

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

**TUESDAY, 21 DECEMBER 2021
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
- Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Lauren Powers
- Tara Rasheed
- Allison Schapker
- Bernita Spagnoli
- Allison Weiss
- Steve Stoughton
- Charles Neer, WRT Design
- Susan Wetherill
- Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
- Donna Lisle
- Charles Kerr, Cadre Design
- David Lockard
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance

Jason Morris
Matt McAuliffe
Suzanne Zlotnick
Kevin Yoder, k YODER Design
J. Oberdorf
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Dennis Carlisle
Juliet Fajardo
Chelsea Hengstler, Precision Decks and Remodeling
Suzanna Barucco
Jay Farrell
Nancy Pontone
David Whipple, Assimilation Design Lab
Omar Zaater, k YODER Design

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 3500 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Convert guardhouse and stables into welcome center

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Aparna Palatino, Parks & Recreation

History: 1915; League Island Park, FDR Park

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: FDR Park Historic District, Contributing, 8/9/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert the guardhouse and stables building into a welcome center for FDR Park. The Arts & Crafts guardhouse building with attached stables was built around 1919, and a large addition was constructed in the 1970s at the rear of the stables. The structure is oriented so that the guardhouse fronts FDR Park Drive to the east. The side of the guardhouse with the stables and addition extend along Pattison Avenue, which is to the north. The structure is used by the Department of Parks and Recreation and currently functions as offices, storage, public restrooms, and locker rooms.

The work to convert the structure into a welcome center would require installing an ADA ramp at the guardhouse, creating a storefront in the stables building, punching new openings into the stables building and addition, infilling several existing openings, installing several new windows and doors, and repairing the masonry. A playground is also proposed to replace a non-contributing, non-historic bandstand.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install ADA ramp at guardhouse;
- Install storefront at southeast corner of historic stables building
- Create new openings in historic stables building and addition;
- Infill openings;
- Install windows and doors;
- Reconstruct stair in stables building;
- Repair masonry;

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 DECEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Demolish non-historic bandstand;
- Install playground

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed storefront opening at the southeast corner of the historic stables building would have the greatest impact on the existing structure. Rather than removing the corner altogether, the corner masonry pier should be retained and individual openings should be punched on the two facades adjacent to the pier. As proposed, the storefront would require the removal of masonry on two walls, including the removal of the corner. If the corner masonry pier is retained, the work complies with Standard 9.
 - o Several additional openings are proposed at the historic stables building and addition. One opening would be an enlargement of an existing opening on the east façade of the historic stables building. Other openings would be on secondary elevations and would have minimal visual impact. The work complies with Standard 9.
 - o Areas of proposed infill include some previously altered locations, such as a public restroom intervention at the courtyard. Most areas of infill are limited to courtyard elevations. Storefront infill is proposed at several large openings of the non-historic stable addition. The work complies with Standard 9.
 - o New windows and doors would replicate the appearance of the building's historic windows and doors. The work complies with this standard.
 - o The bandstand proposed for demolition is not historic and is classified as non-contributing in the district inventory. The proposed playground that would be constructed in its place would have minimal impact on the landscape.
- *Accessibility (Code-Required Work) Guideline | Recommended: Finding solutions to meet accessibility requirements that minimize the impact of any necessary alteration for accessibility on the historic building, its site, or setting, such as compatible ramps, paths, and lifts; Minimizing the visual impact of accessibility ramps by installing them on secondary elevations when it does not compromise accessibility or by screening them with plantings.*
 - o The proposed ramp would be located at the side of the main entrance to the guardhouse and would minimally alter the existing stair. The work complies with this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the southeast corner masonry pier of the historic stables building is retained, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Lauren Powers and Tara Rasheed and Allison Schapker of the Fairmount Park Conservancy represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Rasheed stated that the welcome center is the first phase of a master plan that was completed earlier in the year. The Fairmount Park Conservancy, she continued, has a record of being sensitive to historic buildings, their value, and the communities.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked that the applicant respond to the staff's recommendation to retain the corner pier of the historic stables building.
 - o Ms. Rasheed responded that it is a reasonable and thoughtful recommendation and that they can incorporate the change into the design.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the 1970s addition at the rear had a series of small windows that would be replaced with doors. He questioned whether the addition would be used as assembly space and if it would be better served by the high windows or if the intention is to have an indoor/outdoor function that makes the doors necessary.
 - o Ms. Rasheed answered that the rear of the addition backs up to the lagoon, and the doors create a connection to the multipurpose space. She added that a patio would be constructed at the rear of the addition to emphasize the connection to the water. She then noted that the windows would be retained along the Pattison Avenue elevation.
 - o Mr. Cluver contended that the three doors disrupt the rhythm of the windows on the south elevation, though he stated he would not oppose the inclusion of the doors if there is a strong functional need for them.
 - o Ms. Schapker commented that the doors are needed for the space for it to adequately serve three different user groups. The doors will allow the users of the space to avoid disrupting those individuals in the courtyard or office.
- Mr. Cluver observed that there are two openings on the west elevation and questioned whether a sliding shutter system is being incorporated.
 - o Ms. Powers replied that the plans are proposing to repair the existing doors and reinstall them in an open position, then infill the opening with new glass doors.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he struggled with the presentation and commented that the application was hard to follow. He asked that the plans be presented more clearly as part of a more traditional architectural drawing. Each elevation, he added, is complicated, and he suggested including existing and proposed elevations side by side.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed that including existing and proposed elevations would be beneficial.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the openings on the south elevation need to be so large.
 - o Ms. Powers stated that where doors were proposed, they were aligned with the original window openings to simplify the structural details.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro contended that the design is causing a loss of the barn effect.
 - o Ms. Rasheed reminded Mr. D'Alessandro that a patio will be constructed along the south elevation.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether a single, large opening could be installed rather than the storefront systems.
 - o Ms. Schapker argued that the 1970s addition has very little barn character, except from the west elevation where the original openings remain. She added that where there were barn doors, the doors will be restored and reinstalled.
- Mr. Detwiler contended that the character-defining feature of the addition's south elevation is the solidity of the exterior wall. He then added that he is not opposed to

- cutting down openings but questioned whether the number of cut-down openings could be reduced to two rather than three doors.
- o Mr. Cluver agreed, adding that his preference would be to retain the center windows and create the doors on the ends of the wall.
 - Mr. Cluver asked where the black brick noted on the materials list would be incorporated.
 - o Ms. Powers answered that the black brick would only be used at the interior portion of the courtyard where there are currently non-original walls. She elaborated that the brick was selected so that it is differentiated from the original brick.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked the staff whether the stable addition is considered part of the designated property.
 - o Ms. Keller answered that the addition is not called out separately or identified as non-contributing in the district inventory, so its classification would be the same as the guardhouse and stables, which are contributing.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with the previous Committee comments, clarifying that more of the south wall of the addition should be retained by eliminating one of the large openings. He then asked if there are more details on the ramp proposed for the guardhouse. He questioned whether it is a ramp or a sloped path and whether it would have handrails.
 - o Ms. Powers answered that it would not have handrails and that the surface of the ramp would be concrete with brick sides. She added that the stone treads of the existing steps would be pulled out, and that the entrance steps would be replaced to match the original.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that the proposal would qualify as a sloped walkway, adding that a curb would still be necessary. He noted that the grading could also be changed to make the walkway more comfortable and eliminate the drop-off.
 - Mr. Cluver asked whether the landing is being pulled forward to allow for an additional step, which would also create a deeper landing for the sloped walkway.
 - o Ms. Powers affirmed that the steps would be altered.
 - o Mr. Cluver stated that he does not find the work problematic but wanted to make note of it, because he found that the work was not readily apparent from the presentation.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether the original wood frames remain in the high windows.
 - o Ms. Rasheed explained that she believes the addition retains the original aluminum windows. She elaborated that the addition is stuccoed CMU from the 1970s and did not have wood frames.
 - o Ms. Powers added that the design proposes more demolition at this part of the building, owing to the difference in building construction and materials.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned whether the building signage is part of the application.
 - o Ms. Schapker answered that the rendering has been used to recruit donors for the project and that the signage has not been fully developed. The only confirmed signage, she continued, is the Philadelphia Parks and Recreation standard signage from 2018, along with a donor wall in the landscape that remains to be determined.
 - Mr. Cluver asked whether there are any visible mechanical units.
 - o Ms. Powers replied that there is a transformer on the north side of the guardhouse, along with a small condensing unit that supports the guardhouse. On the north side of the addition, she continued, there is a service drive with a

small trash corral where two condensing units will be located. No units will be mounted to the roof, she noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Philadelphia Parks and Recreation and the Fairmount Park Conservancy have initiated a multi-phase plan for FDR Park. Converting the guardhouse and stables building to a welcome center is the first phase of that plan.
- The conversion of the building to a welcome center requires the installation of a sloped walkway at the guardhouse to create accessibility; the installation of a large storefront at the southeast corner of the stables building to establish an entrance to the center; and the conversion of several windows to doors on the south elevation of the 1970s addition to provide light and establish a connection between the assembly space and adjacent water.
- The signage shown in the rendering is for illustrative purposes only and has not been confirmed by the property owner. Signage will be submitted under a separate building permit application at a future date.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The number of windows converted to doors on the south elevation of the addition should be reduced from three to two, and the southeast masonry pier of the stables building should be retained.
- Alterations would be largely limited to the 1970s addition, with few alterations of the guardhouse or stables building. The work complies with Standard 9.
- Accessibility would be achieved through a sloped walkway at the guardhouse entrance. The sloped walkway is preferred to a ramp with railings, but further details need to be included in the plans. The work complies with the Accessibility Guideline.

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

- the masonry pier of the historic stables' southeast corner is retained;
- the proposed center door of the addition's south elevation is removed from the scope and the existing high windows are retained;
- the details of the sloped walkway at the guardhouse are clarified, such as the necessity for railings;
- mechanical units are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way; and
- signage is submitted under a separate building permit application and not considered as part of the current application.

ITEM: 3500 S BROAD ST MOTION: Approval, with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 8330 MILLMAN ST

Proposal: Construct building for accessory dwelling unit

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David L. Lockard

Applicant: Donna Lisle, Donna Lisle, Architecture and Design

History: 1963; Vanna Venturi House; Mother's House; Robert Venturi, architect

Individual Designation: 11/10/2016

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 8330 Millman Street includes the significant Postmodern-style Vanna Venturi House designed by prominent Philadelphia architect Robert Venturi. The house is set back approximately 200 feet from Millman Street, centered on a long driveway running to the street. The T-shaped lot extends to the southeast and northwest, behind the neighboring properties at 8234 and 8336 Millman Street. The property is bounded by Navajo Street at the rear, though the rear of the house is not visible from that street, owing to heavy vegetation.

At its 10 December 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission approved an in-concept application for an 800-square-foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU), provided reducing the footprint of the new structure was considered. The application proposed to construct the building in the location of an existing non-historic shed to the northwest of the Venturi House, on one of the arms of the T-shaped lot behind the property at 8336 Millman Street. The Commission found the location, height, massing, and scale to be appropriate for the site, owing to the lack of visibility from the public right-of-way.

This application for final approval proposes to construct the ADU in the same location, with similar massing, size, and scale. It would be positioned 37'-6" from the historic house. At its highest point, the proposed structure would be 13 feet tall, and the roof would slope to a low point of 9 feet. The building would be clad in vertical wood siding with a sloped standing seam metal roof, aluminum windows and doors, brick paving, and a schist retaining wall.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct one-story accessory dwelling in the side yard.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 DECEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed one-story building would be differentiated from the historic building and would be compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features.
 - o The proposed building's location on the site would have minimal impact on the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - *Recommended: Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Not Recommended: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.*
- o The new building would be located behind the neighboring property at 8336 Millman Street and would have minimal visibility from the public right-of-way; it would, therefore, not obstruct views of the Vanna Venturi House. The proposed building would be located on the site of a non-historic shed, behind the current parking area.
- o Owing to the massing, size, and scale of the new construction and its siting 37'-6" from the historic building, the new construction would not result in the diminution of the historic character of the Vanna Venturi House.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction, and the Historical Commission's 10 December 2021 approval of an in-concept application.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:30:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Donna Lisle and Juliet Fajardo represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Lisle stated that she responded to the Architectural Committee's comments on the in-concept application that was previously reviewed and reduced the footprint of the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) slightly and separated it further from the Vanna Venturi House. She added that she was asked to eliminate the parapet and lower the roof at the entry, which she also did. She commented that the Committee had asked that the courtyard potentially be eliminated. She noted that she studied the possibility of eliminating it but concluded that it was essential to the design to bring in light and create a relationship to the garden. The courtyard, she continued, was slightly reduced in size.

- Mr. Detwiler commented that he appreciated the change to the roof slope, adding that it relates well to the historic building. He also supported the other modifications Ms. Lisle noted, elaborating that each small change makes an impact to a building of this size. He stated that the design as presented is appropriate.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern over the concealed gutter. He opined that the detail provided in the application does not show how the drain would function. He then questioned whether the wall would have insulation.
 - o Ms. Lisle responded that it would have insulation and that she worked with a structural engineer to confirm that movement would be limited in the joint. She added that a waterproofing layer would be added below the gutter, and some movement would be provided for in the gutter.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro asked where the rainwater conductor would be located.
 - o Ms. Lisle replied that it would be to the back or courtyard side and that the drain itself would be in the bottom of the gutter.
 - o Ms. Fajardo clarified that the drain would be visible on the short end of the building and that it would not go through the wall.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro disapproved of the drain detail.
 - o Mr. Cluver stated that Mr. D'Alessandro raises an important constructability question. In terms of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction and if the applicant needs to switch to an exterior gutter system, he questioned whether the inclusion of that gutter system would prevent the Commission from approving the construction of the ADU.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro again raised issues with the proposed concealed gutter.
 - o Ms. Fajardo responded that the detail is still being worked out and the possibility for an exposed gutter system remains, though she is making the effort to minimize the roofline of the new building.
 - o Ms. Gutterman argued that the detail could be worked out between the architect and the roofing contractor.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the feedback on the concealed gutter is good information and contended that if a hung gutter is necessary that the Committee would not object.
 - o Others agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked that the porch canopy be added to the rendering.
 - o Ms. Lisle agreed, adding that she did not have time to update the rendering.
- The Committee commended the applicants on the attention to detail in the design and for proposing an ADU rather than an addition to the Vanna Venturi House.
- Mr. Cluver asked where the mechanical systems would be located.
 - o Ms. Lisle answered that a split system would be installed. An outdoor unit, she continued, would be located on the rear of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Given the shape of the lot and the minimal visibility of the selected location for the ADU, the construction of the ADU will not have an adverse visual impact on the historic house.

- The footprint of the ADU has been slightly reduced from the previous in-concept application, and the reduction has increased the buffer between the ADU and Vanna Venturi House.
- The parapets have been eliminated and the roof slope has been modified to address the Architectural Committee's comments from the in-concept review.
- The details of the proposed concealed gutter have not been confirmed, and a hung gutter system remains an alternate.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed ADU is appropriate in massing, size, scale, architectural features, and materials. The work complies with Standard 9.
- The proposed ADU would be sited so that it is minimally visible from a public right-of-way. It would also be sited so that it would not be visible from the interior of the Vanna Venturi House. The work complies with the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction, and the Historical Commission's 10 December 2021 approval of an in-concept application.

ITEM: 8330 MILLMAN ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro		X			
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6	1			

ADDRESS: 317 LAWRENCE CT

Proposal: Alter window openings; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Joao Soares and Bernita Spagnoli

Applicant: Kevin Yoder, k Yoder Design

History: 1970; Lawrence Court Townhouses; Bower & Fradley, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW:

This in-concept application proposes to construct a rear addition, insert a new window opening at the recessed front entrance, and install new windows at the third-floor front mansard of this

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 DECEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

courtyard residence constructed c. 1970. The adjacent rear addition at 319 Lawrence Court, which appears to be a design influence for this proposed rear addition, was constructed prior to the designation of the historic district and therefore pre-dates the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. The rear of the property is partially visible from Cypress Street to the north. The existing fenestration at the third-floor front mansard is an alteration that pre-dates the historic designation.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove first-floor rear masonry wall.
- Cut down second-floor rear windows into doors.
- Construct rear addition.
- Construct new window opening at recessed front entry.
- Install new windows at third-floor front mansard to better replicate original fenestration.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed work is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9. The staff recommends that the new doors at the second-floor rear have a vertical division to maintain the rhythm on the rear openings of this row, and that the overall design of the rear addition be differentiated from the adjacent rear addition to avoid confusion about the historical development of these buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, with the recommendation to differentiate the rear addition from the adjacent addition and add a vertical division to the second-floor rear doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:49:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Kevin Yoder represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the original fenestration pattern for the front and rear mansards.
 - o Mr. Yoder responded that the front mansard likely originally had narrow ribbon windows across, and the rear mansard was originally set in from the rear wall and had narrow ribbon windows across. He agreed that he could revise the proposed front windows to be narrower and therefore more contextual. He directed the Committee's attention to the non-historic rear mansard windows and asked if installing ribbon windows here would be acceptable, should the budget allow for it.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the front and rear mansard windows were originally nearly identical and therefore this would be a restoration.

- o Ms. Stein observed that the historic photograph of the rear appears to show eight windows across.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the staff recommended that a vertical division be added to the second-floor rear doors.
 - o Mr. Yoder responded that they are amenable to this change and will plan to install a pair of French doors.
- Ms. Stein opined that the rear addition as proposed is appropriate owing to the limited visibility of the rear and the massing of the addition. She commented that the horizontal railing may not be appropriate for a building of this period.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the solid parapet should be reconsidered, and that perhaps a bit of articulation could provide a lighter feel. Other Committee members agreed.
 - o Mr. Yoder explained that it offers a better sense of privacy off the bedroom but that he can discuss it with his client. He offered to explore ways to reduce the solidness.
- Ms. Stein asked about proposed materials.
 - o Mr. Yoder responded that the adjacent addition is stucco, but that he is considering a glass fiber reinforced concrete panel system, which could change depending on design changes made to reduce the heaviness of the addition.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the alteration to the front recessed entrance is appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The adjacent rear addition pre-dates the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over these properties.
- The rear mansard is an altered condition.
- The fenestration on the front mansard is an altered condition.
- The rear of this property is partially visible from Cypress Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work is largely compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, with the recommendations that new fenestration at the mansard be eight-unit ribbon windows, a vertical division be added to the second-floor rear doors, the balcony parapet and railing be redesigned to be less solid, and that rooftop mechanical equipment not be visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 317 LAWRENCE CT MOTION: Approval in-concept with recommendations MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 6301 WOODBINE AVE

Proposal: Replace slate roof with synthetic slate; simplify pattern

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia/Our Lady of Lourdes Church

Applicant: Marty McMahon, Roofsimple

History: 1895; Our Lady of Lourdes Church; T.P. Lonsdale, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Contributing, 11/8/2019

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to remove the existing slate roof of the Our Lady of Lourdes Church, a contributing structure within the Overbrook Farms Historic District, and replace it with a synthetic slate roofing material. Rather than attempt to approximate the existing tile pattern, which incorporates three shapes of slate tiles, the applicant is proposing to use one shape of synthetic slate tiles only.

According to Section 6.10.c. Staff Approval Authority of the Rules and Regulations:

The staff shall review and may approve without referral to the Architectural Committee and the Commission permit applications proposing:

4. The replacement of slate roofing materials, with the exception of mansards, turrets, and other character-defining features, provided the severity of deterioration requires replacement and the substitute materials closely approximate the color and shape of the historic slate roofing materials.

The staff has already approved an application for this property and applicant for the replacement of the existing slate roof using synthetic slate and approximating the existing tile pattern by using three different shaped synthetic slate tiles. Owing to financial concerns, the applicant is now before the Architectural Committee requesting permission to replace the roof with synthetic slate without having to replicate the existing pattern. Because the staff believes that the existing pattern of the roof tiles is a character-defining feature of the church, the application is being referred to the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Replace existing slate roof with synthetic slate.
- Simplify existing tile pattern by using only shape of synthetic slate tiles.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The synthetic slate is available in shapes that can approximate the existing pattern of the slate roof. The pattern is a character-defining feature of the church and should be replicated as closely as possible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the replacement of existing slate with synthetic slate, but denial of the simplification of the pattern, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:10:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.
- J. Oberdorf represented the owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant specified the cost differential between using one tile shape versus three tile shapes.
 - o Ms. Schmitt responded that this information was requested. However, the applicant was unable to prepare it in time for the Architectural Committee meeting. Ms. Schmitt said that the applicant intended to have it in time for the Historical Commission meeting.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the existing roof was the original roof.
 - o Ms. Schmitt responded that she believed that the roof was original.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if there were replacement slate materials available that could replicate different tile shapes.
 - o Ms. Schmitt showed the members of the Architectural Committee the photographs of the three shapes available in the proposed synthetic slate product. She explained that the reason the staff was able to approve a prior application was because that application proposed replicating the existing pattern using the three available shapes. Ms. Schmitt said that, owing to concerns about price, the applicant had requested to go before the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission for permission to use only one tile shape.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said that the cost involved with the installation of these tiles was associated with the labor of having to install them one by one. He remarked that whether using one shape or three should not impact the labor costs. Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro.
- Mr. Oberdorf introduced himself and said that he represented the owners of the church. He stated that he believed that cost of labor also involved cutting each

individual tile to the correct shape since they did not come from the manufacturer that way.

- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Oberdorf if the roofing company had provided the difference in cost if using one single shaped tile versus the three shapes.
 - o Mr. Oberdorf said that the church had not received that information yet.
- Mr. Cluver said that he was confused because he thought that the application included images of the three shapes available from the manufacturer. Ms. Stein agreed with Mr. Cluver that she thought they were looking at factory-cut shapes.
 - o Mr. Oberdorf responded that that was not his understanding but perhaps it was the case. He said that though the roofing company has not provided the details, it was clear that there was a significant price difference when using one tile shape or three.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Oberdorf whether they had received estimates from other roofers.
 - o Mr. Oberdorf responded that the other estimates they received over the last four years had been prohibitively expensive.
- Ms. Stein wondered if perhaps the roofer misunderstood that the three shapes were available from the manufacturer and did not need to be custom cut. She said that it was possible that the dimensions of the three available shapes were not a perfect match to the dimensions of the existing slate tiles, but she thought it was better to take that approach rather than just use the one traditional-shaped replacement tile.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein and reiterated that while it was important to replicate the existing patterns, he was open to doing so with tiles that may not match the original tiles.
- Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the tiles on the spire needed to be replicated as closely as possible but elsewhere perhaps the roofer could use two shapes rather than three. He stated that there was information missing from the application. He asked Mr. Oberdorf whether they had received estimates from other roofers.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the beaver tail-shaped tile did not appear to be used in all that many sections.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that he agreed with the staff recommendation which considered the existing pattern of the slate tiles to be a character-defining feature of the church. He said that without additional cost information, he did not see how the Architectural Committee could do anything other than support the staff's recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The pattern of the existing roof is a character-defining feature of the church.
- The use of a synthetic material in place of real slate is appropriate, provided it replicates the texture and pattern of the existing roof tiles.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The existing roof pattern is a character-defining feature of the church and should be replicated as closely as possible using the three synthetic slate tile shapes that are available. The applicant's proposal to replace the existing roof using only one single tile shape does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the replacement of existing slate with synthetic slate, but denial of the simplification of the pattern, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 6301 WOODBINE AVE MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 541 N 23RD ST

Proposal: Legalize pergola

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Thomas and Kathleen Klemm

Applicant: Elizabeth Johnson, Brighton Architecture + Design

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

In March 2021, the owners of the property at 541 N. 23rd Street came before the Architectural Committee seeking permission to rebuild two existing decks in their exact locations. Both decks were constructed prior to the designation of the Spring Garden Historic District. No zoning or building permit was found for the decks, but they are visible in aerial photographs as far back as 1996. The historic district was created in 2000 and the decks are noted in the district's inventory. The lower deck is situated on the rear ell and is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The upper deck is located on the flat roof of the main block, and while it is set back from the front façade, it is built to the very edge of the side of the house, making it visible from the public right-of-way.

At the March 2021 meeting, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the upper deck as proposed, but approval of the lower deck and staircase, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline. At its April 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission voted to approve the application as proposed. In early November 2021, the Historical Commission was informed that a pergola structure that was visible from the public right-of-way had been constructed on the upper deck at the subject property. On 3 November 2021, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation (CF-2021-107047) for "work outside the scope."

Today, the owners are applying to legalize the completed work that went beyond the scope of the Historical Commission's April 2021 approval. The pergola is made of aluminum, located on the upper deck, and is highly visible from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Legalize pergola structure.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The pergola is located on the upper deck on the main block and is visible from the public right-of-way. It therefore fails to satisfy this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the legalization of the pergola, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:29:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Chelsea Hengstler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the members of the Architectural Committee likely remembered this project from the review of an earlier application. He said that while they had recommended denial of the rebuilding of the existing upper deck, the Historical Commission ultimately approved both the upper and lower deck since it was seen more as the repair of existing conditions rather than new construction. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the addition of this shade structure far exceeded the Historical Commission's previous approval, which had itself been a compromise that was reached after a lengthy discussion.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she did not believe they could legalize anything. She said that the owners should have gotten the necessary approvals prior to spending money on the pergola and the installation.
 - o Ms. Hengstler responded that the owners had gotten permission from the building inspectors who came out to their property. She said the owners were told that since the pergola was a temporary structure, they could install it.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that since the owners had applied for approval for the decks, they should have known that any further appendage that exceeded the Historical Commission's prior approval would need to be reviewed again.
- Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Detwiler said that once the pergola gets bolted down to the roof deck it is no longer a temporary structure.
 - o Ms. Hengstler remarked that unfortunately the owners had heard different things from different inspectors about what kind of approval they would need.
- Mr. Cluver responded that the job of a building inspector was to confirm that what got built reflected what was on the plans and not to speculate as to what could be

approved. He noted that in the case of legalizations, the Architectural Committee considers whether the illegal work would have been approved had the applicants applied for the appropriate approvals. Mr. Cluver stated that he would not have approved this shade structure.

- Ms. Lukachik agreed with Mr. Cluver and remarked that she remembered this application very well because the Architectural Committee members found the proposal to be a complete reconstruction rather than a repair. She said that she understood the compromise the Historical Commission ultimately made to approve the upper deck. However, she never would have recommended approval of the pergola as built.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked who had called the inspector out to the property.
 - o Ms. Hengstler replied that an inspector visits the property periodically during the construction project.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the pergola was completely inappropriate.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that there was no way this pergola was temporary.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Gutterman.
- Ms. Stein agreed that nothing about this application was acceptable nor should be approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The pergola is highly visible from the public right-of-way.
- The pergola far exceeds what was approved by the Historical Commission and anything that would have been recommended for approval by the Architectural Committee.
- The pergola is not in any way a temporary structure.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The high visibility of the pergola structure is not appropriate for the building or the historic district and therefore does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization of the pergola, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 541 N 23RD ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2430 PINE ST

Proposal: Reconstruct rear wall; construct addition with roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Miguel Aguilo-Seara and Matthew McAuliffe

Applicant: David Whipple, Assimilation Design Lab LLC

History: c. 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to reconstruct the rear wall at the first floor and construct second and third-floor additions with roof decks at 2430 Pine Street. The applicant's cover letter states that front-façade masonry work and structural bolts may be added to the scope of work in the future. For this review, the Architectural Committee should focus on the proposed work to the rear of the building and roof only.

Most of the buildings in this row were constructed circa 1850. At the time of original construction, the buildings were configured with a brick main block and one-story wood frame porch or addition at the rear (as shown in Figure 2). Over time, the rear sections of buildings in this row have been significantly altered.

The proposed materials at the addition would be a cement board lap siding, with simulated divided lite windows and doors. Metal vertical picket railings with a black finish are proposed at the decks and spiral stair. The existing rear eave line would be covered, but not demolished, to construct the upper deck.

The Historical Commission approved a rear alteration at 2426 Pine Street in this row in 2014.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish first floor rear wall.
- Demolish rear wall of main block at second and third floors.
- Extend second floor over first floor and construct new rear wall.
- Add small addition off third-floor main block with roof deck and spiral stair.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 DECEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Construct upper deck behind roof ridge with wood screening.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New addition, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spacial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The exterior work shown to the first, second, and third-floor rears may meet Standard 9. The roof deck and wood screening covering the deck framing do not meet Standard 9 in terms of materials, features, scale, and proportion.
- *Standard 10: New additions, exterior alterations, 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.*
 - o The full removal of the rear wall of the main block at the second and third floors does not meet Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The upper roof deck, wood screen, and spiral stair would be highly visible from the public right-of-way on S. 25th Street. The current proposed design does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:49:38

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect David Whipple and owners Miguel Aguilo-Seara and Matthew McAuliffe represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Whipple provided an overview of the project and details of the design proposal.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification on the extent of rear wall demolition.
 - o Mr. Whipple said the existing first-floor rear ell is built short of the adjacent properties by seven to eight inches and their plan is to move that first-floor wall back to align with the adjacent properties. He continued that at the second and third floor, only portions of those wall will be removed. Mr. Whipple referenced floorplans that show this in the application.
- Ms. Gutterman commented the change to the third floor is dramatic. She added that the entire roof addition is not approvable owing to the visibility of the deck and the size of the overbuild on the main block. Mr. McCoubrey agreed noting that to get the deck up there, the overbuild overwhelms the main block of the house and is highly visible.
 - o Mr. Whipple said they would be willing to remove the deck at the top roof area from the proposal.

- Ms. Gutterman said that the applicant also needs to look at what the overbuild at the third floor is doing to the main block roof.
 - o Mr. Whipple explained that the cornice is remaining but would be covered up by the third-floor addition. He pointed out that a similar design was used at the 2426 Pine Street project.
 - o Ms. Gutterman said that the proposal is not acceptable. She explained that if they are proposing to put a bathroom addition on the third floor, the ceiling of that addition should tie in below the rear cornice. Ms. Gutterman said that it may have worked at 2426 Pine Street but it not approvable here because of the loss of historic fabric and its visibility from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Detwiler said he agreed with Ms. Gutterman's comments on the third floor and roof deck. He added that the alterations at the first and second floor are fine from his point of view. He continued that for the third floor, perhaps limiting the work to reconfiguring the existing bathroom space and creating access to a rear roof deck may suffice while leaving the historic cornice line in place.
- Ms. Lukachik agreed with Mr. Detwiler's comments and noted she is concerned about the amount of wall being removed from the third-floor rear main block.
- Mr. Cluver said that he understands that the plan proposes to align 2430 Pine Street with the adjacent properties but that even this modest 6-foot 3-inch addition makes the changes to the rear of all the properties more visible.
- Ms. Stein said she recognizes the tricky layout on the third floor. She suggested a bay window at the rear wall to expand the space and allow room for additional bathroom space. Ms. Stein noted it could be inserted under the eave and the rear door could be set back in the wall.
 - o Mr. Detwiler pointed out this would minimize the amount of demolition to the rear wall.
 - o Mr. Cluver said it should be in the location of the existing window.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey said that the bay could slightly interrupt the cornice as he understands there is a low ceiling in that area.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Changes proposed to the first and second floor are generally acceptable.
- The proposed roof deck is not acceptable, owing to the size of the overbuild to the main block of the house and the visibility from the public right-of-way.
- The proposed removal of the third-floor rear wall is not recommended and covering up the rear cornice for the third-floor addition results in a loss of historic fabric and character. The applicant should retain as much of the third-floor rear wall as possible. A bay window in the location of the existing window would allow for additional space in the bathroom and a larger third-floor roof deck.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The roof deck, wood screening covering the deck framing, and third-floor addition do not meet Standard 9 in terms of materials, features, scale, and proportion.
- The full removal of the rear wall of the main block at the third floor does not meet Standard 10.

- The upper roof deck, wood screen, and spiral stair would be highly visible from the public right-of-way on S. 25th Street. The current proposed design does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 2430 PINE ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2021 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Demolish majority of existing buildings; construct five-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: San-Mor Limited Partnership

Applicant: Jason Morris, 2021 Sansom Street Development Associates LLC

History: 2021 Sansom St: 1850; converted to roofing company in 1920s; theater in the 1960s

2023 Sansom St: 1860; converted to commercial use about 1900; theater in the 1980s

Individual Designation: None

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

2021 Sansom St: Non-contributing

2023 Sansom St: Contributing

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

OVERVIEW: Located in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District on a block of two to four-story mixed-use buildings, the consolidated property known as 2021 Sansom Street includes two formerly separate buildings, at 2021 Sansom Street and 2023 Sansom Street. The one-story structure at 2021 Sansom is listed as non-contributing, while the circa 1860 three-story former rowhouse at 2023 Sansom is listed as contributing to the district. The property at 2021 Sansom was developed as courtyard houses about 1850, converted for a roofing company in the 1920s, and converted to a nightclub and then a movie theater in the 1960s. The rowhouse building at 2023 Sansom was converted from residential to commercial use around the turn of the twentieth century. The buildings were joined when 2023 Sansom Street was converted to a movie theater in the 1980s.

This application proposes to demolish the non-contributing building at 2021 Sansom, and some of the contributing building at 2023 Sansom, retaining approximately 16 feet of the historic building at the front and creating openings in the party wall on all floor levels. A new building would be constructed behind the remnant of 2023 Sansom, building up an additional two floors

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 DECEMBER 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

from the ridge line of the existing gabled roof and straight up from the rear facade. On the portion of 2023 Sansom Street, the addition would be clad in metal paneling. A new storefront loosely based on a historic photograph of the property and other historic storefronts along Sansom Street would be installed in the existing front façade. On the portion of the property at 2021 Sansom Street, the building would be five stories in height and clad in brick with two columns of punched windows with cast stone lintels and sills. The first floor would feature some brick detailing and a cornice below the second-floor window sills.

A similar application was reviewed and recommended for denial at the 23 November 2021 Architectural Committee meeting but withdrawn prior to the Historical Commission meeting. The Committee requested renderings to determine the level of visibility of the proposed addition on the contributing portion of the property, noting that it had the potential to overwhelm the historic building, and requested modifications to the design of the new construction.

The staff asserts that the new renderings demonstrate that the addition overwhelms the historic building, but recommends approval if the addition is pulled back so that the full gabled roof of the rowhouse is retained and the details of the storefront are refined, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing building and most of contributing building
- Rehabilitate front façade of contributing building
- Construct five-story building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - o The proposed construction destroys the character-defining gabled roof shape, and therefore fails to satisfy Standard 2.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed construction the destroys the historic massing of the three-story rowhouse building, removing substantial amounts of historic material that characterizes the property, including much of the gabled roof, and therefore this portion of the application fails to satisfy Standard 9.

The proposed addition is five stories in height and clad in brick with punched window openings. The use of masonry is generally compatible with the historic district. This portion of the application satisfies Standard 9.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The addition would require significant demolition of the three-story rowhouse building, removing the essential form and integrity of the historic building, therefore making it irreversible. The application fails to satisfy Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the full gabled roof of the rowhouse is retained and the details of the storefront are refined, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:09:36

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Charles Kerr and developer Jason Morris represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Kerr explained that he was recently retained to redesign the project. He noted that there were approximately 10 bullet points from the previous review that they intended to address, including the use of full brick on the 2021 Sansom portion, punched openings, a brick first-floor, pedestrian-friendliness, a more appropriate storefront opening, and cornice line below the second floor windows in roughly the same location as that of the historic photograph. On the contributing side, 2023 Sansom, they intend to maintain the stucco since they are not sure of the condition under the brick, and for the alterations to the storefront, tried to reference the historic photograph, which showed a roof over a divided-lite storefront. He noted that they have set the addition back to the ridge line, and clad it in metal paneling to differentiate it from the old. They have created single, punched window openings with no transoms, and have kept the ground floor distinctly separate from the upper floors. He noted that they are trying to maintain as much of the façade of 2023 as possible as well as the front slope of the gable roof, the interior floor plates, and as much of the existing interior shared party wall as possible.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that he appreciates the changes to the storefront and suggested that the applicants could work out the details with the staff.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the floors of the new construction at 2021 Sansom are taller than the neighbors to either side, noting that the sill lines do not appear to completely match.
 - o Mr. Kerr responded that the sill lines are intended to align with 2023, and that the floor plates will align as well. He noted that the heights may appear misleading because the windows are about one foot taller.
 - o Mr. Detwiler opined that the height jump of the windows is out of scale with the block.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested setting the top two floors of the new construction back because this block of Sansom Street is a street of low-rise buildings.
 - o Mr. Kerr responded that they could change the finish of the fourth and fifth floors, but that he would have to discuss the possibility of additional setbacks.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the brick of the façade wraps onto the shared wall but not on the opposite neighbor. He suggested that there should be a return of 18-24 inches on the east elevation so that the façade does not appear like a billboard.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed, noting that the applicants could look to the parking garage to the west.
- Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the staff has a legitimate concern about the rear slope of the roof of 2023 Sansom Street being consumed by addition. He opined that the addition looms and is highly visible over the historic three-story gable-roofed building. He noted that the staff has suggested pulling the addition back to allow the full gable to express.

- o Mr. Kerr opined that at the previous Architectural Committee meeting, they had understood that the Committee might be open to aligning with the ridge line and left the possibility open-ended.
- o Mr. Morris noted that they played around with other options, but if they recess the addition any further, they would cut into the new stair/fire tower. He hoped it would be acceptable to work off ridge line since they tried to address the Committee's other concerns. He noted that the proposed construction is below what zoning allows by-right under FAR and are trying to make sense financially of the project. He opined that if they lose more square footage, it is difficult to justify financially.
- Ms. Stein commented that she is unhappy where the design landed. She opined that a five-story mass interrupts the eclectic low-rise feel of the block and that the design of the project feelings disjointed. She opined if the applicants set back the fourth and fifth floors on the 2021 Sansom Street portions, the project could have more unity.
 - o Mr. Kerr responded that in the previous meeting, the Committee had been very adamant that the two buildings should be distinctly different. He noted that his predecessor did what Ms. Stein is now suggesting and the Committee opposed it.
 - o Ms. Stein commented that the design lacks detail to make it rich and eclectic. She opined that the applicants could step two floors back and still get a decent volume of building. She opined that a highly visible metal box on top of the historic building is inappropriate, and that lack of cornice, undersized windows, and rhythm of panels are also inappropriate.
 - o Mr. Kerr opined that in previous projects they have provided those types of details and are typically asked to change to a different material and asked to differentiate the new from old. He argued that the Committee's current comments conflict with those of the review for the previous design. He asserted that they have made the changes the Committee asked for, including aligning cornice lines, use brick cladding with cast stone lintels and sills, and punched openings.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the lack of detail sophistication of the overbuild and facades at the street and height jump to five stories is problematic. He opined that the addition and infill construction should be set back further, but that perhaps in exchange a sixth story set farther back might be acceptable. At the street façade, however, five stories is too tall. He suggested also that ceiling heights and windows be treated in a more consistent manner, and that detailing is important. He noted that the applicants gave some thought to the first floor of the historic building itself, but details are lacking in the rest. He opined that the smallness of windows on addition on 2023 makes the mass of the structure seem bigger.
 - o Ms. Lukachik commented that maybe the setback for the new construction does not need to be a whole unit, but just five feet or so as a compromise to break up the massing.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro opined that a sixth floor pushed back to be unseen could be an acceptable option and allow the applicants to gain square footage where it will be less visible.
 - o Mr. Morris explained that they prefer a five-story building to a six-story building and were looking to do a taller building on the non-contributing part of the property. On the contributing 2023 side, almost more square footage is within the stairs, and losing even one unit makes a huge difference in the project. Apart from looking at a six-story building, they are utilizing the by-right FAR but not overutilizing it.

- Mr. Cluver noted the scale of the block is two to four stories, so there is an inherent struggle of trying to fit a five-story building in on a three-story street. He noted, if it is a financial hardship to build a lower building, a financial hardship application could be submitted. Mr. Cluver noted that he has concerns about stepping the building back and the potential that it will create lots of pitches, the potential for visible balconies, and other problems, but, that depending on the depth of plane and architectural treatment of a revised design, that might change his perspective.
- Mr. Kerr expressed frustration that they tried to address specific comments made by the Architectural Committee previously and now are being given different suggestions that seem to conflict with those earlier comments.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that design is iterative, and the further down a road one gets from an initial concept, the more potential there is to vary from it.
- Mr. McCoubrey remarked that he has issues with the massing and details of the proposed design. He commented that he would prefer to see it all as four stories, but more massing further back might be okay if it is not visible. He noted that the storefront cornice on the 2021 Sansom portion is higher than others on the block and suggested lowering it.
 - o Mr. Kerr responded that the height is based on the historic photograph of the one-story building.
 - o Committee members agreed that the cornice should come down.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey opined that the cast stone beltcourse at the roofline is redundant and should be an actual cornice. He also opined that the parapet is too high, and that floor-to-ceiling heights typically get smaller as one moves up the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the proposed massing overwhelms Sansom Street and the historic building.
- Mr. Morris commented that they have received a lot of great comments and hopefully can satisfy the Committee and Commission with additional design changes. He noted that they are on a tight time constraint and willing to make modifications as they go but want a solution on the massing to move forward.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that it is difficult to say yes to the massing, especially because of its impact to the historic portion of the property at 2023 Sansom.
 - o Mr. Morris replied that they can try to bring the massing down, and that there may be a way to recess the upper floors on the 2021 portion but adding a sixth floor adds about 20% to the cost.
 - o Mr. Morris noted that zoning allows for much more than they are proposing.
 - o Mr. Cluver and Ms. Stein responded that the property is subject to multiple regulations, including the regulation that comes with historic designation. By-right zoning and FAR are not the only things that matter.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted it is not the Historical Commission's charge to ensure that a given project is financially viable. The Committee and Commission pay close attention to a project's impact on historic resources, and based on the Committee and staff's consensus, the historic building at 2023 Sansom is suffering from the volume and details of the proposed structure.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The massing of the proposed overbuild on the contributing portion of the property at 2023 Sansom is too visible and overwhelms the historic building. Additional setbacks should be explored.
- Five stories at the street plane on the non-historic portion of the property at 2021 Sansom Street is too tall for the context of the block which is predominantly two to four-stories. Possibilities for reducing the massing of the top two floors may include setbacks as well as lowering the parapet and floor-to-floor heights of the upper floors.
- In exchange for additional setbacks of the proposed overbuild and new construction, a sixth floor set back so that it is not visible from the public right-of-way may be acceptable.
- The height of the storefront cornice above the first floor on the non-contributing portion of the property should be lowered to align with others on the block.
- A real cornice should be added to the new construction at 2021 rather than a beltcourse.
- The brick cladding should have a return on the east elevation of at least 18-24 inches.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed construction destroys the character-defining gabled roof shape and overwhelms the historic building, and therefore fails to satisfy Standards 2 and 10.
- The five-story massing of the proposed construction at 2021 Sansom is out of scale with the two to four-story context of the block, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 2021 SANSOM ST 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:50:20

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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