

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

**TUESDAY, 24 JUNE 2025
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

- Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Josh Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown Civic Association
- Allison Knight
- Amanda Mazie
- Benjamin Estepani, Pace Architecture & Design
- Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNObdesign
- Carl Massara
- Daniel Trubman
- David Gest, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
- David Traub, Save Our Sites
- Emily Kaplan
- Eric Quick
- Eva Zhou
- Evan Litvin, LO Design
- Eva Surmacz
- Gi Giannone, AOS Architects

Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Hassan Edge, WJH Construction
Jay Farrell
Jeff Regan, Tallulah & Bird
Jeffrey McMahon
John Hunter
Josh Fishbein
Jules Pepitone
Kim Wittenberg
Lea Litvin, LO Design
Lorna Katz
Manu
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Rachael Pritzker, Esq.
Rich Leimbach
Robert Kramer
Rustin Ohler, HDO Architecture
Sam Xu, Constrecture LLC
Samuel Olshin, AOS Architects
Stephanie Pennypacker
Steve Black, HDO Architecture
Talluah Regan, Tallulah & Bird
Thomas Keller, CANNOfdesign
Zach Murphy

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 317 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct three-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. Peter's School

Applicant: Sam Olshin, AOS Architects

History: 1873; Saint Peter's School; Lewis Esler; Addition, Mitchell/Guirgola, 1983

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition to the St. Peter's School building at 317 Lombard Street. This Historical Commission approved three earlier versions of this application in 2019, 2021, and 2024, all of which proposed a stand-alone, multi-use building to the east of the school on a surface parking lot owned by St. Peter's Church. The earlier applications proposed a multi-use building that would have been used by both the school and the church. The church has decided not to pursue the project, so the school is now proposing an addition for exclusively school use to the western side of the extant school building on Lombard Street. The original school building was constructed in 1873 and added to in 1983. The school building is classified as contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. The proposed addition would attach to the west façade of the 1983 addition and would be clad in brick and brick-colored composite panels. It would approximate the massing and rhythm of the large three-story rowhouses that once stood on the site.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The addition would be differentiated from the historic building and would be compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features with the property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:06

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Sam Olshin and Gi Giannone represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Olshin introduced the Architectural Committee to the project. He explained that

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JUNE 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

the addition includes classrooms, a half-court gymnasium and assembly space, and a rooftop play area. The addition will make the existing school building accessible. He explained that they made a minor revision to the north façade of the addition since submitting the application in response to comments from the Society Hill Civic Association. He stated that they will need a zoning variance to build to 41 feet to align with the existing cornice. Zoning allows 38 feet in height. Mr. Olshin reported that three-story rowhouses once stood on the site but were demolished many years ago. The addition will be massed like the former rowhouses. He showed the site plans and context photographs of the 1873 school building and 1983 addition. He showed floor plans of the existing building and proposed addition. He showed renderings of the interior and exterior of the proposed addition. Mr. Olshin described the proposed materials including glass block, brick, and porcelain panels. He noted that some of the brick red panels on the rear or north façade were changed to gray panels.

- Mr. Cluver asked about the glass block in the gym façade.
 - Mr. Olshin stated that it is four-inch-thick glass block, called masonry glass block. It is intended to be transparent and durable.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the rooftop mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Olshin stated that it will be screened so that it cannot be seen from the street.
- Mr. Olshin explained that the rooftop play area will include screening for acoustic and visual purposes. The rooftop area will include a mesh around the perimeter to prevent balls and other objects from leaving the area and will also include fabric screens to shade the area.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the current proposal includes solar panels.
 - Mr. Olshin replied that it does not, but they may be added later.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the roofline should drop down where the new building meets the old.
 - Mr. Olshin pointed out the notch in the roofline where the addition meets the existing building.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro indicated that the notch should be 10 inches in depth.
 - Mr. Olshin responded that it is exactly 10 inches in depth.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about archaeology. He noted that an archaeological investigation was undertaken at the earlier site to the east.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that this site is not identified as having archaeological potential in the historic district's inventory. Nonetheless, the applicant has taken archaeology into account. The addition will not have a basement and will not require significant excavation. The addition will have a small area below grade for mechanical equipment, but that area will coincide with a former basement and should not disturb any potential archaeological resources.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Olshin to confirm that the cladding materials around the bench area on the front façade would be sturdy and would stand up to extensive use.
 - Mr. Olshin explained that the cladding behind the bench will be porcelain panels, which will be very durable.
- Ms. Stein stated that metal panels should not be used on the rear façade facing the cemetery.
 - Mr. Olshin stated that porcelain panels, not metal panels, are proposed for the rear façade.
 - Ms. Stein said that she would prefer brick.
 - Mr. Olshin stated that they preferred the porcelain panels because they have a slightly larger module than brick.

- o Ms. Stein advocated for brick.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni, the chair of the Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee of the Society Hill Civic Association, stated that the applicants had presented the project to his committee at a public community meeting but that his committee has not yet had an opportunity to formulate an opinion on the project. Mr. Boni thanked the applicants for their willingness to work with the community.
- Manu, who did not provide a full name, expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to see the project. She noted that she enjoyed walking in the neighborhood and photographing it. She opined that the weather has been very hot.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property with school building at 317 Lombard Street is classified as contributing in the inventory of the Society Hill Historic District.
- The property at 317 Lombard Street is not called out in the Society Hill Historic District inventory as having archaeological potential.
- The Historical Commission has approved three earlier versions of this project for the vacant lot to the east of the school. This application proposes building an addition to the west of the school building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The addition would be differentiated from the historic building and would be compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features with the property and its environment. The application satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the suggestion that more brick is used on the north facade and that the brick wraps around onto the west facade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 317 Lombard St MOTION: Approval 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	5				2

ADDRESS: 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 125, AND 127 N MOLE ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions; restore front facades

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Hassan Edge Jr., WJH Construction

Applicant: Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO design

History: 108: 1840, expanded into alley, new windows 1998, rear masonry fence wall demolished 2017; 109: 1835, new windows and doors 1972, rear one-story addition removed 1972; 110: 1840, rear masonry fence wall demolished 2017; historic door removed without permits 2019; 112: 1840, rear masonry fence wall demolished 2017; 114: 1840, rear masonry fence wall demolished 2017, door and frame replaced without permits 2018; 125: 1850, rear frame addition replaced with brick addition 1938; 127: 1850, rear alterations 1960.

Individual Designation: 9/26/1967

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application for in-concept review proposes to construct rear additions and restore the front facades of seven rowhouses on the 100 block of N. Mole Street, a block of brick rowhouses constructed between 1835 and 1850. Two different height options are proposed for the rear additions, with an applicant preference for the three-story height based on the relatively small square footage of the houses. Public visibility of the rears of the even-number addresses is from across a parking lot from N. 16th Street. There may be an oblique view of the rear of 109 N. Mole Street where a driveway cuts through from Cherry Street. There is no public visibility of the rears of the properties at 125 and 127 N. Mole Street. Front façade restoration work includes window, door, shutter, and stoop restoration or replacement and brick repointing. The Historical Commission's staff can typically review and approve this type of work administratively.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rear additions.
- Restore front facades.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The proposed front façade work will result in restoration or replacement with historically accurate windows, doors, shutters, stoops, and window sills.
- *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 construction of the proposed rear additions will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, and the additions will be compatible with the historic materials and features.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept of the two-story rear addition option, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JUNE 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:28:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Carey Jackson Yonce and Thomas Keller, and property owner Hassan Edge represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein opined that the three-story rear additions are appropriate for the three-story historic buildings, as long as the additions do not break the lines of the parapets.
 - o Mr. Yonce called attention to the notches between the historic buildings and the new additions, designed to maintain the parapet lines of the existing houses.
- Mr. D'Alessandro recommended that each building be treated individually, rather than as a whole where all buildings are receiving the same treatment. He stated that the existing two-story buildings should have two-story rear additions, and the existing three-story buildings could have three-story rear additions, but the additions should be designed to reflect the characteristics of each unique building. He stated that the proposed work to the front facades should follow this same treatment, in that each is considered individually in terms of what can be restored instead of replaced. He questioned the need to replace front facade elements rather than restore them all.
 - o Some Architectural Committee members and the applicant pointed out that this application requests an in-concept review so that the Architectural Committee can provide feedback on the overall massing proposal and front facade scope, which would be individualized for each property when submitted for final review. The in-concept application provides an overall concept for the group of properties. Individualized applications will be submitted at a later date for final approval.
 - o Ms. Chantry noted that many elements on the fronts of these properties were replaced without permits in the recent past and therefore are neither original nor historic fabric.
- Mr. Cluver recommended that the scale of the windows on the rear additions be reconsidered to be more responsive to the historic character of the block.
- Mr. Cluver asked about decks on the rear additions.
 - o Mr. Yonce responded that the two-story rear additions are proposed to have small decks with parapets, but the three-story rear additions would not have decks.
 - o Mr. Cluver suggested that a railing on the two-story additions may be more appropriate than a parapet wall.
- Ms. Gutterman recommended that each rear addition is considered individually.
 - o Mr. Cluver agreed, noting that rear additions are not always on the same side and instead could be paired or otherwise reflect the existing placement of rear doors.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that 109 N. Mole Street is a two-story building, so it should only receive a two-story rear addition with deck.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the parapets on the three-story rear additions could be lowered, which would make it easier to clean the hyphen areas between the buildings and the rear additions.
- Ms. Gutterman recommended creating an inventory of each building that would list

original and replaced elements like windows and doors. She stated that the inventory could then be used to determine the approach of repair versus replacement for the front facade scopes of work.

- Property owner and contractor Hassan Edge introduced himself and stated that he is excited to honor the history of this block and that his goals for the restoration of the properties align with the comments of the Architectural Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in general support of the investment in these historic buildings and the need to treat each building uniquely for the restoration scope.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This application was submitted for in-concept review. The applicant will need to submit again for final review, at which time more details should be provided for each unique property.
- Roof decks on any two-story rear additions are appropriate but not on any three-story rear additions.
- An inventory of each building should be created documenting what is original or historic fabric and what is not. This inventory can then be used to determine the approach of repair versus replacement for the front facade scopes of work.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed front façade work will result in restoration or replacement with historically accurate windows, doors, shutters, stoops, and window sills, which will be determined based on an inventory of all facades to be provided by the applicant, satisfying Standard 6.
- The construction of the proposed rear additions will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, and the additions will be compatible with the historic materials and features with recommended design revisions, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, provided the rear additions respond to the character of each building and do not extend above the parapet lines, the windows in the additions respond to the scale of each building, any rear roof decks do not extend above existing parapets, and any front facade elements proposed for replacement are called out as such in application materials submitted for final approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ITEM: 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 125, and 127 N Mole St MOTION: Approval in concept 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	5				2

ADDRESS: 800 S 5TH ST

Proposal: Construct third-floor rear addition; alter rear wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Quinn Blackwell

Applicant: Carl Massara

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 6/2/1975

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic rear addition, construct a third-floor rear addition, and alter the rear wall openings of this corner building in Queen Village. New basement windows will be installed into existing basement window openings, which are currently infilled with plywood.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove non-historic rear addition.
- Construct third-floor rear addition.
- Alter rear wall openings.
- Install basement windows.

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 alterations will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JUNE 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:53:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carl Massara represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Massara outlined the project scope.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the age of the existing second-story wood addition proposed for removal.
 - o Ms. Chantry displayed a photograph from 1981 that showed a two-story wood addition. It was noted that the first floor of the addition has since been opened up.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the two-story brick addition was always a wing of the main house, or if it was an individual house that was later combined with the main house.
 - o Ms. Chantry responded that she was unable to determine this one way or the other based on historic map research and the Historical Commission's files on the property.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the transition of the brickwork where the new third-floor addition will connect to the existing rear addition. He asked if there is an existing brick cornice on the side or some other form of articulation in the existing brick that could be maintained.
 - o Mr. Massara responded that his intention is to match the brick and mortar as close as possible. He explained that he needs to lower the existing top of the rear addition in order to construct the new addition, because of his adjustment of ceiling heights so that the new addition sits below the historic cornice of the main building.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the new rear elevation windows are a standard size rather than floor-to-ceiling doors with Juliette balconies.
 - o Mr. Massara responded that he can easily make this adjustment, but that he was trying to get as much light into the rear rooms as possible.
- Mr. McCoubrey recommended that the windows in the rear wall align with the heads of the windows on the main building.
 - o Mr. Massara responded that he could make that change to the drawings.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the rear windows be shifted slightly so that they are more centered on the rear dormer.
 - o Mr. Massara noted that there is a fireplace proposed for the side of the room, which is why the windows were shown slightly off-center, but that he can look into this and also the question of a chimney.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the first-floor rear windows could be casements instead of sliders.
 - o Mr. Massara noted that he would like to lower these windows to be more like sliding doors.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey indicated that this would be an acceptable change.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Centering the new rear windows below the existing rear dormer may be visually desirable.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed alterations will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions with several modifications, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the rear elevation uses standard windows to match the size of the side windows, the Juliette balconies are omitted, and any brick cornice or special treatment of the existing brick on the rear addition is retained when the third story is constructed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 800 S 5th 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	5				2

ADDRESS: 700 S 2ND ST

Proposal: Demolish one-story buildings; construct four-story buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Emily Larfviere

Applicant: Evan Litvin, LO Design

History: 1785

Individual Designation: 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson.Mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolishing two one-story buildings and constructing two four-story buildings at 700 S. 2nd Street. The property runs west from S. 2nd Street to S. Philip Street along Bainbridge Street. The building at the southeast corner of S. 2nd and Bainbridge Streets was constructed about 1785 and individually designated in 1966. The other two buildings on the property are considered non-contributing to the historic resource. The middle one-story building was constructed in the 1940s. The one-story building at the southeast corner of S. Philip and Bainbridge Street, at the rear of the property, was historically designated and

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JUNE 2025

11

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

listed the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places as 208 Bainbridge Street in 1958, but the designation was rescinded after the upper floors and roof were demolished in 1959.

The two proposed four-story buildings will be single-family residences with pilot houses and roof decks. They will be clad in red brick with entrances facing onto Bainbridge Street. The new buildings will be built directly adjacent to the historic building but there will be no internal connection.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish two one-story buildings.
- Construct two four-story buildings.

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 design of the proposed four-story buildings successfully differentiates itself from the historic building through its more contemporary design but maintains material compatibility through the use of red brick cladding. However, the massing, size, and scale of the proposed buildings are too large. They should be reduced in height. The cornice of the new buildings should match or be lower than the roofline of the historic building in order to meet Standard 9.
 - o The scale and rhythm of the window openings of the proposed buildings are not compatible with the historic building. The design should be further studied and revised to meet Standard 9.
- *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 will be unimpaired.*
 - o If a future owner wishes to return 700 S. 2nd Street to its original appearance, the two new buildings could be removed and the historic rear openings restored; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval of a revised design with reduced height and window openings that are more compatible with the rhythm and scale of the historic building, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:11:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Evan Litvin and Lea Litvin and owner Francis Mangubat represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein commented on the massing, scale, and window patterns. She stated that the proposal is a clever urban infill project but perhaps a bit too clever. Ms. Stein said that the design is trying to insert an extra floor within the volume of space, but it is

not successful for a number of reasons. The proposed buildings are discontinuous with the rhythm of the adjoining building. She continued that the extra floor being inserted is not successful because it breaks from the pattern of the streetscape. She noted that this is important because the parcel is individually designated and the rhythm is critical to the site and the neighborhood. Ms. Stein observed that the compression of the first floor is unusual. She said the first floor of the proposed buildings is not as tall as the upper floors, which is unusual, and the first floor breaks the line and the water table of the adjoining building on the primary elevation. Ms. Stein expressed concern about the height of the proposed buildings and stated that it is important for the new construction to maintain the cornice line of the building that is designated historic.

- Ms. Stein stated that the design should bring together the context of the neighborhood, but it currently does not. She objected to the composition of the elevations and noted the inappropriateness of the large scale of the windows. She stated that the misaligned floors cause the proposed buildings to stand out as separate objects. Ms. Stein concluded that, even though it is red brick, the design does not do enough to pull together the context of this block and neighborhood.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the building is individually designated and not within a historic district. He noted that his observation is that the surrounding built context is kind of a jumbled neighborhood and in that sense the proposed design has more in common with the neighborhood around it than it does with the designated property. Mr. Cluver observed that the property is individually designated, so the proposed buildings should be compatible with the designated resource, not so much the surrounding neighborhood. He acknowledged that the proposed design uses brick and one of the windows picks up the sizes of the windows in the historic building, but there is no sense of that connection or the scale or the rhythm, or anything like that. Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed buildings, as an addition to the designated building, are not compatible.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the first floors of the proposed buildings are incompatible because the design is forcing a four-story building into a three-story massing. He contended that a three-story building with a fourth floor as a penthouse might be successful, but he acknowledged that the narrowness of the lot may not provide enough room for a setback.
- Mr. McCoubrey also expressed concern about the two pilot houses that he assumed would be visible and noted that the design is aggressive in its form and material.
 - o Mr. Cluver stated that the pilot houses appeared taller than the floors below them.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the basement level. He noted that one elevation drawing showed it having egress windows right on the street, but the renderings and floorplans did not. Mr. Cluver asked about the dimensions of the egress wells to understand how intrusive they would be. He stated that he is concerned about the egress windows directly onto the street.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated the proposed design has too much glass.
- Mr. Mangubat, the owner of the property, said that he lives in the neighborhood near the corner of Front and Fitzwater Streets in a historically designated building. He pointed out that there are numerous four-story buildings around 700 S. 2nd Street. Mr. Mangubat said that he is flexible on the design and will defer to his architects and the Historical Commission for recommendations.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that the proposed buildings have a large and aggressive scale relative to the historic building.

- Ms. Gutterman pointed out that there is no setback between the new development and the historic building and that the new construction obscures the party wall.
 - o Mr. Litvin, the architect, replied that he can reconsider this detail.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Amanda Maisie, a neighboring resident at 715 S. Philips Street, opposed the application. She stated the proposed application does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She asked the developer to lower the cornice height, reduce the height of the pilot houses, eliminate the solid parapet wall on the south side of the roof deck, and reduce the overall height of the building. Ms. Maisie also voiced concerns about zoning issues.
- Emily Kaplan, a neighboring resident at 702 S. 2nd Street, opposed the application. She requested that the developer consider lowering the height of the building in order to maintain the current historic character, light, air, and views. Ms. Kaplan asked the Committee to deny the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed buildings would stand taller than the historic building. It may not be possible to design four-story buildings for this site that will be compatible with the historic building.
- The scale or the rhythm of the proposed buildings are not compatible with those of the historic buildings.
- The property is individually designated and not part of a historic district. The proposed design should focus on compatibility with the historic building rather than the surrounding buildings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9; the proposed four-story buildings are incompatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building. They should be reduced in height. The cornice of the new buildings should match or be lower than the roofline of the historic building to satisfy Standard 9.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 as the scale and rhythm or the window openings of the proposed buildings are not compatible with those of the historic building.
- The application satisfies Standard 10; the proposed buildings could be removed and the historic building restored.

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

ITEM: 700 S 2nd 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				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 4567 FLEMING ST

Proposal: Construct two additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Timothy Spell

Applicant: Brett Harman, Harman Deutch Ohler Architecture

History: 1868

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Victorian Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 5/13/2022

Staff Contact: Allyson.Mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a two-story addition to the historic building and a separate two-story building with a walk-out basement at 4567 Fleming Street. The three-story, two-bay historic building was constructed of stone in the late 1860s. Details of a brick rear ell with a wood porch appeared on historic maps beginning in 1923 but may have been constructed at an earlier date. The property is a contributing resource to the Victorian Roxborough Historic District. The legal parcel is located at the edge of the historic district and the majority of properties facing the property are not within the district boundary. The public visibility of some of the proposed changes may be limited, owing to existing landscaping and natural slope of the full parcel.

The proposed two-story garage addition is set back from the street and is connected by a new hyphen structure to the rear ell behind the main block of the historic building. A covered porch and sections of the wall of the rear ell would be removed to connect the addition to the house. The proposed design shows a shed roof and vertical composite wood siding with a dark finish. A separate two-story building with a walk-out basement is proposed for an open area to the north of the house. The design of the new building is like that of the proposed garage addition with a shed roof and composite wood siding. A suspended metal walkway connects the new building to the addition's hyphen connector.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove sections of the south wall of rear ell.
- Construct garage addition.
- Construct two-story building with a walk-out basement.

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 two-story garage addition is successfully differentiated from the historic building through its massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The use of a hyphen structure to connect the historic building and new garage successfully limits the removal of historic materials and eases the transition between the old and new. Although the general massing is compatible, the architectural details such as the shed roof and dark vertical siding are not compatible with the historic building; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 9. As proposed, the degree of differentiation between historic and new construction is too great with the addition's design competing with historic building rather than complementing it.
 - o Similar to the garage addition, the proposed design for the stand-alone building is not compatible with the historic building but the physical separation from the historic building makes its lack of compatibility less crucial; therefore, the proposed new stand-alone building could meet Standard 9.
 - o There will be limited visibility of the proposed elevated walkway between the addition and new building, therefore it meets Standard 9.
- *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 will be unimpaired.*
 - o The removal of historic materials from the historic building is limited to a side porch and select areas of the rear ell's south wall. If a future owner wishes to return it to its original appearance, the hyphen structure and addition could be removed leaving the rear ell largely intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the cladding and roof shape of the garage addition and stand-alone building are revised to be more compatible with the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:33:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to respond to the staff's recommendation.
 - o Mr. Ohler replied that the dark-colored siding color is the client's preference. He said they worked closely with the owner on the materials, pointing out that the shed roof was designed to accommodate solar panels and take advantage of the angle of the sun. Mr. Ohler stated that the property has always been single family and the current owner plans to continue to use it for his family. He said that the owner intends to maintain the existing landscaping and natural screening. Mr. Ohler pointed out that the larger, standalone addition would appear as a separate structure from Fleming Street, and would be obscured, owing to the landscaping

and changes in grade. He said the historic building will be minimally altered to accommodate the garage addition. They will only remove the rear porch and the window openings for the addition's connection.

- Ms. Gutterman asked if the client would consider an alternate siding color and suggested that a grayish color may be a good alternative. She added that she was recommending the color for both additions.
 - o Mr. Ohler suggested an alternate color may be reddish-brown. He said the material shown is a Japanese charred finish and the color is black not gray. Mr. Ohler said he would consult with the client on the color. He acknowledged that the Architectural Committee was suggesting an alternate color for both additions, and noted that an earlier conversation with the staff left him with the impression that a change in siding color was only being suggested for the garage addition.
- Mr. Ohler responded to the staff recommendation comments about the shed roof, explaining that the shed roof is important for the solar panels and green design.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the basement material.
 - o Mr. Ohler replied that the exterior basement walls would be concrete and would not be visible from the street or any public right-of-way.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the change in floor levels.
 - o Mr. Ohler confirmed there is no step up or change to the second floor throughout the entire site. He pointed out that it applies to the back building as well.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the configuration of rear standalone building.
 - o Mr. Ohler stated that it is two stories with a basement, so three levels total. He said it has a walkout basement due to the grade change at the lower level of the building. Mr. Ohler described the interior as containing a home office at the upper floor and a family room and guest suite at the first floor near the pool.
- Ms. Stein asked about the height of the standalone addition and commented that it looked very tall. She said that it feels like a four-story building because of the slope in grade. Ms. Stein observed that it appeared to be double the height of the neighboring properties and stated the proposed height seems overwhelming. Ms. Stein inquired about the height of the floors. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the nearby properties were limited to two floors
 - o Mr. Ohler replied that it is three-stories at the rear. He said the basement is ten feet floor to floor, first level is eleven feet floor to floor, and the second floor is eleven feet floor to floor and at the top angle of the roof it is fifteen feet. Mr. Ohler said their intent was to align the floors with those of the historic building. He said it is 32 feet in height from a zoning standpoint and 38 feet as a physical measurement to the highest point on the roof. Mr. Ohler pointed to the rendering in their submission that showed the standalone addition from Fleming Street and said that from the public right-of-way it looks like a detached structure on an adjacent lot.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that if the sloped roof was situated in the opposite direction, it would have less of a visual impact.
 - o Mr. Ohler replied that this would place the solar panels opposite the sun. He said that if the additions had a flat roof, they would stick up at the same slope.
- Mr. Cluver said he is under the impression that the whole design has been done to accommodate the solar panels. Mr. Cluver added that if the addition had a flat roof with a slight parapet, and the solar panels were angled, it would not be very visually obtrusive. Mr. McCoubrey agreed.
 - o Mr. Ohler said they would discuss this with their client.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the garage roof has a substantial overhang, and this may be creating a bulkier appearance than necessary. He noted the overhangs appear to be approximately eighteen inches.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the discussion could return to the question of exterior color. He asked Mr. Ohler if the composite siding is a pre-finished material.
 - o Mr. Ohler confirmed the siding was pre-finished.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he is always wary with color because what you think is neutral is not always as neutral as you want it to be. He said he also wary of a potential unintended consequence of saying no to the proposed to the charcoal color because it may be more benign than some of the other options out there.
- Ms. Gutterman said the issue is that the renderings make the color look dark in comparison to everything else and that it looks uncomfortable.
- Ms. Gutterman stated she had a question regarding the solar panels. She said the three-dimensional aerial rendering shows the panels on a small roof on the standalone addition and wondered if all panels were installed in in a similar direction would this reduce the visibility of the solar panels for the nearby neighbors.
 - o Mr. Ohler said they can explore if changing the orientation of the roof and solar panels.
- Ms. Gutterman recommended submitting a physical sample or a high-quality color photograph of the black siding to the Historical Commission for review. She said this would help them better understand how dark the material is.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he believed the black siding is going to stand out and a more neutral color is warranted in this location.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the proposed design of the additions is not compatible with the Victorian Roxborough Historic District. He said he did not understand why the proposed design needed to look so different from the historic, especially the materials.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Alternate neutral color schemes for the exterior siding should be explored.
- The applicant should provide a physical sample or a high-quality photograph of the prefabricated black siding.
- The property can accommodate two new additions without negatively impacting the historic character.
- The height and mass of the standalone addition is too tall and should be reconsidered.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, owing to the additions' architectural details. The shed roof and dark vertical siding are not compatible with the historic building; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 9. As proposed, the degree of differentiation between historic and new construction is too great with the additions' designs competing with historic building rather than complementing it.
- There will be limited visibility of the proposed elevated walkway between the addition and new building, therefore it meets Standard 9.
- The application satisfies Standard 10; the removal of historic materials from the

historic building is limited to a side porch and select areas of the rear ell's south wall. If a future owner wishes to return the historic building to its original appearance, the hyphen structure and addition could be removed, leaving the rear ell largely intact.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the massing, cladding, and roof shape of the garage addition and stand-alone building are revised to be more compatible with the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 4567 Fleming St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro		X			
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4	1			2

ADDRESS: 7321 ELBOW LN

Proposal: Construct one-story addition; modify window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael and Christina Peterson

Applicant: Jeffrey Regan, Tallulah Regan, and Eva Zhou, Tallulah & Bird

History: 1925; Willing, Sims & Talbutt

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: French Village Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2021

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story addition on a two-story wing of a large Norman style residence in the French Village Historic District. The property is classified as contributing to the historic district. The addition will be clad in stone matching that of the house and will feature wide windows and French doors on all sides and a hipped standing seam copper roof. Sections of a first-floor wall of the wing will be removed where the addition will connect to it. Stone will be salvaged to be used in the construction of the addition. The application also proposes widening an existing window on the adjacent southwestern facade of the building near the new addition.

The house was constructed in 1925 in a French Norman style as part of a planned suburban residential neighborhood. The proposed addition faces and will be minimally visible from the adjacent Elbow Lane and not visible from the adjacent McCallum Street. Most of the addition will be hidden behind tall garden walls that delimit a courtyard between the house and the street. The addition will feature windows and doors that will replicate the design of those on the historic building and a hipped copper roof that reflects the roof design of the historic building,

albeit in a different material. The construction of the addition will necessitate removing sections of a first-floor façade with windows and doors. The window on the southwestern façade proposed for widening will not be visible from any surrounding public rights-of-way but is a historic feature of the building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove sections of a first-floor wall, including windows and doors, on a wing of the house.
- Construct a one-story addition.
- Widen an existing window.

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 addition satisfies Standard 9. It will necessitate the removal of sections of an original exterior wall along with windows and doors. Its massing, size, scale, and architectural features are compatible with those of the historic building.

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

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

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Tallulah Regan, Jeff Regan, and Eva Zhao represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the addition's roof in relation to the second-floor windows and commented that it looks to be very close to the sills.
 - o Mr. Regan explained that the roof will be positioned approximately six inches below the sills, though the flashing will come up a bit closer to them.
 - o Ms. Gutterman suggested ensuring that the flashing also fully clears the sills. She added that, overall, the proposed addition is an acceptable modification to the historic building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented on the extent of removal that is being proposed for the first-floor wall of the existing building. He suggested that the project could be accomplished with less removal than is being proposed and particularly pointed out that the windows on the ends of the wall could be kept in some fashion while focusing the removal on the area around the existing doors.
 - o Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the entire area proposed for removal will become inside space as a result of the addition.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated that he would still like to see less removal of historic fabric as part of the project. He pointed out the small window proposed for removal as an example or an area that could be left intact.
 - o Ms. Regan responded that the small window that was highlighted opens on an existing powder room that will be removed. She added that their design intent is

to improve the relationship between the interior spaces and the exterior space at this area of the house and that they are aiming to create an open living space inside.

- o Mr. D'Alessandro replied that the goal of creating more interior space does not necessarily mean that the entire portion of exterior wall needs to be removed and some parts of the original fabric could be retained.
- o Mr. Regan replied that their goal is to make an aesthetically designed space and wanted to point out that all of the windows and doors that are part of the proposed removal are not visible from any surrounding public views. He also added that their goal is to reuse all of the removed stone to create the new walls of the addition, though they might need to mix in some newer material with that as well.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro responded that he is not arguing against the visibility aspect of the project, but that he is still hesitant to see so much original fabric removed.
- o Ms. Gutterman agreed regarding the proposed widening of the window on the adjacent wall above the kitchen sink and suggested the removal could be reduced there.
- o Other Architectural Committee members opined that the amount of stone proposed for removal was not excessive.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicants examine if it is possible to retain some of the original exterior wall in the interior area that will be made by the addition.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.
 - o Mr. Cluver added that he has some similar thoughts and suggested that the portion of the exterior wall be retained in the area between the proposed lounge and pantry as there is a new interior partition proposed for that space on the plan. He also added that he does not think they can make an official recommendation on this as they do not regulate interior space.
 - o Ms. Gutterman agreed and reiterated that the Architectural Committee would like to try and retain as much historic fabric as possible.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the proposed wider window on the adjacent wall is not currently centered under the existing second-floor window. He suggested the applicants shorten it slightly to a four-casement design instead of five.
 - o Mr. Regan responded that he agrees about centering the new window and will revise the design to do so. He went on to respond to the questions regarding the wall between the pantry and lounge areas and explained that the current design proposes to remove the relatively thick existing exterior wall in order to ensure there is enough usable space inside.
 - o Ms. Gutterman reiterated that the committee is making suggestions, but they have no jurisdiction over interior spaces.
 - o Mr. Cluver suggested that the walls on the exterior of the new addition are drawn very thick and they likely could reduce that in order to gain more interior space. He also suggested that the insulation they need in the addition does not have to be as thick as proposed either to meet proper requirements. If those changes are made, they could perhaps retain some more of the historic wall inside.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the size of the masonry piers that flank the door on the new addition and suggested the applicants make sure they are thick enough. He added that the applicants should also confirm the width of the lintels are wide enough on the addition as well.
 - o Mr. Regan responded that both elements will be done to meet structural requirements.

- o Mr. McCoubrey also suggested that the piers could be removed, and the stone wall could only extend up on the lower portion of that wall.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 7321 Elbow Lane is a contributing resource to the French Village Historic District.
- The proposed addition and alterations are compatible with the historic character of the building and are largely not visible from any surrounding public rights-of-way.
- The applicants should revise the proposed widened window so that it is symmetrically positioned on its façade and look into the possibility of reducing the amount of removal of historic materials.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9. The proposed addition will necessitate the removal of sections of an original exterior wall along with windows and doors, but its massing, size, scale, and architectural features are compatible with those of the historic building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the enlarged window is symmetrical, the sizes of the masonry piers and other elements are refined, and as much of the exterior wall is retained as possible, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9.

ITEM: 7321 Elbow Ln					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
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	5				2

ADDRESS: 2024 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct garage; remove rear bay; install windows; stucco rear; construct deck on rear ell

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bella Projects LLC

Applicant: Jeffrey McMahon, JM DB

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes various work to the rear of the building at 2024 Delancey Place, which backs up onto a service alley block of Panama Street. The scope includes construction of a rear garage, removal of a rear bay and solarium, and installation of windows where the bay and solarium have been removed, replacement of the rear ell's sloped roof with a flat roof with deck, and installation of stucco to all exposed brick on the rear of the building. The existing rear bay is clad in siding but may be original as a wood bay appears on an 1895 atlas. The construction of a rear garage would reduce the public visibility of proposed changes to the rear ell.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct garage.
- Remove rear bay.
- Install new windows in rear wall of rear ell.
- Install roof deck on rear ell.
- Stucco rear masonry.

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 Removing the two-story bay and installing non-historic windows as well as covering the rear masonry in stucco will alter character-defining features.
 - o The roof deck addition on the rear ell is appropriate, provided the historic roof slope is maintained.
 - o The removal of the non-historic solarium and construction of a rear garage satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the removal of the rear bay and covering the masonry in stucco; approval of the roof deck, provided the pitched rear-ell roof is maintained; and, approval of the removal of the solarium and construction of the garage, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 2:12:50

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JUNE 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Contractor Jeffrey McMahon represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McMahon indicated his client's willingness to remove the proposed stucco from the application. He noted that the rear street functions as a service alley. He stated that some neighbors have indicated support for a garage at the rear, owing to security concerns about the open area. Mr. McMahon opined that the rear bay is not original to the building.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey disagreed that the rear bay is not historic.
 - o Mr. McMahon stated that an 1895 atlas shows the bay, but a 1910 atlas does not.
 - o Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff observed that the 1895 atlas shows many rear bays on the 2000 block of Panama Street. These bays do not appear on the 1910 atlas but are shown on the 1916 Sanborn fire insurance maps, which are very detailed. He concluded that the rear bays were likely extant throughout the period.
- Ms. Gutterman observed that historic elements such as the door on the east side of the rear facade's fourth floor and the rear bay windows would be replaced with contemporary doors and windows. She supported the proposed removal of the solarium.
 - o Mr. McMahon responded that the fourth-floor door will not be visible from Panama Street when the project is executed.
- Mr. Cluver expressed concern that the proposal lacks floor plans and demolition drawings. He suggested including these plans for the Historical Commission's review.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the ability to maintain the roof slope of the rear ell with the construction of the roof deck.
 - o Mr. McMahon responded that he would prefer to avoid the aesthetic of a wood deck and metal railing atop a sloped roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant to provide elevation drawings of the garage for the Historical Commission's review. He recommended red brick rather than stucco for the garage exterior.
 - o Mr. McMahon agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The two-story bay on the rear ell is likely original but has been altered.
- The roof slope of the rear ell is a typical historic configuration.
- The application lacks some drawings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 because it is incomplete and proposes inappropriate alterations to historic fabric.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of removal of the rear bay, covering the masonry in stucco, and rear ell roof alterations; approval of the removal of the solarium and construction of a garage, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2024 Delancey PI MOTION: Denial of bay, stucco, roof alts; approval of garage and solarium removal 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	5				2

ADDRESS: 2022 GREEN ST

Proposal: Add lightwells at front and side facades

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2022 Green St Condominium Association

Applicant: Benjamin Estepani, Pace Architecture and Design

History: 1864

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install five new emergency escape windows into the basement floor of 2022 Green Street, a semi-detached house in the Spring Garden Historic District. Two egress wells would be located at the front façade and three would be located in the side yard of the property. All proposed window locations would be within existing basement window openings. The existing decorative front facade basement security gates would be retained and reinstalled. The front egress well grates would be flush with the existing flagstone sidewalk and painted to match.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct five lightwells at basement level.

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.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the three side egress wells, but denial of the two front egress wells, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:31:00

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JUNE 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Benjamin Estepani represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the appearance and the patterning of the grates that would be installed in the sidewalk.
 - o Mr. Estepani responded that they would be metal powder coated with vertical bars with the goal of having the least visual impact on the building. He noted that they could provide a cut sheet of the grate specifications.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Hendrickson to explain the staff's concerns with the project.
 - o Ms. Hendrickson responded that the staff were concerned about the visibility of the project, noting that there was no precedent for egress wells on this block and that the staff believed that this proposal surpassed its approval authority being that it was on the front facade of the property and highly visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if the existing window grilles could be modified to make them operable.
 - o Mr. Estepani responded that they could adjust the hinges or replace the metal standoffs with hinges to have them swing out.
- Ms. Gutterman asked that, if the hinges could be adjusted, would there still be a need for the openings in the sidewalk.
 - o Mr. Estepani responded that there would still need for the openings in the sidewalk but that they would not have to be as low as a double-hung window opening. He explained that they would still need to lower the sills below grade to meet the egress code requirements but that the depth of the wells could be reduced.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the necessity of two egress wells at the front façade to meet code requirements.
 - o Mr. Estepani noted that the code requirement could be satisfied with just the left well but that they were proposing two wells in order to maintain the symmetry of the building.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the possibility of putting the wells in the side yard instead of at the front.
 - o Mr. Estepani responded that there was an existing bedroom underneath the front entry door area and that the egress well would need to be connected to that bedroom.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicant if the egress window had to be in the bedroom itself or if it could be in an adjacent hallway.
 - o Mr. Estepani answered that it needed to be in the bedroom specifically and that you could not travel through one bedroom to egress out another. He noted that the living room and kitchen would be on the first floor in the first unit, and there would be two bedrooms in the basement. He explained that the spiral stair could not be moved, owing to the layout.
- Ms. Gutterman proposed exploring modification of the existing grille at one window as opposed to modifying the sidewalk and the grate. She noted that they should determine what modification would have the least impact on the building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a staircase outside the second bedroom.

- o Mr. Estepani replied that there was but that it could not be considered a means of egress, owing to its narrowness. He explained that it connected the basement with the first-floor common hallway.
- Mr. Cluver added that, if the hinged window grille option did not work out and they reverted back to creating full egress window wells, he would have a concern with the flagstone paving extending over the walls of the wells. He noted that, while it would be aesthetically better, the stone paving would crack over time from the differential settlement of the soil. He noted that it would be preferable to put a flagstone cap matching the width of the retaining walls as a joint between the retaining wall and the stone that would be settling around the grate.
- o Mr. Estepani agreed to the change and offer to provide an section drawing of the well for review by the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- There was no demonstrated need for the front right egress well.
- The existing basement window grille could be hinged to satisfy egress requirements.
- If a full egress well is necessary, the flagstone should not cover the top of the well walls because the soil around the well will settle and the flagstone will crack.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The construction of the three side window wells satisfies Standard 9.
- The construction of the two front window wells fails to satisfy Standard 9 and an alternative, less conspicuous option should be sought.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the three side egress wells and denial of the two front egress wells, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2022 Green St					
MOTION: Approval of 3 side wells, denial of 2 front wells					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 614 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct addition with roof deck and pilot houses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Qian Jin Real Estate LLC

Applicant: Sam Xu, Constrecture, LLC

History: 1925

Individual Designation:

District Designation: Society Hill, Contributing, 1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing an addition on the two-story portion of the rear ell of 614 Pine Street, with a roof deck over the entire rear ell serviced by two pilot houses. The addition would be clad in an unidentified panel material and fenestrated in a random manner. The proposed addition and roof deck would likely not be visible from Pine Street but would be visible from the side and rear from Waverly and Addison Streets. As proposed, one pilot house would require the demolition of a portion of the rear slope of the roof. Two skylights are also proposed for the rear slope of the gable roof.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct addition on two-story portion of rear ell.
- Construct roof deck and pilot 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 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.*
- *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 roof deck and pilot house would require the demolition of a small portion of the roof of the main block.
 - o While the adjacent stretch of Addison Street is largely a service alley, two houses on have their primary entrances on Waverly Street.
 - o The third-story addition is very tall with a very large floor-to-ceiling height. The addition should be reduced in height by several feet.
 - o No details are given for the cladding on the east elevation. Given the visibility from Waverly Street, it should be clad in a way that is compatible with the existing brick walls.
 - o A black metal picket railing around the roof deck would be more appropriate than the panel-clad parapet wall shown in the plans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the parapet wall is replaced with a black metal picket railing and the cladding is revised to be more compatible with the existing building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:50:40

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JUNE 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sam Xu represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification about the extent of removal of historic fabric on the east elevation of the third floor of the rear ell.
 - o Mr. Xu responded that the window openings would be enlarged. The wall would not be removed.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey said it was difficult to evaluate the amount of removal without an elevation showing the existing conditions of that wall.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the height of the proposed third floor is quite tall; the floor-to-ceiling height is greater than 13 feet. He suggested reducing the height of the third floor to reduce the visibility of the addition, which would be preferable.
- Mr. McCoubrey further noted that the front pilot house would require the removal of a portion of the original gable roof. He contended that constructing one pilot house rather than two would better meet the Standards.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the proposed fenestration pattern was unusual.
 - o Mr. Xu responded that the windows reflect interior changes the owner may make later.
- Mr. McCoubrey wondered why the third floor, which relates to the main block of the house, needs to be replaced with such a tall addition. He suggested that the entirely new third-floor segment could pop up if further height was required.
- Mr. D'Alessandro opined that this application proposes the removal of too much historic fabric. He highlighted the front pilot house and skylights as particularly objectionable.
 - o Mr. Xu asked if reducing the height of the front pilot house would be preferable to the Architectural Committee.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro said the location of the front pilot house was problematic.
 - o Mr. Xu said the pilot house was proposed as an extension of an existing stair.
- Mr. D'Alessandro objected to the proposed metal panel cladding, especially if it is to be multicolored as shown in the example photograph that was submitted.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association appreciated the comments of the Architectural Committee members and invited the architect to come to an upcoming meeting of his organization.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes the removal of a significant amount of historic fabric.
- The proposed floor-to-ceiling height of the third floor, coupled with the use of a parapet wall railing for the roof decks, would make the addition more visible than necessary.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 as the proposed addition involves the removal of a significant amount of historic fabric and is not compatible with the existing forms and materials of the property.

- The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline, as one pilot house requires demolition of a portion of the gable roof and including two pilot houses increases the visual impact from the public right-of-way.

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

ITEM: 614 Pine St MOTION: Denial 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				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:06:04

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:07 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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