

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

**TUESDAY, 19 FEBRUARY 2019
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-031
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:02:40

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

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

The following staff members were present:

- 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

The following persons were present:

- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Bob Quinn, Diplomat Demolition
- Kimberly Valentine
- Martha Adams
- Neil Block, Cairone Construction Company
- Al Fuscaldo, Esq., Fuscaldo Law Group
- Craig Schelter, Schelter & Associates
- David Ertz, Cope Linder – Nelson
- John Turchi, Turchi Properties
- Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
- Richard Glazer
- Bill O'Brien, Esq., Lawyers on Main
- Rob Neducsin, Neducsin Properties
- Jane Lipton, Manayunk Development Corporation
- Gwen McCauley, Manayunk Development Corporation
- Ian Cope, Cope Linder – Nelson

M. Abdullah
Joseph Hoban, KenCrest
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Steve Bonitatibus, Bonitatibus Architects
Egen Naydovich, Haverford Square
Bochy Fu
Shao-Xian Xu

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 147-53 BERKLEY ST

Proposal: Remove one-story rear section; brace front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Original Church of God in Christ Inc.

Applicant: Joshua Strickler, Diplomat Demolition

History: 1910; Arguto Oilless Bearing Company; Mellor & Meigs, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Wayne Junction Historic District, Contributing, 7/13/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

A one-story brick building that is Contributing to the Wayne Junction Historic District stands on 149 Berkley Street, part of a larger property at 147-53 Berkley Street. The building consists of a headhouse along Berkley Street, with a character-defining Arguto Oilless Bearing Company sign, and a rear production shed which runs back approximately 170 feet, the majority of which is not visible from the public right-of-way. The building is in very poor condition and is missing most of its roof structure. The owner sought the Historical Commission's approval in 2018 to demolish the building in its entirety, to comply an Unsafe violation issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The Commission denied the complete demolition application in October 2018, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibition against demolition. During that review, several Commissioners suggested that the headhouse is the significant portion of the building, and that the rear, which is severely deteriorated and not highly visible from the public right-of-way, may be a candidate for removal. The staff recently approved a make-safe permit application for masonry repair and restoration work to the headhouse, the scope of which satisfies preservation standards.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Retain and brace front façade and approximately 14 feet of masonry return at west side wall and visible masonry return at east side wall. Bracing of façade to be done from interior.
- Remove remainder of building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The proposed project retains the main headhouse, which is the highly visible portion of the building that conveys the historic character of the building, and which maintains the industrial streetscape along Berkley Street.
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - The proposed project retains the main headhouse, which is the highly visible portion of the building that conveys the historic materials and features of the building.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature*

will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

- The proposed project retains the main headhouse. The rear production shed is not a distinctive feature, and is in disrepair, and therefore does not require repair nor replacement in kind.
- *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.*
 - The proposed removal of all parts remaining of the structure except for the front façade and portion of the side walls can be considered an alteration, instead of a demolition in the legal sense, because it involves a section of a building that has little historic character and is not highly visible to the public.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, as an alteration to a site where the historically significant section of the building is being retained, and provided a bracing plan is submitted for staff review, which is prepared by a licensed structural engineer and which shows that the bracing will cause no further damage to the remaining walls, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6, and the Commission's comments from its 12 October 2018 meeting.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:02:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Contractors Neil Block and Bob Quinn, and Kimberly Valentine and Martha Adams of the Original Glorious Church of God in Christ Apostolic Faith – The Church of Philadelphia, the property owner, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked if there is a future development plan for the site, or if this application is in response to the need to take down the rear in a controlled manner so that it does not fall down on its own.
 - The applicants responded that the future use of the site is to be determined, but that this application is a result of the need to safely remove the rear of the building now.
- The Committee asked if the bracing is temporary or is intended to be in place for some time.

- The applicant responded that the bracing proposal will be a reinforced masonry wall built directly behind the front façade and two return walls, and can be considered to be permanent.
- The Committee asked about the timing and sequence of the proposed work.
 - The applicant responded that there is some debris that needs to be cleared out in order to get into the space, and the roof structure is nearly one hundred percent collapsed in, so there will be some level of demolition done prior to the bracing, for the purposes of accessing a cleared site.
- The Committee asked how the end of the masonry walls will be protected after demolition of the rear.
 - The applicant responded that there will be a clean saw cut in the masonry, approximately 14 feet back, where there is an existing expansion joint right at the transition.
- The Committee asked if there will be a new roof over the headhouse to further protect it from water damage.
 - The applicant responded that there will be no roof because there will not be a structure to put a roof on. However, there will be a cap to stop water from going between the reinforced masonry wall and the historic wall. The cap will cover the historic wall.
- The Committee asked if the historic window on the west side wall will be retained.
 - The applicant responded that the window in the return wall, which is within the 14-foot return, will remain.
- The Committee asked about the existing water tower, and stated that it should remain in a stabilized state, if there is no immediate reason to take it down and if there is no plan yet for the site which would involve the water tower.
 - The applicant responded that the water tower can remain if that is preferred.
- The Committee reiterated that anything that is part of the façade or retained return walls is expected to remain. This includes architectural features such as windows, doors, outriggers, pent roofs, the pier with ball, and front stoops.
 - The applicant acknowledged this, and explained that the only parts of the remaining façade that are going to be touched include the cracked upper right parapet, and the left corner where a tree was growing out of the wall. The approved permit for that scope of work allows for reconstruction of those areas.
- The staff commented that the owner of the property next door at 137-45 Berkley Street, Ken Weinstein, inquired with the staff as to whether the scope of work includes removal of all debris from the site. Mr. Weinstein indicated non-opposition to this application when speaking with the staff.
 - The applicant responded that the scope of work includes removal of all debris from the site.
- The Committee suggested that some brick should be salvaged from the demolished portion.
 - The applicant agreed with this suggestion.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed project retains the main headhouse, which is the highly visible portion of the building that conveys the historic character of the building, and which maintains the industrial streetscape along Berkley Street. The rear production shed

is not a distinctive feature, and is in disrepair, and therefore does not require repair nor replacement in kind.

- The proposed removal of all parts remaining of the structure except for the front façade and portion of the side walls can be considered an alteration, instead of a demolition in the legal sense, because it involves a section of a building that has little historic character and is not highly visible to the public.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, as an alteration to a site where the historically significant section of the building is being retained, and with the understanding that the new supporting structure includes a cap to protect the historic brick, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6, and the Commission’s comments from its 12 October 2018 meeting, provided:

- a bracing plan is submitted for staff review, which is prepared by a licensed structural engineer and which shows that the bracing will cause no further damage to the remaining walls,
- all extant architectural features of the head house are retained, and
- the water tower is retained until a plan for the site is developed.

ITEM: 147-53 BERKLEY ST				
MOTION: Approval with conditions				
MOVED BY: Cluver				
SECONDED BY: Gutterman				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X			
John Cluver	X			
Rudy D'Alessandro	X			
Justin Detwiler	X			
Nan Gutterman	X			
Suzanne Pentz	X			
Amy Stein	X			
Total	7			

ADDRESS: 223 S 6TH ST

Proposal: Remove rear wing; construct mid-rise residential building with link to historic building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mary & John J. Turchi, Jr.

Applicant: David Ertz, Cope Linder Architects

History: 1957, Edward Brumbaugh, architect, for Mayor Richardson Dilworth

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND: This application proposes to construct a mid-rise residential building at the rear of an historic building that faces Washington Square. Architect Edward Brumbaugh designed the now-historic building for Mayor Richardson Dilworth in 1957. Mayor Dilworth constructed his house on Washington Square in a neo-Colonial style to demonstrate his commitment to the redevelopment of the historic Society Hill neighborhood. The property is classified as Significant in the Society Hill Historic District, owing to its connection to Dilworth.

The site is bounded by S. 6th Street and Washington Square at the west, S. Randolph Street at the east, the Athenaeum of Philadelphia at the north, and the former J.B. Lippincott Publishing Co. building at the south.

The application proposes removing the rear ell of the historic house, leaving the main block, and constructing an 12-story, 150-foot tall, residential building at the rear. The main block would be restored. The new building would include 20 parking spaces in the basement, accessed from S. Randolph Street. The new building would connect to the rear of the historic building at the first through third floors. The main entrance to the new building would be linked to 6th Street by a walkway running along the north of the historic house. The new building would share a party wall with the Athenaeum. A walkway running along the south of the historic house would link 6th Street to Randolph Street and separate the new building from the Lippincott building to the south. The new building would be clad with a grey, zinc panel system, with pre-cast concrete panels as an alternate. It would have balconies with glass railings. All four facades would be fenestrated. The building would be set back about 50 feet from 6th Street and 22 feet from Randolph Street. The building would step back at the east and west at the 9th floor.

The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a similar project in 2007 that included the removal of the service wing or rear ell and the construction of a 16-story residential building. Unlike the current project, which sets the addition back behind the historic house, the 2007 addition cantilevered out over the historic house. At that time the Historical Commission found that the removal of the service wing or rear ell was an alteration, not a demolition in the eyes of the preservation ordinance and did not require a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest for an approval. Neighbors appealed the 2007 decision. The complex litigation, which took eight years to work through the courts, centered on whether the Board of License & Inspection should defer to the Historical Commission on the interpretation of the Commission's ordinance and Rules & Regulations. In 2015, the Commonwealth Court upheld the Historical Commission's approval, deciding that the Historical Commission was due deference and had based its decision to approve the removal of the service wing as an alteration, not a demolition in the legal sense, on sufficient evidence, and throwing out the appeal. Setting an important precedent, the Commonwealth Court decided that the Historical Commission, which includes members with specific types of expertise, is owed deference by reviewing bodies like the Board of License & Inspection Review, which does not include experts in architecture, history, and historic preservation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 FEBRUARY 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove rear ell or service wing;
- Construct 12-story addition with basement parking; and,
- Restore the main block of the historic house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The City's historic preservation ordinance and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines provide guidance for reviewing this application.

- Sections 14-203(15), 14-203(88), and 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the historic preservation ordinance, define demolition and alteration and place restrictions on the approvals of applications proposing demolition.
 - Section 14-203(15): Alter or Alteration: a change in the appearance of a building, structure, site, or object which is not otherwise covered by the definition of demolition, or any other change for which a permit is required under The Philadelphia Code of General Ordinances.
 - Section 14-203(88): Demolition or Demolish: The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object.
 - Section 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.
 - The current application proposes to remove the rear ell or service wing of the building as well as some sections of the rear wall of the main block. Virtually the same sections of the building were proposed for removal in 2007 and approved as an alteration.
 - The proposed razing or destruction of the rear ell or service wing of the building as well as some sections of the rear wall of the main block is not a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88) because the sections proposed for removal are not significant, character-defining, or essential sections of the historic building. They can be removed without impairing the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment. The proposed razing or destruction of the rear ell or service wing of the building as well as some sections of the rear wall of the main block is an alteration as defined in Section 14-203(15) and therefore does not trigger the restrictions mandated in Section 14-1005(6)(d). The Historical Commission does not need to find necessity in the public interest or that the building cannot be reasonably adapted before approving this application.
 - The Historical Commission determined in 2007 and the Commonwealth Court agreed on appeal that the removal of the rear ell and other portions of this building did not constitute a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88) and was justifiably approved as an alteration.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature*

will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

- The staff will review all restoration details for the historic house to ensure that the work complies with Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The Historical Commission already determined and the Commonwealth Court agreed that the project approved in 2007 satisfied the Historical Commission's review criteria including Standard 9. From the perspective of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the current application is an improvement over the project approved in 2007.
 - The removal of the rear ell or service wing will not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property because the rear ell is a secondary feature that does not characterize the property.
 - The proposed building will be differentiated from the old. The proposed building partakes of a contemporary architectural vocabulary, differentiating it from the 1950s Colonial Revival building.
 - The proposed building will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
 - Washington Square is surrounded by several tall buildings. The proposed 12-story building with set-backs at the upper floors is compatible with this environment. The size (height, breadth, and depth of the building) and massing (general shape and form of the building) of the building are appropriate. The currently proposed building is shorter than, set back more, and does not cantilever like the approved 2007 building.
 - The materials and features are compatible with the context. The proposed mid-rise is designed to recede, rightfully giving the historic building the position of prominence. The sloped section at the top of the mid-rise acknowledges the nearby historic buildings without imitating them.
 - The scale (the dimensional relationships of the building and its features to its surroundings including humans) and proportions (the dimensional relationships of the building's features to one another) of the new building are appropriate.
 - The main block of the historic building will be used for active purposes, lobby at the first floor and living at the second and third floors.
- *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.*
 - The Historical Commission already determined and the Commonwealth Court agreed that the project approved in 2007 satisfied the Historical Commission's review criteria including Standard 10. The new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired. The rear ell or service wing is not part of the essential form of the building and may be removed without violating Standard 10. The construction of the mid-rise addition will not impair the integrity of the historic property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review the restoration details of the main block, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10, Sections 14-203(15), 14-203(88), and 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, and the Historical Commission's approval of 9 November 2007.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:16:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Developer John Turchi, architect David Ertz, consultant Craig Schelter, and attorney Alfred Fuscaldo represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked about the plans for the gates and fences along S. 6th Street.
 - Mr. Ertz responded that the gate and fence at the south would remain in place as is. The gate at the north would be widened and the fence altered to accommodate the pedestrian traffic in and out of the building.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the choice of the cladding material for the exterior of the building. He noted that it differs from the cladding of the masonry buildings around Washington Square.
 - Mr. Ertz responded that they are proposing to use a zinc panel, but are also considering a cast material. He stated that the zinc is their preference. He displayed photographs of buildings clad in the proposed zinc panel. He also showed samples of the zinc panel. He stated that the zinc panels are both contemporary and historic. He stated that the zinc panels would relate well to the slate roof on the historic house. He stated that the zinc panels would replicate the pattern of the slate roof. He stated that the zinc panels would be a recessive color and would be compatible with the historic house. He showed a sample of the color that they are proposing. He stated that the zinc panels would create shadow lines that would be reminiscent of those created by the slate roof and brick façade of the historic house. He stated that the zinc has an old and a new feel to it. It is differentiated from yet compatible with the historic building.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the massing of the proposed addition is acceptable. He noted that the proposed addition is more compatible than the addition approved in 2007; it is shorter than and set back farther from 6th Street than the earlier proposal.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the party wall at the north and noted that the texture or articulation of the wall is appreciated. He asked if more windows could be added to the wall. He acknowledged the restrictions to windows on party walls but noted that there may be some provisions that allow for them, perhaps an easement with the neighbor. Mr. Detwiler asked if more articulation could be introduced onto that wall.
 - Mr. Ertz explained that the north façade already includes some windows, where the building steps back at the rear. He noted that there are north-facing windows along the link to the house as well. Mr. Ertz stated that they could potentially add windows to the north party wall, but it would require an agreement with the neighboring property owner. He explained, however, that about half of the interior space behind that party wall is devoted to the elevator core and fire stairs. Mr. Ertz concluded that windows could be added, but they would require an agreement with the neighbor and additional life safety features.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the connection of the new addition to the historic house. He asked in the cornice of the historic house would turn from the side at the corner and

- run for some distance along the rear of the house before connecting with the addition. He stated that it is important that the cornice wrap around to the rear of the house.
- Mr. Ertz stated that the cornice would wrap the corner and run along the rear of the house. He stated that preserving that cornice line is very important. The cornice will wrap at both the north and south.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that his only concern with the proposal is the color of the zinc panels. He stated that he finds the proposed color to be too dark. He suggested a lighter color. Some others on the Architectural Committee agreed. Ms. Gutterman stated that one must consider the addition in relation to the nearby buildings as well including the Athenaeum and Lippincott buildings. Mr. Cluver stated that the color of the addition as seen in the renderings in the application materials is an appropriate color. He suggested a mock-up.
 - Mr. Ertz responded that the color of the zinc panel cannot be accurately judged in the conference room with 70 watts of light, when it will be seen outside in the sunlight, 1000 watts of light. He stated that the sample panel looks much lighter in natural light. He stated that the perspective view in the application package provides an accurate representation of the color seen in sunlight. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Cluver suggested that the staff could verify the appropriateness of the color with a mockup at the site.
 - Mr. Schelter noted that the addition will not be visible when one stands in front of the house on 6th Street. It will be seen from Washington Square, but through many trees.
 - Mr. Cluver observed that the historic house would have an active use, which is positive.
 - Mr. Ertz stated that the ground floor would be used as common space for the residents. The second, third, and attic floors would be incorporated into a residential unit and will be occupied spaces.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked about the Randolph Street façade.
 - Mr. Ertz reported that the Athenaeum has a rear wall and fence along Randolph Street. The Lippincott building is built out to the property line along Randolph and includes a garage entrance. He stated that the garage door at the proposed building will be set back three feet from the property line along Randolph Street. The set back as well as the width of the garage door were dictated by the Streets Department to provide a sufficient turning radius.
 - Ms. Stein asked if vehicles would back up onto the street waiting for the lift that takes cars to the basement parking.
 - Mr. Ertz explained that the proposed building would include 10 residential units and 20 parking spaces. He stated that there will be three queuing spaces within the building, one for unloading and two for entering the garage. With only 10 units, the movement in and out of the garage will be very infrequent. The garage door will have translucent panels, like the one that the Historical Commission approved at 17th and Rittenhouse Square Streets. Residents will have transponders in their cars to open the garage door from the street. The automobile elevator is programed to wait at street level for arrivals when not in use, so that you can drive right in. The driver gets out, answers some questions on a panel, and then the elevator automatically takes the car to the basement storage. On the way out of the building, a resident can call for the car while riding down on the elevator.

- Mr. D'Alessandro observed that the building would include glass railings at the balconies and asserted that the Historical Commission does not approve glass railings. Mr. Cluver corrected Mr. D'Alessandro, noting that the Architectural Committee does not typically recommend approval of glass railings on historic buildings, but often recommends their approval on new construction such as this. He asserted that glass railings satisfy the Standards in this case.
 - Mr. Ertz stated that they chose glass for transparency and views from the inside out.
- Mr. Cluver asked how the exposed side wall of the Athenaeum would be treated.
 - Mr. Ertz explained that the north wall of the rowhouse that stood on the site before the Dilworth House was erected still stands up against the south party wall of the Athenaeum. Two 1830s rowhouses stood on the Dilworth House site until the 1950s. He stated that the party wall remnant will be restuccoed and scored to be compatible with the Athenaeum. He stated that the new building and the Athenaeum will not engage one another. There will be a separation.
- Ms. Stein asked about the color of the glass proposed for the building. She stated that she would not want to see blue or green glass used at this project.
 - Mr. Ertz presented a glass sample to the Architectural Committee showing that it was standard glass without a blue or green tint. He stated that the proposed glass is two clear layers with a low-E coating for energy efficiency. He stated that the window mullions would be slightly darker than the cladding. He stated that the low-E coating makes the glass slightly more reflective. He noted that the glass railings would not have the low-E coating. The railings would be single-layer structural glass. He stated again that the windows would be standard glass.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association introduced himself and noted that the project has not yet been formally presented to his organization.
 - Mr. Boni stated that he disagreed with the staff's characterizations of the court decisions. He stated that he was unsure whether determining if the removal of the rear wing of the house constituted a demolition or alteration was within the purview of the Architectural Committee. He suggested that the Architectural Committee deferred to the Historical Commission on the matter of demolition when it reviewed the previous application many years ago.
 - Mr. Boni said that it seems to him that the removal of material is greater in this case than it was in the previous, approved application, especially at the rear of the front block. Mr. Fuscaldo disagreed. He stated that they are proposing to remove less of the rear wall of the main block than was proposed and approved for removal in the earlier, approved application. Mr. Fuscaldo added that both the approved application and the current application call for encapsulating the rear wall of the main block in new construction.
 - Mr. Boni asked rhetorically if there is "some sort of guidance on additions." He paraphrased Standard 9, stating that additions should not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. He paraphrased Standard 10, stating that new construction should be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired. He stated that he could not see how those standards are met. He then referred to the Guidelines for additions and asserted that additions should be inconspicuous.

- Mr. Boni stated that the project would result in the removal of the rear window and rear balcony on the main block and the destruction of “a beautiful garden.” He also asked whether the reference to the rear part of the house as a “service wing” is a technically accurate term.
- Mr. Boni concluded that the proposed project does not fit into its context. The massing is too large. The size is too large. The scale is too large. He asked the Architectural Committee to require the applicant to appear again before the Committee before proceeding to the Historical Commission.
- Richard Glazer, a resident of the Lippincott building, stated that Locust Walk, One Independence Place, and Washington East Condominium Association are represented in this matter by David Fineman of the law firm of Fineman, Krekstein & Harris.
- Mr. Fuscaldo responded to the public comment. He stated that he agrees with the staff that the question of whether removal of the rear wing and other portions of the building constitutes a demolition or an alteration in the eyes of the preservation ordinance was settled by the Commonwealth Court. He stated that his client is proposing to remove the same portions of the building that the Historical Commission approved for removal in 2007. He stated that the portions of the building proposed for removal were not historically significant in 2007 and are not historically significant now. Mr. Cluver stated that the question of demolition versus alteration has been reviewed extensively and a determination has been made. He stated that his comments about the project were predicated on a belief that the proposed removal of the rear wing and other parts of the building are an alteration, not a demolition. He stated that he believes that issue to be settled, but the Historical Commission could always revisit it.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed razing or destruction of the rear ell or service wing of the building as well as some sections of the rear wall of the main block is not a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88) because the sections proposed for removal are not significant, character-defining, or essential sections of the historic building. They can be removed without impairing the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment. The proposed razing or destruction of the rear ell or service wing of the building as well as some sections of the rear wall of the main block is an alteration as defined in Section 14-203(15) and therefore does not trigger the restrictions mandated in Section 14-1005(6)(d). The Historical Commission does not need to find necessity in the public interest or that the building cannot be reasonably adapted before approving this application.
- The staff can review all restoration details for the historic house to ensure that the work complies with Standard 6.
- The removal of the rear ell or service wing will not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property because the rear ell is a secondary feature that does not characterize the property. The project satisfies this aspect of Standard 9.
- The new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired. The rear ell or service wing is not part of the essential form of the building and may be removed without violating Standard 10.

- The proposed building will be differentiated from the old. The proposed building partakes of a contemporary architectural vocabulary, differentiating it from the 1950s Colonial Revival building, and thereby satisfying this aspect of Standard 9.
- The proposed building will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment, provided the gray color of the exterior cladding is not too dark, satisfying this aspect of Standard 9.
- The construction of the mid-rise addition will not impair the integrity of the historic property and its environment, thereby satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review the restoration details of the main block, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10, Sections 14-203(15), 14-203(88), and 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, and the Historical Commission’s approval of 9 November 2007.

ITEM: 223 S 6TH ST				
MOTION: Approval				
MOVED BY: Cluver				
SECONDED BY: Gutterman				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x			
John Cluver	x			
Rudy D’Alessandro		x		
Justin Detwiler	x			
Nan Gutterman	x			
Suzanne Pentz	x			
Amy Stein		x		
Total	5	2		

ADDRESS: 106-08 AND 110 GRAPE ST

Proposal: Demolish buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan Nedusin

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 106-08 Grape Street, c. 1930; 110 Grape Street, c. 1835

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk, 12/14/1983

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

BACKGROUND: This application proposes to demolish a one-story garage at 106-08 Grape Street and a three-story residential building at 110 Grape Street. The application includes architectural plans for a new building to be constructed on the cleared site, but they appear to be included for information only and not for review for approval. The building permit application included with the application describes the work as demolition only and does not mention any new construction.

The application is titled "Application to demolish a contributing structure within the Main Street Manayunk Historic District due to financial hardship by the Manayunk Development Corporation ("MDC"), a non-profit charitable organization." The application includes a cover letter that asserts that 106-08 Grape Street is classified as non-contributing in the historic district and 110 Grape Street is classified as contributing. The cover letter references a report from a historic preservation consultant that concludes that the building at 110 Grape Street lacks historical significance and integrity. The cover letter references an engineer's report that concludes that the building at 110 Grape Street is severely deteriorated and suffers from structural defects. The cover letter explains that the MDC, a 501(c)(3) charitable entity, seeks to develop the site as office, meeting, and retail space. The cover letter concludes that "Considering the building's weak contributing stature, its severe deterioration and the community benefit of the proposed redevelopment, the Commission is urged to allow demolition of 110 Grape Street."

In addition to the cover letter, building permit application, preservation consultant's report, and engineer's report, the application includes plans for the new building, the bylaws of the MDC, and an affidavit from the current owner, Daniel R. Neducsin. The index states that the application also includes a zoning permit for the new development, but it instead includes a second copy of the bylaws of the MDC at the tab reserved for the zoning permit.

Owing to fact that the application is presented as a financial hardship application, the staff of the Historical Commission has reviewed it to determine whether it includes the requisite information for a hardship application as enumerated in Section 9.2.a.1-6 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations. 9.2.a. In addition to the standard submission documents required by Section 6.7 of the Rules & Regulations, an applicant claiming financial hardship shall submit, by affidavit, the following information for the entire property:

1. amount paid for the property, date of purchase, and party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, whether business or familial, if any, between the owner and the person from whom the property was purchased;
 - a. The affidavit states that the current owner, Daniel R. Neducsin, purchased the property from Clifford LeBlang for \$65,000 on 25 April 1991. The seller and buyer had no business or familial relationship.
2. assessed value of the land and improvements thereon according to the most recent assessment;
 - a. The affidavit states that the current assessed value is \$207,900.

3. financial information for the previous two (2) years which shall include, at a minimum, annual gross income from the property, itemized operating and maintenance expenses, real estate taxes, annual debt service, annual cash flow, the amount of depreciation taken for federal income tax purposes, and other federal income tax deductions produced;
 - a. The affidavit states that the property has been vacant and unoccupied since its purchase in 1991. The property has produced no income. The property has been depreciated for federal income tax purposes, but the affidavit does not provide the amount of the depreciation. The real estate taxes for 2018 were \$2,564.43 and for 2019 are \$2,910.18.
4. all appraisals obtained by the owner in connection with the purchase or financing of the property, or during the ownership of the property;
 - a. The affidavit states that the current owner has never obtained an appraisal for the property.
5. all listings of the property for sale or rent, price asked, and offers received, if any; and,
 - a. The affidavit provides a summary of the marketing of the property and offers received.
6. any consideration by the owner as to profitable uses and adaptive uses for the property.
 - a. The affidavit provides no information about any consideration by the owner as to profitable uses and adaptive uses for the property.

The application includes an affidavit providing the information required in Section 9.2.a. and the staff has concluded that the application provides sufficient information to begin the review process. However, while the staff has determined that the application meets the minimum requirements for review, it notes that the application is deficient in several ways and suggests that it may need to be supplemented and/or amended.

Section 9.2.b of the Rules & Regulations authorizes the Historical Commission to “require the [property] owner to conduct, at the owner’s expense, evaluations or studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Historical Commission, to determine whether the building ... has or may have alternate uses consistent with preservation.” Typically, financial hardship applications provide detailed analyses of potential reuses of the subject buildings that include architectural plans for several potential reuses, construction costs analyses to implement those plans, and 10-year pro forma financial analyses to demonstrate whether those plans will produce a reasonable rate of return and are therefore financially feasible. Section 9.2.b.1-5 of the Rules & Regulations details the minimum additional evaluations and studies the Historical Commission may request. In a case like this one, the Historical Commission would typically expect detailed analyses of potential reuses such as residential, retail, and office.

The application makes some assumptions about the Main Street Manayunk Historic District and classifications of properties in it that are incorrect and may have significant bearing on this case. The Main Street Manayunk Historic District was created by City Council, not the Historical Commission, in 1983, before the Historical Commission had the legal authority to create historic districts. The Main Street Manayunk Historic District is therefore subject to the regulatory framework laid out in Chapter 8 of the City’s Property Maintenance Code, not Section 14-1000, the City’s historic preservation ordinance. Section 18 of the Historical Commission’s Rules & Regulations does authorize the Historical Commission to apply the Rules & Regulations to reviews for Main Street Manayunk properties where the Rules & Regulations do not conflict with the Property Maintenance Code, and the Rules & Regulations do reflect the provisions of the

preservation ordinance including the hardship provision, but the Property Maintenance Code, not the preservation ordinance, provides the primary regulatory rubric. The distinction is worth noting and may have implications for the review. For example, the provisions in the Property Maintenance Code do not address demolition or financial hardship, leaving the Historical Commission to devise an appropriate hardship process for Manayunk, which may or may not follow the hardship process in the preservation ordinance. Also, the Historical Commission did not officially adopt the inventory from the National Register nomination for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District; the classifications in that inventory cannot be applied as though they are classifications in an inventory adopted by the Historical Commission. Therefore, the arguments in the application regarding the contributing or non-contributing classification of the property may not have much validity because they are predicated on the National Register inventory, which may be informative, but is not definitive. The Historical Commission must determine whether either of the properties “contributes” to the historic district.

The inventory for the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District classifies properties as follows:

- A. Significant Building/Structure
- B. Contributing Building/Structure
- C. Linking Building/Structure – Appropriate scale and materials although later or altered
- D. Intrusion

The inventory also states that “All categories except for ‘D’ are considered ‘contributing’ and eligible for tax credits.” The property at 106-08 Grape Street is classified as a “D” or Intrusion. The property at 110 Grape Street is classified as a “B” or Contributing building.

The application contends that the Manayunk Development Corporation, a non-profit charitable organization, is suffering a financial hardship, owing to the circumstances of the properties on Grape Street. However, as is acknowledged in the application, the Manayunk Development Corporation does not own the property outright; it has a lease-to-buy agreement with Neducsin Properties.

This is not the first application to the Historical Commission proposing to demolish the buildings at 106-08 and 110 Grape Street. In February 2008, the Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept application proposing to demolish the buildings at 106-08 and 110 Grape Street and construct a four-story building. The application was withdrawn before the Historical Commission reviewed it.

In April 2008, the Historical reviewed an in-concept application proposing to demolish the buildings at 106-08 and 110 Grape Street and construct a four-story building. The Historical Commission approved the demolition of the building at 106-08 Grape Street in concept, but denied the demolition of the building at 110 Grape Street and the construction of the four-story building.

In July 2008, the Historical Commission denied an application for final approval proposing to demolish the buildings and construct a four-story building in their place.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish buildings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code provides the following standards for the review of building permit applications for properties in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District.

PM-804.2 Historic area standards: Standards within the designated historic area shall be as set forth in Sections PM-804.2.1 through PM-804.2.7 in addition to the requirements of Sections PM-804.1 through PM-804.1.4.2.

PM-804.2.1 Permit: No building or portion of the exterior thereof within the historic district shall hereafter be constructed, altered, repaired, demolished, or partially demolished unless a permit has first been obtained from the code official.

PM-804.2.2 Approval: All applications for such permits shall be forwarded by the code official to the Historical Commission for review and approval, before issuance of the permit. No permit shall be issued unless the proposed work has been approved by the Historical Commission staff as preserving the historical character of the district.

PM-804.2.3 Repair: Original architectural features such as cornices and bays shall not be removed. Deteriorated features shall be repaired where possible. Replacement material where necessary shall duplicate the original as closely as possible.

PM-804.2.4 Facings: Refacing of facades, bays, cornices with inappropriate materials such as aluminum siding, or brick veneer shall be prohibited. Existing inappropriate facade facings shall be removed at the termination of the useful life of the facing. Any inappropriate facing material lawfully in existence shall not be repaired or altered in any substantial manner.

PM-804.2.5 Elements: Original window and door openings, sills, lintels, and sashes shall be retained and repaired whenever possible. Replacement elements shall match the original appearance in proportion, form, and materials as closely as possible.

PM-804.2.6 Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.

PM-804.2.7 Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.

Section 18 of the Rules & Regulations authorizes the Historical Commission to apply the provisions of the Rules & Regulations to Main Street Manayunk properties.

For properties located in the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District, placed under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission by Chapter 7 [now 8] of the Philadelphia Property Maintenance Code, and not designated as historic pursuant Section 14-2007 [now 14-1000] of the Philadelphia Code, the Commission, its committees, and staff shall apply these Rules & Regulations except where they conflict with Chapter 7 [now 8] of the Philadelphia Property Maintenance Code.

Section 9.4 of the Rules & Regulations provides the standards for reviewing financial hardship applications proposing demolition.

To substantiate a claim of financial hardship to justify a demolition, the applicant 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 applicant has an affirmative obligation in good faith to attempt the sale of the property, to seek tenants for it, and to explore potential reuses for it.

Section 10 of the Rules & Regulations provides guidance for reviewing applications claiming financial hardship submitted by non-profit organizations. It states that the Historical Commission:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 FEBRUARY 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

recognizes that the provisions of [the preservation ordinance] and other sections of these Rules & Regulations may not all have applicability to a property owned and used by a non-profit organization. No single set of measures can encompass the highly variegated types and contexts of buildings held by non-profit organizations. The economics of a building in the middle of a college campus may differ from that of a church, hospital, museum, or child care center.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The staff recommends that the Historical Commission:

- acknowledge that Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code does not provide a mechanism for reviewing this application proposing demolition;
- invoke Section 18 of the Rules & Regulations and apply the “financial hardship” provisions of the Rules & Regulations to this application even though it was designated under Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code;
- concur with the classifications provided by the inventory for the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District that the property at 106-08 Grape Street is Non-contributing and the property at 110 Grape Street is Contributing, even though that inventory was not adopted by the Historical Commission and is not binding on the Historical Commission;
- decline to take the poor condition of the building at 110 Grape Street into account when determining whether the building can or cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted because the current owner has owned the property since 1991 and has had a responsibility over the past 28 years under the Property Maintenance Code as well as Section 13.2 of the Rules & Regulations to keep the building in good repair;
- apply Section 9.2.b of the Rules & Regulations and “require the [property] owner to conduct, at the owner’s expense, evaluations or studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Historical Commission, to determine whether the building ... has or may have alternate uses consistent with preservation.” The Historical Commission should require the property owner to provide detailed analyses of potential reuses of the 110 Grape Street property for fee-simple single-family residential, rental residential, retail, and office that include architectural plans for the suggested potential reuses, construction costs analyses to implement those plans, and 10-year pro forma financial analyses to demonstrate whether those plans will produce a reasonable rate of return and are therefore financially feasible.
- denial, pursuant Section 9 of the Rules & Regulations, unless and until the property owner and/or equitable owner demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:02:28

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney William O’Brien, property owner Rob Neducsin, and Jane Lipton and Gwen McCauley of the Manayunk Development Corporation represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver commented that the claims about the infeasibility of reuse of the building seem to be founded on the poor condition of the building. He observed that the building appears to have suffered from demolition by neglect by the current owner.

- He stated that he believes that there would be viable reuse for this building if it had not been allowed to deteriorate. He asserted that this is a self-inflicted hardship.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he considers the building at 110 Grape Street to be contributing to the historic district.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the flaws of the building outlined in the application appear to be able to be repaired.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked the applications to explain the lease-to-own agreement between Neducsin Properties and the Manayunk Development Corporation.
 - Mr. O'Brien responded that, contrary to the staff's claims, the Manayunk Development Corporation is the equitable owner of the property. The MDC has paid \$25,000 toward the purchase price, which is non-refundable. He stated that the lease-purchase agreement requires the MDC to obtain the Historical Commission's approval for the project. All other conditions have been met. The legal owner is Daniel Neducsin and the equitable owner is the MDC.
 - Mr. O'Brien stated that the last renovation of the building was nearly 100 years ago, when the first floor was converted to a garage. The current owner has owned it since 1991. The current owner has been seeking a tenant or a buyer since 1991, but was unsuccessful until he entered into the agreement with the MDC. The current owner does not renovate for tenants. The last time anyone sought to buy the property was in 2008. He noted that an application was submitted to the Historical Commission at that time. He noted that he did not know the outcome of the review of that application.
 - Mr. O'Brien stated the staff considered the building at 110 Grape Street to be contributing at the time of the review in 2008. He countered that his expert has concluded that the building at 110 Grape Street is on "the cusp" of being contributing. He stated that there is nothing on the façade that is of note. Nobody of note is associated with the building. Half the façade has been removed. The only aspect of the building of note is its scale, he concluded.
 - Mr. O'Brien stated that the owner has not neglected the building. When the roof leaked, he repaired it. The owner is not trying to demolish it.
 - Mr. O'Brien stated that the footprint of the 110 Grape Street building is 615 square feet. He stated that there are currently 26 vacant retail spaces in Manayunk. No one is going to try to use this building. It would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to renovate this small space. People will select the viable spaces on Main Street over this space. Vacant properties on Main Street remain vacant for years
 - Mr. O'Brien described the building that would be constructed on the site. It would look like the building at 107 Cotton Street, which fits in well. The first floor of the Grape Street building would be used for incubator retail. The second for office space. The third for the MDC. The fourth would have a community room.
 - Mr. O'Brien stated that the properties on Grape "have laid fallow for 30 years." He concluded that the proposed use is a good one.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that Mr. O'Brien needs to document the case that he has just made anecdotally. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. O'Brien if he had undertaken any analysis to prove his assertion that there is no feasible reuse for the property. Mr. Cluver acknowledged that the market has provided some evidence; the buildings have not been used in years. But Mr. Cluver also noted that the applicants have not provided any documentary evidence about how the property has been marketed. Mr. Cluver stated that the application provides no hard information about the buildings have been marketed.

- Responding to Mr. Cluver, Mr. Neducsin stated that, typically, when marketing a building, his company will put a sign in the window and will list the property on the company's website. He stated that his company places commercial properties on LoopNet, a nationwide realty website. He added that they will inform another realtor of the availability. He stated that that process is standard for small properties like this one. He concluded that there has been no interest in this property. Mr. Neducsin stated that the building would not work as a restaurant. Mr. Detwiler responded that it should be reused as a residence.
- Ms. Lipton stated that they have been looking for a home for the MDC for many years. She stated that she used to be a real estate agent. She stated that the ceiling is too low on the third floor. The first floor has been converted to a garage. She stated that this building could be rehabilitated, but it would cost too much. She stated that the building is too small to be reused.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the building has a rear ell.
 - Mr. O'Brien responded that it has a one-story shed rear addition.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the application fails to document the attempts to market the property or to demonstrate that the existing building cannot be reused. She added that the proposed new building, which is not part of the application, is inappropriate for the historic district. She stated that the application is incomplete.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that it is his inclination to be sympathetic to the MDC, which has done very good work, and to Neducsin Properties, which almost single-handedly rescued Manayunk. However, the Preservation Alliance agrees with the staff recommendation. Mr. Steinke stated that the building's condition may result from neglect. He stated that the building still is perceived as an 1830s house. He stated that the building at 110 Grape Street should be incorporated into the new development.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Committee on Historic Designation should consider the proposed classifications for the two properties and the Committee on Financial Hardship should consider the economic aspects of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code does not provide a mechanism for reviewing this application proposing demolition;
- Section 18 of the Rules & Regulations authorizes the Historical Commission to apply the "financial hardship" provisions of the Rules & Regulations to this application even though it was designated under Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code;
- the classifications provided by the inventory for the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District that the property at 106-08 Grape Street is Non-contributing and the property at 110 Grape Street is Contributing are appropriate, but the Committee on Historic Designation could be consulted if time allows; and,
- the poor condition of the building at 110 Grape Street can be considered demolition by neglect because the current owner has owned the property since 1991 and has had a responsibility over the past 28 years under the Property Maintenance Code as well as Section 13.2 of the Rules & Regulations to keep the building in good repair;

- the application is incomplete and should be supplemented with documentation of the efforts to market the property and with financial analyses of potential reuses for the property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Historical Commission:

- apply Section 9.2.b of the Rules & Regulations and “require the [property] owner to conduct, at the owner’s expense, evaluations or studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Historical Commission, to determine whether the building ... has or may have alternate uses consistent with preservation.” The Historical Commission should require the property owner to provide detailed analyses of potential reuses of the 110 Grape Street property for fee-simple single-family residential, rental residential, retail, and office that include architectural plans for the suggested potential reuses, construction costs analyses to implement those plans, and 10-year pro forma financial analyses to demonstrate whether those plans will produce a reasonable rate of return and are therefore financially feasible; and,
- deny the application, pursuant Section 9 of the Rules & Regulations, unless and until the property owner and/or equitable owner demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted.

ITEM: 106-08 and 110 GRAPE ST				
MOTION: Deny				
MOVED BY: D’Alessandro				
SECONDED BY: Gutterman				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x			
John Cluver	x			
Rudy D’Alessandro	x			
Justin Detwiler	x			
Nan Gutterman	x			
Suzanne Pentz	x			
Amy Stein	x			
Total	7	0		

ADDRESS: 6341 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Construct one-story frame addition at side

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: KenCrest Services

Applicant: Joseph Hoban, KenCrest Services

History: 1796; Levering-Jones House-Washington Tavern; Remodeled in 1907 by W. Ross Haggart. Front porch removed; Door surround added

Individual Designation: 11/27/1962

District Designation: Ridge Avenue Roxborough Historic District, Significant, 10/12/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

The early Federal style building is situated on a large parcel at the corner of Ridge Avenue and Gates Street. Classified as significant in the Ridge Avenue Historic District, the property was individually designated in 1962.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct 600-square-foot one-story addition with porch at northwest side of building.
- Create new opening to porch through historic masonry wall.
- Seal historic opening.
- Demolish portion of rear garage and renovate structure.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
The proposed addition does not adversely impact any character-defining features of the property. However, due to its location, the addition would be visible from the public rights-of-way. The proposed addition largely complies with this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
The proposed addition minimally impacts the historic materials of the existing building and is compatible in its massing, size, scale and architectural features. The addition is differentiated from the old in its frame construction, but is compatible in its incorporation of stucco, six-over-six double-hung windows, wood doors, and wood cornice. The proposed addition complies with this standard.
- *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.*
The proposed frame addition will abut the existing masonry walls of the historic structure and will allow the overall integrity of the historic building to remain unimpaired if the addition is removed in the future. The proposed addition complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:38:18

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Stephen Bonitatibus and property manager Joseph Hoban represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee inquired about the location of the addition, asking whether it could be hidden behind the existing building to eliminate visibility from Ridge Avenue.
 - The applicants responded that the addition, in its proposed location, is well concealed from Ridge Avenue due to the distance from the street and the vegetation. The applicants referred the Committee to the site plan, noting that setback restrictions prohibit them from locating the addition at the rear.
 - The applicants explained that the building serves medically fragile children and that the east yard offers a play area for them. Locating the addition on the yard, they continued, would be a huge loss for the children.
 - The applicants explained that the addition will provide more appropriate bedrooms for the children, while freeing up some interior space within the historic building for public use.
- The Committee observed that a visible white TPO roof is proposed for the addition and questioned whether it would be compatible with the historic structure. The Committee suggested creating a flat roof or parapet to hide the roof from public view.
 - The applicants agreed to revise the roof.
- The Committee commented that the historic structure reflects a certain aesthetic, with its symmetrical windows, gabled roof, the relationship of its features to one another, and the long views from the street. The addition, the Committee added, does not maintain the same sense of scale and proportion, with doors and windows in random locations, and does not complement the historic structure.
 - The applicants explained that the window and door placement results from the interior plan and argued that the formality of the front does not continue at the sides, which are much more circumstantial.
- The Committee contended that certain elements of the historic building should be incorporated. Instead of creating two separate but adjacent windows, the Committee suggested installing a pairing with a mullion between windows and connecting trim piece that relates to the building's historic pairing.
- The Committee noted that the windows, placed at the corners of the addition, do not reflect the character of the historic building and suggested that they be moved. The Committee also asked whether some doors could be omitted.
 - The applicants responded that the window placement is determined by the interior arrangement and that they are licensed as a nursing home. The children, they continued, require around the clock nursing care, so a direct means of egress is required from the bedrooms.
 - The applicants clarified that the building functions like a hospital in that each bed has oxygen machines, because the children are vent dependent. The floor plan, they explained, reflects the functional needs of the children.

- The Committee asked whether the applicants will be using traditional stucco and whether that stucco extends to the ground and recommended that it stop above grade with masonry below to prevent moisture from wicking into the stucco.
 - The applicants agreed to reconsider the detail.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The white TPO roof is highly visible and conflicts with the historic character of the building.
- The window placement is circumstantial and does not reflect the historic configurations, particularly due to the placement of windows at the corners of the proposed addition.
- The stucco at the base of the proposed addition may wick up water and accelerate deterioration.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The roof should either have a steeper pitch to allow for the application of shingles or a shallower pitch to reduce visibility.
- The windows should be relocated away from the corners, and groupings with a center mullion and connecting trim should be incorporated.
- The proposed addition should incorporate a masonry base to prevent moisture damage to the stucco.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, with the following suggestions:

- The pitch of the roof should either have a steeper pitch to allow for the application of shingles or a shallower pitch to reduce visibility, and a black instead of white membrane should be considered; and
- The window locations and details should be reconsidered to better reflect the character of the historic building.

ITEM: 6341 RIDGE AVE				
MOTION: Approval, with comments				
MOVED BY: Cluver				
SECONDED BY: Gutterman				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x			
John Cluver	x			
Rudy D'Alessandro	x			
Justin Detwiler	x			
Nan Gutterman	x			
Suzanne Pentz	x			
Amy Stein	x			
Total	7			

ADDRESS: 2321 N. BROAD STREET

Proposal: Construct two, five-story buildings.

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

BACKGROUND:

2321 N. Broad Street presently includes one two-story building and landscaped courtyard that was historically part of Dropsie College. Historic aerial photographs show the landscaped courtyard existed in the 1940s and may date to the building's original construction in 1915.

This in-concept application proposes to construct two new buildings on the site. Each building is proposed as five stories and together will include a total of 56 apartments (one-bedroom units). The two new buildings are positioned at the front of the property along N. Broad Street and are separated from each other by a reconfigured 68-foot courtyard between them. The courtyard allows for a view of the historic building at the rear of the property.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier application for 2321 N. Broad Street at the 23 October 2018 meeting. The proposal at that time was for a single, nine-story building with 120 apartments. The Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and 10. At the October meeting, Committee members inquired if the owner and architect had explored options for a more modestly sized building on the site. The applicant withdrew their applicant prior to the Historical Commission meeting.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct two new, 5-story buildings at the front of property facing N. Broad Street. Buildings are proposed to contain 56, 1-bedroom apartments and will be approximately 50 feet tall.
- Reconfigure historic courtyard to a 68-foot wide private garden in between the new buildings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval in concept based on proposed massing, size, scale, and location of new buildings, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:59:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Richard Villa, of Ambit Architecture, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver noted that he appreciated the reconsideration of the first proposal and incorporated feedback received from the 23 October 2018 meeting.
 - Mr. Villa stated that his takeaway from the earlier meeting was that smaller scale buildings may enable the project to move forward. He stated that he worked with staff over multiple meetings to come up with the new proposal.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the fifth (top) floor was apartments.
 - Mr. Villa responded that it is all residential apartments.
- Ms. Stein asked if the fifth (top) floor was clear glass or spandrel glass.
 - Mr. Villa replied that it is all clear glass.
- Mr. Cluver recommended more articulation of solid material on the top floor rather than extensive glass. Ms. Gutterman added that if the intent is to replicate mansards along Broad Street there should be less glass on the top floor and noted that the glass fifth floor does not quite go with the lower portion of the building.
 - Mr. Villa responded that he will look into this and believes he can do this.
- Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Cluver inquired if there is a roof deck planned.
 - Mr. Villa answered that there is no roof deck in the proposal.
- Mr. Cluver asked about condensing units and mechanical equipment planned for the roof top.
 - Mr. Villa stated that they are currently reviewing options. He continued that they are looking at smaller units rather than one large unit on top of each building in order to reduce visibility.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the roof plan showed an overrun for an elevator and asked if there will be stair access as well.
 - Mr. Villa responded there will be roof hatch for each of the two stairs.
- Ms. Stein inquired why the elevator overrun is not visible in the renderings. Ms. Gutterman stated that she believes the elevator overrun will be visible.
 - Mr. Villa responded that if they are not visible in the renderings it is because they will not be visible from street level.
- Ms. Stein asked if the buildings have parapets. She requested a site line study to determine the extent of visibility of the elevator overrun.
 - Mr. Villa stated that there is a small parapet and they are looking into hydraulic elevators which will have lower overrun due to the limited height of the buildings. He noted that since they are smaller buildings they would not need a 12 foot overrun for the elevator. Mr. Villa agreed to provide a sight-line study.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the drawings indicated that the exterior cladding is proposed as limestone. He asked Mr. Villa if it would be limestone or cast stone.
 - Mr. Villa responded that it would be limestone.
- Mr. Cluver inquired if the proposed windows would be operable.

- Mr. Villa responded that the windows are still being worked out but they are intended to be operable.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the bay windows along Broad Street are centered on their facades. He added that they could be moved toward the courtyard to reinforce that they are part of an overall complex. Mr. Culver responded to Mr. McCoubrey that this recommendation sounded like a design decision that should be left up to Mr. Villa.
- Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Cluver inquired the courtyard redesign.
 - Mr. Villa responded that their intent is recreate the historic octagon and other design elements seen in historic documentation, the aerial photographs. He noted current elements that exist may have been more recently added and that changes over time have rendered the landscaped area less symmetrical. He continued that their plan is to engage a landscape architect to complete the courtyard plan.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- El Amor Brawne Ali, Ward Leader of the 37th Ward, stated that they had met with the architect after the 23 October 2018 Architectural Committee meeting and before the team revised their proposal for 2321 N. Broad Street. She noted that the new proposal seems more feasible and is glad to see the lower-scale buildings. She added that she still needs to share the updated proposal with her constituents and ask for their feedback. An unidentified representative, also from the 37th Ward, joined Ms. Ali at the table and agreed with her comments.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The architect significantly revised the application and proposal for 2321 N Broad Street based on feedback from the Architectural Committee 's 23 October 2018 meeting, the local community in the 37th Ward, and Historical Commission staff.
- The current application is more sympathetic to the historic property.
- The architect had successfully revised the proposal and offered a good solution for the reuse of the historic property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The in-concept application should receive approval with the understanding that specific Committee feedback should be incorporated in the submission for final approval from the Historical Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the in-concept application based on the proposed massing, size, scale, and location of new buildings and requests further consideration of the following:

- reduce the amount of glass on fifth floor façade;
- minimize elevator and stair roof penetrations;
- conceal the rooftop mechanical equipment; and,
- articulate the windows to reflect the details and scale of the windows of the neighborhood buildings.

ITEM: 2321 N BROAD ST
MOTION: Approval
MOVED BY: John Cluver
SECONDED BY: Nan Gutterman

VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X			
John Cluver	X			
Rudy D'Alessandro	X			
Justin Detwiler	X			
Nan Gutterman	X			
Suzanne Pentz	X			
Amy Stein	X			

ADDRESS: 1728 MARLTON AVE

Proposal: Construct new three-story building with six residential units

Review Requested: Review and comment

Owner: 1213 N 41 LLC

Applicant: German Yakubov

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/11/2009

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

BACKGROUND:

1728 Marlton Avenue is a non-contributing vacant lot in the Parkside Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct new three-story multi-family residence.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction over this site. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - Generally speaking, the design of the proposed new construction project reflects the size, scale, proportion and massing of the architecture of the Parkside Historic District. The proposed materials, however, do not. Vinyl siding is proposed for the prominent bay window at the front façade, and vinyl windows are proposed throughout. A brick veneer is proposed for the front façade; however, it would be helpful to know if the intent is to match the thin, tan-colored brick that is seen throughout the district. The front windows at the third story are square-topped rather than curved like the majority of the houses on the block, and no decorative brick mold is proposed. The front façade also lacks the circular window at the top which is another design feature seen at most of the other houses in the row.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired*
 - Because this proposed new construction is being considered on a vacant parcel, no historic fabric will be impaired by the project.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed design is generally compatible with the historic district, but the windows, window bay and siding should be made of wood rather than vinyl; the brick veneer should match the tan brick seen throughout the district; the windows at the third story should be curved; and decorative brick window surrounds should be added to the design of the front façade, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:18:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Egen Naydovich of Haverford Square represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee requested information on the material of the decorative cornice, the porch columns.
 - The applicant responded that they were still unsure about what materials they would use throughout the project because they would need to work with their general contractor. He explained that their goal was to have the two new buildings match the surrounding historic structures as much as possible.
- The Committee suggested that the applicant use the vocabulary of the surrounding houses for the scale, massing and materials of the new buildings.
- The Committee requested clarification on the egress windows, including whether the ones at the base of the buildings would have wells.
 - The applicant responded that he did not have further details at that time.
- The Committee remarked that the design of the front doors needed to be more sympathetic to the front doors seen throughout the neighborhood.
- The Committee said that overall, they appreciated the applicant’s desire to have the two new buildings fit into the historic context of the Parkside Historic District, however there were many details that could be improved upon with the assistance of the staff.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Overall, the applicant’s desire to have the two new buildings fit into the historic context of the Parkside Historic District was appreciated. However, many details could be improved upon with the assistance of the staff.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that it would be helpful if the applicant incorporated the Committee’s suggestions into revised plans and then worked with the staff to ensure that the design details and materials were more compatible with those seen throughout the historic district.

ITEM: 1728 MEMORIAL AVE				
MOTION: N/A for Review and Comment				
MOVED BY: N/A for Review and Comment				
SECONDED BY: N/A for Review and Comment				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x			
John Cluver	x			
Rudy D’Alessandro	x			
Justin Detwiler	x			
Nan Gutterman	x			
Suzanne Pentz	x			
Amy Stein	x			
Total	7			

ADDRESS: 1728 MEMORIAL AVE

Proposal: Construct new three-story building with six residential units

Review Requested: Review and comment

Owner: 1213 N 41 LLC

Applicant: German Yakubov

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/11/2009

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

BACKGROUND:

1728 Memorial Avenue is a non-contributing vacant lot in the Parkside Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct new three-story multi-family residence.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction over this site. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - Generally speaking, the design of the proposed new construction project reflects the size, scale, proportion and massing of the architecture of the Parkside Historic District. The proposed materials, however, do not. Vinyl siding is proposed for the prominent bay window at the front façade, and vinyl windows are proposed throughout. A brick veneer is proposed for the front façade, however it would be helpful to know if the intent is to match the thin, tan-colored brick that is seen throughout the district. The front windows at the third story are square-topped rather than curved like the majority of the houses on the block, and no decorative brick mold is proposed. The front façade also lacks the circular window at the top which is another design feature seen at most of the other houses in the row.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired*
 - Because this proposed new construction is being considered on a vacant parcel, no historic fabric will be impaired by the project.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed design is generally compatible with the historic district, but the windows, window bay and siding should be made of wood rather than vinyl; the brick veneer should match the tan brick seen throughout the district; the windows at the third story should be curved; and decorative brick window surrounds should be added to the design of the front façade, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:18:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Egen Naydovich of Haverford Square represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee requested information on the material of the decorative cornice, the porch columns.
 - The applicant responded that they were still unsure about what materials they would use throughout the project because they would need to work with their general contractor. He explained that their goal was to have the two new buildings match the surrounding historic structures as much as possible.
- The Committee suggested that the applicant use the vocabulary of the surrounding houses for the scale, massing and materials of the new buildings.
- The Committee requested clarification on the egress windows, including whether the ones at the base of the buildings would have wells.
 - The applicant responded that he did not have further details at that time.
- The Committee remarked that the design of the front doors needed to be more sympathetic to the front doors seen throughout the neighborhood.
- The Committee said that overall, they appreciated the applicant's desire to have the two new buildings fit into the historic context of the Parkside Historic District, however there were many details that could be improved upon with the assistance of the staff.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Overall, the applicant's desire to have the two new buildings fit into the historic context of the Parkside Historic District was appreciated. However, many details could be improved upon with the assistance of the staff.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that it would be helpful if the applicant incorporated the Committee's suggestions into revised plans and then worked with the staff to ensure that the design details and materials were more compatible with those seen throughout the historic district.

ITEM: 1728 MEMORIAL AVE				
MOTION: N/A for Review and Comment				
MOVED BY: N/A for Review and Comment				
SECONDED BY: N/A for Review and Comment				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x			
John Cluver	x			
Rudy D'Alessandro	x			
Justin Detwiler	x			
Nan Gutterman	x			
Suzanne Pentz	x			
Amy Stein	x			
Total	7			