

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

**TUESDAY, 23 APRIL 2019
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-031
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:03 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
- 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

The following persons were present:

- Ryan Strand Greenberg, Mural Arts
- Matthew Millan, Matthew Millan Architects
- Francesco DiCianni, DiCianni Group
- Patrick Boyle, Spring Garden CDC
- Luke Wade
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Jasmine Hempel
- Lauren Boudreaux
- Colin Lott, Drexel University
- Natalie Kotsidis
- Benjamin Nia, Matthew Millan Architects
- Yuval Ben-Zeev, TIY Properties
- David McArthur, DPM RA LLC
- Serge Maslennikov
- Victoria Maslennikov
- Cynthia Sze
- Michael Mattioni, Esq., Mattioni, Ltd.

Anita Tookes
Othneil Tookes
Rachel Tookes
Frederick Tookes
Bro Fred, Local 332
Ray Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect
Bill Frusco
Dee Tessler
David Beilman, Beilman Architecture
Michael McIlhinney, Esq., Orphanides & Toner
Jared Klein, Esq., Orphanides & Toner
Joseph Pecora, Orphanides & Toner
Deborah Hayward
Michael P. Creedon, Creedon & Feliciani, P.C.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 600 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Install mural on side wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Arts and Crafts Holdings

Applicant: Ryan Strand Greenberg, Mural Arts Philadelphia

History: 1872; Northern Savings Bank, Provident Bank; Frank Furness, architect; partially demolished, 1978

Individual Designation: 12/7/1978, 10/11/2000

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to paint a mural on the west façade of 600 Spring Garden Street. The project is proposed by Philadelphia Mural Arts Project and will be completed by Philadelphia artist Jim Houser.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Artist will use Golden Mural Paint to apply painting to stucco the wall. The wall the mural will be applied to is a later addition to the historic building. This small section of the building was added after the west side and rear of the building was demolished in 1978.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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: Approval, pursuant to Standard 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:01:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Ryan Strand Greenberg represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked about the stucco that is on the west wall of the building.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked about the interior of that area of the building.
 - The applicant responded that the area of the building is a small addition that encloses a stairwell.
 - Ms. Mehley added that the addition was constructed after a portion of the building was demolished in 1978. She confirmed that the mural will be painted on a non-historic part of the building.
- The Committee inquired about the power washing to the west wall and the pressure that would be used. Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the other products to be used such as the paint.
 - Mr. Greenberg responded he could follow up with staff and provide the product information and other technical specifications.
 - The Committee asked for a verbal description of the products used in the mural.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the primer to be applied.
 - Mr. Greenberg responded that they will use a product called ProCryl. He explained that it is a preparatory primer Mural Arts uses regularly, to seal the wall so the paint can be applied and the mural can last longer.
 - The Committee asked if the primer allowed the stucco wall to breath after application.
 - Mr. Greenberg responded that the primer does not seal the wall, but creates a surface that allows the mural paint can be applied.
 - The Committee asked the applicant to submit all product data to the staff.
 - The Committee asked if these are the products consistently used by the organization. Ms. Stein commented that the Committee understands that Mural Arts Philadelphia is a world-wide leader in mural arts so the Committee is inquiring if these are standard products used by them during the past 10 years.
 - Mr. Greenberg confirmed they are standard products and the paints are specialized for mural arts.
- The Committee asked about product warranties.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro inquired if the products are warranted and stated the product warranties should be submitted for review as well.
 - Others contended that the Historical Commission has no interest in the warranties.
- The Architectural Committee requested, for purposes of record, a card that identifies the mural colors used and their names so that in the future the Commission has on record what was used for this mural.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The mural will be applied to a wall that is part of a non-historic addition.
- The mural will be created with a process and products that will not damage the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project would 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, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including the product specifications and power-washing details, pursuant to Standard 10.

ITEM: 600 SPRING GARDEN ST					
MOTION: Approval					
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	6				1

ADDRESS: 1503-05 BRANDYWINE ST

Proposal: Construct four-story multi-family dwelling on surface parking lot

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: TIY Properties

Applicant: Angelina Dallago, Canno Design

History: parking lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a four-story building in the Spring Garden Historic District. At the time of the historic district's designation, 1503-05 Brandywine Street was a vacant lot and deemed non-contributing to the historic district. The property is considered an undeveloped site pursuant to Section 2.23 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations and the Commission's jurisdiction over the site is Review and Comment, not plenary.

The parcel directly to the east of 1503-05 Brandywine Street includes 6 condominium parking spaces associated with 1500 Green Street. Existing access to this parking area is granted by an easement on the 1503-05 deed. The proposed design for 1503-05 Brandywine Street continues to maintain this easement and allows access to their parking spaces through the new building's garage door and driveway.

It should be noted that 1500 Green Street is a contributing property to the Spring Garden Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolition of existing wall, parking gate, and parking lot.
- Construct a new four-story building. The building is proposed as a multi-family with twelve residential units and a roof deck.
- The exterior will be clad in brick and metal panel with large aluminum and aluminum-clad windows.
- Cleaning and repairing 1500 Green Street's historic brick wall where it abuts the new building.
- New parking lot at grade for 11 cars (6 of these are part of the 1500 Green Street easement). The parking lot covers 1503-05 Brandywine and 1500 Green Street's at grade surface.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed massing, scale, form, and building materials, specifically the black metal panels, do not satisfy Standard 9. The proposed new building is not compatible with its environment.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:13:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gabrielle Canno and developer Yuval Ben-Zeev of TIY Properties represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked about the designation status of the wall surrounding the 1500 Green Street parking area.
 - Ms. Mehley confirmed the Committee was referencing the brick wall topped with terra cotta tile and stated that it is part of the adjacent property, 1500 Green Street, a contributing property to the Spring Garden Historic District. The area inside the wall is used as parking for the building at 1500 Green Street.
 - Mr. Cluver inquired about the proposed work on the 1500 Green Street wall and parking area.
 - Ms. Canno responded that only repaving is in scope and will be done only as needed.
 - Ms. Stein pointed out that in the submission documentation, the applicant states the wall will be cleaned and repaired.
 - Ms. Canno responded that they do not own the 1500 Green Street property. The project being proposed is located at 1503-05 Brandywine Street, a separate property to the west. The parking lot at 1500 Green is accessed across the 1503-05 Brandywine property and will be repaved as a separate project.
 - Ms. Pentz inquired about the history of the wall and parking area.

- Ms. Mehley and Ms. Canno stated the history of the wall or use is not known. The wall and parking area at 1503-05 Brandywine is non-historic and classified as non-contributing in the district inventory.
- The Committee asked about the height of the building.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that the zoning code limits height in the area to 38 feet but the project is proposed to be 45 feet tall.
 - Ms. Canno responded that there is a low and moderate housing bonus that the project is going for and it allows for an additional seven feet of height.
 - Ms. Stein pointed out that the drawings show the building as 48 feet tall.
 - Ms. Canno responded that the difference in height between 45 feet and 48 feet is the parapet. She explained that, in terms of zoning, the parapet does not contribute to the height of the building.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if the pilot houses counted toward height.
 - Ms. Canno replied that the pilot houses are not included in the height calculation as long as it stays under a certain percentage of the size.
- The Committee asked why the roof deck required two legal means of egress.
 - Ms. Canno responded that it requires two means of egress because there is a small portion of the roof that is a common, shared roof deck; common roof decks require two means of egress. She continued that the roof deck will also be accessible via an elevator.
 - The Committee asked if the elevator goes to the roof deck and is the overrun accurately portrayed. Mr. Cluver commented that given the mechanical requirements of the elevator, he wondered if the pilot houses would be taller than shown in the drawings.
- The Committee asked about the selection of the black panels for exterior cladding. Ms. Gutterman inquired if any other materials were considered.
 - Ms. Canno responded that the overarching concept of the design is that the new building will be located both at the extreme fringe of the Spring Garden Historic District but is also close to the Broad Street corridor which has much larger scale buildings and a commercial corridor. She explained the choices of the two main materials, the brick, which references the historic district, and the black metal panels, which reference the buildings along the Broad Street corridor.
 - Ms. Gutterman inquired if any colors other than black were considered.
 - Ms. Canno responded that they had not but are open to comments and recommendations.
 - Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that that the proposed design uses the brick in a way that you would expect the lighter material to be used. He noted that the brick does not come all the way down to the ground and instead is used for the balcony fronts.
 - Ms. Canno responded that this had been considered and she handed out a rendering to the Committee that showed the brick coming down to the ground on the front façade. She explained that they were hesitant to do this is because there was a door to the trash room there and other doors on the front façade. Ms. Canno pointed out that on the revised rendering given to the Architectural Committee, the trash room door had been removed in order to bring the brick all the way to the ground. The brick does not go across the entire front façade on the first floor owing to the garage door opening and related setback.
- The Committee asked if the applicant had considered windows along the east façade as it is the longest and most visible façade.
 - Ms. Canno responded that there are windows along the east façade.

- Ms. Stein noted that there are windows but they are hiding behind balconies. She pointed out that the areas with dark metal panels have no windows.
- Ms. Canno responded that the two areas along the east façade without windows that are party walls. She explained they worked to minimize these areas and that part of the east wall was set back with windows to make the view from N. 15th Street as inviting as possible. Ms. Canno added that they are open to suggestions. For example, if the railing is too heavy, they could be made into open railings instead of solid metal panels to appear more residential and increase the visibility of the windows.
- The Committee asked about the setback of the pilot house closest to the front façade along Brandywine Street.
 - Ms. Canno responded that it is approximately 12 feet from the edge of the roof to the elevator shaft.
 - Ms. Gutterman expressed concerns about the accuracy of some of the dimensions shown on the different drawings.
- The Committee asked about the mechanical pad and visibility from the street.
 - Ms. Canno responded that the height of the parapet wall is intended to shield the mechanical equipment from the street view.
- The Committee asked again why there are two pilot houses.
 - Ms. Canno responded there is an interlocking stair and there are two required stairs to the roof deck. Ms. Canno explained that, because it is a common roof deck and is accessible for all units, they are required to have two means of egress per the building code.
- The Committee asked about the occupancy requirements on the roof deck.
 - Ms. Canno responded that she did not know the exact number but stated that the roof deck is common space and therefore requires the two means of egress.
- The Committee asked about proposed deck railing.
 - The applicant responded that the parapet wall serves as the railing and will be 42 inches in height around the area.
- The Committee commented on the overall design of the project.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that the design is a complete thought and there is an internal consistency. He noted that, even with the change to the brick on the first floor, it is still a non-historic way of using brick. He continued that he agrees that the black panels of not part of the character of the historic district. Mr. Cluver stated there are no tweaks that he could suggest to make it feel more compatible with the district. He pointed out that you either accept the design premise or you start over with the design premise. For example, you could invert the approach and use the brick on the main block and the balconies are added, making it almost a warehouse type building. Mr. Cluver stated that this is a big picture comment on the overall design; he does not see the possibility of any small adjustments.
- The Committee asked if the brick wraps the corner on the west side of the building.
 - Ms. Canno responded that it does not.
- The Committee inquired what cladding material is proposed for the west elevation.
 - Ms. Canno responded that it is the black metal panel. She noted it a party wall and next door is a vacant lot.
- The Committee commented on the use of brick in the overall design.
 - Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that, if the brick comes to the ground as was discussed earlier, he would suggest that the brick wraps from the front back to where the party wall begins. He pointed out that the side elevations could be a metal panel system with the brick concentrated on the front. He continued that for

the historic district a polite approach would be brick on the front façade and transition to metal as you move to the side.

- Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's comments. She added that the recesses with metal panels and the east and west elevations in metal panels are acceptable, but the primary façade should be brick in order for the building to be compatible with the historic district. She recommended that the brick should wrap from the front façade around the sides at least eight inches to the east and west elevations. She continued that the primary façade should appear to be a full masonry wall that then wraps around the corners and then abuts the material on the side elevations. Ms. Gutterman noted that the garage and other doors on the front elevation can be of another material.
- The Committee asked if a full dimensional brick is proposed.
 - Ms. Canno responded it is a full dimensional brick with a cavity wall.
- The Committee complimented the applicant on the high quality of the application's drawings and renderings.
- The Committee asked the applicant to consider a lighter color than the black panels for the material on the secondary elevations.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Boyle, representing the Spring Garden Civic Association, stated that the building is out of character with the block. He pointed out that the buildings on the block are primarily one and two stories with some three-story buildings and carriage houses. Mr. Boyle stated that the Spring Garden Civic Association would prefer a design that has more of a carriage house feel with a maximum of three stories. He also stated that he organization is open to meeting with the applicant to discuss the project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- 1503-05 Brandywine Street is a non-contributing property to the Spring Garden Historic District. The parking area at the rear of 1500 Green Street, a contributing property to the historic district, would be repaved.
- The height of the building will be 45 feet with an additional three-foot parapet. Zoning allows for a height of 38 feet but the project includes a green roof and low-to-mid income housing, which allows the design capitalize on zoning bonuses which allows an increase of an additional seven feet.
- The design proposes two primary cladding materials, red brick and black metal panels. The brick material proposed is a full dimensional brick. The black metal panels are proposed mainly for the party walls.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is not compatible with its environment in its massing, scale, form, and building materials, specifically in the use of the black metal panels, and does not satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The proposed building is not compatible with its environment, pursuant to Standard 9. The primary façade along Brandywine Street should be red brick for compatibility with the surrounding historic district. The black metal panels are recommended for use only on secondary elevations only. The use of a lighter color panel on the secondary facades should be considered.

ADDRESS: 1640 PINE ST AND 1643 WAVERLY ST

Proposal: Construct additions; alter façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Francesco and Laura DiCianni

Applicant: Benjamin Nia, Matthew Millan Architects, Inc.

History: 1937

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 1640 Pine Street was constructed in 1937, and a rear extension was added in 1942. That rear extension demolished the rear ell and the rear masonry wall of the 1937 building. The rear of the property is not visible from any public right-of-way.

The building at 1643 Waverly Street was historically three stories in height with a rear addition. The rear addition was removed prior to 1939. The third story of the main building was removed in 1939 and a garage door was inserted into the front façade, and the building was used by a painting contractor. The current appearance of the front façade likely dates to these late-1930s alterations, which resulted in the building being dated to 1930 in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District inventory. The rear of the property is not visible from any public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK (1640 PINE ST)

- Demolish rear masonry wall and construct eight-foot addition in rear courtyard.

SCOPE OF WORK (1643 WAVERLY ST)

- Demolish flat roof and construct a two-story addition with mansard roof and new rear facade.
- Alter Waverly Street façade:
 - Widen garage entrance by eight inches
 - Remove alleyway and access door
 - Relocate entrance door in location of alleyway door
 - Widen second floor window openings by eight inches

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 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 rear extension at 1640 Pine Street replaces an earlier rear extension from 1942, is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, and is not visible from the public right-of-way.
 - The proposed two-story addition at 1643 Waverly Street can be understood as a modern alteration, provided the first two stories remain relatively intact so as to provide historic context regarding the changes to this building over the years.

- *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 rear extension at 1640 Pine Street could be removed in the future without the loss of original fabric.
 - The proposed two-story addition at 1643 Waverly Street could theoretically be removed in the future and the essential form and integrity of the historic building would remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of 1640 Pine Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Approval of the two-story addition at 1643 Waverly Street, provided the existing front façade remains relatively intact, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:37:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Benjamin Nia and Matthew Millan, and property owner Francesco DiCianni represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee focused its discussion on 1643 Waverly Street. The Committee commented that the proposed fourth-story mansard roof is not appropriate in terms of massing and scale, because Waverly Street is a secondary street which typically contains lower-scale buildings, and because the building historically was three stories in height. The proposed building overwhelms the narrow street.
 - Mr. Nia responded that there are precedents for fourth-story mansard roofs in the immediate area, which he documented in the application.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that the four-story, new-construction townhouse on this block was a vacant lot at the time of the historic district designation, so the Commission had only “review and comment” jurisdiction over that proposal.
- Mr. Nia presented an alternative fourth-story/habitable attic space option which showed a more modest gable roof with dormer rather than a mansard roof. He explained that it could be a compromise to allow for fourth-floor space in a less-imposing manner. He distributed renderings and a section drawing. He stated that the standing seam metal roof is an 8 on 12 pitch with dormer.
 - The Committee responded favorably to the alternative roof option.
- The Committee asked about the front façade proposal in the alternative rendering.
 - Mr. Nia responded that they are seeking a change at the first floor. He explained that the narrow garage opening is challenging and borderline unsafe from a functionality standpoint, and reflects a prior use of the building as a painting contractor’s shop. They are seeking to widen the opening by four inches on either side.
 - Mr. Millan explained that the brick becomes better proportioned when one of the door openings is extinguished, and the brick currently does not appear as though it is even bearing the weight of the structure.
 - Mr. Nia confirmed that real red brick will be used on the façade and visible side wall, and wood simulated-divided lite windows will be installed with review and approval by the staff.

- Committee members disagreed on the appropriateness of the proposed changes to the front facade.
- Mr. Nia asked about the option of extinguishing the alley but retaining the opening.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that an option is to install a solid wood door rather than a gate, and the staff could review those details.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing façade at 1643 Waverly Street, including the garage opening, dates to 1939.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed rear extension at 1640 Pine Street replaces an earlier rear extension from 1942, is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, is not visible from the public right-of-way, and could be removed in the future without the loss of historic fabric, satisfying Standards 9 and 10.
- The proposed fourth-story gable roof alternative at 1643 Waverly Street is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed alterations to the first floor at 1643 Waverly Street do not satisfy the Standards because the façade should reflect its appearance at the time of the designation of the historic district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application for 1640 Pine Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; denial of the mansard roof, change in width of garage opening, and removal of door into the alley at 1643 Waverly Street, but approval of the application with the gable-roof option presented during the review, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 1640 PINE ST and 1643 WAVERLY ST					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 2131 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Demolish rear; construct rear addition, roof deck, and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Serge Maslennikov

Applicant: David McArthur, David P. McArthur RA LLC

History: 1859

Individual Designation: 2/7/1974

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The rowhouse at 2131 Mount Vernon Street, constructed as a residence, was converted to a clubhouse by the Italian American Citizens Club in 1931. The new owner wishes to convert it back to a single-family residence. Interior alterations during the clubhouse use included the raising of the second and third floors, resulting in an extremely low ceiling height at the third floor rear, rendering the space uninhabitable. The rear of the property is not visible from any public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish rear additions and rear half of roof.
- Construct rear addition with roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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.*
 - Provided original rear ell walls are retained, the proposed addition will not destroy historic spatial relationships that characterize the property. The overbuild on the rear of the roof is justified owing to the existing 47-inch ceiling height at the third-floor rear. The new addition is differentiated from the old but will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided any original rear ell walls are retained, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:56:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect David McArthur and property owners Serge and Victoria Maslennikov represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked for clarification of what original rear ell walls exist and what is proposed for retention.

- Mr. McArthur responded that the only original rear ell walls that are proposed for removal are a portion of a wood-framed wall on the side at the second floor, and the brick wall at the back of the third floor, which is only approximately four feet high. Below that section of wall, the wall was removed at the first and second floors, but is structurally supported.
- The Committee asked about the staff recommendation of retaining any remaining original rear ell walls. The Committee agreed that the section of wall at the third floor rear cannot be saved, given that the wall below it was removed, and owing to the alignment of the floors. The Committee agreed that it is a necessary removal of a remnant which would be difficult to reintegrate.
- The Committee asked about visibility of the proposed work from a public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Maslennikov responded that there is no visibility of the rear from a public right-of-way.
- The Committee asked about the overbuild on the existing roof and the internal rainwater conductor. The Committee suggested extending the roof to eliminate the potential for leaks at that location, or creating a slight gable, as long as it is not visible from a public right-of-way.
 - Mr. McArthur responded that the idea is to remove just enough of the roof to get the minimal eight-foot ceiling heights and then preserve the portion at the front. He agreed to reconsider the design of the overbuild to eliminate the V-shape gutter condition.
- The Committee asked about the extension of the edge walls, and noted that there is a small section of detailing on the brick wall. The Committee suggested that the staff could review that onsite.
 - Mr. Maslennikov responded that the intention is to use stucco over the brick. He explained that most of the side wall is a mismatch of brick used to infill openings over the years.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed work will not be visible from any public right-of-way.
- The overbuild on the roof is justified owing to the existing 47-inch ceiling height at the third-floor rear.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition will not destroy historic materials or spatial relationships that characterize the property, and the addition is differentiated from the old, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, and with the suggestion that the connection between the overbuild roof and existing roof be reconsidered to eliminate the V-shape gutter condition, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2131 MOUNT VERNON ST					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 662 N 15TH ST

Proposal: Construct four-story, multi-family dwelling

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: DBSS Home Builders LLC c/o Shimon Shain

Applicant: David McArthur, David P. McArthur RA LLC

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 662 N. 15th Street is currently a vacant lot. It is located in the Spring Garden Historic District. The inventory for the district describes a three-story Italianate rowhouse in poor condition standing on the site, but, when the designation photograph taken in 2001, the site was vacant; the building had been demolished. The date of the demolition is unknown; it is unclear whether it occurred before or after designation. No permit or other documentation has been found. The property was owned by the Philadelphia Housing Authority at the time. The property should be considered an undeveloped site and the application should be subject to review-and-comment only, not full jurisdiction.

The current application proposes to construct four-story, multi-family residential building. The fourth floor is set back from the front façade with a deck at the front.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a four-story residential building.

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 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 new construction conforms to the general massing, rhythm and materials of other buildings on the block and in the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the suggestion that the fourth floor is pulled forward and configured as a mansard and the deck relocated to the rear, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 1:14:50

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect David McArthur and attorney Michael Mattioni represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The architect distributed a new drawing to show the height of adjacent buildings with the proposed new construction.
- Mr. Mattioni explained that they had met with the Spring Garden Civic Association, which had insisted on the set back of the top floor.
- Mr Cluver found the sloped roof at the fourth floor to be awkward. He said that the rooftop addition should sit back 15 feet rather than 10 feet and would be treated as a normal wall with windows and a central door.
- Ms. Gutterman said that the recessed dormer had no precedent in the architecture of the neighborhood.
- Mr. Cluver said that setting back the parapet at the top floor would lower the overall profile of the building.
- Ms. Stein commented that the red brick of the façade should wrap around the returns of the sides.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed sloped roof at the fourth floor and the recessed or inverted dormer are not elements found in the Spring Garden Historic District.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- To comply with Standard 9, the addition at the fourth floor should be set back 15 feet and should have a vertical, not sloped, front wall with a more standard treatment including two windows and a symmetrically placed central door. The parapet should be set back at the top floor to lower the visual height of the building. The red brick façade should return on the sides.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the fourth floor should set back at least 15 rather than 10 feet and should have a vertical rather than sloped front wall. The new wall should be treated with a symmetrical placement of windows and door. The parapet at the top floor should be setback from the front façade to lower the overall appearance of the façade. The brick of the façade should be red and return on the sides of the new building.

ADDRESS: 621 S HANCOCK ST

Proposal: Legalize demolition of rear addition; construct addition; alter façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bill Frusco

Applicant: Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect

History: 1750; Front façade replaced

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The house at 621 S. Hancock Street was constructed in the mid eighteenth century. The building was significantly altered and the front façade replaced in the mid twentieth century. The original roof was removed. The staff has visited the property and identified a very small, surviving section of the original façade in Flemish bond with glazed headers. A 2-½-story rear ell remains. The owner recently demolished a rear addition without a permit.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish and reconstruct façade in Flemish bond with darkened headers.
- Construct third floor.
- Construct three-story rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The applicant proposes to replace the façade and construct an upper floor. The staff recommends reconstructing the upper floor as a half story with dormer based on the Hexamer and Locher map, which calls the building two-and-one-half stories.
- *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 new rear addition should be redesigned shorter and narrower.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the 2-½-story main block with gable roof and dormer, not a third story, is reconstructed, and the rear addition is shorter and narrower, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Standards 6 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:31:36

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Raymond Rola and property owner Bill Frusco represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 APRIL 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Baron showed photographs that he took at the property which support the proposal to reconstruct the façade and roof. He explained that the façade was less than 50 years old at the time the building was designated. The Commission designated many properties in consultation with the Redevelopment Authority with the idea that the façade was to be reconstructed with guidance from the Historical Commission. Much of Society Hill was redeveloped in this way. Mr. Baron explained that the staff supports this reconstruction based on the evidence and this practice. Mr. Rola distributed a revised drawing not yet seen by the staff which showed the two and one half story concept.
- The Committee noted that the upper half story appeared too tall and the dormer too large.
 - The applicant responded he was trying to give the upper floor an eight foot head room but that he could reduce its height. Mr. Baron noted that the staff needs to work with the architect on the height and size of many details. It was noted that the dormer should be a shed type.
- The Committee asked about the rear addition.
 - The applicant responded that he had reduced the new addition from three stories down to two.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The reconstruction of the façade was appropriate, provided the staff to reviews the details.
- The half story roof construction with a flat roof behind the ridge was appropriate.
- A two-story rear addition would be appropriate.

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Once the staff has worked with the applicant on the details, the revised design will satisfy Standards 6 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with the two and a half story main block and full width two-story rear addition, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ITEM: 621 S HANCOCK 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				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1512-16 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Demolish building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Original Apostolic Faith

Applicant: Michael P. Creedon, Creedon & Feliciani, P.C.

History: 1933; Levin Funeral Home; Edwin Rothschild, architect

Individual Designation: 11/27/1985

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 1512-16 N. Broad Street was constructed as the Levin Funeral Home in 1933. Designed by architect Edwin Rothschild, the building is a fine example of the Art Deco style. No longer used as a funeral home, a church occupied the building for decades. On 29 March 2018, the building suffered a major fire. The Department of Licenses and Inspections cited the building as Imminently Dangerous and had a portion of the rear demolished. Most recently the building has been the subject of a conservatorship hearing, which was filed in January 2019.

The historic preservation ordinance prohibits the demolition of designated buildings unless the property owner demonstrates that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that there is no feasible reuse for the building. The application makes no claims about the public interest or reuse.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish complete 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 project would remove all of the character-defining 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.*
 - None of the features will be repaired.
- *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 project would destroy all historic features.
- *Demolition: Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance prohibits the demolition of a designated building unless the Historical Commission has found that the issuance of the demolition permit is necessary public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose that it is or may be reasonably adapted. Section 14-203(88) defines the demolition of a building as its razing or destruction entirely or in significant part.*
 - The application makes no claims about public interest or feasibility of reuse.
- *Demolition: No permit shall be issued for the demolition of an historic building...unless the Commission finds that it meets an argument of public interest or has proven financial hardship.*
 - The application makes no argument for public interest or financial hardship.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:50:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Michael Creedon and church representatives Abigail Tookes and Deborah Hayward represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Creedon explained that the church has received three violation notices from the Department of Licenses & Inspections requiring the owner to demolish the church, owing to a fire at the building. He said that he submitted a letter explaining that 24 buildings of historical significance have been demolished in Philadelphia within an 18-month period including a church and a chocolate factory.
 - The Committee members responded that every application is considered on its merits. The demolition of this building cannot be approved because other demolitions may have been approved. They also questioned whether the 24 buildings referenced were actually under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.
- Mr. Creedon said that Department of Licenses & Inspections will demolish the imminently dangerous building if his client does not.
 - It was explained that such violations order property owners to repair or demolish imminently dangerous buildings. When a building is designated as historic, the

- property owner must repair the building unless the Department of Licenses & Inspections determines that the building cannot be safely repaired.
- Mr. Cluver explained that the Committee makes its recommendation based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the historic preservation ordinance's provision on demolition. He noted that no hardship application or public interest argument is made in the application. The City's the historic preservation ordinance prohibits the Historical Commission from approving a demolition unless the Commission finds that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or the property owner proves that there is no feasible reuse for the building, i.e. to reuse the building would result in a financial hardship. The current application make neither argument and is therefore incomplete on its face.
 - Mr. Creedon stated that, if the church was allowed to demolish the building, it would try to save the façade to possibly rebuild it at another location on a new church building.
 - Ms. Pentz noted that the demolition plans do not call for saving any pieces and Mr. Cluver said that the façade should remain at this site. He said that the discussion for saving the front portion of the building needs details about pinning the existing pieces in place versus reconstruction but such information has not been provided. It was also noted that moving a building to a new site is considered a demolition in the preservation ordinance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Attorney Jared Klein explained that his firm has filed a conservatorship action in court on behalf of the developer Temple 1438 and that it will be considered by the court on 9 May 2019. He contended that any work should occur under the supervision of the court. The judge in the case has indicated that he will not grant further continuances but will make a decision on the conservatorship. His client has the funds and the experience with development on N. Broad Street as well as a plan to renovate and restore the building. He opined that the church does not have the funds to successfully demolish the building because their demolition estimate of \$40,000 is actually several hundred thousand dollars less than what the demolition will actually cost. In addition, he said they question the validity of the corporate structure of the church and who has the authority to act on behalf of the church.
- Priscilla Tookes spoke as a "spectator" in favor of the demolition of the church. She submitted a petition with signatures of people in favor of the demolition.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that any claims of financial hardship should be vetted with a complete application by the Committee on Financial Hardship and the Historical Commission.
- Othniel Tookes spoke as a former parishioner. He said that he thought that the building was too damaged to be made safe. He said that they have removed many heavy stones from the façade and that the internal steel is bent from the heat of the fire. He favored demolition.
- Rachel Tookes said that she spoke on behalf of the church. She said that her deceased father, Reverend Tookes, who was the pastor of the church, would have wanted the building demolished because it is dangerous and they do not want the liability.
- Stephen Lucas spoke in favor of demolition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Department of Licenses & Inspections has cited the building as Imminently Dangerous but has not determined that the dangerous condition cannot be safely repaired.
- The application does not make an argument for demolition based upon financial hardship or public interest as required by Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The demolition of the building does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards 2, 5, 6, 9.
 - Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
 - Standard 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.
 - Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.
- The application is incomplete because it does not make an argument for the proposed demolition based upon financial hardship or public interest as required by Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

ITEM: 1512-16 N BROAD ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Nan Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Rudy 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	6				1

Several members of the audience asked questions of the Architectural Committee after the review was completed.

ADDRESS: 8205 SEMINOLE AVE

Proposal: Remove porch and addition; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alan and Duckhyun Tessler

Applicant: David Beilman, Beilman Architecture

History: 1885; Houston-Sauveur House; G. W. and W. D. Hewitt, architects

Individual Designation: 6/1/1972

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Henry H. Houston commissioned G.W. & W.D. Hewitt to construct several high-style Queen Anne houses along Seminole Avenue at the end of the nineteenth century, which galvanized development of the St. Martins neighborhood of Chestnut Hill. The Houston-Sauveur House initially served as a rental for Houston and was purchased two years after its construction by Louis Sauveur. While the building has undergone several alterations since construction, including a small rear addition in 1927 and conservatory addition likely in the 1960s, it largely reflects the original Hewitt design.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove non-original rear addition and enclosed porch.
- Remove rear chimney.
- Construct two-story rear addition with accessible platform lift.
- Reroof existing conservatory and level floor.

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 rear enclosed porch, identified in the application as having been rebuilt in the 1980s, appears to retain historic material and was not replaced in whole. The removal of the porch and rear chimney does not comply with this standard. The proposed two-story addition also greatly alters the footprint of the building, adding approximately 20 additional feet in length, and would have high visibility from Hartwell Lane. The addition does not comply with this standard. The reroofing of the non-historic conservatory and leveling of the floors would not alter character-defining features and, therefore, complies with this standard.
- *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 addition draws on the vocabulary of the historic building in its detailing and materials and provides visibility to a currently obstructed dormer; however, the size of the addition is inappropriate for the building and does not comply 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 addition would cause the removal of a 1927 addition and rear porch, which have gained significance over time. The staff also finds that the demolition plans included in the application do not accurately reflect the amount of demolition required at the second-story rear wall. The staff contends that a substantial portion of the wall would be demolished to accommodate the addition. Consequently, the addition does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the work to the conservatory, but denial of the remainder of the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:13:53

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect David Beilman and owner Dee Tessler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Beilman distributed revised plans and explained that the second-floor rear wall would not be demolished. The other supporting document, he continued, is a discovery from the previous day in which he found the concrete slab and foundation for the back porch were constructed in 1986. The glass in that addition is tempered with a date of 1984 etched into it. He contended that the materials consist of Fypon and Azek, adding that he could not identify any roofing material. He argued that the porch was reconstructed.
- The Committee asked whether the water tower addition still dates to 1927.
 - Mr. Beilman affirmed, adding that it is two wythes of bricks that is cement plastered on the outside and inside with no furring, no insulation, and no drainage off the backside of the wall.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the applicant is proposing to remove the rear chimney and widen the addition.
 - The applicant confirmed that the chimney will be removed and addition widened, but clarified that the third story of the addition would be removed.
- Mr. Cluver observed some inconsistencies in the application related to the conservatory roof and asked whether the conservatory roof is being replaced.
 - Mr. Beilman affirmed that it would be replaced.
- Mr. Beilman clarified that the drawings show a light gray footprint that indicates the location of the existing 1927 addition, adding that he does not understand why the perimeter bearing wall was not used when the addition was constructed. Instead, he continued, the builders installed a 22-foot steel beam across the entire back to hold up the structure.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the chimney removal and whether it could be saved.
 - Mr. Beilman answered that it is an old coal fire chimney that served the kitchen and is not used. He explained that moisture condenses inside and, though it has been capped off, it leaks. He argued that chimneys are meant to be used and are not adornments.
 - Ms. Stein asked whether the chimney could be supported under the roofline and kept in place at the exterior.

- Mr. Beilman replied that it could remain at the exterior and that it could be pointed and sealed.
- Ms. Tessler stated that there are lots of chimneys that need support and her heart sinks every time there is a heavy rain, because moisture enters the house that causes bubbling at the interior.
- Ms. Tessler noted that there is no historic photograph of the rear of the house, and Mr. Beilman added that it is a non-primary façade. Ms. Tessler commented that this is the first time the rear has been documented. She remarked that she visited several Hewitt-designed houses in the hopes of gaining clarity on what the rears of the buildings looked like. Her house, she continued, has two additions dating to 1927 and 1986.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the applicant is adding a wheelchair lift to provide an accessible entrance to the building, which otherwise does not have one.
 - The applicants affirmed, and Mr. Beilman elaborated that he considered other areas of the building where one could be installed, but argued that it would be inappropriate on the Seminole Street façade. The Hartwell Lane façade is inaccessible, he added.
 - Ms. Tessler commented that the house sits 48 inches above grade, so any entrance would need to be converted to be accessible. This entrance, she continued, would be the least intrusive. She stated that her husband will turn 76 in several weeks and safe access is necessary.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the rear addition is too big and suggested that only one bathroom be created at the second story.
 - Ms. Tessler responded that people generally do not like Jack and Jill bathrooms.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro argued that the addition is too wide and too long and that it is not needed just for a lift and bathrooms. He observed that the addition would contain a laundry room, butler pantry, and coat closet.
 - Mr. Beilman replied that the addition becomes the entry to the house.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro argued that the applicants are proposing the elements that they desire, but are not considering the size and proportions of the historic structure.
 - Ms. Tessler contended that times have changed and asked why it is problematic that she would like a laundry room.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro answered that the building is a historic structure.
 - Ms. Tessler asked how to incorporate a laundry room.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro replied that the scale is too big for what is needed. He opined that the addition is nice but not what the owner needs.
 - Ms. Tessler responded that Mr. D'Alessandro does not know what she needs.
- Mr. Cluver opined whether the addition and location proposed is appropriate. He stated that, if the addition could be made smaller, the discussion may be different. He added that he would like to see smaller additions, but agreed that the location is appropriate since the rear has already been modified, though he acknowledged that the location is highly visible from Hartwell Lane. He stated that the question remains about scale and design.
 - Ms. Tessler argued that there are numerous trees that hide the rear.
 - Mr. Cluver acknowledged that there may be vegetation but added that trees lose leaves in the winter.
- Ms. Tessler directed the Committee to the rendering that shows the removal of the third-story addition.
 - Mr. Cluver reiterated that the concept of an addition is acceptable, but that any addition would be scrutinized for scale and design. He added that the removal of

the third story and exposure of the original dormer would be an improvement. Other Committee members agreed.

- Mr. Cluver questioned the scale of windows and their configurations, adding that those details should be discussed.
- Mr. Beilman stated that the addition would add 25 feet to the rear and of the 25 feet, 10 feet consists of laundry room space. He suggested that the space be reconfigured to reduce the length to 16 feet. He further explained that he beveled the ends of the addition to reduce the apparent mass of it. When square, he added, it appears much more massive.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed that the size of the current addition is too large in scale and massing. She acknowledged that an addition may be necessary to modernize the building and maximize its use, but argued that the proposed addition is not sympathetic to the historic structure. She questioned whether reducing it by eight feet would be appropriate, stating that it needs to be considered in terms of divisions and the size adjusted accordingly. She added that the second-story addition is wide rather than tall but that it similarly meets the house in an “unfriendly manner.”
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with the Committee’s comments. He noted that the lot is quite deep, though he also recommended minimizing the length of the addition. He added that the relationship between the second-story roof and the original roof is uncomfortable and asked that it be reconfigured.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rear chimney proposed for demolition has historical significance and should not be demolished, though it may be properly supported under the roofline and removed at the interior.
- The proposed addition would add 25 feet to the length of the building and is not compatible with the historic structure.
- Owing to existing modifications at the rear, an addition of an appropriate scale and design could be acceptable at the proposed location.
- The removal of the current addition’s third story and restoration of the original dormer would be an appropriate modification.
- The proposed work to the conservatory is minimal and does not have an adverse impact on the historic resource.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The removal of the rear chimney causes a loss of historic character and does not comply with Standard 2.
- As proposed, the addition is not compatible in size, scale, proportion, or massing and does not comply with Standard 9; however, an appropriately-scaled and designed addition in the same location could satisfy the standard.
- The reroofing of the conservatory does not adversely impact the building and complies with Standard 2.
- The revised plan that shows the retention of the rear wall complies with Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the work to the conservatory, with the staff to review details, but denial of the remainder of the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, with the following comments:

- the addition’s height, width, and length should be reduced;
- and the addition should be sympathetic to the existing building so as not to overpower it.

ITEM: 8205 SEMINOLE AVE					
MOTION: Partial approval					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D’Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1918 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Legalize stucco and paint on stringcourse and arch

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: N 18 Street Holding Group LLC

Applicant: Matan Brenner, N 18 Street Holding Group LLC

History: 1889

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Contributing, 1/29/1986

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

BACKGROUND:

Located in the Diamond Street Historic District, the building at 1918 Diamond Street was constructed in 1889 as one of fourteen three-story brick rowhouses with brownstone-faced first stories and terra cotta trim. On 3 April 2019, the staff of the Historical Commission learned of the illegal stuccoing of the decorative terra cotta stringcourse between the second and third stories and the stuccoing and painting of the first-story brownstone arch. The staff contacted the Department of Licenses and Inspections and requested a Stop Work Order, which was issued on 4 April 2019. At that time, the staff requested that the owners remove the stucco and paint and restore the character-defining features to their historic appearance. The owners have instead chosen to submit an application and attempt to legalize the work.

This most recent violation follows an earlier violation issued to a previous owner. At its 11 April 2008 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed an application to legalize vinyl windows, a steel door, and glass block that were installed at the front façade of the property. The Commission voted to deny that application. However, the violation was never corrected, and the vinyl windows, steel door, and glass block currently remain in place.

SCOPE OF WORK:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 APRIL 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Legalize stuccoing and painting of brownstone arch.
- Legalize stuccoing of terra cotta stringcourse.

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 stuccoing of the decorative terra cotta stringcourse resulted in the removal of the character-defining feature and disrupted the relationship of this property with the western buildings in the row, all of which retain a similar stringcourse that continues across the extant buildings. The stuccoing and painting of the brownstone arch further resulted in the alteration of a character-defining feature.
- *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 stuccoing of the brownstone and terra cotta fails to replicate the historic fabric in design, color, texture, and material.
- *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 removal of deteriorated masonry and stuccoing of the brownstone arch and terra cotta stringcourse are inappropriate and have damaged historic materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 7.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:29:54

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee agreed with the staff recommendation of denial, adding that it is a shame the owner stuccoed parts of the building.
- The Committee questioned whether there is any way to return the features to their original condition.
 - Mr. Baron stated that he had made a site visit and explained that the stucco was not applied all over the brownstone. He clarified that the owner painted the brownstone and stuccoed over missing areas of stone. Mr. Baron argued that the paint should be removed, the stucco removed, and the damaged stone repaired with an appropriate patching mortar, such as Jahn. He added that the stone should be left unpainted. The terra cotta stringcourse, he continued, can be replaced. He noted that similar replacement was done at a carriage house on Rittenhouse Square Street where terra cotta elements had to be recreated when

a historic entryway was reestablished. He commented that the staff has a contact for a company that can do that work.

- Ms. Gutterman agreed, adding that Jahn can also be cast into shapes.
- Mr. Baron contended that the building is repairable. The Committee members agreed.
- Ms. Pentz added that she would like to see the windows and door corrected.
- Mr. Cluver noted that there is rust-jacking at the façade.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The decorative terra cotta stringcourse was inappropriately stuccoed.
- The first-story brownstone arch was inappropriate stuccoed and painted.
- The windows and door remain in violation, per the Historical Commission’s 11 April 2008 denial of an application to legalize the vinyl windows, steel door, and glass block that were installed without permits.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The stuccoing of the terra cotta stringcourse and stuccoing and painting of the brownstone arch alters the historic character of the property and does not comply with Standards 2, 6, or 7. The illegal work should be reversed.
- The windows and door remain in violation and do not comply with Standards 2 or 6. The windows and door should be replaced with appropriate windows and door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 7.

ITEM: 1918 DIAMOND ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D’Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1701 PORTER ST

Proposal: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Centeno

Applicant: Joseph Centeno, DB Construction Management LLC

History: 1906; Mansard roof addition, 1970

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Non-contributing, 11/10/1999

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 1701 Porter St is a two-story twin. The property is located at the northeast corner of the Girard Estate Historic District. Constructed in 1906 to match its counterpart to the west, the building was heavily altered in the 1970s and, as a result, is considered non-contributing to the district. Given the building's status as non-contributing, the Commission's task when reviewing the application is to consider the impact of the proposed alterations on the district. The Girard Estate Historic District is characterized by blocks of primarily two-story twin houses and one block of three-story rowhouses. While there is a block of three-story twins within the district, the district is characterized by consistency within a given block. The 1700 block of Porter Street is comprised exclusively of two-story houses.

This application proposes to construct a third-floor addition with a parapet to conceal a roof deck, which would be accessed by a nine-foot tall pilot house. The addition would be clad in vinyl siding.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct third-floor addition with pilot house and deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

Girard Estate Historic District Manual:

- *Height: ...Even though buildings vary along some street, most houses are similar in height to adjacent structures. The height of adjacent houses will help dictate the height of your new construction.*
 - The proposed addition is approximately 14 feet taller than the existing building and neighboring properties. The nine-foot tall pilot house adds additional height and would be highly visible given the corner location.
- *Material: Brick and stucco are the most common building materials found in the district.*
 - The proposed addition is clad in vinyl siding, which is not compatible with the historic materials used in the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Girard Estate Historic District Manual.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:34:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee agreed with the staff recommendation and opined that a third story is not appropriate for this location.
- The Committee questioned whether such an addition would even be possible on top of the existing structure, noting that the structural integrity of such an addition is dubious.
- The Committee argued that approving such an addition would set a bad precedent.
- The Committee questioned whether there are neighboring three-story buildings.
 - The staff responded that this building is located at the northeast corner of the district, so the properties to the north and east are not part of the Girard Estate Historic District. She noted that there is a three-story set of rowhouses within the district to the south facing 17th Street, but that those buildings are of a different character and face a different block.
 - The staff noted that this block of Porter Street and the perpendicular blocks to the southwest that intersect with the 1700 block of Porter Street contain exclusively two-story twins.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that the only way a third-floor addition might be appropriate for this location is if it was reduced in height, the roof deck eliminated, and the second-floor mansard removed so it is a flush wall. She opined that even that would still be too tall for this location.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- 1701 Porter St is a modified, two-story twin on a block of consistent two-story twins.
- The proposed addition is too tall for this location and the height, massing, and materials detract from the character of the historic district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project is incompatible with the massing, size, scale, or architectural features of the environment, and does not comply with Standard 9.
- The proposed addition is approximately 14 feet taller than the existing building and neighboring properties and is clad in vinyl siding, a material not consistent with the historic buildings in the district, and therefore does not comply with the recommendations in the Girard Estate Historic District manual.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Girard Estate Historic District manual.

ITEM: 1701 PORTER ST					
MOTION: Denial, Standard 9 and Girard Estate Historic District manual					
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	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:41 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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