored into the asphalt shingles and decking did not leak.
 - The applicant explained that they use two types of attachments for the arrays. He stated that one is a solar flashing that slides up into the shingles and the other is a roof mount with a base on the bottom that creates a water-tight seal.
- The Architectural Committee asked how many asphalt roofs were currently on the house and whether the owner was replacing the roof as part of this work.
 - The applicant replied that he thought there were two asphalt roofs on the building and that the owner was not proposing to replace the roof as a part of the installation of solar panels.
- The Architectural Committee asked about the ages of the existing roofs.
 - The applicant answered that he did not have that information with him.
- The Architectural Committee expressed concern about adding the weight of the arrays without first removing and replacing the roof that is already there.
 - The applicant responded that at the beginning of each project, the roof is inspected and its structural integrity is assessed for soundness.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- There were opportunities to minimize the visibility of the panels from the right-of-way by pulling them away from the front and side of the roof of the main house.
- Preparing a mock-up for the staff to review once the recommended adjustments had been made would further assist in determining the visibility of the panels from the public right-of-way. The mock-up should be constructed with a black glass material similar to that of the panels rather than a piece of plywood in order to gauge the potential impact of the reflective surface.
- The applicant would likely be coming before the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission more frequently due to new energy initiatives; therefore, consistently providing the following information in their applications would be helpful: A variety of layout options for the arrays in order for the Architectural Committee to evaluate which one would be the least conspicuous from the public right-of-way; an accurate survey of the roof so that the existing conditions were reflected in the roof plan; the applicant's preferred array layout as well as the other tested alternatives; section drawings; dimensions on plans; documentation such as a letter or report from an engineer that demonstrates the structural integrity of the roof to support the weight of the proposed arrays.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project seems like it could be approved once the applicant provides the additional information that has been requested.
- Rearranging the placement of the arrays can reduce the visibility from the public right-of-way, which would satisfy the Roofs Guideline. However, as proposed, they are conspicuous.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incomplete information.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ITEM: 109 Bainbridge Street MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 260 S 20TH ST

Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Su Bin Jian and Bo Meng Lin

Applicant: Yao-Chang Huang, Sky Design Studio

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The application proposes to demolish the building's rear ell and replace it with a new three-story addition. The existing, historic ell is three stories tall. Historic maps show that the 1860 building originally had a one-story rear wing. The existing rear ell was added between 1860 and 1895.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish existing three-story rear ell.
- Construct new three-story addition with rear roof deck on second floor and rear balcony on third floor.
- Interior renovations within main block; no work to front facade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The demolition of the rear ell will result in the removal of distinctive materials and the alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The demolition of the rear ell will diminish the historic character of the property. The application does not demonstrate rear ell requires full demolition and cannot be rehabilitated.

- *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 construction of the rear addition will destroy the historic rear ell, which characterizes the property. The proposal will not protect the historic integrity of the property. The application does not demonstrate rear ell requires full demolition and cannot be rehabilitated.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:59:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chwen-Ping Wang represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee commented that the application lacks plans that show what is existing and what is proposed for demolition.
 - The applicant responded that the demolition includes only the rear ell. He explained that, during construction, it was determined that the foundation of the existing rear ell was not stable, and that it should be demolished and rebuilt.
 - The Committee suggested that a letter from a structural engineer should be provided which supports this assertion.
- The Committee asked if there is a full basement or a crawlspace.
 - The applicant responded that there is a crawlspace.
- The Committee observed that the proposed reconstruction of the rear ell shows it as full width rather than retaining a lightwell between the buildings. The Committee asked if the adjacent property has windows.
 - The applicant responded that the neighboring properties all have full-width rear additions. He noted that the rear of the building is landlocked and not visible from any public right-of-way. He stated that he does not know if the neighboring building has windows on the side.
- The Committee asked if the proposal calls for demolition of the rear wall of the main block, and noted that the plans show removal of the rear wall.
 - The applicant agreed that the drawings show removal of the rear wall of the main block, although he did not believe it was part of the scope of work.
- The Committee asked about the width of the alley.
 - The applicant responded that it is two feet, six inches.
- The Committee asked about lot coverage.
 - The applicant responded that a zoning permit has been issued.
- The Committee asked for an elevation of the existing rear.
 - The applicant explained that the rear of the property is not visible from a public right-of-way.
- Randal Baron, a staff member in attendance, commented that the application submitted to the staff previously proposed removal of the floors of the main block. He stated that he is concerned that this is a demolition. He stated that entire buildings

- can be compromised when rear ells are removed. He questioned the logistics of removing the rear ell given its landlocked location.
- The Committee commented that the lack of demolition plans is contributing to the confusion over the scope of work. The Committee noted that it typically does not approve the demolition of rear ells.
 - The applicant responded that he can prepare additional information regarding the demolition.
 - Ms. Stein suggested that it may be more appropriate to retain the rear ell and infill the approximately five feet of open space. She noted that the application lacks structural details.
 - The applicant responded that the structure of the rear ell is weak, and that is the reason for requesting to demolish it and reconstruct a rear addition. He reiterated that the rear of the building is not visible to the public, and that no work is proposed for the front façade.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rear of the building is not visible from any public right-of-way.
- No work is proposed for the front façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application lacks sufficient information regarding existing conditions, proposed demolition, and construction of a new rear addition.

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

ITEM: 260 S 20th St. MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 152, 154, 156, 158, 160-64 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing buildings; construct 6-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Swift Bros. Inc and 160-164 N 2nd St LP

Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application to construct a six-story structure at the corner of N. 2nd and Race Streets follows a series of applications to the Historical Commission. In 2017, the developer requested that the Commission reclassify 152 N. 2nd Street from contributing to non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. The Commission denied that request, finding that the building was constructed within the district's period of significance

In 2018, the developer submitted an in-concept application to construct a 19-story mixed-use building that included a contextual brick base with a setback tower. The contributing building at 152 N. 2nd Street was to be retained and function as a hotel lobby. Members of the public and the Historical Commission raised concerns over the height and massing of the proposed building.

The current application abandons the previous design, though it similarly seeks to rehabilitate the contributing building at 152 N. 2nd Street and repurpose it as an entrance to the adjacent new building. The five lots would be consolidated and the remaining three buildings, which are considered non-contributing, would be demolished.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing buildings
- Rehabilitate building at 152 N. 2nd Street
- Construct six-story brick building with roof deck

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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.*
 - This application proposes to rehabilitate and repurpose the contributing building at 152 N. 2nd Street with minimal loss to historic fabric. The building would abut a new six-story structure that references the industrial qualities of the historic structure. Though larger than the historic buildings immediately surrounding it, the new structure is generally compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features and would be situated across from a high-rise building. The proposed work complies with this standard.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed construction minimally impacts the historic structure and would leave the building at 152 N. 2nd Street unimpaired. The work complies with this standard.
- *Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*
 - The roof deck would be inconspicuous from all public rights-of-way and would comply with the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:13:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Developers Andrew Kaplin and Marc Kaplin and architect Rich Villa represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Villa explained that he designed the building to work within the existing zoning code, which has a 65-foot height limit. He added that its appearance draws from Old City's industrial context and the commercial nature of the adjacent buildings. He noted that he created a tripartite design and angled in the clerestory as a pseudo-roof or *piano nobile* to visually lower the building's height. Mr. Villa described the building as a Philadelphia-school column and beam structure wrapped in brick that uses industrial windows with muntins to hold the corner at 2nd and Race Streets. The building at 152 N. 2nd Street, he continued, would be restored and its demolished parapet would be reconstructed.
 - Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Villa to clarify his use of *piano nobile*, since the feature is typically at the ground level.
 - Mr. Villa responded that the top floor is taller and achieves the same effect as when the *piano nobile* is located at ground level.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the windows for the new construction are larger, with larger muntins than those of the historic building. He asked Mr. Villa to address the change of scale.
 - Mr. Villa replied that he responded to proportion and attempted to find the right number of muntins for the building. He added that he tried more and fewer muntins and found the proportion of what is proposed worked best.
 - Mr. Cluver agreed with the proportion but raised issue with the scale. He inquired about the size of an individual glass pane.
 - Mr. Villa answered that the panes measure 18-inches by 26-inches.
 - The Committee inquired whether the glass would be clear or if spandrel panels would be inserted.
 - Mr. Villa clarified that the windows would contain clear glass, though he added that there would be a Z-panel in some of the windows.

- Mr. Cluver observed that the rhythm of the brick piers is changed at the corners and asked whether the intention is to emphasize the corners.
 - Mr. Villa affirmed.
- Mr. Cluver stated that, if an industrial appearance is desired, the brick piers look very slender and the floor plates even more slender to the point where the eye does not believe that they are structurally sound. Mr. Cluver added that the change to the zinc cladding obstructs the pattern.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the awning at 2nd and Race Streets, noting that it breaks the rhythm of the ground story and asked whether it would contain lighting.
 - Mr. Villa replied that the awning would include lighting, adding that the underside of the awning would be wood. He further explained that the awning would serve a commercial tenant rather than the residential component.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked whether there is the potential for more signage on the awning.
 - Andrew Kaplin answered that there would not be more signage than what is shown, but the awning signage shown in the rendering functions as a placeholder for a future tenant.
- Ms. Stein stated that the scale and massing of the proposed building seems appropriate. She commented that the tilted façade at the top of the building is out of character, suggesting that it may be a proportion issue. As an architectural feature, she stated that too much emphasis is on the tilt. She considered whether the tilt should be limited to one side. She added that the site wants an infill building and the proposed design is trying to be an object building.
 - The applicants disagreed, noting that the building sits at a corner across from The Bridge, a large multi-use building.
 - Ms. Stein countered that the Bridge has a very different character in that it emphasizes a four-story base with a tower above, which is successful due to the continuity of the cornice height with the adjoining buildings. The proposed building, she continued, has a much taller height and the tilted façade at the top two floors does not provide the same level of continuity with the cornice heights of the surrounding buildings. She questioned whether straightening the façade would make the design more successful.
 - Marc Kaplin contended that Ms. Stein's comments are a question of opinion, and Ms. Stein agreed. Mr. Kaplin argued that the design element is not addressed in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and argued that the building complies with the Standards. He noted that the Standards advise against replicating a historic building that previously existed on site.
 - Ms. Stein agreed that the building does not replicate a previous building, adding that the brick components are extremely thin.
 - Ms. Gutterman commented that the tilted façade does not add to or detract from the requirements, also agreeing that the Committee's reaction to the tilt is opinion.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that decks are typically required to maintain a five-foot setback from the façade and asked what the setback of the deck is for the proposed building.
 - Mr. Villa answered that the deck is set back five feet from the front façade of the building.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the location of the mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Villa replied that there would be low roof-mounted units that would not be visible from the street.

- Andrew Kaplin added that the height of the units would be lower than the height of the stair tower.
 - Ms. Gutterman questioned whether they would be taller than the parapet or deck railings.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the second and third floors of the existing building would be occupied or used.
 - Mr. Villa answered that the floors would not be used and directed the Committee to a drawing in the application, stating that the intention is to remove the second and third floors to create one large space as the lobby for the residential portion of the new construction. The rear of the building, he added, would be outdoor space for the residents. He noted that a steel structure would be inserted to support the exterior walls and two skylights would be installed in the existing roof.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked whether the removal of the interior structure of the historic building would be considered a demolition.
 - Ms. Keller responded that the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the interior and that the staff could approve the removal of the interior floors and bracing of the structure from the interior.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the zinc panels highlight the corner but questioned their use at the party wall.
 - Mr. Villa acknowledged that he struggled with that design choice and how to transition between the new construction and the adjacent historic structure.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that at the peripheral side walls clapboards are proposed. He argued that it denotes wood framing and recommended that a paneling system, such as metal panels or another type of panels, be used, since the building is masonry construction.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the party wall is not sloped.
 - Mr. Villa affirmed, adding that there is some open space with a six-foot pathway leading to the backyard.
- Mr. Cluver noted that there are slight inconsistencies between the rendering and the elevation drawings and asked which is intended.
 - Mr. Villa responded that the elevation drawings are correct.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the columns at the storefronts are set back slightly and asked whether that detail is intentional.
 - Mr. Villa answered that the detail is intentional and is part of the tripartite design to differentiate the commercial area. He noted that the brick piers are not set back at the corners.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia spoke in support of the project. He stated that he has commented on the previous application, adding that he appreciated the design ambition, but ultimately recommended a building that was contextual and abided by the height limit. He noted that the applicants have designed the building within the height limit and added that he agrees with the staff recommendation for approval. He further commented that he likes the tilt, stating that it is a subtle gesture that communicates a modern building in a historic context. He remarked that he appreciates the Committee's comments, noting that there are some small design changes that could improve the proposal. He concluded that he is appreciative of the effort and appreciative of the retention of 152 N. 2nd Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes to rehabilitate the historic building at 152 N. 2nd Street, and includes the reconstruction of the altered parapet. While the interior floors would be removed, the exterior would remain largely intact.
- The site of the new construction consists of vacant lots and non-contributing buildings.
- The proposed new construction would be six stories in height and would consist of masonry piers, industrial windows, and clapboards on the secondary wall.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application complies with Standard 9, because it proposes to rehabilitate the historic building at 152 N. 2nd Street with minimal loss of historic fabric. The application further complies with the Standard owing to the size, scale, massing, and architectural features of the proposed new building.
- Because the proposed new construction would minimally impact the historic structure, the application complies with Standard 10.
- The roof deck would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and would comply with the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline, provided that the clapboard material is substituted for a paneling system.

ITEM: 152, 154, 156, 158, 160-64 N 2ND ST					
MOTION: Approval, with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

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

Proposal: Consolidate lots; demolish rears; construct additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

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

Applicant: Ming-Lee Yuan, Olson Kundig

History: 1805

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes work to a site that consists of three parcels and includes two rowhouses and a garden surrounded by a brick wall with fence. The rowhouses face S. 4th Street and open onto Leithgow at the rear. The garden runs west from 4th Street to Leithgow Street along Locust Street. A similar in-concept application was reviewed by the Architectural Committee in July 2019. The Committee objected to the proposal and the application was withdrawn before the August meeting of the Historical Commission.

The application proposes to combine the parcels, join the historic rowhouses, and construct additions to create one large dwelling. The application proposes to demolish the rear ells of the two rowhouses as well as a later garage and dining room addition. In 1913, architect Albert Kelsey altered the building at 232 S. 4th Street, converting the rowhouse and adding the rear dining room addition for a clubhouse for the Fire Insurance Society of Philadelphia, an insurance industry trade organization. The party wall between the rowhouses would be partially removed. Additions would be constructed and several internal courtyards and yards would be created.

During its review of the earlier application, the Architectural Committee objected to the demolitions of the rear ells and rear additions and suggested that the applicants either revise the application to retain more historic fabric or supplement it to justify the demolitions of the historic rear sections. The new application does neither. Also, the application, which proposes significant ground disturbance, does not account for the potential for archeological resources.

SCOPE OF WORK:

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

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 8: Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.*
 - The application does not address the potential for archaeological resources.
- *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 massing, size, scale, proportions, and height of the proposed addition are not compatible with the historic buildings to which they will attach.

- The demolitions of the rear ells and rear additions will destroy historic materials that characterize the property.
- *Standard 10: New Additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - In light of the proposed demolition, the work proposed in the application is not reversible. If the project were undertaken, the form and integrity of the historic property would be significantly impaired.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition:

- *No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, 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, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.*
 - The applicants have not demonstrated that the existing building cannot be reasonably adapted, that the sale is impracticable, or that all other potential uses of the property have been foreclosed upon.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) and Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:36:56

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He distributed a letter from the Society Hill Civic Association.
- Architect Ming-Lee Yuan, attorney Brett Peanasky, and property owner Michael Forman represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked the architect why the applicants had not addressed the question raised by the Committee at its original meeting regarding the removal of the historic fabric. Ms. Gutterman asked if they have found anything structurally deficient with the existing ells.
 - Mr. Peanasky responded that they had looked at the summary of the buildings in the inventory of the district and found that much of the emphasis was on the front facades, which are being retained. He explained that the ells are not structurally deficient but that they wish to create a courtyard to bring a large open space and more natural light into the building. He stated that this could not be achieved with the retention of the ells. He explained that they must address the zoning requirements for open space. He stated that they have worked with the community to create a pedestrian-friendly scale.
 - Ms. Gutterman commented that this rationale is based on program, not on the condition or significance of the building. She opined that the Architectural Committee would entertain a compromise that allowed alterations to the ells

to let in more light, such as the cutting of openings. She stated that the applicant's plan would remove significant fabric and replace it with a big glass wall, which is not in keeping with the building.

- Mr. Peanasky asked the Committee how it would propose to make the narrow rooms and lesser finishes of the rear ell work for this applicant.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that smaller rooms can serve many functions in a house. Ms. Gutterman stated that they are allowed to change finishes as that is an interior alteration. Mr. McCoubrey explained that rear ells, while not grand, contained very important functions in a house and are integral to the history and significance of the property. The Architectural Committee members noted that there is a tremendous amount of room on this combined lot to create a courtyard and save the significant pieces of these houses while satisfying zoning requirements. The demolitions of the ells is not necessary.
- Mr. Forman, the property owner, stated that they have an alternate design under consideration, but without the removal of these walls, the project is dead, and he will let the existing houses rot.
 - The Architectural Committee members responded that they are willing to compromise but cannot ignore the demolition prohibition in the preservation ordinance. The Committee cannot recommend approval of the total demolition of the rear ells but would entertain proposals for modifications.
- The Architectural Committee members opined that the new proposal is not particularly pedestrian-friendly. It is based on the nearby I.M. Pei houses, which were designed in an era of defensive architecture that is not necessarily appropriate today. Ms. Gutterman opined that a single-story building is not appropriate for a corner lot in this historic district.
- Mr. Cluver commented that it is admirable that the applicant is not seeking to squeeze development on every piece of this ground, but that retaining a large amount of open space on the street is not best for the district. He stated that the I.M. Pei-based design was appropriate in its own time and place but is not appropriate for this time and place. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the street face should be bricks and mortar, not vegetation.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the side of 234 S. 4th Street would be clad in brick.
 - Ms. Yuan responded that it would remain stucco, and that the note on the drawing is a mistake.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni, representing the Society Hill Civic Association, spoke in favor of the project. He commented that the applicant presented to their association's committee last night. He commented that this is a complex of buildings. He commented that other people have demolished rear ells, and there are other modern buildings in the area and few people would miss this historic fabric. He opined that the scale is pedestrian-friendly and the building is aesthetically pleasing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicants are proposing to demolish character-defining features of buildings that are both individually designated and are significant buildings in the Society Hill Historic District.
- The site is large enough to accommodate the applicant's needs for light and open space without this level of demolition.

- The proposed addition is not compatible with 232 and 234 S. 4th Street, the existing historic buildings to which it will attach.
- The rear ells that would be demolished as well as the proposed addition are or would be highly visible from three streets and the Rose Garden of Independence National Historical Park.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project does not comply with Section 14-1005(6)(d) because it proposes to demolish character-defining features of two significant buildings without making an argument of financial hardship or public interest.
- The proposed project does not comply with Standard 9 because the new addition will destroy historic materials, features and special relationships that characterize the property. The new work will not be compatible with the historic features, size scale and proportion to protect the property and its environment.
- The proposed project does not comply with Standard 10 because the new additions if removed in the future will impair the essential form and integrity of the property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) and Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 230, 232, 234-36 S 4th St. MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: D'Alessandro 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				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 776 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Replace Windows

Review Requested: Final

Owner: Joseph Casile

Applicant: Joseph Casile, Contractors R Us

History: 1800

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to remove multi-pane wood windows from the front façade of a Georgian style town house and replace them with windows that do not match in design. The applicant has not provided shop drawings or other documentation of the proposed windows to demonstrate that they will faithfully replicate the exterior appearance of the historic windows. The brand of window that is proposed is available with muntins sandwiched between the glass or a very shallow applied muntins, neither of which replicates the appearance of the original windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated Historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials.*
 - The proposed windows will not match the historic windows in design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:01:44

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Baron explained that the applicant seeks an approval for JELD-WEN windows. Cost information for both JELD-WEN and Trimline windows is provided in the application to show that the JELD-WEN windows are less expensive. However, shop drawings and photographs are not provided for either window option. The staff believes that the muntins for the JELD-WEN window are either sandwiched between the glass or applied to the exterior but are very shallow and lack depth. Mr. Baron stated that his understanding is that the applicant's estimate is for the option of muntins between the glass.
- The Committee asked if the proposal would retain the existing frames and brickmold.
 - Mr. Baron responded that his understanding is that this application is for a sash kit, which would retain the existing frames.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed project would replace the existing wood windows with windows with details that do not match the design of the existing.
- The applicant has not provided shop drawings or photographs of the proposed window.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project does not comply with Standard 6 because deteriorated features should be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing to an incomplete application.

ITEM: 776 S. Front 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				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	4				3

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:06 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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