

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

**TUESDAY, 23 OCTOBER 2018
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-031
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
Justin Detwiler
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola, Arch.
Elliot Kopel
Stuart Rosenberg, SgRA
Annebelle Salle, SgRA
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Shimi Zakin, Atrium Design Group
Snezana Litvinovic, Atrium Design Group
Rich Giordano, Upper Roxborough Civic Association
Kenny Grono, Buckminster Green LLC
Richard Villa, Ambit Architecture
Rhea Gargullo, Sargenti Architects
Anthony Gerardi, Sargenti Architects
Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop, Inc.
Norma VanDyke
Shai Argitman
Ruth Birchett, Heritage CDC
Donna Price
David McArthur, DPM Arch LLC
William O'Brien, Esq., Manayunk Law Office
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein, and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro and Detwiler joined him.

ADDRESS: 2032-38 CHANCELLOR ST

Proposal: Remove interior structure and roof; construct rooftop addition; replace doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tom and Jill Durosvik

Applicant: Shimi Zakin, Atrium Design Group

History: 1885

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make extensive alterations and a rooftop addition to this former carriage house building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The application proposes to remove all interior floorplates, excavate for a superbasement, and construct a new interior structure within the existing walls. The structural drawings for the support of the existing walls have not been provided. On the first floor Chancellor Street elevation, the application proposes to install a new modern metal and glass garage door in one of the two existing carriage door openings, and to install a set of metal gates in the second opening. The primary entrance to the house would be recessed behind those gates. The Historical Commission has previously required the installation of wood carriage-style doors in historic carriage door openings.

The application proposes to create a two-story open courtyard at the second-floor level. It will occupy about one-third of the floorplate at the east, where the roof and third floor will be eliminated. An approximately 33-foot long by 18-foot deep by 11-foot tall metal and glass addition is proposed for the roof. The addition will be surrounded by a metal railing and rooftop plantings. The applicant asserts that the addition will not be visible from Chancellor Street, but will be partially visible from St. James Street. Along St. James Street, the application proposes to restore several window and door openings.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Shimi Zakin and Snezana Litvinovic represented the application.

Ms. Litvinovic stated that this project will convert this historic building into a single-family residence. She stated that all changes required for the new use have been kept to a minimum. She stated that the treatment of the exterior façade is aimed at preserving the existing character and restoring as much as possible. She stated that the proposed addition is not to be visible from Chancellor Street, and will only be visible from the west on St. James Street, where anything on the roof would be visible, including the existing pilot house. Mr. Zakin commented that the images of the addition in the application are accurate models and demonstrate that the addition will not be visible from Chancellor Street. Ms. Litvinovic noted that the block contains buildings of various heights. Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the proposed roof

addition. Mr. Zakin responded that it is 11 feet to the top of the roof. He explained that Ms. Gutterman was looking at an earlier zoning submission, which was reduced in height after receiving feedback from the Historical Commission's staff. Mr. McCoubrey asked if all interior flooring is proposed to be new. Mr. Zakin confirmed this, and explained that all interior elements would be removed and replaced with steel and concrete. He stated that the most important aspect of the project is the second and third-floor opening to create an outdoor space within the footprint of the building. He explained that there is no proposed outdoor space on the roof. Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the existing pilot house. Mr. Zakin responded that it is approximately nine feet in height. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the 11-foot height of the addition plus mechanical equipment. Mr. Zakin confirmed that there would be a small bump-up for the elevator, which is required. Ms. Pentz asked if engineering drawings will be provided to show the bracing of the walls. Mr. Zakin confirmed this, and stated that he is working with an engineer that is familiar with this type of work. Mr. Cluver commented that this project is essentially a "facadectomy." He stated that he sees three main issues, being the size and massing of the roof addition, the carriage house doors, and the open space within the building. He opined that it would be odd to see sky through the windows where the interior and roof structure would be removed. He stated that it is a very aggressive treatment of the building. Mr. Zakin responded that they propose to install blinds along all windows so that someone will not be able to see sky from the outside looking in. He commented that the proposed doors are a modern interpretation of what is believed to have been there, for which there are no historic photographs.

Ms. Pentz asked about the existing chimney. Mr. Zakin responded that they believe the existing chimney is not original owing to its location, materials, and size. Ms. Litvinovic commented that it is more of a mechanical shaft than a real chimney. Ms. Pentz asked about replacement windows. Mr. Zakin responded that they are proposing new historically-appropriate wood windows, the details of which will be submitted to the staff for review.

Mr. McCoubrey discussed floor-to-floor heights. He suggested that each floor could drop down by one foot, resulting in an overall reduction of the visible height of the rooftop addition. Ms. Stein agreed, and noted that the parapet on St. James Street is proposed to be extended, which is a result of the floor heights. Mr. Zakin responded that the current height along Chancellor Street is higher than that on St. James Street, and therefore there is a conflict which the proposed design addresses. He stated that the visibility of the roof structure and extended parapet would be from one specific viewpoint only along St. James Street. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Architectural Committee is concerned with minimizing the visibility of the addition, and reducing the floor heights would help achieve this goal. Mr. Zakin responded that removing one or two feet from the building will have almost zero impact on the visibility. Mr. McCoubrey countered that the rooftop addition is tall relative to the building from its only point of visibility on St. James Street. Ms. Gutterman suggested that dropping floor heights by two feet overall will remove the need for the extended parapet or metal planter. Ms. Litvinovic commented that what is dimensioned in the drawings for the floor heights is the minimum structure. Once all systems that actually need to go below the ceilings are factored in, the ceiling height in many of the spaces will in fact be nine feet or even a little lower. Mr. Detweiler commented that he frequently works in high-end residential in Rittenhouse and makes these types of concessions. He reiterated that the reduction in floor levels will prevent the problem at the parapet, and will reduce the visible height of the rooftop addition. He commended the applicants on their comprehensive presentation materials. Mr. Zakin directed the Architectural

Committee's attention to a section drawing. He stated that the new second and third floors were designed to be within several inches of the original floor locations. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the third and fourth floors are the ones in question, and that changing those will not change window alignment. Ms. Litvinovic commented that this is an 1885 Italianate building, and would have had eleven or twelve-foot high ceilings in residential use. Mr. McCoubrey and others responded that that is not the case in an alley carriage house like this one, which was not historically a single-family residence.

Mr. Zakin directed the Architectural Committee's attention to a page showing immediate context photographs, including photographs of several carriage house-style buildings with highly visible rooftop additions. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Architectural Committee is reviewing the application in front of it. Mr. Zakin questioned if the additions shown in his photographs were approved by the Historical Commission. Ms. Gutterman responded that the Committee does not know, but the additions may have been constructed prior to the designation of the historic district.

Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Chantry if the staff had raised other issues of concern. Ms. Chantry responded that the staff focused some of its internal discussion on the proposed doors, because the Commission has previously required the installation of wood carriage-style doors in historic carriage door openings.

The Architectural Committee members encouraged the applicant to look into elevator options with small overruns.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the floor-to-floor heights are reduced from 12 to 11 feet at the second and third floors, and from 11 to 10 feet at the fourth floor, resulting in an overall reduction of three feet; the doors are wood but may be contemporary in style; and rooftop plantings and mechanical equipment, except for the elevator overrun, are not visible from the public right-of-way.

ADDRESS: 8819 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Demolish building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barwel Development LLC

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 1859; Absalom Loyle House

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Avenue Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the detached, three-story house, shed, and garage at 8819 Ridge Avenue. The building was protected by the Ridge Avenue demolition moratorium and then designated as historic as part of the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District on 12 October 2018. The inventory of the historic district indicates that this property is classified as contributing to the district. The Ridge Avenue demolition moratorium was introduced into City Council on 28 September 2017, it became effective on 5 December 2017 when it was favorably recommended out of committee, it was passed by City Council on 14 December 2017, and it was signed into law by the Mayor on 20 December 2017.

On 6 April 2018, HC Site Construction, Inc., a contractor, submitted an application for a complete demolition permit (#865318) for 8819 Ridge Avenue to the Department of Licenses & Inspections, which was forwarded to Philadelphia Historical Commission because the property was subject to Section 14-1009 of the Philadelphia Code, the Ridge Avenue Demolition Moratorium. On 10 April 2018, the staff of the Historical Commission determined that the demolition permit application was incomplete, pursuant to Section 6.8 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations, because it did not address the criteria for approval and therefore declined to process it. The staff returned the application to the applicant with a list of its deficiencies. The staff explained that the application must demonstrate that the property has been cited as imminently dangerous and that demolition is the *only* means of abating the dangerous condition; that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application failed to justify the proposed demolition with any one of the three possible bases for approval.

On 31 July 2018, attorney William O'Brien submitted a building permit application for 8819 Ridge Avenue (#893122) to the Historical Commission. As of 9 July 2018, the property owner had been notified that the property had been nominated for historic designation as part of the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District and that all building permit applications for the property were therefore subject to the Historical Commission's review as of that date. The Ridge Avenue Demolition Moratorium lapsed on the same date that the Historical Commission sent the notification. This application was likewise deemed incomplete, pursuant to Section 6.8 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations, and could not be processed. The application form stipulated "Partial demolition of existing three-story home to make safe," but nothing in the application identified the part(s) of the building to be removed or whether or how the remaining part(s) would be treated following the removal. The permit application included a building permit application form, violation notice, cover letter, certificate of liability insurance, certificate of tax clearance, and a zoning permit application form, but no photographs, site plan,

or architectural drawings documenting the property and building in question or the work to be performed.

The current application includes a permit application form, photographs, a site plan, the violation notice, engineers' reports, and other materials. The most recent engineer's report, dated 11 September 2018, states that "this building [should] be demolished due to the possible dangerous condition." Dated 8 June 2018, the violation notice indicates that the Department of Licenses & Inspections has determined that the building is imminently dangerous. However, a letter from the Department of Licenses & Inspections to the property owner, dated 9 July 2018, states that the Department had declined to issue a demolition permit because "neither of the engineers reports submitted provides adequate detail demonstrating that the demolition of this building is necessary to abate an imminently dangerous condition."

The City's historic preservation ordinance, Section 14-1005(6)(d), restricts the Historical Commission from approving demolition permit applications unless certain conditions are met.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

The photographs and engineer's reports demonstrate that the building is in very poor condition, but nothing in the application indicates that demolition is the *only* means of abating the imminently dangerous condition; that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The Historical Commission cannot approve demolition applications based solely on the condition unless the Department of Licenses & Inspections determines that demolition is the only means of abating a dangerous condition. Without such a determination, the applicant must prove that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest before the Historical Commission can approve the demolition. As an aside, the Historical Commission could have excluded this property from the historic district based on condition when it designated it on 12 October 2018, but no one appeared at that meeting representing this property to make such an argument. The property is now designated and the bar for a demolition approval is high.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia code.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham reported that the applicant had called the Historical Commission's offices to explain that he was caught in traffic. The applicant requested that the Architectural Committee delay his review until he had arrived. Mr. McCoubrey asked the Committee members whether they wanted to wait for the arrival of the applicant, who was tardy. Some suggested that the review could be moved to the end of the meeting. Mr. Farnham noted that there may be persons in the audience who wished to comment on the application. He observed that it would be unfair to make them wait several hours when they had arrived at the meeting on

time. Mr. McCoubrey asked if anyone in the audience wished to participate in the review. Rich Giordano, the president of the Upper Roxborough Civic Association, identified himself and stated that he planned to comment on the application. Mr. Cluver stated that it would not be fair to Mr. Giordano to hold the application until the end of the agenda. Other Committee members suggested that the Committee should not delay the review any longer because it would place them behind schedule for the rest of the meeting. Mr. McCoubrey decided to proceed with the review.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz questioned some aspects of the violation. Mr. D'Alessandro read from Violation Notice #636638, which states that "the anchorage of the floor or roof to walls or columns, and of walls and columns to foundations is not capable of resisting all nominal loads or load effects." He questioned how the inspector made that determination. He stated that he sees no evidence to come to that conclusion. Ms. Pentz agreed. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that "the original violation wasn't correct." He asked why the violation was issued. He stated that he saw no evidence of exposed joist pockets and no rot in the ends of joists. He observed that some failures in the stucco are not surprising or troubling. Ms. Pentz observed that the walls of the house appear to be plumb. They are not buckled, bowing, or otherwise failing. Mr. D'Alessandro turned his attention to the SEC Engineering, LLC report of 11 September 2018. He noted that the report refers to the building as a "wood frame house." He corrected that it is a masonry-wall load-bearing building, not a wood-frame building. He stated that he could not believe the conclusions of the report when the engineer did not correctly identify the type of building. He concluded that the report was thrown together without really evaluating the building's structure or its condition. Mr. D'Alessandro concluded that the application lacks sufficient evidence to warrant a recommendation of approval of the demolition.

Ms. Stein observed that the violation notice states that the Department of Licenses & Inspections will address the dangerous condition if the owner fails to do so. She asked if the Department will delay its demolition of the property in light of the circumstances. Mr. Farnham responded that the violation notices include generic language that may not apply when the property is designated as historic. He reported that, when a building is designated as historic, the Department of Licenses & Inspections will not proceed with the demolition or compel a property owner to proceed with the demolition unless the building is deemed to pose a significant risk to public safety. Mr. Farnham stated that it is his understanding that the Department has concluded that, while this building is in violation, it does not pose an immediate risk to public safety because it is set back from the public right-of-way and fenced. It is unlikely that the building would collapse into the street. He concluded that the language in the violation notice is targeted at non-historic buildings.

Ms. Pentz asked about the Ridge Avenue Demolition Moratorium. Mr. Farnham explained that Councilman Curtis Jones proposed the demolition moratorium about one year ago. It was passed by City Council and signed into law by the Mayor. It prohibited the complete demolition of potentially historic buildings along Ridge Avenue in Roxborough for one year, to give the Historical Commission sufficient time to prepare a nomination for a Ridge Avenue Roxborough historic district. He explained that the law included a provision that allowed for the demolition of imminently dangerous buildings. It also included a sunset provision that ended the moratorium when the Historical Commission had notified property owners of the consideration of the designation of the district and assumed jurisdiction over the properties. Mr. Farnham explained

that the moratorium was in place until 9 July 2018, when the Historical Commission notified property owners of the consideration of the designation of the district. With that notification, the moratorium lapsed and was replaced by the historic preservation ordinance's provisions regarding demolition. The current application is being reviewed under the historic preservation ordinance, not the demolition moratorium, which has expired.

Attorney William O'Brien arrived at the meeting to represent the application. Mr. Farnham explained to him that the Committee had received his message about being delayed in traffic and had begun discussing the application, owing to a community representative in the audience and the need to keep to the schedule. Mr. Farnham summarized the conversation prior to Mr. O'Brien's arrival.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the application for demolition was submitted in April 2018. He observed that there was some question as to whether it was complete or not. The Department of Licenses & Inspections initially determined that the property was unsafe. He stated that the application was supplemented. On 8 June 2018, the Department of Licenses & Inspections determined that the building was in imminent danger of collapse. Mr. O'Brien stated that he informed the Historical Commission's attorney that the building had been cited as imminently dangerous, to which the attorney responded that the Historical Commission "would look into the matter." Mr. O'Brien asserted that "a thorough review occurred from 8 June to 9 July." He reported that his client received two letters on 9 July; one from the Department of Licenses & Inspections stated that the demolition application was being marked as withdrawn; "the other from the Historic Commission congratulating him on the designation of 8819 as a contributing structure to the thematic district." Mr. O'Brien informed the Committee that the engineer had suggested that an application for a make-safe permit should be submitted to the Department of Licenses & Inspections, with the belief that a qualified representative of the Department would visit the site and review the work proposed to make the building safe. The engineer hoped that, once the inspector toured the property, the inspector would conclude that the property could not be made safe and would order the demolition of the building. Mr. O'Brien observed that the make-safe permit application was determined to be incomplete. Ms. Pentz asked if the application proposed to make the building safe or to demolish it. Mr. O'Brien stated that, on its face, it was an application to make the building safe, but the property owner had been informed by the engineer that he submit the application "as a backdoor way of getting a demolition." "In full candor," the make-safe permit application "was intended to result in the demolition of the building. It was a more efficient way of moving the question forward, but that application was determined to be incomplete so it didn't go anywhere." Mr. O'Brien stated that the current application is the third application. Mr. O'Brien introduced a copy of the zoning permit dated 21 November 2017 for the subdivision of the property and the complete demolition of the building. He noted that the subdivision and demolition process started in July 2017, when a survey was commissioned. The zoning application was submitted in late August 2017 and led to the over-the-counter zoning permit. Mr. O'Brien stated that the redevelopment of this property began long before the demolition moratorium bill was introduced.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. O'Brien how the property got to be in such poor condition. Mr. O'Brien responded that it has been vacant for "many, many years." Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. O'Brien how long his client has owned the property. Mr. O'Brien responded that he has owned it for less than one year.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the zoning permit preceded the beginning of the demolition moratorium. Mr. O'Brien stated that he had included a copy of the demolition moratorium legislation with his application. Mr. Farnham explained that the moratorium bill was passed by City Council on 14 December 2017 and signed by the Mayor into law on 20 December 2017. He noted that the zoning permit is dated 21 November 2017. Mr. O'Brien remarked that the zoning permit application was submitted months before it was issued, in August. Ms. Gutterman asked if the zoning permit included the demolition of the building. Mr. O'Brien stated that it did. Mr. Farnham concluded that Mr. O'Brien's client indicated an intent to demolish the building prior to the effective date of the moratorium, 5 December 2017, when it was favorably recommended out of committee, but he noted that the zoning permit does not vest a right to undertake the work. He explained that the Historical Commission is authorized to review building permits. Zoning permits are prerequisites for building permits. If the property owner had obtained a building permit for the demolition prior to the effective date of the demolition moratorium, the Historical Commission would have had no authority to review that permit. However, the zoning permit does vest a right in the demolition. Mr. Farnham noted that the zoning permit does indicate that the developer was pursuing a development plan for this property prior to the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over it. The Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations does have a provision, known as the transition rule, that does allow the Commission, its committees, and staff to take into account development plans in place at the time the Historical Commission's jurisdiction begins. He added that the transition rule does not trump the demolition moratorium or the demolition provisions in the preservation ordinance, but development plans can be taken into account.

Mr. McCoubrey reminded everyone that the Architectural Committee is charged with applying the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to applications and advising the Commission on those Standards. He stated that he has seen properties in much worse condition than this one restored to good condition. He noted that the previous application proposed completely removing the interior structure of a building and reconstructing it. Mr. McCoubrey concluded that he could not recommend to the Commission that this building needs to be demolished. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. He again pointed out that the engineer's report fundamentally misunderstands the structural system of the building. He stated that the application does not prove that the building cannot be repaired. Ms. Pentz agreed. They both stated that, from what they see in the application, the building can be repaired relatively easily. Ms. Pentz asked about the thickness of the masonry walls. Mr. O'Brien replied that he does not know because he has never been in the structure. He noted that the engineer wore a respirator when he entered the building about one month ago. Mr. O'Brien reported that the owner and engineer both discouraged him from entering the building. He observed that the building has extensive mold. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the 11 September 2018 engineer's report states that the structure only shows "early stages of failure."

Ms. Pentz stated that it is her understanding that the Historical Commission can approve demolitions that are necessary in the public interest. Those cases can include demolitions for important public projects like schools, but they can also include demolitions to abate dangerous conditions because ensuring public safety is necessary in the public interest. Mr. Farnham agreed, stating that the Historical Commission has and does approve the demolitions of buildings that pose significant risks to public safety. He noted that the preservation ordinance does not address dangerous buildings specifically, but such conditions can be abated through the Historical Commission's authority to approve demolitions that are necessary in the public

interest. She noted that the moratorium authorized the demolitions of imminently dangerous buildings. Mr. O'Brien stated that the moratorium ordinance was more liberal with regard to demolition than the preservation ordinance. He stated that under Section 14-1009(2) of the moratorium law, one could demolish a building if it was necessary to abate an imminently dangerous condition or if the Historical Commission approved the demolition under its normal course. Mr. O'Brien stated that his client has been frustrated because the building was deemed to be imminently dangerous, as shown by engineers' reports, but the Historical Commission allowed the application to languish until the property was designated as part of the historic district. Mr. O'Brien asserted that demolition should have been allowed under the first provision regarding demolition in the moratorium code because the Department of Licenses & Inspections had determined that the building was imminently dangerous. That option was lost once the property was designated as part of the historic district. He claimed that there was a window for demolition under the moratorium that was closed with the historic district. He observed that this has caused great frustration for his client. He claimed that the Historical Commission allowed that window to close by prolonging its review for 30 days. Mr. Farnham respectfully disagreed with Mr. O'Brien. He quoted from the demolition moratorium, reporting that it allowed for a demolition permit to be issued when "such demolition is necessary to abate an imminently dangerous condition as determined by the Department of Licenses & Inspections." He explained that the moratorium code allowed for demolitions when the demolition was necessary to abate the imminently dangerous condition, not simply when there was an imminently dangerous condition. The question is whether the demolition is necessary to abate the condition. He pointed out that on 9 July 2018 the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a letter stating that the Department had declined to issue a demolition permit because "neither of the engineers reports submitted provides adequate detail demonstrating that the demolition of this building is necessary to abate an imminently dangerous condition." Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission did not move forward with the demolition permit because the Department of Licenses & Inspections had concluded that the applicant had not shown that demolition was necessary to abate the dangerous condition. By coming to that conclusion, the Department implied that the imminently dangerous condition could be abated through repair. The demolition was not shown to be necessary. Mr. O'Brien responded that the engineers' reports conclude that the building needed to be demolished. The Department of Licenses & Inspections decided that those conclusions were not adequately supported. Neither the Department nor the Historical Commission engaged an engineer to make a determination. They came to their conclusions based on a belief that the engineer's conclusions were not adequately supported by detail.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed with the conclusions of both the property owner's engineer and the Department of Licenses & Inspections. They claimed that the building could be repaired. Mr. O'Brien replied that the Department of Licenses & Inspections performed at least four on-site inspections. The building was first deemed unsafe and then later it was deemed imminently dangerous. He stated that the inspections were thorough. Mr. D'Alessandro again disagreed with the conclusions in the reports and violation. He stated again that the photographs in the application do not indicate that the building must be demolished. The photographs show a building that can be repaired. They show no failed structural members. Mr. D'Alessandro again pointed out that the engineer's report wrongly identifies this building as a wood-frame house. It is not. Mr. O'Brien asked Mr. D'Alessandro if he had been in the house. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the photographs clearly show that it has masonry load-bearing walls. Mr. O'Brien countered that the floor joists are likely made of wood. Mr. D'Alessandro

concluded that the report does not include any photographs showing that the structure is failing. He added that the engineer should have attended the meeting to testify about the condition of the building. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee should come to the same conclusion as the Department of Licenses & Inspections, that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that this building cannot be repaired.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if anyone in the audience wanted to comment.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization supports the staff recommendation to deny the application. He asked Mr. O'Brien to direct his client to take immediate action to stabilize the structure. He also asked him to explore adaptive reuse possibilities for the property. In conclusion, Mr. Steinke stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections and Historical Commission are obligated to enforce the demolition by neglect provisions of the law to the fullest extent and must force the property owner to repair this property or to sell it to someone who would repair it. Mr. O'Brien responded that the property is secured and fenced.

Mr. Giordano, the president of the Upper Roxborough Civic Association, stated that his organization is concerned that the City has undertaken a long and arduous task to designate the historic district and the district could be placed at risk if the historic buildings in it are lost one by one.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia code.

ADDRESS: 2321 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct nine-story building with roof deck

Review Requested: Review in concept

Owner: Brit Emet, LLC

Applicant: Richard Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1915; Dropsie University/Mikveh Israel; Levy Abraham, architect

Individual Designation: 11/30/1971

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a nine-story building at 2321 North Broad Street in the historically-open courtyard of the former Dropsie College. The building will contain 120 one-bedroom apartments. The proposed building is open at the first and mezzanine levels to allow for view of the historic building, located at the rear of the site and behind the new building. The space between the proposed and existing building will contain a reconfigured landscaped courtyard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture, represented the application.

Mr. Villa stated that multiple options were explored for the site. He noted that his firm looked at the parcel in three different ways. Mr. Villa explained that the first option placed the new building to the south side of the parcel with a reconfigured courtyard and the existing parking would remain in place. He continued that the second option included two buildings separated by a reconfigured courtyard. He noted that with the second option, the buildings were physically close to the rear historic building and created a “hallway” effect. Mr. Villa stated that the third option included a building raised 35-40 feet in the air and wide enough with an expansive open base through which the historic building at the rear is viewed. He noted that the third option allows for a 60’ to 65’ wide courtyard between the new building and the historic building. Mr. Villa explained that the width of the building is intentionally thin to allow for the new, reconfigured courtyard space. Mr. Villa confirmed that the third option was explored further and is the option being presented at this meeting.

Mr. Villa stated that the site under discussion contains the former Dropsie College building. He clarified that the synagogue next door and the building behind the synagogue are on a separate parcel and not part of this site. Mr. Villa stated that he recognizes that they are part of an overall larger design but they are on a separate parcel. He noted that in the past a parcel to the south of this parcel but it was sold a while ago before current owner purchased property and although this would have been a natural place to put a new building, it is no longer part of this property.

Mr. Villa showed the Committee photographs of the existing building and site. He pointed out that the courtyard is lower than street level and that it is an octagon shape but it looks like it was rebuilt sometime between its original construction and now. Mr. Villa stated that the symmetry of the courtyard is no longer apparent because of the current landscaping and the parking. He continued that his idea was to create a new space that has symmetry and has openness.

Mr. Villa stated that the intended use of the building is for disadvantaged youths in the neighborhood and is planned to be 120 to 127 units. He continued that the owner currently has 36 neighborhood youth living in the former Dropsie College building on the site. Mr. Villa stated that the owner is well known in the neighborhood for getting local youths jobs, housing, and helping turn people around and they plan to do more of this on the site.

Ms. Stein asked Ms. Mehley about the individual designation of the building. She asked if the landscape is considered part of the site as part of the designation of 2321 N. Broad. Ms. Mehley confirmed that the staff believes it is. Ms. Stein asked Ms. Mehley when it was designated in 1971 was the parcel split at that time. Ms Mehley responded that it was not, that the Dropsie College building and courtyard were one parcel. The property at 2331 N. Broad was designated separately in 1971, with the synagogue and rear building.

Mr. Cluver inquired what the condition of the site was at the time of designation and if the parking lot existed. Ms. Mehley responded that photographs from the time of designation, early 1970s, show that the site looks very similar to as it looks today. Mr. Villa added that historic aerials appear to show that the parking lot was there at the time of designation and perhaps earlier.

Mr. Villa stated that they looked at building in just the parking lot. He continued that that symmetry was important to the historic design and that is why they opted to go with the single

building at the front of the parcel. Mr. Villa noted that the ability to view the historic building from N. Broad Street through the new building was better architecturally.

Ms. Gutterman asked if in the earlier building schemes were taller and Mr. Villa responded that they were. Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the proposed design required a zoning variance. Mr. Villa replied that a variance would be needed for height and density.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired as to who uses the parking lot. Mr. Villa replied that it is used by people going to the synagogue, now a retail store, as well as neighbors. He stated that the building directly behind the synagogue, at the corner of York and N. Watts Street, is currently vacant and the owners have recently started cleaning it out. Mr. McCoubrey asked if there had been an investigation of other sites to locate a facility like this. Mr. Villa responded that this is where the owner owns the land, so this is the site that was studied.

Ms. Stein commented that the project volume, size and scale of the building just seem to overwhelm buildings and landscaped courtyard. She acknowledged that they are separate parcels but the new building overwhelms the three historic buildings. Ms. Stein inquired if a smaller scale building had been explored. Mr. Villa responded that the proposed building is tall but there are other existing tall buildings within a few block of this site on N. Broad. Ms. Stein noted that this site is not within the institutional district. Mr. Villa responded that it is in the East Susquehanna Neighborhood District and that the development team had met with them once, with an earlier version of the design that was 212 feet tall. He noted that the current proposed design is 126 feet tall and that they had been able to reduce the height by widening the building. Mr. Villa continued that in order he worked the design to accommodate a certain number of apartments, while attempting to make it as low as possible, as thin as possible, and to have the least amount of impact on the historic Dropsie College building. He stated that, from N. Broad Street, the proposed building is visually wide, broad, and open at the base. Mr. Villa noted that it made little sense to block the view of the historic building so a 75 foot wide and 40 foot tall opening was created at the building's base.

Mr. Cluver stated that part of the character of this building is that it is set back from the street and has a presence in that regard. Mr. Cluver noted that while he appreciates the "cut-out" open area under new building, for a good part of the day the historic building at the rear will be in shadow given the large scale of the proposed building. Ms. Gutterman stated that she understood the architect's process of trying to be sympathetic to the historic building. She inquired if there had been any thought of just making a more modestly sized building on the site, that would be sympathetic in scale but may block the view. Mr. Villa responded that the height of the building is based on the number of units requested by his client, the building's owner.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the synagogue was designated. The staff confirmed that it is designated.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the problem is that the proposed building simply does not fit the location; the building is too big.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment.

Ruth Birchett, the founder of the Heritage Community Development Corporation, president of Heritage Homeowners Association, and North Philadelphia resident, spoke in opposition to the proposed project. Ms. Birchett stated that the proposed building is too large for the location and does not reflect the historic character of the block. She stated that the surrounding buildings need preservation as too many demolitions have occurred already. She is also concerned that construction of a building of this size will invite similar large scale projects to the block.

Jacqueline Wiggins, a resident of north central Philadelphia and the committee person of the 32nd Ward, 11th Division, spoke in opposition to the proposed project. Ms. Wiggins stated that owners, developers, and other groups are not effectively reaching out and informing community residents, who will be impacted by these projects. She seconded Ms. Birchett's statements.

Dawn Rice, a resident of North Philadelphia and block captain of the 1900 block of W. Master Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed project. Ms. Rice stated that she does not want history demolished. She does not want to see historical buildings replaced with new construction. She stated that the owners need to be better at communicating their plans to the community members. She commented that the building should be a smaller scale and flow better with the existing and surrounding buildings. She thinks that what is currently on the site should be enhanced and anything new should complement the old.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia spoke in opposition to the proposed project. Mr. Steinke stated that he wished to say two positive things. He stated he wished to compliment the property owner for his stewardship of the property and that he is glad that it is now occupied and being well maintained. Second, he wished to commend the architect for trying to respect the historic architecture by creating the breezeway that opens up somewhat view to that portion of the historic property. Mr. Steinke stated though that he agrees with the staff recommendation of denial for two reasons. One is that the scale of the proposed building is too large for the site. Second, the open space at this location is a character defining feature of what was built as a campus.

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

ADDRESS: 2221 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Katherine Milkman, Cullen Blake

Applicant: Kenny Grono, Buckminster Green LLC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a pilot house and roof deck at 2221 Pine Street. The deck will be constructed at the rear of the property on the existing three-story addition. The application proposes to cantilever the deck 18 inches beyond the rear façade, which faces Panama Street. The underside of the cantilever will appear as a cornice with

painted moldings and rim joist similar to those on homes that front Panama Street. The stucco of the rear facade will be extended to the underside of the deck. A 42-inch high glass railing will be installed along the rear of the deck, while the sides of the deck will be enclosed by 72-inch fiber cement-clad walls. A new pilot house will be constructed for roof access and clad in painted fiber cement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the cantilever is removed, the glass railing and 72-inch side walls are eliminated and the deck is enclosed by a simple 42-inch picket railing, and the pilot house height is lowered and sloped towards the front of the house, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Kenny Grono of Buckminster Green, contractor, and David McArthur, project architect, represented the application.

Mr. Grono provided a detail drawing of the proposed rear cornice and cantilever to assist the Committee's discussion. Mr. Grono stated that the cantilever came at the request of his client to increase the size of the deck. He explained that they looked at multiple options to increase the size of the deck and opted to go with the rear cantilever. Mr. Grono noted that the rear cornice was intended to address the cantilever's appearance .

Ms. Stein requested that Mr. Grono respond to the staff's recommendations, including the recommendation to remove the cantilever. Mr. Grono replied that his client was amenable to certain changes but that the opaque sidewalls and the wall height were important to them for privacy. Ms. Stein pointed out that the sidewalls are visible from the public right-of-way on Panama Street, the street at the rear of the property, and it would appear like another floor has been added to the building. She noted that the building is already bigger than other buildings around it and the additional height may be overwhelming from the public right-of-way. Ms. Stein stated the removal of the solid walls and replacement with picket fencing would make a big difference for the design proposal.

Nan Gutterman inquired if there was an existing roof deck on 2221 Pine Street. Mr. Grono confirmed that there was no current roof deck. Mr. Grono stated that he did not believe there was another third-floor roof deck on the block. Ms. Gutterman reviewed the roof dimensions and noted that the extension or cantilever off the rear is 18 inches. She asked Mr. Grono why an additional 18 inches was important. Mr. Grono responded that the space was designed to accommodate a dining table with chairs and additional seating at the rear. He noted that the client requested this as part of the design.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the pilot house should be limited to 8 feet in height and should slope down toward the front of the house. Mr. Grono stated that he did not believe there would be any difficulty accommodating that request. Mr. McArthur responded that the proposed change would be acceptable as long as it meets the building code.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that, because the deck will be visible from the public right-of-way, he agreed with the staff that the sidewalls should be replaced with picket rails and that the cantilever should be removed.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. No one offered public comment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the cantilever is removed, the glass railing and 72-inch side walls are eliminated, and the deck is enclosed by a simple 42-inch picket railing, and the pilot house height is lowered to no more than 8 feet and sloped toward the front of the house, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 119 AND 121 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Modify storefronts

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lewin Associates and Winig Properties

Applicant: Rhea Gargullo, Sargenti Architects

History: 1835

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: @phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert two existing retail spaces into one in order to accommodate a new food establishment. The previously altered storefronts will be replaced with a new aluminum storefront that will be installed into the existing masonry openings. The brick at both facades is to remain, as is the existing stone at the windows and doors, and at the base of number 121. The downspout will be replaced in kind but the cast iron boot will remain. The existing cellar windows and cast iron bars at number 121 are to remain.

A new metal cornice is proposed for just below the windows at the second story. The proposal calls for the existing brick facades to be power washed and then painted white up to the height of the new cornice. A metal trellis with a planter on top is proposed to span the storefront at number 119. Ten inch acrylic letter signage is proposed for the face of the trellis and one foot eleven inch illuminated channel letters are proposed on the brick façade just above the trellis. A new, brightly colored metal awning is proposed to span the window at number 121. Two LED lights are proposed for above the metal awning.

Several aspects the proposal fail to satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards including the painting of the brick, the use of metal for the awning rather than fabric, and the installation of a metal cornice at the second story. The new storefront system should have more of a vertical orientation rather than a horizontal one, as proposed, and the transom windows at number 121 should be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Rhea Gargullo and Anthony Gerardi represented the application.

Mr. Gerardi commented that he believed the ground-floor commercial space was already one space, and the restaurant would occupy space at the second floor at 119 S. 18th Street. He explained that they had tried to maintain as much of the original façade as they could. Mr.

Gerardi said that their client, Zoës Kitchen, was more of a suburban type of chain, and what they were proposing was more of a muted down version of the company's standard. He remarked that some of the features such as the horizontal glass and the colored metal awning were a part of their standard. Mr. Gerardi said that he did not think they would have any objection to making the awning out of fabric instead; however, the colors were a part of their standard. He told the Architectural Committee members that previous versions of the plans had banners going up and down the entire building; the current proposal was the most muted version they had.

Mr. Gerardi asked about the staff's comments regarding the transom windows above the door at 121 S. 18th Street. Ms. Schmitt replied that the staff recommended that the transom windows remain. Mr. Gerardi said that he thought the transom windows were to remain behind the proposed awning. Ms. Schmitt said that they just wanted to put it on the record that the transom should be retained, and Mr. Gerardi replied that he thought it could be maintained easily. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that he saw a note on the demolition plan that said that the existing transom window and frame were to be removed. Ms. Gutterman added that the rest of the note read that a new, dark bronze, aluminum storefront window was to be installed, but it did not really show whether the transom was staying. Mr. Cluver remarked that it implied that it would not remain on the section drawing, and Mr. Gerardi agreed, adding that he thought that could be changed to maintain the transom.

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Gerardi to respond to the staff's comments about painting the brick and the metal cornice at the second floor. Mr. Gerardi responded that with the metal cornice, they were trying to create a storefront that was in line with the other buildings on the street, explaining that they took some evidence from the Dandelion's storefront across the street which had a stone cornice and originally had a commercial space at the ground floor. He said that they were trying to match the look of the street as far as the ground-floor retail spaces. Mr. Gerardi said that their two buildings had originally been residences and were converted to commercial, unlike the Dandelion building which had evidently always had a commercial space at the ground floor. He reiterated that they had just been trying to pick up references from other commercial spaces on the street, and asked if there was a different material they could use for the cornice.

Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that he was concerned about painting the existing stone and asked Mr. Gerardi why they wanted to paint it. Mr. Gerardi responded that they could leave the façade as it was, and Mr. D'Alessandro said that the brick should be cleaned and restored but not painted.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Gerardi why the storefront at 121 S. 18th Street was being removed. Mr. Gerardi replied that it was in fairly bad disrepair and was not original to the building. Mr. Cluver said that he agreed that it did not look original, but that it looked like it fit a little better than what was being proposed. He remarked that if it was strictly to tie the two buildings together with the same storefront, paint could help do that too. Mr. Gerardi explained that the rectangular horizontal storefront configuration was part of his client's look. Mr. Cluver asked why the number of panes and proportions change between the two storefronts, remarking that he did not see the brand identity coming out of them. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that Mr. Cluver made a good point, adding that the storefronts do not read as a brand. Mr. Cluver said that the way the storefronts were drawn on the detail sheet of their packets showed both resting on the ground. However, the one at 121 S. 18th Street would not be resting on the ground, adding that other

than being the same material, he really did not see the dialogue between the two. Mr. Gerardi said that he agreed with Mr. Cluver's comments.

Ms. Gutterman told the applicant that she did not think that the proposed cornice was appropriate, and though it may be his client's brand to have the pergola-type awning with the plantings over one of the buildings, she did not think it was appropriate for a historic building. Mr. D'Alessandro added that he did not like that it was covering up the brick. Ms. Gutterman said that there could be an awning of some type, and told the applicant that she was not sure what the LED lights were doing, and asked if the sconces that were above the awning were lighting up the building. Mr. Gerardi responded that the lights were washing down the awning. Ms. Gutterman asked why they would not be mounted underneath the awning to actually provide light to the people sitting there as opposed to washing the top of the building. Mr. Gerardi explained that there were some existing sconces that they were leaving at the side of the awning, but that the overhead lights were to wash the awning. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if they had studied what was currently on the street to see what was providing enough light. Mr. Gerardi asked Ms. Gutterman if she was referring to the lighting underneath the awning. Ms. Gutterman replied that she understood that they might want lights under the awning, but she was not sure about the lighting washing down the awning because there was already lighting on the street. Mr. Gerardi said that they could adjust the lighting to work better for the seating.

Mr. D'Alessandro requested some clarification about what was going to happen to the existing fabric of the façade. He asked the applicant if the front façade was going to be painted from the second story down to the ground, and Mr. Gerardi confirmed that that was their intent. Mr. D'Alessandro said that he was opposed to them painting the existing brick, adding that pointing and cleaning it would be fine, but that he would not approve painting it for no reason other than to change the color.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if they could go back to the awning for a moment in order to confirm that the applicant was proposing it be made out of aluminum rather than fabric, and Mr. Gerardi said yes. Mr. McCoubrey remarked that it was difficult to take a brand that did not have an 18th Street paradigm to use and apply here. He said that the proposal was missing the mark on every element including the painting of the brick, cornice, metal awning, proportions of the windows, and even the signage, which were all things that did not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Gerardi asked if the proposed channel letter signage was unacceptable. Ms. Gutterman responded that he should probably do a mock up on site to see the size of the letters in relation to the elevations.

Mr. Gerardi stated that he did not think his client would object to changing the metal awning to canvas, and they could likely adjust the down lighting. He said that they could probably pick up a more historic look for the storefronts and pull the two together more. Mr. Gerardi explained that they had looked at the façade without the paint, and it did take away from a more pronounced retail look, but he did not know if they would object to leaving the brick unpainted. Ms. Gutterman remarked that she understood that this was their client's brand, but that it needed to be amended to work within the streetscape of Philadelphia. She said that the wood awning and the fake plants were not appropriate for S. 18th Street. Mr. Gerardi clarified that the trellis was actually made of metal. Ms. Gutterman asked if it had a wood fascia on it or if it was entirely metal, and Mr. Gerardi replied that it was metal with a wood face. Mr. McCoubrey

commented that typically the Historical Commission approves real awnings. He said that maybe the brand identity could be most seen in the colors of the awning, and Ms. Gutterman added that it could also be seen in the color of the letters, but that their scale needed to be adjusted.

Mr. Detwiler said that in terms of the lighting, the applicant should avoid penetrations into the façade, unless they could work with existing holes.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if they could go back to the elevations for the demolition plans. He asked why the existing downspout was going to be removed but the cast iron boot was to remain. Ms. Gutterman directed Mr. D'Alessandro to drawing HC 2.2 to a photograph of the existing rainwater conductor. Mr. D'Alessandro repeated his question as to why they were proposing to remove the existing rainwater conductor, and Ms. Gutterman replied that it looked as though it was a replacement and that it was no longer attached to the wall. Mr. McCoubrey said that they were proposing to replace the downspout. Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that they would have to replace the downspout if they planned on removing it. Mr. Gerardi confirmed that the existing downspout was pulling away from the wall and that they were proposing to replace it.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were any other comments from the Architectural Committee, and Mr. Cluver commented that on the plans there was a note that called for power washing the brick, and he said he would like to think that they could find a gentler way to clean the façade. Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicant use a low pressure water wash.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there was public comment, and there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 300-04 RICHMOND ST

Proposal: Replace windows; construct ADA ramp; install mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Review

Owner: Kensington M.E. Church

Applicant: Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect

History: 1853; Kensington "Old Brick" ME Church

Individual Designation: 2/28/1967, 6/27/1967

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert the church at 300-04 Richmond Street into multiple residential units with a chapel retained for religious services. The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier version of this application in August 2018. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness, and the application was withdrawn before the Historical Commission meeting in September. A revised application was submitted for the September 2018 meeting of the Architectural Committee meeting, but withdrawn before the meeting was held.

New floors will be inserted into the church building. The new floors will run across the large stained glass windows, necessitating some changes to the windows. The application proposes to remove some stained glass windows from the side facades. The stained glass will be retained on the front façade and the first floor and top floor of the side facades. The spandrel panels will be retained in their present positions. The central portions of the side windows will be replaced with clear and spandrel glass to allow light and air to the new floors. The application also proposes to add mechanical equipment to the roof of the building, and add a ramp at the front door. The mechanical equipment should not be visible from the street as shown in the site line study. Although the Historical Commission does not have interior jurisdiction over this property, the applicant has made appropriate plans to address any potential archeological concerns related to the former cemetery in the basement. The developer no longer plans to alter the basement to create additional living units. Also, the developer is no longer proposing to add skylights in the roof.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Raymond Rola and developer Elliot Kopel represented the application.

Mr. Rola explained that he recently presented an application to the Architectural Committee in which he proposed 37 units that included major work in the basement and the exposure of trusses for loft apartments with skylights in the roof. Since that time, he continued, he has received zoning approval. He informed the Committee that the number of units has been reduced to 26, and that the plans no longer include roof work, exposed trusses, skylights, or work to the basement, aside from a sprinkler room and electrical metering. The scope of the project, he continued, has been substantially reduced.

Ms. Pentz asked how the attic will be accessed for maintenance and inspection. Mr. Rola answered that a hatchway with a pull-down stair would need to be provided in a common area. He elaborated that he plans to include an exit stair and that the hatch could be incorporated into the stair. There would be no projecting stair leading to the roof, he clarified.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the new floor structure would need to have columns extending into the basement with footings. Mr. Rola responded that massive footings already exist in the basement and that he intends to work with those footings as much as possible. He noted that they are 3' x 4' and are composed of brick and stone. Ms. Gutterman observed that the section drawing does not indicate any columns extending to the basement, but clarified that support would be required. Mr. Rola confirmed that structural work would be needed but that he is not proposing any excavation and that the existing footings would be reused as much as possible.

Ms. Pentz commented that the proposal calls for the addition of two new floors, which is a substantial amount of load. Mr. Rola responded that a footing would be added around the perimeter to execute a "belt and suspenders" solution in which the floors would be tied into the bearing wall.

Ms. Stein questioned why that system is not illustrated in the section drawing. Mr. Rola replied that he did not include a structural wall section and that the drawing included is meant to show

the window configuration and floor locations. He added that he has not addressed the structural issues at this time.

Mr. Cluver noted that the stained glass windows would be retained at the top story and asked whether the units at that level would not have any clear glass. Mr. Rola affirmed that the top units would only have stained glass windows. Mr. Cluver observed that the lower section of windows that would be replaced with new units is composed of five parts. Mr. Rola clarified that the middle section would be an opaque pane of glass. He then directed the Committee to the window details in the application, adding that they will be provided by Jeld-Wen. He stated that this approach would follow the one employed at 3rd Street, where a dark spandrel would be installed at the floor level and the rest of the unit would be a custom aluminum-clad wood window. Mr. Cluver responded that, because the proposal calls for the removal of single stained glass units, he would prefer a window that more closely resembles the original configuration. Mr. Rola explained that the stained glass has operators at the top and that there are steel horizontal divisions within the glass. Mr. Kopel added that the existing windows are comprised of five parts, which includes four stained glass parts and one spandrel. Mr. Cluver asked that the hierarchy of elements that currently exists be retained.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the fate of the stained glass that is to be removed. Mr. Kopel explained that there are several steps taking place. The main issue, he continued, is that the glass is in terrible disrepair. He stated that he reached out to the bishop of the United Methodist Church to see if there would be any interest in its reuse. He noted that there was not. He then approached different churches to inquire whether they would be interested. The final step, he continued, is to either utilize some of the windows in the rebuilding of the church, which will be located in the adjoining building, or to offer the windows to stained glass professionals to incorporate into their work.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the proposal is an excellent example of adaptive reuse of a historical church and that the Alliance testified to the Zoning Board in favor of the variance that was eventually granted. He added that he supports the staff recommendation of approval of this application.

Ms. Pentz noted that the application states that appropriate plans have been made to address any archaeological concerns related to the cemetery. She then asked whether that remains true, given that no work is proposed to the basement. Mr. Kopel responded that even though there are no plans to do extensive work, there may still be some aspect that requires work to the basement. He offered the example of footings. If it is determined that another footing is required, he explained that he has done extensive research to develop a plan to address the situation in the most respectful manner. He elaborated that there are no grave markers, so the next of kin would be the church members. He then stated that the church recommended the creation of a communal grave in Forest Hills Cemetery, where other remains of the congregation reside. Mr. Kopel commented that years ago the church expanded and many bodies were exhumed and ultimately interred at Forest Hills Cemetery. He explained that he contacted the cemetery's director who agreed to sell a plot so that a communal grave could be established for any remains that may be uncovered during this work. Ms. Pentz thanked Mr. Kopel for his answer, adding that these structural issues may very well require intervention.

The Architectural Committee members noted that the applicant has agreed to retain an archaeologist and make provisions for proper reinterment, should remains be uncovered in the basement.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2216 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish building behind façade; construct 6-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ascent Design and Builders

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: 1880; Façade replaced 1950, reclassified as NC 2/9/2018

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish all but the front façade of the existing four-story building at 2216 Walnut Street and to construct a six-story building behind the retained facade. At its 9 February 2018 meeting, the Historical Commission voted to reclassify the property from contributing to non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. The new building would be clad in brick, and the top two stories would be stepped back from the Walnut Street façade. The stepped upper stories would have decks with glass railings, and a roof deck would be further incorporated above. The building's rear would follow a similar pattern of stepped upper stories and decks. A new steel and aluminum storefront system would be installed within the existing limestone opening at the ground floor of the Walnut Street façade.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Stuart Rosenberg and Annebelle Salle represented the application.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that the application is based on the reclassification of the existing building from contributing to non-contributing in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The building, he continued, is a companion to the Roosevelt Hotel next door, and the designation was based on the fact that both buildings were owned by the same entity. He noted that the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia holds an easement on the properties and that it is his intention to retain and restore the mid-century façade. He explained that he worked extensively with the Alliance staff to ensure that the mid-century detailing of the storefront, the replacement of the awning windows at the upper floors, and the restoration of the brickwork would be done according to their standards. He then commented that the application proposes modest additions to the top of the structure, but that those upper stories would be intentionally stepped back. The visibility, he continued, is minimized so that the stepped upper stories fall out of the sightlines on both Walnut Street and the rear alleyway.

Mr. Cluver asked for clarification on the building's status as a non-contributing building with a preservation easement. Mr. Rosenberg responded that the easement is only for the façade, and it was established owing to the original building's history as part of a row of buildings designed by Frank Furness. Prior to the erection of the new façade in the 1950s, he continued, the Furness house was drastically modified. He elaborated that the façade was removed, the roofline was eliminated, and the interior floor elevations were altered. The first floor was originally five feet above sidewalk level, he explained, but the 1950s renovation changed the entrance to be at grade. Mr. Rosenberg further commented that, with the exception of a few minor pieces of millwork at the interior stair railing and some copper, nothing remains. He noted that the rear wing of the building was modified and a modern elevator tower was installed facing the alley. For those reasons, he concluded, the Historical Commission deemed the building non-contributing.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether Mr. Rosenberg considered an aluminum railing rather than glass. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the drawings contain a discrepancy in the railing. The elevation drawing, he asserted, shows a parapet wall with a railing above, but the rendering shows glass railings. Mr. Rosenberg clarified that the glass railing was the most recent iteration, though he thought the owners would be willing to substitute the glass for a brick parapet wall if that was the Committee's preference. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the elevation showed the parapet with a railing above. Mr. Rosenberg responded that it was drawn that way to address a code requirement, which is 42 inches. The design, he continued, was intended to minimize the height of the parapet wall by incorporating a 30-inch parapet with a 12-inch railing.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether there is a double railing at the fifth floor. Mr. Rosenberg answered that the setback railing is a concession to the zoning ordinance, which requires roof decks to be set back a minimum dimension. He elaborated that he is not intending to construct a double brick wall.

Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee reviews many applications for roof decks at the fronts of buildings and the guidelines clearly indicate that roof decks should remain at the rear of a property, though this application proposes a deck at the front overlooking Walnut Street. It feels very much out of place in the district, he contended. Mr. Rosenberg responded that the deck would be recessed significantly from the front façade to comply with both the Historical Commission's requirements and the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Gutterman observed that the deck at the fifth floor has no setback in plan. She noted that the elevation and plan contain inconsistencies. Mr. Rosenberg stated that the railing seems to be omitted in plan but that there would be a railing to hold occupancy of the front roof deck back from the façade.

Mr. Cluver questioned whether the rear façade proposed for demolition has some historic significance. Mr. Rosenberg replied that the original rear wing did have a chamfered bay window. He stated that, based on archaeological investigations, the rear historically contained bay windows. During the 1950s renovation, he continued, the windows were removed, the masonry openings were eliminated, and the heads were demolished and infilled with modern CMU. What is left, he clarified, are two chamfered walls. Mr. Cluver responded that the property's reclassification as non-contributing also helps to answer his question.

Ms. Stein noted that the first story of the front façade appears to be a stainless steel curtain wall that will be modified and repaired. She observed that it will not be a complete replacement but asked Mr. Rosenberg to verify the retention of material, adding that a new aluminum door is proposed rather than stainless steel. She further questioned the material of the windows at the upper stories. Mr. Rosenberg answered that his intention is to replace the metal work on the storefront in stainless steel, including the door. He elaborated that he is unsure to what extent the existing stainless steel trim could be preserved. In anticipation of replacement, he stated that he is committed to replacing all the stainless steel. The upper windows, he continued, are currently aluminum or steel, though not stainless, and would be replaced in kind. He reiterated that he worked extensively with the Preservation Alliance and will continue to do so during the shop drawing review process.

Mr. Cluver referenced Mr. Rosenberg's earlier comment, in which he stated that the decks step back from Walnut Street. Mr. Cluver then asked why, in plan, unit 500 is depicted with a deck at the edge of the street. Mr. Rosenberg answered that the floor plan omits the railing that will need to be installed and that is shown in the building section. The lower deck directly behind the façade, he continued, is the deck that requires the setback according to the zoning ordinance. He added that the deck on the floor above is already set far enough back to meet the zoning requirement. He then claimed that both decks fall beyond the sightline so that neither will be visible from the street. Mr. Cluver disagreed about the visibility of the decks along Walnut Street. Mr. Rosenberg responded that a sliver may be visible from tight angles.

Mr. Cluver referred to the massing diagram, noting that the top floor consists of a roof deck but does not match the plan. The Committee and applicants discussed the inconsistencies in the drawings. Mr. Rosenberg stated that the inconsistencies require coordination to resolve and that the massing diagram more accurately reflects the proposal.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that his organization holds an easement on the property and that the property was once merged into a single tax parcel with the neighboring Roosevelt Hotel. In about 2016, he continued, the property was sold and 2216 was severed from the Roosevelt, though the easement remained in place. The Preservation Alliance, he noted, still holds easement jurisdiction over the property and has been closely involved in reviewing the plans.

Mr. Rosenberg added that the owners for the Roosevelt building have provided written support for the proposed project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, with the following comments:

- the applicant should work with the staff to coordinate the plans, sections, and massing diagrams before the Historical Commission meeting to accurately represent the proposed building;
- the minimum five-foot setback of the deck required along Walnut Street is reflected in the drawings;
- the railing system at the deck is executed in a way that prevents future residents from removing it to expand the deck;

- aluminum rather than glass railings in keeping with a 1950s building are used at the decks along Walnut Street; and,
- additional storefront details are provided to make them as streamlined as possible.

ADDRESS: 262 S 16TH ST

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

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Briarpatch Holdings LLC

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop, Inc.

History: 1980

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-contributing building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District and to construct a six-story building with pilot house and front-facing decks with glass railings. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction. The Historical Commission reviewed an earlier iteration of this project at its September 2018 meeting. This application proposes three stories flush with the street and clad in red brick and cast stone. The fourth floor would feature a mansard roof with large dormer windows and a cornice aligned with those of the neighboring properties. The front elevation of the fifth and sixth floors would be clad in spandrel glass, while the side elevations would be clad in metal panels. The fifth floor would be set back 10 feet from the front façade and feature a 42-inch glass railing set back five feet from the front façade, rising directly out of the proposed mansard roof. The sixth floor would be set back 15 feet from the front façade, and the pilot house, which runs over 40 feet along the south elevation, would be set back approximately 22 feet from the front elevation.

At the September Historical Commission meeting, the Commission noted that a change in materials between the lower and upper floors in addition to greater setbacks of those upper floors might make the project more appropriate for this location. While the applicant has changed the materials between the lower and upper floors, the 10-foot setback for the fifth floor remains the same as the application reviewed and denied at the previous Historical Commission meeting. At the September meeting of the Historical Commission, the Commission and architect discussed projects at 2110 Walnut Street and the Curtis Institute of Music. By contrast, the upper-floor setbacks of those projects are approximately 19 feet and 40 feet, respectively.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano opined that they had made significant changes to the overall massing, scale, and materiality of the proposed building from the previous submission, and obtained useful comments during the last submission. He explained that they created a material distinction between the upper and lower floors, set back the upper floors, and better aligned the lower floors with the row of existing buildings to the north and south. He noted that there is a

discrepancy between the drawing and the rendering. Sheet A2, he explained, shows the third-floor windows as intended, tight to the underside of the cornice, which is in keeping with the buildings to the north. He explained that on A6, the rendering, there is a line of brick between the cornice and windows, which is not the intention. The cornice line would be slightly lower than that of the Monk's Café building to the south, but would align with the buildings to the north. Mr. Montalbano noted that this application introduces a mansard-roofed fourth floor which would pitch back approximately five feet. He opined that the mansard is complementary to the Monk's building in color, scale, and massing, and that it helps minimize the visual impact of the fourth floor. Mr. Montalbano clarified that the railing at the fifth floor is currently shown as a glass guard rail, but could be revised to a vertical metal picket. He noted that it might be more appropriate to keep the railings at the sixth floor and roof as glass since they will be in front of curtain wall glass. He also clarified that the side elevations are currently shown as metal panels, but the owner has requested that they be in stucco or a stucco-like material instead.

Mr. McCoubrey recalled that the Historical Commission and Architectural Committee had previously stated that, given the context of the block and mass of the proposed upper floors, the a significant setback would be needed in order to diminish the impact of the upper floors. He noted that there has not been a change in the setback. Mr. Montalbano responded that the prior submission had a 10-foot setback for both the fifth and sixth floors, but in this submission, they have increased the setback of the sixth floor by an additional five feet. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the upper floors will still be highly visible even from directly across the street and feel overwhelming to an intact block of mainly three-story buildings. Mr. Montalbano responded that one issue they encountered in trying to increase the setbacks at the front is that the roof deck requires two means of egress, resulting in a large pilot house with the elevator and stair tower. He explained that they looked at increasing the setbacks of the upper floors to align with the front face of the pilot house, but that actually made the upper floors look taller because it was a greater expanse vertically without any additional relief and setback. He opined that the proposed massing helps hide the pilot house better. Mr. McCoubrey responded that even that may not be a sufficient setback. Ms. Gutterman explains that she understands the intent, but still believes the proposed massing is too great for this site.

Ms. Gutterman opined that there are too many windows in the mansard, making it less identifiable as a mansard. She suggested reducing the size or number of the windows. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the three windows do not read properly in the mansard. Ms. Gutterman also suggested that this project might be more successful if there were not balconies in front of the front set back upper floors, explaining that the balconies will not just have railings, but will also have umbrellas, chairs, tables, etc., which will make them more conspicuous. She opined that the referenced comparable projects might have been more successful because the lots are wider, whereas this project is packed and compressed.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that part of the success of the other referenced projects is that the upper and lower floors do not read as part of the same building. Mr. Montalbano noted that the 2110 Walnut Street project referenced at the Historical Commission meeting was a good example to follow, although that project is actually taller and the upper floors highly visible. He acknowledged, though, that he understands the point that it feels like a different building. He offered to bring several massing examples to the Architectural Committee to see whether the stepped back version actually helps the proposed design feel less tall.

Mr. Cluver noted that he was not present for the reviews of the previous submissions, but opined that the design is overly busy. He suggested limiting the height to three floors along the street, with a strong cornice line, and then greater setbacks of floors four through six. Mr. Montalbano showed Mr. Cluver the previous submission, noting that even the base massing and scale were in question previously, and the windows and floors were not as well aligned. Mr. Montalbano opined that the introduction of the cornice line and mansard improves upon the previous submission. Mr. Cluver noted that, in looking at the floor plan and where front stair opens, there is some dead space on the interior. He suggested that if the door turned into the living room, the setbacks could be increased without a strong impact on the interior program. Mr. Cluver noted that he is not a fan of the Juliette balconies on the second-floor façade and opined that the street frontages still seem heavy on the lower floors. Mr. Montalbano replied that both adjacent buildings have large windows, and that he thinks the scale of these windows with three bays carries the rhythm of the neighboring properties. Mr. Montalbano agreed that the mansard could be revised to scale down the dormer windows. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that there should not be three windows in the mansard. Mr. Cluver opined that there should not be a fourth floor on the street at all.

Mr. Cluver questioned the placement of mechanical equipment. Mr. Montalbano responded that they have not worked out the details of the mechanical systems yet, but that the property has a large rear yard, so some of the equipment could be located in the back yard and some on the roof. Mr. Detwiler asked whether the applicants could utilize some of the back yard to reduce the height of the building. Mr. Montalbano responded that ideally they would like to, but this is the maximum footprint allowed by zoning without a variance. Mr. Montalbano noted that they are significantly below the floor area ratio allowed by zoning. He noted that their original plans started at over 100 feet in height.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none. Mr. Montalbano noted that it might not be his place to speak for someone else, but that Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance had told him that it was a great improvement from the previous submission.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials,

features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs—their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roof material such as slate, wood, clay, tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning. Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish.

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.