

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

**TUESDAY, 26 MARCH 2019
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-031
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:53

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:02 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:

- Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
- 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:

- Amelia Riley, Fidler Square Improvement Association
- Cliff Eylor, Fidler Square Improvement Association
- Julie Marchetti, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Lea Litvin, Lo Design
- Evan Litvin, Lo Design
- Robert Esposito
- Anner Rodriguez
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
- David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
- Yue Wu, Philadelphia Chinatown Development Corp.
- Lin Liu
- John Chin, Philadelphia Chinatown Development Corp.
- James Baylor
- Christopher Miller, John Milner Architects
- Fon Wang, Ballinger
- Jack Zhang

Greg Pastore
Eric Rosenfeld, WCNP
Anthony Rufo, Rufo Construction
Monica Miraglilo, Rufo Companies
Anthony Tsirantonakis
Parbir Mundi
Mihoko Samejima
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 5250 WAYNE AVE

Proposal: Convert church into residences; replace windows; construct ADA ramp
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 5250 Wayne Avenue LLC
Applicant: Raymond F. Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect
History: 1910; Methodist Episcopal Church of the Advocate; Wilson, Harris & Richards, architects
Individual Designation: 1/13/2017
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The church located at 5250 Wayne Avenue, historically known as Methodist Episcopal Church of the Advocate, was designated in 2017. At the time of its designation, the property's ownership was tenuous and the congregation had not been active for several decades. The Department of Licenses & Inspections had issued numerous violations for the property, including Imminently Dangerous violations for cracked, bulging, and collapsed walls. The Department addressed the falling and dangerous condition at the bell tower in 2017 by removing the stone ornamentation and parapet from the top of the structure. However, the building remains in poor condition and with numerous outstanding violations.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert church to multi-family residential building with twenty-four units, gym, and meeting room.
- Construct ADA ramp at side of building.
- Repair leaded glass windows.
- Replace leaded glass windows with fixed and operable aluminum windows.
- Clean and repair stone façade.
- Repair slate roof.
- Replace gutters and downspouts.
- Install condensing units at side 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 shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*

The proposed conversion of the church to residential units allows for the retention and preservation of the building's exterior envelope. The condensing units and ADA ramp will be as inconspicuous as possible and will be reversible.

- *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 existing leaded glass windows are highly deteriorated and require repair or replacement. In certain instances, the application proposes to retain and repair the windows. In other locations, the application proposes to provide functionality to the residential units by installing aluminum windows behind the wood tracery. In general, the application lacks sufficient detail to determine how the proposed windows will be incorporated into the existing openings, but the staff can work with the applicant on the details.
- *Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.*
The historic masonry will be cleaned using an appropriate chemical cleaner and in a manner that will not cause damage.
- *Accessibility Guideline: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.*
The ADA ramp, proposed at the southeast elevation, would provide barrier-free access with minimal impact to the historic resource.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that window shop drawings show that the proposed windows replicate the existing molding profiles and are installed in a compatible manner, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 7, and the Accessibility Guideline.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Raymond F. Rola represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee requested clarification as to whether the review was in-concept or final approval.
 - The staff confirmed that it had been changed to a final review because there was enough information provided in the application.
 - The Committee disagreed and opined that there was not enough information about the windows. They decided to review the application as an in-concept application.
- The Committee requested numerous clarifications on the windows.
 - The Committee asked about the window materials for the primary elevations.

- Mr. Rola explained that there were several window types seen throughout the building. He directed the Committee to drawing A-22 and said that the Type A window was the most common type in the sanctuary portion of the building, which had leaded glass within steel frames, integrated into the wood tracery.
 - The Committee asked if these were the windows seen at the West Queen Lane side of the building.
 - Mr. Rola confirmed that these windows were seen at the West Queen Lane façade and also the front façade. He explained that the windows were in varying condition throughout the building. Mr. Rola said that his approach for the windows in very poor condition was to remove the leaded glass and put in large Thermopane behind the wooden tracery.
 - The Committee indicated that the applicant needed to provide much more details about the proposed window replacement.
 - The Committee asked if the applicant's intent for the large window on the north elevation was to remove the leaded glass and restore the wood tracery.
 - The applicant confirmed that this was his intent, and that an aluminum operable awning window would be installed within the wood frame.
 - The Committee asked if the frame of the Thermopane would follow the tracery.
 - The applicant said that the existing tracery would almost act like a simulated divided lite.
 - The Committee expressed concern for the possibility of condensation accumulation at the new Thermopane. The members stated that window details, including section drawings, would be critical to understanding the viability of the approach to the window replacement.
 - Mr. Rola stated that the windows would be the biggest complication of the project. He described the building's stone and slate roof as being in very good condition, but the windows were very complicated because there were several sub-types of windows within the main three types that had been identified. Mr. Rola explained that they were only proposing 24 units, which allowed them to set back the loft units and avoid having to create another floor level.
 - The Committee commented that normally it does not recommend approval of replacing wood windows with metal windows on a primary elevation.
 - The applicant clarified that that was not his proposal, and that they were retaining the wooden tracery.
 - The Committee repeated that there were no details to explain how much of the wood was being retained or how the metal frame would be attached to the stone.
 - The Committee asked if the leaded glass pattern would be lost owing to the window replacement.
 - The applicant confirmed that it would be lost.
- The Committee asked if it would be possible to use a lead tape on the replacement windows that would allow the existing pattern to be replicated.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that he did not think lead tape could be applied to Thermopane, but that it would work with a plate of glass.
- The Committee asked where the 24 condenser units would be located.
 - The applicant said they would be placed along flat section of the roof and pushed back sufficiently so as not to be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - The Committee asked that any of the condenser units that were located at the side of the building be screened with landscaping.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The project proposed excellent reuse of the church building and that it would have a positive impact on the neighborhood.
- That the project would satisfy Standards 2, 6, 7, and the Accessibility Guideline, provided several conditions were met.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, not final as was requested, provided:

- the window details are resolved;
- the use of lead tape is explored to replicate the pattern of the existing leaded glass;
- the air conditioner units that are located on the ground are pulled back from the street and that their visibility is minimized to the greatest extent possible;
- the mezzanine level is pulled back in the interior from the exterior walls so as not to interfere with the windows;
- no railings or anything visually obtrusive is installed at the basement-level windows; and,
- no rooftop mechanical equipment is visible from the public right-of-way.

ITEM: 5250 WAYNE AVE					
MOTION: Approval in concept with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2301-23 PINE ST

Proposal: Remove garden shed; construct pavillion and pergola; install gate

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia, Fitler Square/ Fitler Square Improvement Assoc. Inc

Applicant: Evan Litvin, LO Design Company, LLC

History: 1896; Fitler Square

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

Named for former nineteenth-century Philadelphia Mayor Edwin H. Fitler, Fitler Square was dedicated soon after his death in 1896. The square is bounded by Panama Street to the north, Pine Street to the south, 23rd Street to the east, and 24th Street to the west. Currently, a small

brick storage shed is located on a pathway at the north end of the square. This application responds to the need to replace the storage shed following storm damage that rendered it unusable.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove non-historic storage shed.
- Construct stone- and wood-clad pavilion.
- Construct wood pergola structure with stone site wall, stone bench, and granite pavers.
- Install gate along Panama Street.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
The proposed pavilion and pergola are compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features and do not create an adverse impact on the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.
- *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 pavilion and pergola would have minimal impact on the square if removed in the future.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:21:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Evan Litvin and Lea Litvin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein inquired whether the hairpin fence to be removed at the Panama Street side of the park is historic fabric.
 - Ms. Keller responded that she is unsure of the installation date but added that she did not believe the fence was historically significant, since it does not appear in the historic photographs she reviewed.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether Ms. Stein was referring to the hairpin fence and whether that fence is part of the park.
 - Ms. Litvin affirmed that the fence is part of the park.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the fence should not be removed.
- Ms. Litvin gave an overview of the project, noting that there is a very active group, the Fitler Square Improvement Association (FSIA), that maintains the park and uses the shed. The park, she noted, is used throughout the year for seasonal events, holiday celebrations, and a spring fair. She explained that a tree damaged the

- existing shed in 2018, and the FSIA approached her and Mr. Litvin to design a new shed to replace the existing one. The organization had other reasons, she continued, for replacing the shed, including increasing storage capacity for gardening and event supplies and addressing safety and trash concerns caused by the space between the existing shed and fence. She noted that the FSIA also requested seating and gathering space that would frame the events held at the square. She further commented that the design has support from FSIA and Councilman Kenyatta Johnson.
- Mr. Litvin explained the reasoning behind the design, clarifying that he drew on the context, materials, and sightlines of the park. In plan, he added, there is almost no symmetry, which presents an interesting design challenge. He commented that his design places all emphasis on the fountain and, at that point, he overlaid a new axis of symmetry. The proposed design, he continued, picks up on the circulation path.
 - Ms. Stein asked whether the wall material is precast or real stone.
 - Mr. Litvin answered that it would be real stone that will either be or approximate Wissahickon schist, which was chosen to reflect context. He explained that the placement of the wall along Panama Street creates separation between the backs of the Delancey Street properties, cars, and trash.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that the open wall is created from Wissahickon schist, adding that the wall could consist of cut stones.
 - Mr. Litvin responded that it would consist of stacked stone, noting that the goal is to use Wissahickon schist, though the final product may be an alternate that is similar to it, such as Eramosa limestone.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern over the position of the structure and asked whether there is a setback requirement, adding that the structure should not be against the property line. He argued against demolishing the hairpin fence.
 - The applicants responded that the fence is not historic and that it was damaged by the fallen tree in the location where it would be removed.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked how historic the fence is, noting that it may not be original but could have historic value.
 - Amy Riley of the Fidler Square Improvement Association board stated that, based on photographs, she believes the fencing was installed in the mid-1970s.
 - Ms. Litvin added that the new gate between the pavilion and pergola will duplicate the fencing.
 - Ms. Stein stated that the staff overview notes that any part of the proposal could be removed in the future but questioned what would remain following the removal of the pavilion. She commented that she is fine with the Modernist aesthetic, because it can be removed. She then expressed concern over historic trees that could be impacted, adding that the trees create the park. Ms. Stein observed that trees stand on the other side of the pavilion wall and asked how the applicants would protect the tree if the wall has deep foundations and stands only about three feet away.
 - Mr. Litvin noted that all trees are identified in the site plan and clarified that the tree Ms. Stein is referencing is the tree that fell on the current shed.
 - Mr. Cluver observed that there were no elevations provided and asked how tall the pavilion would be.
 - Mr. Litvin answered that the top of the shade structure is 11 feet and the top of the pavilion parapet is 10 feet.
 - Mr. Cluver asked if there is a lighting proposal or air conditioning in the pavilion.

- The applicants replied that there is no air conditioning proposed for the pavilion, but there would be uplighting on the stone walls and potentially some along the bench of the pergola structure to avoid creating dark space at night.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked how solid the walls would be along Panama Street, adding that the park has always been so visually transparent. He asked that every effort be made to reduce the amount of wall that occurs along the sidewalk, further suggesting that the wing wall at the pavilion be reconsidered. He then asked whether the pergola could be open along Panama Street or if there was a specific purpose for creating the screen.
 - Ms. Litvin answered that the screen wall was designed to create a backdrop for the events in the park and it obscures the view into the backs of houses, garages, and cars along Panama Street.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro argued that at Rittenhouse Square there are many events and that any equipment is installed only during the event and is not a permanent feature. He added that he opposes the pavilion and pergola being set along the property line.
 - Mr. Litvin responded that if they move it away from the property line, the pavilion and pergola would creep closer to the fountain, which he stated has far more significance than Panama Street, which is essentially an alley.
- Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that the proposed design is not compatible and greatly alters the view.
 - Mr. Litvin replied that he worked with Philadelphia Parks & Recreation and it recommended creating the perforation in the stone wall to allow visibility for security reasons. He added that the suggestion was welcome, because it increases the openness.
 - Ms. Riley argued that constructing only the pavilion would create imbalance. She added that currently there is no natural place for people to gather and that the pergola would provide a backdrop to their events.
 - Mr. Detwiler argued that the effect could still be created with a more open and transparent wall.
- Mr. Detwiler contended that the proposed schist is not an appropriate material for the neighborhood, arguing that there is very little schist near Fidler Square. He noted that Fidler Commons, located at the south side of the park, consists of limestone and that, in general, the neighborhood is composed of brick and limestone. He observed that within the brick of the surrounding buildings, there are numerous tones, such as the purplish tone of the existing brick shed, which he suggested is more in keeping with the materiality of the neighborhood than the schist.
 - Mr. Litvin agreed that brick is prevalent in the neighborhood but stated that several nearby buildings use schist. He argued that he specifically chose a material other than brick to contrast with the neighborhood's prevalent material.
 - Mr. McCoubrey contended that the schist could be challenging to use due to its relative fragility.
 - Ms. Litvin responded that she and Mr. Litvin are considering an alternate to the schist. She noted that while the paths in the park are brick, they are all lined in gray granite block. She added that she considered brick extensively, but ultimately the pavilion and pergola wall were considered as a border and edge to the park rather than part of the field condition of the brick. The schist, she continued, references the granite.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked whether the granite block will be used as pavers under the seating area, and Ms. Litvin affirmed.

- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the design is too imposing and needs to be much more understated. He added that the design does not fit the park's aesthetic.
 - Ms. Riley responded that the use of brick made the structures look very heavy in the renderings, arguing that the wood and stone, though dense, creates more balance and blends in better with the surrounding context.
 - Mr. Detwiler countered that the brick blends more with the park paving and building rears on Panama Street. The schist, he continued, is not as natural for this area as it is for Chestnut Hill or Mount Airy. Much of the southern façade at Fidler Commons, he reiterated, is limestone. He suggested achieving the distinction the applicants seek with a material that's closer to that of the surrounding context.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the proposed wood and its finish.
 - Mr. Litvin responded that it is a blackened wood intended to be slatted along the curved part of the pavilion facing the fountain to create a soft face. The pergola structure, he continued, would be made of the same material and finished in the same way, which would be either charred or stained black.
- Ms. Gutterman requested details on the roof of the pergola.
 - Mr. Litvin explained that the plan shows a patterned opening that will create dappled light underneath.
- Ms. Pentz asked what creates the blackness of the blackened wood.
 - Mr. Litvin clarified that the wood is burned and provided a sample for the Committee to review.
- Ms. Stein asked about the maintenance program for charred wood.
 - Mr. Litvin answered that it patinas over time and that the char on the wood offers protection.
 - Ms. Stein noted that in a similar application in the city, the charred edges of recently installed blacked wood are nicked. She inquired how that would be repaired and whether it would need to be recharred.
 - Mr. Litvin replied that it could be touched up, but that a clear coat would be applied every few years.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the application is all "pretty pictures" and lacks details.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the roof details of the pavilion and how it engages with the vertical battens. He stated that he expects the end grain of the wood would be capped. He then asked whether there is a section.
 - Mr. Litvin answered Mr. McCoubrey's question, stating that the battens would function as a rainscreen with flashing behind.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that the west side of the pavilion is not depicted in the renderings. He asked whether there is a view of it and whether it will be a solid stone wall.
 - The applicants responded that it would be a solid stone wall, adding that there is a pump for the fountain in that location. Ms. Litvin further explained that hedges surround the pump, and they are trying not to disturb the pump due to the difficulty in relocating it.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why two double doors are necessary.
 - Mr. Litvin answered that the pavilion functions as a storage facility that needs to hold wide equipment, such as a lawnmower. He stated that the door consists of two 34-inch slabs in patinaed blackened steel.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that there is too much overbuild, and the design overpowers the space.

- Ms. Pentz stated that she finds the materials to be acceptable but would like to see less wall along Panama Street.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that he is a longtime resident of the neighborhood and that he was unaware of the proposal. He asked the applicants to inform him of the proposal.
 - Mr. Litvin answered that he would be happy to explain the project to Mr. Traub after the review.
 - Mr. Traub asked if the proposal has been circulated. Ms. Litvin replied that it was presented at a public meeting.
 - Mr. Traub stated that he was not in attendance. He asked how long the applicant would be at the meeting, and Mr. Litvin stated that he would come find Mr. Traub at an appropriate time.
 - Several people suggested that Mr. Traub review the meeting materials that are emailed to all interested parties one week in advance of the meetings, rather than asking the applicants, staff, and Committee members to explain proposals to him during the meetings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The walls along Panama Street are too large and solid.
- The Wissahickon schist selected does not relate to the context of the park.
- The blackened wood proposed for the pavilion screen wall and pergola is acceptable, though it would require regular maintenance.
- The hairpin fence may have historic significance.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The wall of the pergola structure could be revised to include piers rather than perforated stone, and the wing wall of the pavilion could be removed to lessen the span of the pavilion wall along Panama Street.
- Brick or limestone would be a preferable building material, since those materials are found throughout the Fidler Square neighborhood.
- Photographic evidence is needed to show the approximate installation date of the hairpin fence and to justify the removal of a portion of the fence from the Panama Street side.

Mr. D'Alessandro made a motion to recommend denial with the following comments:

- the hairpin fencing should not be removed;
- the intensity of the privacy wall should be reduced;
- the pavilion material should be brick; and
- both structures should be set back from Panama Street.

Ms. Gutterman seconded the motion. Mr. D'Alessandro withdrew the motion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, with the following comments:

- other materials in lieu of the schist are explored, including limestone or brick;
- the wall along Panama Street is opened more to lessen its solidity;

- the structures in general are lightened in appearance to maintain the openness of the park; and
- the applicants provide evidence to show that the hairpin fence has no historical significance.

ITEM: 2301-23 PINE ST					
MOTION: Denial, with comments					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2113 PORTER ST

Proposal: Remove terracotta tile roof; install asphalt shingle roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robert Esposito

Applicant: Marcy Zammer, Castelli Roofing

History: 1912

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 2113 Porter Street is a two-story, stucco, Mission-Tudor, semi-detached house in the Girard Estate Historic District. The building was constructed in 1914 and retains much of its historic fabric including a full terra cotta tile roof. The applicant and owner submitted a roofing application due to the failing condition of the existing terra cotta roof. This application proposes full removal of the terra cotta roof and replacement with an architectural shingle asphalt roof.

For this application, the staff initially proposed that the owner repair and reuse the terra cotta on the front part of the roof and install the asphalt shingle on the rear portion. The owner solicited two contractors for this scope of work. The first bid the owner received was \$60,000 and the second was \$62,500. Both proposed bids are cost prohibitive to the owner. In general, our staff has observed that costs for full and partial terra cotta roof replacement present an economic challenge to Girard Estate’s homeowners. While one might suggest that a financial hardship or unnecessary hardship application is required to review this proposal, the staff notes that Standard 6, the most applicable of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards in this case, recommends replacing deteriorated materials with the same material “where possible.” The staff contends that it is not possible to use the same material, owing to the enormous cost. The staff proposes that this application can be approved in compliance with the Standards without a hardship application or finding.

According to the National Park Service's Preservation Brief #30, terra cotta tile roofs have a lifespan of approximately 100 years. In recent years, as terra cotta roofs in the Girard Estate Historic District have reached their 100 year mark, the staff has begun to see more requests for terra cotta roof removal. In the Philadelphia Historical Commission Rules & Regulations there are alternate materials guidelines for slate but there are no similar guidelines for terra cotta roof tiles. The staff has researched alternate materials for terra cotta roof tiles and has not identified an alternate, cost-effective replacement roof shingle that successfully replicates the material characteristics of terra cotta roof tile. One option, a red "Slateline" asphalt shingle that simulates the dimension and depth of the terra cotta tile, has been previously installed on some buildings in the historic district but has been discontinued in red and no longer available.

The staff requests review of this application and guidance for future applications that propose replacement of terra cotta with asphalt. The staff's preference is to have staff approval authority for similar applications in the Girard Estate Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Full removal of historic terra cotta tile roof.
- Install new GAF Timberline Patriot Red Shingles to main roof and bay window roof.

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 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
- *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.*
- *Regulation 6.11.e of the Philadelphia Historical Commission Rules & Regulations: The Architectural Committee shall review and may approval without referral to the Commission application that are subject to staff approval but which the staff has declined to approve. If the Committee declines to approve such an application, it shall formulate an advisory recommendation for approval, denial, or deferral, with or without conditions and qualifications; and refer the application with recommendation to the Commission for review at the next meeting. The Architectural Committee approval or recommendation shall be confirmed in writing to the applicant.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval for the replacement of the terra cotta with the GAF Timberline asphalt shingle in Patriot Red, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6 and Regulation 6.11.e.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:52:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Robert Esposito, the homeowner, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if this proposal consists of one or two applications.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that it is one application for the roofing application and the staff is seeking guidance on the terra cotta removal and replacement question. She noted that the staff is looking for guidance from the Committee about how to handle similar requests going forward.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the description of the district—what role do materials such as the roof play in that description? He noted that in looking at photos of the properties, the roofs have a very distinctive character, making it a difficult discussion.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that the roofs are character-defining features and that is the real struggle with this question. She continued that many of the roofs have been replaced with asphalt shingles; some legally and many without any approval.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if it was the terra cotta material that is the character-defining feature or the red color.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that it is both the material and the color. She noted that, if the asphalt is approved, it will be a red color that is similar to the terra cotta tile.
- Ms. McCoubrey inquired if there was a high-profile red shingle available.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded there are Ludowici terra cotta tiles and they are available. Ms. Mehley pointed out that the original recommendation by the staff for this project was to reuse the building's existing terra cotta roof tiles on the front of the roof and install asphalt shingles on the rear roof. She explained that even with the re-use of existing tiles, the project cost was still \$60,000. Ms. Gutterman noted that the expense comes from the careful removal of the existing tiles. Mr. D'Alessandro added that it is not so much the material as the labor.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out the roof's front edge profile is distinctive, as well as the ridge.
- Ms. Stein inquired if there was a pressed metal product that replicates the terra cotta.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that there is a copper product but the cost would be expensive, similar to the terra cotta. Ms. Stein and Ms. Gutterman also noted the expense of this type of replacement.
- Mr. Cluver noted that, when you look at the capital cost of the terra cotta vs. the asphalt shingle, you cannot compare the two, as one is much less expensive, but when you look at it in terms of a life-cycle cost, it starts to even out. He noted that for many decades the building's homeowners benefitted from the initial decision to use a very durable roof material and they have not had to incur the cost of additional roofing.
- Ms. Mehley stated that that the staff's experience is that often by the time the applications for this and similar terra cotta roof projects in Girard Estate are submitted for review, the homeowners have already completed numerous repairs and often experiencing water infiltration, potentially putting the overall structure at risk. Ms. Mehley stated that it would be helpful to hear from the property owner for this application.
- Mr. Esposito stated that he purchased the property in 2010 and lives in the home with his family and also noted that he and his wife are lifelong South Philadelphia residents. He explained that when they purchased the property the home, initially there was bad water infiltration, with water fully coming down on one side of the house. Mr. Esposito commented that the former owners probably did not address this issue for almost a decade. He said that he has done patchwork repairs including roofing cement, lining the gutters with rubber, and it seemed to work for a while. Mr. Esposito stated that eventually they started to see water come back in, especially during 2018 when it started to accelerate.
- Ms. Gutterman asked where the water is coming in.

- Mr. Esposito responded that it is coming in through two main areas – both roof valley areas. He explained that one is at the front valley in between the houses and in the area where the bay is. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that it is possible that it is the flashing that is the problem and not the terra cotta. Mr. Esposito noted that it is not just those two areas, there are also areas on the rear roof where the terra cotta is broken. He stated that terra cotta is not in good condition and he has been up on the roof himself and the existing material is brittle. He explained he solicited multiple estimates for the full roof replacement with asphalt shingles and decided to go with Castelli Roofing who has completed many roofing projects in their neighborhood. Mr. Esposito pointed out this includes a full replacement with asphalt at 2521 S. 21st Street which was approved by the Historical Commission staff. Ms. Mehley confirmed that 2521 S. 21st Street was approved by the staff and is the same material proposed for this application. Mr. Esposito pointed to the photographs included with his application and the damage currently occurring on the interior of his house.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired what type of material is proposed in the valleys with the new roof. She stated it should be copper.
 - Mr. Esposito responded that he thinks it is copper flashing. Mr. D'Alessandro interjected that it should be copper. Mr. Esposito also pointed out that part of the gutter near the side bay has collapsed from roof issues.
- Ms. Pentz asked about some of the building's trim details, such as the gable end and front porch trim, inquiring if they were naturally red or painted.
 - Mr. Esposito responded that those areas are painted including the stucco.
- Mr. Esposito stated that even the \$12,500 is a large cost for him and he estimates that it will probably be a few thousand more for rotten wood the roofer will have to replace with new decking, once they start taking off the terra cotta.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he sees this building's character-defining elements in the following order: first is color, second is roof details, for example exposed rafter tails and the terra cotta turn along the front edge, and third are other types of details, for example closed roof valleys versus an open valleys.
- Mr. Cluver stated that, when you look at a historic district like Girard Estate, you think about the Task Force recommendation regarding the different levels of historic significance and the roles the materials play in it. He noted that Girard Estate is a prime example of the district as the overall character and that the specific materials are not as front and center as they would be on other properties. He stated that he is willing to look at it from that perspective. Mr. Cluver clarified that he would like to see an approach for this roof that keeps the red color, maintains a sense of rhythm, and keeps a shadow line. He added this is the Slateline was a better product to do this but what he does not want to see is a very flat shingle, like a thin asphalt shingle. Mr. Cluver stated that he would like to see a dimensional shingle that provides some sense of depth, like the product proposed, GAF Timberline HD shingles, and pointed out that this is a fiberglass shingle not technically asphalt. He added that the other key part of the roof is the front gable drip edge and suggested painting it to match the shingle color to add depth to imitate the terra cotta shingle wrapping this edge and noted this could make a big difference.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired if the roof valleys are currently metal and if they are visible.
 - Mr. Esposito stated he thinks it is metal but it is hard to tell because of all of the roof cement. He added that they are open valleys.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the fiberglass should do the same with the roof valleys open and exposed with copper flashing. He added that you should see the reveal of the

copper as it is an architectural element. He noted that a lot of times when they do this with the asphalt/fiberglass they close the valley and it has a totally different appearance.

- Mr. Cluver asked Mr. D'Alessandro if there is any technical or construction-related issue why this could not be done.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the open valley can be done and there should not be any issue. He added the closed valley is usually done out of convenience.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- 2113 Porter Street's roof has deteriorated to the point that replacement is warranted. Targeted repairs are not longer effective and water infiltration is presently occurring.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The architectural character of the roof includes the terra cotta but is equally reflected in its historic color, detailing, and craftsmanship.
- The proposed replacement shingle should be red to match the historic terra cotta color.
- The proposed replacement shingle should not be a thin, flat shingle but a shingle that has provides shadow and dimension on the roof.
- The front gable drip edge should maintain the appearance of the terra cotta wrapping the edge; this can be done by painting the new drip edge to match the color of the new shingle.
- The new roof should have open valleys with copper flashing; similar to its historic roof.
- It could invoke Section 6.11.e of the Rules & Regulations and approve this application outright, without referral to the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee provided guidance to the Historical Commission staff for future roof applications similar to that for 2113 Porter Street and within the Girard Estate Historic District, stating that the staff could approve these applications using the Architectural Committee's recommended approval and guidelines for the 2113 Porter Street application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to approve the replacement of the terra cotta shingles, which are deteriorated and can no longer be repaired, with fiberglass shingles, GAF Timberline shingle or like product in red, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6 and Regulation 6.11.e, provided:

- the front drip edge should have the appearance of depth;
- the valleys are treated as open valleys; and,
- details such as the configuration of the pole gutter, open rafter tails, and similar roof details are maintained.

ITEM: 2113 PORTER ST					
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: 5164 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Remove slate roof; install asphalt shingle roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 5164 Ridge Ave LLC

Applicant: Simon Ojeda, PQ Construction & Remodeling

History: 1877; St. Timothy's Working Men's Club and Institute; Charles M. Burns (attributed)

Individual Designation: 3/7/1974

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 5164 Ridge Avenue was constructed in 1877 as the St. Timothy's Working Men's Club and Institute. The Club closed in 1912. The building historically had a prominent corner tower, shown in the historic image in this application, which was removed prior to historic designation. The building was individually designated in 1974, and was included in the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District inventory in 2018. The current owner purchased the property in 2018, after the building had suffered from many years of deferred maintenance. Shortly after purchasing the property, the owner contacted the Historical Commission's staff to inquire how to submit an application to repair the roof, owing to the failing condition of the existing slate. This application proposes a full removal of the existing slate roof and replacement with a shingle asphalt roof, owing to the cost of real slate replacement. The proposed Belmont shingle is advertised as "replicating the authentic appearance of natural slate." The staff encouraged the property owner to obtain two or three quotes for re-roofing, to include asphalt shingles, real slate, and synthetic slate. This application includes a quote of \$24,200 for re-roofing using the Belmont asphalt shingles, and a quote of \$57,200 for re-roofing using slate. The roofing contractor conveyed to the staff that the quote for using a synthetic slate would be comparable in cost to the real slate quote. The cost for re-roofing using real or synthetic slate are cost-prohibitive for the owner, especially when combined with the larger scope of work that the new owner is confronting in bringing this building back into use and into compliance with building code requirements. While one might suggest that a financial hardship or unnecessary hardship application is required to review this proposal, the staff notes that Standard 6, the most applicable of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in this case, recommends replacing deteriorated materials with the same material "where possible." The staff contends that it is not possible to use the same material, owing to the enormous cost. The staff proposes that this

application can be approved in compliance with the Standards without a hardship application or finding.

According to the National Park Service's Preservation Brief #29, slate roofs have a lifespan of 60 to 125 years. Section 6.10.c.4 of the Commission Rules & Regulations states that "the staff shall review and may approve without referral to the Architectural Committee and the Commission permit applications proposing the replacement of slate roofing materials, with the exception of mansards, turrets, and other character-defining features, provided the severity of deterioration requires replacement and the substitute materials closely approximate the color and shape of the historic slate roofing materials." The staff suggests that, although the existing tower may be a character-defining feature of the building today, it is not original to the building and therefore should not be held to the above standards. The staff suggests that the remainder of the roof, although visible owing to the location of this building on a prominent corner along Ridge Avenue, is a candidate for replacement with asphalt shingles which are the approximate shape and color of slate.

The staff requests review of this application and guidance for future applications that propose replacement of slate with asphalt, where replacement with slate is cost-prohibitive given the overall condition of the building.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Remove existing slate on entire roof.
- Install CertainTeed Belmont Luxury Shingles to entire roof.

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 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
- *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.*
- *Section 6.10.c.4 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations: "The staff shall review and may approve without referral to the Architectural Committee and the Commission permit applications proposing: ...the replacement of slate roofing materials, with the exception of mansards, turrets, and other character-defining features, provided the severity of deterioration requires replacement and the substitute materials closely approximate the color and shape of the historic slate roofing materials."*
- *Section 6.11.e of the Commission's Rules & Regulations: "The Architectural Committee shall review and may approval without referral to the Commission application that are subject to staff approval but which the staff has declined to approve. If the Committee declines to approve such an application, it shall formulate an advisory recommendation for approval, denial, or deferral, with or without conditions and qualifications; and refer the application with recommendation to the Commission for review at the next meeting. The Architectural Committee approval or recommendation shall be confirmed in writing to the applicant."*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval for the replacement of the slate roof with CertainTeed Belmont Luxury Shingles or equivalent, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6 and Sections 6.10.c and 6.11.e of the Commission’s Rules & Regulations.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:14:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Anner Rodriguez, a contractor employed by the applicant, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. D’Alessandro proclaimed that the application is incomplete because it lacks roofing drawings.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that the staff routinely approves roofing applications at the staff-level without roofing drawings, and explained that she contributed the majority of the application materials because the applicant did not provide much information. She explained that the applicant provided a building permit application and two roofing estimates; she supplemented the application with six photographs, an aerial photograph, a historic photograph, and the advertising materials for the Belmont Luxury Roofing Shingles, which shows the shingles used on several different residences, in addition to the different colors available and a close-up image to show the shape and depth of the shingle.
 - Mr. D’Alessandro asserted that the application is incomplete because it contains “a lot of generic printouts.”
 - Ms. Chantry responded that the Historical Commission rarely requires architectural drawings for roofing applications. She directed Mr. D’Alessandro to Section 6.7.f of the Commission’s Rules & Regulations, which addresses submission requirements: “For less complex projects, annotated photographs and/or photomontages with notes and/or specifications may be acceptable in lieu of drawings.”
- The Committee commented that the application provides no clear information regarding details such as copper flashing and ridges, and whether those elements will be repaired or replaced, and with what materials.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that, should the concept of the replacement roofing shingle be approved, the staff would require that those details are provided by the contractor for review and approval. The staff typically reviews those low-level details when considering the permit submission.
- Mr. D’Alessandro referenced the Belmont Luxury Roofing Shingles advertising materials and asked if the staff would approve the hip and ridge caps as shown. He stated that those should be metal rather than shingles. He stated that “anyone can pull this up.”
 - Ms. Chantry agreed, and reminded Mr. D’Alessandro that indeed anyone can obtain these promotional materials, as she was the one who put them in the application, because the only paperwork provided by the applicant was the building permit application and two estimates.
- The Committee requested that the estimates be itemized so that details are provided as to exactly what is proposed. The Committee stated that it cannot recommend approval of this application without that information.

- Ms. Chantry responded that this application would not be approved by the staff without that information either, but that the application before the Committee is to review the proposal of a change in roofing material from slate to asphalt shingles. The question before the Committee is whether the slate can be replaced with the shingles. The staff can work out the minor details with the applicant at a later date.
- The Committee asked about the shape of the shingles, owing to the existing slate roof having two different shaped slates.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that if the Committee accepts the premise of a change in materials, it could direct the staff to work with the applicant to determine what options exist in asphalt shingles to replicate the shape of the existing slates.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that that is wrong, and the Committee has to "catch all of this stuff verbally."
- The Committee asked if work is proposed to the dormers.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that it is not called out in the scope of work, but presumably the dormers will need to have work done owing to the extensive deterioration visible in the photographs.
- The Committee observed that there is likely a plywood substrate underneath the slate that will need to be completely removed, owing to the poor condition of the roof. The Committee questioned whether the estimates took this into account. The Committee observed that there is extensive damage to the roof, and there is likely water damage that extends to the framing owing to the holes in the roof.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that, as a contractor, he would love to get an approval like this because he could do whatever he wanted. Ms. Chantry disagreed and reminded him that the staff always reviews myriad minor details after the Committee and Commission have acted on applications. The question before the Committee is whether or not the slate can be replaced. Ms. Gutterman asked if there are any flat sections of the roof. Mr. D'Alessandro continued by stating, "I can just show up with a bundle of shingles and put them on." Committee members determined that there are no flat portions of the roof.
- Mr. Cluver explained that this application is different from the previous application for 2113 Porter Street in that this building is individually designated, whereas the previous building was designated as part of a historic district. He acknowledged that the tower is not part of the original design, but suggested that it is still visually prominent and decoratively treated with slate patterns. He stated that the only reason that the Committee would consider the change from slate to an alternate material is because of the economics. He stated that this is very much an economic argument. He cautioned that, should it get to a point where this application is approved, it should not be accepted as the default going forward, and when the roof needs to be replaced again in 20 years because of the materials used, it would need to be reviewed once again and the economics should once again be reviewed because they may have changed. He stated that this is too prominent of a building to accept this as a standard approach. He acknowledged that the existing roof has reached the end of its useful life and needs to be replaced. He noted that a replacement with real slate would result in a long-term repair, but opined that, if real slate is required by the Commission, the roof may not get repaired and the building may sit empty and continue to deteriorate. He stated that it is a hardship argument. Ms. Stein agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The severity of deterioration of the existing slate roof requires replacement.
- No information is provided in the written estimate regarding details such as flashings, ridges, gutters, and dormers.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application is incomplete because it does not provide an extensive written scope of work for the roof replacement, including proposals for flashings, ridges, gutters, and dormers, and options for asphalt shingles to replicate the approximate shape of the existing slate patterns.

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

ITEM: 5164 RIDGE AVE					
MOTION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D’Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D’Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 125 N 10TH ST

Proposal: Remove sections of rear of building; construct rear addition; rehabilitate front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PZ Zhangs Associate LLC

Applicant: Anthony Palimore, Anthony Palimore, RA

History: 1831; alterations in 1906; 1910; 1967-71; Chinatown YMCA, Chinese Cultural and Community Center; Yang Chou-Cheng

Individual Designation: 6/14/2013

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 125 N. 10th Street is a mid-block parcel between Cherry and Arch Streets in the Chinatown neighborhood. The building was originally constructed c. 1831 as Federal-style rowhouse. A one-story side addition and three-story rear addition were constructed in 1906. A commercial storefront and a second story to the side addition were added in 1910. The building’s existing elaborate façade and tile roof were constructed between 1967 and 1971 by the Chinese Cultural and Community Center, but the original gabled-roof building is still extant behind the facade. The nomination notes that this alteration excluded the property from the Historical Commission’s designation of comparable Federal-style buildings in the neighborhood

in 1974. The nomination for the property, which was designated in 2013, identifies the period of significance as 1955-2006, beginning with the year that the Chinatown YMCA opened on the second floor of the building, prior to the construction of the existing façade. In 1966, T.T. Chang, founder of the Chinatown YMCA, purchased the property and formed the Chinese Cultural and Community Center.

The application proposes to remove the second and third-floor side walls, floor joists, and roof of the rear ell, and the rear wall of the main block, and to construct a large rear addition that would extend onto the gabled roof of the main block. The front façade would be rehabilitated.

The staff notes that the proposed drawings have not been revised from an earlier application that would have demolished a considerable portion of the main block as well as the rear ell, and maintain a note that 13 feet 4 inches of the building will be limited to historic restoration. As such, it is difficult to determine the impact of the proposed addition to the roof of the main block of the building.

While the rear of the property is minimally visible from the public right-of-way, it should be noted that the existing structure is integral to the structural stability of the front façade and tile roof. Moreover, the older portions of the building speak to the history and evolution of the property from its rowhouse past, through its conversion to a mixed-use property along a commercial corridor, and into the development of the Chinatown neighborhood.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Retain main block of building.
- Demolish rear wall and rear roof slope of main block.
- Demolish second and third-floor side walls, floors, and roof.
- Construct four-story addition at rear.
- Rehabilitate front façade.

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 project retains the building's primary character-defining features, the elaborate front façade and roof. It proposes to remove portions of the building that do not fall within the period of significance, but which do speak to the building's evolution. The proposed project partially 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 is compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the environment, but the impact of the addition to the roof of the main block is not easily discernable. The project partially complies with this standard.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed demolition destroys the form of the property and is not reversible. The project does not comply with this standard.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:27:37

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Anthony Palimore and developers Steven Chung and Jerry Zhang represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. DiPasquale stressed that this application does not propose to demolish the character-defining façade and pagoda roof.
- The Committee noted that the period of significance defined in the nomination is 1955-2006 and asked whether portions of the building dating to before that period are considered non-historic or non-significant.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission should consider that question. She explained that the staff's belief is that the earlier portions of the building speak to the overall evolution of the building and the Chinatown neighborhood.
- The Committee asked whether the ridgeline of the roof is visible from the street and questioned the inconsistencies regarding building depths shown in the drawings.
 - Ms. DiPasquale explained that she believes that not all of the drawings were updated between the previous and current submissions.
- The Committee addressed the roof plan and section cuts. They expressed confusion over the hatched portion of the section drawing, noting that hatching typically indicates new work.
 - The applicant responded that they are proposing to retain the entire headhouse of the building.
- The applicant explained that they are proposing a fourth-floor addition and to demolish the rear ell floor levels to align them through the entire building.
- The Committee asked whether the applicants are proposing to construct or rest the roof of the new addition on top of the existing fourth-floor gable roof.
 - The applicants claimed they were not proposing to touch the existing roof.
 - Ms. DiPasquale asked if that was true, as the drawings show the fourth-floor addition extending onto the rear slope of the existing main roof.
 - The applicants responded there was a heavily deteriorated wall that is gone.
 - The Committee asked how the new addition will be tied into, rest on, or intersect with the existing building's roof, and whether they are proposing to remove any of the lower eave of the main roof.
 - The applicants responded that they are not proposing to remove any of the front portion of the roof.
- The Committee asked whether the applicants propose to extend up the party walls on the main block.
 - The applicants responded affirmatively.

- The Committee questioned whether the proposed fourth-floor addition would be visible from the public right-of-way and suggested the applicant provide sight-line studies to show the potential visibility.
 - The applicants noted that they could provide further photographic and sight-line studies.
 - The Committee noted that a mock-up may also be helpful.
- Mr. Baron asked whether the proposed addition demolishes the dormer on the rear slope of the main block.
- The Committee expressed confusion over the way existing conditions are shown versus proposed work. They noted that the decorative terra cotta and tile work is shown as a simple triangle on the drawings. They requested to know how the terra cotta is currently attached and supported, and how close the proposed construction will come to it.
- The Committee noted that the proposed addition may be acceptable, but that the documentation is insufficient.
- The Committee requested exterior elevation drawings and additional section drawings.
- Mr. Palimore withdrew the application.

ADDRESS: 238 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct rear additions; add dormers

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Andrew Hohns and Leah Popowich

Applicant: Christopher Miller, John Milner Architects

History: 1765; Shippen-Wistar House; Mutual Assurance Co., 1912

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956, 4/30/1957

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The Shippen Wistar House, at the corner of 4th and Locust Streets, dates to the middle of the eighteenth century and has undergone significant alterations over many years, specifically to the rear and interior of the building. Originally, the main block of the house had two-story additions at the rear. The first addition was a piazza with stair which extended into a kitchen. The property was altered circa 1830, at which time the stair was relocated to the main block. The staff believes that the existing dormers were added at this time, as the taller building next door was constructed in 1830 and would have blocked the light into the attic from the south, which was previously gained through a window on this side. By the late 1800s, the rear additions were replaced or expanded into Italianate-style rowhouses. The Mutual Assurance Company purchased the buildings for office use and demolished the rear additions and houses in the 1920s, leaving only the main, original house. The building was then connected internally to the adjacent building via doorways cut through the party wall on each floor. Much of the current exterior appearance of the building reflects the work done in the 1920s.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct two-story brick addition with cedar shake roof and one-story kitchen addition with Boral siding and lead-coated copper roof.
- Construct additional dormers on front and rear roof.
- Install new cedar shake roof on main house.

- Restore windows, doors, and shutters on main house.
- Install wood and metal fence and wood arbor within existing garden at rear.

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 and preserves the main house, and reintroduces a spatial relationship at the rear that historically existed.
- *Standard 3: Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.*
 - The proposed brick rear addition is not attempting to reconstruct the historic rear ell exactly; however, the addition uses materials and a façade design which may too closely resemble an original rear addition. The proposed construction of an additional dormer on both the front and rear roofs, while creating symmetry found on numerous historic buildings nearby, does not appear to have been a condition found on this particular building at any point in the past. The staff notes that an existing attic window on the north side of the building allows for light into the space.
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - The proposed project restores the historic materials, features, and finishes of the facades of the main house.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed additions will not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. Although the proposed rear ell has a very historic look, it will be sufficiently differentiated from the old. Both proposed rear additions will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of additional dormers; approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:45:10

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Owner Andrew Hohns and Architect Christopher Miller represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Baron explained that the Historical Commission has not typically approved additional dormers for corner houses because historically such houses used gable end windows to provide light. Mr. D'Alessandro said that it would be relatively easy to gain additional space in the basement. Mr. Cluver asked if the rear dormer was needed considering that it will fall in a closet.
 - Mr. Hohns explained that the attic space is very significant because Richard Henry Lee left from this "attic tree" to visit the Library Company where he proposed the initial resolution that became the Declaration of Independence. He said that they are returning this house to residential use. It only has three bedrooms and they are making this space more usable with light. Mr. Miller said that although the one dormer will be in a service space that it will provide symmetry.
- Ms. Stein recommended centering the door on the new rear ell. She had questions about the purpose of the new gate in the garden wall.
- Mr. Miller explained that the gate will provide access to a separate secured service area behind the main garden.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the proposed projecting rear balcony was not appropriate to this house.
 - The applicant responded that they would be happy to change it to a Juliet balcony.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association asked what would be altered on the north wall of the Cadwalader house adjacent to the garden and how the applicants plan to differentiate the new addition from the old construction. Mr. Hohns responded that the wall will not be altered and that the new construction will be differentiated in the bond of the new brick.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The form and massing of the proposed additions are appropriate
- A Juliet balcony would be appropriate.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- With exception of the projecting balcony, the application satisfies Standards 2, 3, 5, and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of all but the projecting balcony, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 9.

ITEM: 238-40 S 4th ST					
MOTION: Approval of all but the balcony					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler			X		
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6		1		

ADDRESS: 1249-53 S 19TH ST

Proposal: Demolish building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 19th Street Baptist Church

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1874; 19th Street Baptist Church; Furness & Hewitt, architects

Individual Designation: 7/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 1249-53 S. 19th Street is located at the southeast corner of Titan and S. 19th Streets. Constructed in 1874 by the architectural firm of Furness & Hewitt, this Gothic Revival, green-serpentine stone church and school complex was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1984.

The applicant is proposing the complete demolition of the church and school building, seemingly in response to several open violations including partially collapsed roof and wall, resulting in an unsafe structure determination by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The materials provided in the application include four photographs of the overall structures and two of the interior of the sanctuary. There is no engineer's report or cover letter explaining the existing conditions or scope of work.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Complete demolition of church and school 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. foreclosed.*
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*

- The proposed complete demolition of the buildings fails to retain the historic character, distinctive materials, features, spaces, spatial relationships, finishes, construction techniques, or examples of craftsmanship that characterize this complex.

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5, and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:34:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Church Trustee James Baylor represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Baron explained that an engineering report had been submitted the day before the Architectural Committee meeting.
 - In summary, the report says that the church is repairable but at considerable expense. Mr. Baron explained that the report does not constitute a hardship application.
- Mr. Taylor explained that the former pastor had requested to put the church on the Philadelphia Register and had pursued working with Partners for Sacred Places and other groups to preserve the church. He said that they have not found a partner to pay for the needed repairs. He said that they have an estimate that it will cost \$5 million to totally restore the building and \$10,000 per window to repair the wall. He added that the City issued a violation for an Unsafe building and that they had to vacate the building 11 November 2018. He said that the violation indicates that the City may demolish the building and bill the owners. He said that they have had only one offer to buy the land but that that sales agreement is contingent on the church receiving a demolition permit.

- Ms. Pentz suggested that the proposed buyer should submit a hardship application. She noted that she visited the building 15 years ago that it was in very poor condition. However, since that time, money had been raised and work has been done including new roofs and a new wall.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the violation is Unsafe not Imminently Dangerous.
- Mr. Baron said that he had spoken to a developer who said he had offered the congregation \$500,000 to sell it to him to restore and convert to housing.
 - Mr. Baylor acknowledged that in fact they had received such an offer but that they determined that they could get more money for the land without the church building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance said that over the years many members of the public have contributed to efforts to save the building and have a stake in the preservation of the building. He said that it is highly significant as a rare surviving example of the work of Furness & Hewitt. He recommended that the Committee follow the staff's recommendation of denial. If a hardship application is eventually submitted the Commission should follow its Rules & Regulations regarding the review of hardship applications.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites also recommended that the Committee follow the staff recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property has been cited as Unsafe, but not Imminently Dangerous.
- The application proposes complete demolition, but makes no claim that the building cannot be reasonably adapted for a new use or that the issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The applicants have not demonstrated that the existing building cannot be reasonably adapted, that the sale is impracticable, or that all other potential uses of the property have been foreclosed upon. The applicants have not demonstrated that the issuance of the demolition permit is necessary in the public interest. While abating unsafe and imminently dangerous conditions are in the public interest, the proposed demolition may not be *necessary* in the public interest. The unsafe condition should be abated through repair. The application fails to satisfy Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5, and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition.

ITEM: 1249-53 S 19th ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: D'Alessandro					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1524-38 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Rehabilitate buildings; construct additions

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: TR-GRETZ LP

Applicant: Anthony Tsirantonakis, T + Associates

History: 1885; Gretz Brewery; 1894-96; 1900; 1901; 1903; 1905; c. 1944

Individual Designation: 11/9/2018

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes the adaptive reuse of the former Gretz Brewery complex, which was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in November 2018. At the time of designation, the Commission voted to consider “Building 12” at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Redner Street as non-contributing, so that it may be approved for demolition to allow for greater flexibility with the plans for redevelopment. Also at the time of designation, the developer briefly showed preliminary plans to the Commission for redevelopment of the site, to demonstrate that plans for reuse of the property had been in the works for some time prior to the proposed historic designation. Several members of the staff toured the complex with the developer and architect in late 2018 and can confirm that the buildings have suffered from years of deferred maintenance and exposure to the elements. Several buildings in the complex are lacking roofs.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish non-contributing “Building 12” at corner of Germantown Avenue and Redner Street.
- Construct new mixed-use buildings on vacant lot created by demolition of “Building 12” and on existing vacant lot at corner of Germantown Avenue and W. Oxford Street.
- Construct overbuilds and additions on existing historic buildings.
- Rehabilitate historic facades and iconic chimney with “Gretz beer” signage.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 historic facades and chimney, which are the highly visible portions of the complex that convey the historic materials and features.

- *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 historic street-facing facades. The interior of the complex, which is not visible from the street, is not a distinctive feature, and is in disrepair, and therefore does not require repair nor replacement in kind.

- *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.*
 - The proposed project includes overbuilds with setbacks on historic facades, in an attempt to minimize the massing on the historic structures. Overall, the new construction portions of the complex may not strictly satisfy preservation standards, but should be considered owing to the poor condition of the complex, in addition to the plans having been developed prior to notice of proposed historic designation.

- *Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission’s Rules & Regulations (also known as the “Transition Rule”): The Commission, its committees, and staff may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.*
 - At the time that notice was sent to the property owner notifying the owner of the proposed historic designation, plans for a mixed-use adaptive reuse of the complex had been developed by the owner and architect, which were similar to what has been submitted for this in-concept review. The Committee and Commission may take this into account when reviewing redevelopment plans for this site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, with the recommendation that massing of new construction on historic buildings be reduced where possible, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9 and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission’s Rules & Regulations.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:55:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.

- Architects Anthony Tsirantonakis, Parbir Mundi, Mihoko Samejima and owners Anthony Rufo Sr. and Anthony Rufo Jr. represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked the architect to discuss the massing.
- Mr. Tsirantonakis responded that he has designed the building to place the larger mass on the site of the non-contributing structure that will be demolished. He has broken up that structure into two parts to lessen the sense of the size of the building.
- The Committee asked about moving the construction above the historic facades back to lessen the impression that they are shallow facades stuck onto the new building. They suggested moving the facades back from the existing eight feet to somewhere between ten to twelve feet.
 - The applicant responded that he would restudy this question.
 - The Committee asked the applicant to simplify the new construction elements and make them less bright in color. They also asked him to modify the corner building to recall the height and cornice lines of the former structure in order to tie those building together.
 - Mr. Tsirontankis said that he would modify the color and work with staff on the design.
 - Mr. Cluver asked the architect to restudy the Redner Street façade to give it more interest. He also urged the architect to work with the staff on the window and storefront designs and present them at the next round of design review.
 - Mr. Tsirontanakis said that he would provide an elevation of Redner Street for the Commission and work with the staff on a resubmission for the windows and storefronts.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance voiced support for the project but echoed the Committee’s comments regarding greater setbacks, redesigning the corner and calming the design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The overall massing was acceptable with the provisos that: the setbacks of the new construction above the historic buildings is increased and the color and design of the new construction shown in white is toned down, allowing the new construction to read as a new building behind the existing historic buildings.
- The corner building should be modified to relate more to the historic buildings by reflecting the horizontal cornice lines and roof of the historic building that once stood on that site.
- The Redner Street façade have greater visual interest.
- The architect should work with the staff on windows and storefronts and present them at the next round of design review.
- The chimney and its signage should be allowed to read prominently as a neighborhood landmark.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application will meet Standards 5, 6, and 9 when the above provisions are satisfied and can be approved in concept pursuant to Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission’s Rules & Regulations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, provided the overbuilds are set back more on the historic buildings; the bright white color, corner building, and Redner Street façade designs are modified as per the Committee’s comments; and the architect works with the staff on the window and storefront details, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9, and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Historical Commission’s Rules & Regulations.

ITEM: 1524-38 GERMANTOWN AVE					
MOTION: Approval in-concept with conditions					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro			X		
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6		1		

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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