

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

**TUESDAY, 22 OCTOBER 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 9:00 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Comment</b>
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:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- H. Marsh
- Kate Cowing, Kate Cowing Architect
- Derrek Etsell
- Art Corsini
- Kevin Wilson
- Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos Architects
- Giuliano Pignataro
- Ronald Patterson, Klehr Harrison
- Richard DeMarco, Esq., Lauletta Birnbaum
- Dart Sageser
- Eric Marshall
- Lindsey Glasgow, Peruto Development
- Ming Yuan, Olson Kundig
- Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
- Michael Forman
- Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison

Nick Kraus, Heritage Consulting  
Dan Rocha  
Matthew Park  
Christine Petty Taber  
Roberta Reiner  
Patrick Boyle, Spring Garden Civic Association  
David A. Wilkes  
Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects  
Carolina Pena, Parallel Architecture Studio  
Stuart Udis, PA Realty Advisors  
Bill O'Brien, Esq., Manayunk Law  
Al Hitchcock  
Lisa Lamprou, Manayunk Development Corporation  
Gwen McCauley, Manayunk Development Corporation

## **AGENDA**

### **ADDRESS: 69-71 N 2ND ST**

Proposal: Construct roof deck, stair tower, and elevator tower  
Review Requested: Final Approval  
Owner: 69-71 N. 2nd St LLC  
Applicant: Kevin Wilson, 69-71 N 2nd St LLC  
History: 1840  
Individual Designation: 1/6/1977  
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003  
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

### **BACKGROUND:**

The applicant has been working with the staff to renovate two commercial structures into residential units. The staff has already approved a storefront, windows, and an addition at the rear. The applicant now seeks to construct a roof deck and two pilot houses. The rear pilot house will sit on the new addition and will not be visible from the street. The front pilot house will house a stair and will replace an existing visible freight elevator penthouse. The staff recommends lowering and sloping the roof of the front pilot house and relocating the HVAC units to the lower roof to reduce the visibility of the new construction from the street. Industrial buildings of this type often had rooftop structures.

### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Install roof deck and pilothouses.

### **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
- *Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof such as air conditioning ... when required for the new use so that they are*

*inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].*

- The proposed deck and pilothouses partially comply with this Standard and Guideline. However, they could be improved by reducing the height and sloping the roof of the pilothouse and relocating the HVAC units to the lower roof to reduce the visibility of the new construction from the street.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the suggested modifications are implemented, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

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

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Schmidt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Developers Art Corsini and Kevin Wilson represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicants to respond to the staff recommendation.
  - The applicants responded that they can comply with the staff's suggested revisions.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if any mock-ups had been erected.
  - The applicants responded that they erected two mock-ups on site. Mr. Baron reviewed the mock-ups in the field and asked the applicants to reduce the height of the deck and pilot house near 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and to relocate the mechanical equipment from the pilot house roof to another less conspicuous location.
- Messrs. McCoubrey and Detwiler suggested that the ceiling height in the pilot house should be set at the minimum height allowed by code.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he wanted to review the work to the storefront windows and began to ask questions about the work. He stated that he did not understand the dotted lines on the drawings.
  - The applicants responded that the façade work is outside the scope of work for this application. They stated that Randal Baron has already reviewed and approved that work.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro replied that the applicants needed to talk to him, not Mr. Baron.
  - The other Architectural Committee members reminded Mr. D'Alessandro that the Committee was considering the roof deck and pilot houses only. The storefront windows are outside the scope of work for this application. The staff has already approved a restoration of the storefront. Ms. Schmidt agreed that the proposal under review today is the roof deck and pilot houses with mechanical equipment.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The roof deck and pilot house will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way if the height of the pilot house is reduced, the roof of the pilot house is sloped down toward the street, and the mechanical equipment is relocated from the pilot house roof.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application will comply with Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline if the suggested modifications are implemented.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the height of the pilot house is reduced, the roof of the pilot house is sloped down toward the street, and the mechanical equipment is relocated from the pilot house roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

<b>ITEM: 69-71 N 2<sup>nd</sup> St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval with conditions</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b>					
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: 12 LONGFORD ST**

Proposal: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Derrek Etsell and Jeff Etsell

Applicant: Derrek Etsell

History: Vacant lot; house damaged by fire and demolished, 2011

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Greenbelt Knoll Historic District, Contributing, 6/9/2006

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

**BACKGROUND:** The applicant seeks to construct a house on a lot in the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District. The houses in the district are Modernist in style. The house that stood on the site was damaged in a fire, declared Imminently Dangerous, and demolished in 2011. The proposed house seeks to use the vocabulary and massing of the old house though it does not replicate it. The staff recommends that proposed design could perhaps better match the vocabulary of the district by using casement windows without muntins, particularly as the proposed muntins are sandwiched between the glass. The staff also recommends against cladding the house with vinyl siding.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct house on vacant lot

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 OCTOBER 2019**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions [and] 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 design is compatible with the district in massing and scale but could better match the detail and materials to protect the environment of the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of a revised design that uses casement windows and wood or composite siding rather than vinyl siding, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee on behalf of her colleague Randal Baron, who was out of the office.
- Property owner Derrek Etsell represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- The Committee asked if the staff had any specific recommendation about the material that should be used for the new windows.
  - Mr. Etsell said that he was proposing to use a fiberglass composite material.
  - Ms. Schmitt said that she believed that the staff's concern related to the suggestion to use a casement window instead of a double-hung window, as is proposed by the applicant.
- The Committee noted that the colors of the materials in the district seemed to be warmer colors that blended into the landscape.
- The Committee asked the applicant to confirm if the siding specified on the plans was vinyl.
  - The applicant confirmed he was proposing vinyl siding and had a sample of the product with him to show the Committee. He explained that he had chosen a product that would replicate the grain of wood.
- The Committee asked if the stucco would be a traditional stucco.
  - The applicant responded that he believed it would be a traditional-style stucco.
- The Committee asked the staff what the significance of the historic district was.
  - Ms. Schmitt referred to the staff overview's description of Greenbelt Knoll as a district representing the Modernist style that was surrounded by a lush landscape.
- The Committee commented that they imagined that the materials within the district would be important for these reasons, and therefore the use of something such as vinyl was counter to the character of the district.
- The Committee said that the board and batten section of the house was lacking in details and did not appear fully designed.

- Mr. Etsell responded that that was his architect's attempt to break up the design of the house, and that he would be better able to explain the idea.
- The Committee asked if the board and batten section would have a flat roof.
  - Mr. Etsell said that he was not sure. He told the Committee that he had asked whether he should provide section drawings and was told that the plans he had were sufficient.
  - The applicant added that he believed that there were homes on the same block that had vinyl siding.
- The Committee responded that the vinyl siding could have been there at the time of designation and therefore grandfathered in. They explained that their goal was to help the historic district return to its original aesthetic.
- Ms. Gutterman said that her opinion was that the applicant should use something like an Azek siding in place of the proposed vinyl siding, and that the use of a composite material for the windows could be acceptable if they were casement instead of double hung.
  - Mr. Etsell responded that the biggest obstacle to using these suggested materials was the cost involved.
- The Committee pointed out that the roof pitch proposed on the plans was not per manufacturer standards, which was something the applicant should discuss with his architect or contractor.
- The Committee said that the plans they were reviewing did not inspire confidence that the designer understood what it meant to work within the historic district. They remarked that the components of the plan appeared generic and did not successfully communicate any design references to the house that was there before.
  - The applicant responded that all of the homes within the historic district were unique. He said that he did not see any common design elements throughout the houses, and that it was the setting that tied them all together.
  - The applicant added that the proposed structure would sit several feet below the street level because of the topography of the parcel, which would significantly minimize the visibility of the house from the right-of-way.
  - Mr. Etsell said that the interior layout of the previous house was very crowded and not desirable for a growing family.
- The Committee expressed an understanding for wanting a more traditional two-story layout; however, as proposed, the house was lacking some of the key characteristics of the district.
- The Committee asked why the first floor was so high and whether there would be a basement.
  - The applicant responded the height of the first floor was due to the way the existing drainage came through the site, and that there would be a basement.
- The Committee told the applicant that they would want to see details of the proposed windows for the basement.
- Mr. Farnham informed the Committee that he and some of the property owners wrote the nomination for the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District, which describes this property as being at the end of the cul-de-sac, below the level of the street, as was mentioned by Mr. Etsell. Mr. Farnham explained that most of the other houses in the historic district were set up higher and therefore more clearly visible from the right-of-way. However, owing to the way the terrain drops at the subject parcel, this site has very little if any impact on the rest of the historic district. When standing in the cul-de-sac, one looked from a great distance down onto the roof of the previous structure. Mr. Farnham suggested that the previous structure could have been excluded from the

historic district and commented that the bar for new construction at this specific site should be fairly low. The design of this house will have little or no impact on the historic district.

- Members of the Committee commented that there could be flexibility with some of the design elements such as the style of the roof and the location of the basement windows. However, the choice of materials and color palette was unfortunate. The Committee agreed that there was an overall lack of detail in the plans as presented that made it challenging to understand what would actually be built.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The district was designed by the prominent firm of Montgomery & Bishop with architect Louis I. Kahn serving as a consultant.
- The current design does not communicate enough of an understanding of its surroundings. The horizontality of the design of the previous house, as well as its integration into its immediate topography were not reflected in the proposal.
- Although outside the purview of the Historical Commission, a tree protection plan would be important during construction since the area is so wooded.
- A roof plan should be created so that the builder could show that the design of the roof would not lead to water pooling or infiltration.
- The board and batten “tower” created a vertical element that did not belong in the district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The plans as proposed do not appropriately reflect the unique qualities of the houses found in the district, particularly owing to the materials proposed and the use of double-hung windows instead of casement.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing materials and design elements such as windows, pursuant to Standard 9.

<b>ITEM: 12 LONGFORD ST</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Stein</b>					
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: 3001 BYBERRY RD**

Proposal: Construct one-story addition and ADA ramp

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Trustees of the Byberry Friends Meeting

Applicant: Kate Cowing, Kate Cowing Architect, LLC

History: 1808; Byberry Friends Meeting House

Individual Designation: 9/12/1974

District Designation: None

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

**BACKGROUND:**

The applicant proposes to add a single-story structure with a restroom, kitchen, and function room to a historic meetinghouse. The addition will also provide accessibility to the meetinghouse. Although there is a garage addition at the rear that could perhaps be adapted, that structure has a much lower floor level, which poses accessibility problems. There is also a historic outhouse wing, the only restrooms at the meetinghouse, but altering or removing it would detract from the historic character of the site. The applicant has designed the proposed addition to avoid obstructing the rear windows of the meeting house, demolishing its historic outhouse wing, altering the historic stepped pews, removing significant trees, altering views of the meetinghouse from the street, or building on the historic graveyard.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct one-story addition along the side façade of the meetinghouse.

**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 partially complies with this Standard. However, it could perhaps be improved by orienting it along the driveway, connecting with a glazed link and using more compatible fenestration.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided additional refinements are explored, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 00:41:50

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Kate Cowing represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Farnham explained that Historical Commission staff member Randal Baron, who is on vacation, is administering the project and has visited the site. He reported that Mr. Baron recommends revising the design to reorient the addition along the driveway, so that the attachment to the historic building is minimized. He stated that he believes that Mr. Baron has discussed the proposed revision with the applicant.



- Ms. Cowing stated that she proposed Mr. Baron’s suggested revision to the members of the Quaker meeting and they were “dead set against it.” She stated that her clients object because an addition oriented as Mr. Baron suggests would detract from the appearance of the meeting house and its site.
- Ms. Cowing explained that the addition on the back is used for storage. It is not able to be converted for the required facilities for several reasons including floor levels.
- Ms. Stein asked if the existing entrance vestibule at the southeast could be enlarged to house the needed facilities.
  - Ms. Cowing stated that it cannot for various reasons including the fact that the cemetery prevents expanding into the area. Also, an addition in this area would block the main view of the meeting house as one approaches up the driveway.
  - Ms. Cowing explained that there is a small outhouse wing on the east façade of the meeting house, where Ms. Stein suggested locating the new addition. Ms. Cowing explained that the outhouse wing is too small to house the required facilities and is also historically significant in its own right. She stated that the meeting plans to stop using the outhouse, but to retain it in its historic condition owing to its significance. She added that there are no modern restrooms at the meeting house.
  - Ms. Cowing explained that they also considered an addition between the outhouse and the shed, but that did not work. The location was too inaccessible and would have required unsatisfactory changes to the historic building. She also noted that it would cost \$180,000 to run a sewer line to the street; therefore, they plan to use composting toilets.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the addition should disengage with the building as much as possible. Mr. Cluver and Mr. Detwiler agreed. Ms. Cowing asked whether an addition oriented like the current addition but less connected to the meeting house would work. Mr. Cluver commented that it would. Ms. Cowing stated that the meeting is concerned about trees, especially a memorial tree.
- Ms. Stein suggested demolishing the outhouse and building the new addition in its place. Ms. Cowing and the other Architectural Committee members disagreed and stated that the outhouse should be preserved for its historical significance. The Committee members concluded that the proposed location for the addition is the correct location, but the design of the addition could be reconfigured slightly to disengage more from the historic building.
- Ms. Cowing asked for comments about the design of the addition.
  - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the addition should be as simple a volume as possible. It should be a less complicated shape than the one proposed. Others agreed that simplicity would be better.
- Ms. Cowing noted that Mr. Baron had suggested double-hung windows with punched openings rather than the proposed casements.
  - The Architectural Committee members did not object to the proposed windows or other elements.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that Ms. Cowing revise the design as the Architectural Committee suggested before the Historical Commission meeting and present the revised design to the Commission. She stated that Mr. McCoubrey could determine at the Historical Commission meeting whether the design had been revised as the Architectural Committee suggested.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed addition connects with too much of the façade of the meeting house. The addition should be pulled away from the meeting house and should only connect to it at the doorway.
- The proposed addition is too complex in shape. The volume of the addition should be simplified.
- The proposed doors, windows, and other elements of the addition are appropriate.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition does not satisfy Standard 9, but an addition revised as suggested could satisfy the Standards.

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

<b>ITEM: 3001 Byberry Rd</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				

**ADDRESS: 230, 232, 234-36 S 4TH ST**

Proposal: Remove rear ells and additions; construct additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 234 S. 4th St. LP and Forman Family Realty Trust

Applicant: Ming-Lee Yuan, Olson Kundig

History: 1805

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This in-concept application proposes to combine two historic rowhouses and construct large additions at the rear and on an adjacent vacant lot to create one large residence. The Architectural Committee reviewed the first in-concept application in July 2019. The Committee objected to the proposal and the application was withdrawn before the August meeting of the Historical Commission. The Architectural Committee reviewed a second in-concept application in August 2019 and voted to recommend denial of it, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance, the demolition prohibition. The applicants were granted a one-month continuance following the Architectural Committee's August meeting, during which they developed a third design. At its 11 October 2019 meeting, the Historical Commission considered and then remanded the third in-concept application to the Architectural Committee for review at its 22 October 2019 meeting. The Commission remanded it because the third design, which the Architectural Committee had not seen, deviated significantly from the second.

The application proposes work to a site that consists of three parcels and includes two historic rowhouses at 230 and 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street and a lot surrounded by a non-historic brick wall with fence. The rowhouses face S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street and open onto Leithgow at the rear. The open lot runs west from 4th Street to Leithgow Street along Locust Street. The application proposes to combine the parcels, join the historic rowhouses, remove the rear ells of the two rowhouses as well as later garage and dining room additions, and construct additions to create one large dwelling. The houses date to about 1805. The rear ells may or may not be original, but are evident in their current forms on the 1860 Hexamer & Locher map. A rear addition at 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street was constructed in 1913, when the building was converted into a clubhouse for an insurance industry trade organization. Later one and two-story rear additions were built alongside the rear ell at 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The application proposes to remove most of the rear ells and additions and construct new side and rear additions. The piazza at 230 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street would be retained. The new additions would be clad in brick with metal windows. The additions would be in the style of nearby mid twentieth-century Modernist houses. The new design includes four courtyard areas and a garage accessed from Leithgow.

After the 11 October meeting of the Historical Commission but before the 22 October meeting of the Architectural Committee, the applicant submitted a supplement, which responded to the Historical Commission's comments and questions at the 11 October 2019 meeting. It included the following:

1. A proposal to retain, not demolish, the Leithgow Street facades of the historic buildings;
2. Additional information about the restoration work, including the repair of the stucco on the south party wall of 234 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, which was specifically requested by the chair of the Historical Commission at the 11 October 2019 Commission meeting;
3. Additional information about and photographs of the rear ells, including detailed information about the sections of the ells that would be retained and removed;

4. Information about a similar project including demolition of a rear ell that the Historical Commission approved for the two buildings to the north at 226 and 228 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street; and
5. A comparison of the rear elevation shown to the Historical Commission and the new proposed rear elevation revised since the October Historical Commission meeting.

To date, the reviews have focused on whether the removal of the rear ells and additions would constitute a demolition or an alteration as defined in the historic preservation ordinance. The applicants have argued that the rear ells are not character-defining features, and, therefore, their removal is not a “demolition.” The historic preservation ordinance, at Section 14-203(88), defines a demolition as:

Demolition or Demolish.

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

If the removal of the rear ells and additions is a demolition in the legal sense, the Historical Commission may only approve it after finding that there is no feasible reuse for the buildings without the demolition or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. If the removal is found to be an alteration, the Commission may approve it at its discretion. For the removal to constitute a demolition in the legal sense, it must be a “razing or destruction ... in significant part.” The Historical Commission must determine whether the rear ells and additions are “significant parts” of the historic rowhouses. The application now includes a report from a historic preservation consultant, who concludes that:

As these rear appendages were secondary in character and are not character-defining, their removal does not alter the historic character of the subject properties and should not be considered a demolition under Section 14-1005(6)(d). Additionally, the ells are not readily visible from primary vantage points and thus their removal will not negatively impact the feeling of the historic district.

The Historical Commission has reviewed many applications proposing the removals of rear ells since the enactment of the current preservation ordinance in 1985, when it gained the authority to deny demolitions. The Commission has approved some and denied others, always based on the unique circumstances of the case. Perhaps most famously, the Historical Commission approved the removal of the rear ell or wing of the Dilworth House as an alteration, not a demolition. That case was litigated for years. Ultimately, the Commonwealth Court affirmed the Historical Commission’s decision to approve the removal as an alteration, citing that sufficient evidence was on record to support the decision.

#### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Remove rear sections of the buildings at 230 and 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Construct additions.

#### **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.*

- Whether this application satisfies the first requirement of Standard 9 depends on whether the rear ells and additions are considered “historic materials that characterize the property.” The proposed additions are differentiated from the old and are compatible in 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 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.*
  - Whether this application satisfies Standard 10 depends on whether the rear ells and additions are considered part of “the essential form and integrity of the historic property.”
- *Section 14-203(88) of the Philadelphia Code defines “Demolition or Demolish” as “The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.”*
  - Whether this application would result in a “demolition” in the legal sense depends on whether the removal of the rear ells and additions is considered a “razing or destruction ... in significant part.”

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff offers no recommendation on whether the rear ells and additions are historically significant and whether their removals would constitute a demolition in the legal sense until it has visited the site and inspected the rear ells in person. The staff recommends that the proposed additions satisfy the “new construction” section of Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:00:53

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ming-Lee Yuan, attorney Carl Primavera, preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton, and property owner Michael Forman represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Farnham explained that he visited the site on 21 October 2019 and inspected every aspect of the interiors and exteriors of the buildings, from the basements to the attics. He distributed copies of an aerial photograph of the properties with the components at the rears labelled 1 to 10. He explained that:
  - Number 1 is the piazza at 230 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street. It includes an original stair and would be retained;
  - Numbers 2 and 3 are sections of the rear ell at 230. Number 3 has a brick floor at the first floor, no basement, and a stuccoed rear wall. Number 3 appears to be later than Numbers 1 and 2;
  - Number 4 is the garage at 230.
  - Number 5 is the piazza at 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street. It includes a stair that has been altered;
  - Numbers 6 and 7 are sections of the three-story rear ell at 232;
  - Number 8 is a one-story addition at the rear of 232, which probably dates to the early twentieth century;
  - Number 9 is a two-story, non-historic addition at 232; and,
  - Number 10 is a one-story, non-historic addition at 232.

- Mr. Farnham stated that the building at 230 is in poor condition, owing to decades of deferred maintenance. The brick of the rear ell is in poor condition. The rear ell cornice is severely deteriorated. In the interior of 230, nearly all of the finishes have been removed; it is a shell. The interior of the building at 232 has been significantly altered with numerous additions, drywall partitions, and drop ceilings.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about Number 5, the piazza at 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street. He asked if it includes a stair and if that stair is original.
  - Ms. Yuan replied that it encloses a stair, but the stair is not original. Mr. Forman added that the interior of 232 was completely rehabilitated for office use about 20 years ago. He stated that a massage therapist and others occupied the building until recently. He noted that month-to-month commercial tenants occupied the space.
  - Mr. Detwiler stated that the main stairs for houses of this era were typically found in the piazza sections, the narrow sections linking the main blocks to the rear ells.
- Mr. Cluver directed people to the maps in Heritage Consulting report and noted that sections Number 5, 6, and 7 seem to be depicted on the 1895 map. He concluded that Number 5, 6, and 7 are more important than Numbers 1, 2, and 3 because they are more prominent.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the open lot at 234-36 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street.
  - Mr. Primavera reported that his client purchased the open lot because he was concerned that a 10-unit by-right apartment building was going to be built on it. He explained that the Historical Commission would be limited to review-and-comment jurisdiction over any development that was limited to the open lot. He stated that his client will build something much more compatible with the historic district.
  - Mr. Farnham confirmed that the lot is an undeveloped site and construction on it would be subject to review-and-comment jurisdiction only.
- Ms. Hamilton stated that there was a large building on the lot at 234-36 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street. It was demolished in 1958. Mr. Primavera added that, when the building was standing, the rear ell at 232 was not highly visible from the street.
- The Architectural Committee turned to the design of the proposed additions. Ms. Yuan walked the Architectural Committee members through the revised design. She pointed out that the existing facades along Leithgow Street are now proposed to be retained. Mr. Forman stated that he is willing to keep the rear facades but would prefer to replace them.
- Ms. Yuan pointed out that she had amended the design to show pitched roofs instead of flat roofs in response to suggestions from the Architectural Committee during the previous review.
  - Mr. Cluver responded that he preferred the scale of the flat-roofed buildings.
  - Mr. Forman explained that the Society Hill Civic Association advocated for the pitched roofs.
- Ms. Gutterman objected to the scale of the proposed rear addition. Ms. Stein disagreed, opining that the proposed addition looks like a carriage house.
  - Mr. Forman stated that the massing and scale of the proposed addition is very much like the massing and scale of the addition that the Historical Commission approved for his current house at 226-28 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, the property to the north. He noted that the Historical Commission approved the removal of the rear ell from 228 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street about 12 years ago, when he combined the houses at 226 and 228 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street.

- Mr. Detwiler stated that the buildings are very significant. He stated that the rear ells should be preserved, even if they were built over time.
  - Ms. Stein suggested that the Historical Commission should be able to compromise with the applicant. She acknowledged the positive aspects of the project.
- Mr. D'Alessandro pointed to the National Park Service letter and indicated that the rears are visible from the Rose Garden of the park.
  - Ms. Yuan directed the Committee members to pages in her submission that addressed the visibility from the Rose Garden. She opined that there is limited visibility of the rear ells from the garden.
  - Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Farnham to comment on the visibility of the ells generally from public spaces. Mr. Farnham responded that the north side of the rear sections of 230 are not visible from public spaces. He stated that the west end of the rear ell, which has been stuccoed, as well as the Leithgow Street façade of the garage, which is proposed to be retained are visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Farnham stated that the upper floors of the rear ell at 232 is visible from Locust and Leithgow, but the lower floors of the rear ell have been encased by non-historic one and two-story additions to the south of the ell. The rear façade of 232 on Leithgow, which is highly visible, is proposed to be retained. If and when something is built on the vacant lot at 234-36 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, the rear ell of 232 will be largely invisible.
  - Ms. Yuan noted that the side of the rear ell at 232 is entirely obscured by vegetation. She noted that there is an existing condition drawing in her materials that shows the rear ell with additions.
- Ms. Hamilton, the preservation consultant, observed that the rear ells are not mentioned in the inventory for the Society Hill Historic District.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the rear ells would be replaced with a brick, two-story addition with a pitched roof.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the architectural plans call for removing the top of rear section Number 1. Ms. Yuan stated that they would retain all of section Number 1.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he understands the logic behind the design and can safely assume that this project will be completed to a high standard. He observed that he is struggling with this application because he knows that the resulting building will be a building of very high architectural quality and an excellent addition to the neighborhood, but at the cost of most of the rear ells. He noted, however, that what would replace the ells has its own character and value and is representative of the evolution of the historic district. He asked rhetorically whether relatively insignificant rear ells could appropriately be traded for a relatively significant architectural project. He wondered about precedent.
  - Mr. Forman stated that he is sympathetic to the Historical Commission's mission and historic preservation and would preserve the ells if he could. He stated that he has studied the problem extensively and cannot find a way to save the ells that justifies the investment that it will take to rehabilitate these two derelict buildings. He stated that he wants to return these buildings to residential use and thereby improve the neighborhood. He stated that the ells are "gerrymandered." They were built over a period of time and have numerous different floor levels and other characteristics that make them very difficult to use. He added that the views of the property from the Rose Garden are very limited, owing to tall walls and buildings.

- Mr. Primavera added that Leithgow Street is a very narrow, short, dead-end, service alley that is only used by Mr. Forman, the applicant, to access his parking spaces.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she is concerned by the precedent that an approval of the removal of sections of these ells would set. She concluded that they may be in poor condition, difficult to reuse, and not highly visible, but they are still “fabric.”
  - Mr. Forman objected to the claim that an approval would set precedent. He also stated that this project will be good for the neighborhood and city.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the sections Number 1 and Number 5 are piazzas, or stair towers. They appear to be original to the buildings.
  - Ms. Yuan stated that the stair in Number 5 has been significantly altered.
  - Ms. Stein suggested requiring the retention of Numbers 1 and 5. Ms. Yuan replied that they are retaining Number 1 and will consider retaining Number 5.
  - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the retentions of Numbers 1 and 5 have a higher priority than the other sections. Mr. Cluver stated that the story of these rears is a story of evolution over time. He stated that approving this project would allow that story to continue.
- Mr. Primavera suggested that the Historical Commission must consider this proposal in its context, and not as an abstract academic exercise about the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. He concluded that compromise can be positive.
- Mr. Farnham addressed the assertions that an approval in this case will set a precedent. He stated that it will not. That horse is already out of the barn. The Historical Commission has both approved and denied numerous applications to demolish rear ells. To set a precedent means to do something for the first time that becomes a model for subsequent actions. This decision will not set a precedent because the Historical Commission has approved numerous applications like this in the past including one for the building to the north at 228 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, which is owned by the current applicant. Mr. Farnham stated that he is not advocating for or against this application but is only disagreeing with those who claim that an approval in this case will set a precedent. He noted that he prepared a list of partial and complete demolitions of rear ells that the Historical Commission had approved when he was working on the Dilworth House appeals. That list was lengthy. The Historical Commission has approved numerous demolitions of rear ells; it has also denied applications to demolish rear ells. He advised the Architectural Committee to look at the facts of this particular case and make a decision based on evidence on the record.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the Historical Commission should look at the totality of the proposal and decide whether the overall project is worth the loss of the ells. He stated that the Architectural Committee should base its decision on a strict reading of the Standards, but the Historical Commission should look at the project more holistically. Mr. Cluver read the pertinent section from Standard 9, “new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property,” and asked whether the rear ells “characterize” the property. He stated that he feels somewhat “constrained” by Standard 9 but asserted that the rears of Philadelphia rowhouses are always evolving over time. While the fronts of buildings remain somewhat static, the rears change based on changing conditions. The fact that this project could be seen as the next step in that evolution is a strong and compelling story. He stated that the quality of the architecture that is proposed offsets the loss of the ells. He suggested that the Historical Commission should consider this application “holistically.” He concluded that he will vote against the application based on a strict



reading of Standard 9 with the understanding that the Historical Commission, which has a broader purview, should take the entire project into account.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke stated that he is in favor of the new construction and accepts the praise of the proposed architecture that has been offered by the near neighbors. He stated, however, that he is concerned about the amount of removal at the rears. He asked the Committee members to consider the removal of the rear ells in isolation, without the new construction. Mr. Steinke stated that the removal of the rear wing at the Dilworth House is being used as a precedent for this project. The Dilworth House is a “1950s Hollywood stage-set house,” while these buildings are real historic buildings. He asked whether the current project complies with preservation standards but did not offer an answer to his own question.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The original and older sections of the rear ells characterize the properties.
- The Architectural Committee must focus narrowly and interpret the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards strictly. The Historical Commission may consider the project more holistically and take into account the benefits of the new construction as well as the adverse effects of the removals of the rear ells.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The removals original and older sections of the rear ells do not satisfy Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the concept of removing the original and older sections of the rear ells, pursuant to Standard 9.

<b>ITEM: 230, 232, and 234-36 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D’Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein		x			
Total	5	1			1

**ADDRESS: 2016 SPRUCE ST**

Proposal: Construct third-story addition and garages

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Charles Peruto

Applicant: Lindsey Glasgow, Peruto Development LLC

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**BACKGROUND:**

This three-story double-wide brownstone at 2016 Spruce Street is a contributing structure in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. It was constructed c. 1870. The Architectural Committee reviewed and the Historical Commission denied an earlier proposal for a third-story addition because of concerns about the extent of demolition and incomplete information regarding the proposed addition's relationship with the main block.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Construct a third story on the existing two-story addition at the rear.
- Construct a one-car garage.
- Construct a four-car garage with deck.
- Rebuild existing sun room at rear of 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.*
  - The applicant is proposing to add a third story with a mansard roof to the two-story rear addition. Shingles are proposed for the new third story mansard to match the main house. The work also involves the removal of all existing windows at the second-story addition, with three at the east façade's ground level to be in-filled and the rest replaced.
  - Two new masonry openings are proposed for the southern façade of the existing two-story addition in order to accommodate access to the proposed deck.
  - The proposed garage doors facing Cypress Street would not detract from this service alley which is already comprised of other garage doors along the block.
  - The building permit application mentions that the sun-room at the rear of the house will be rebuilt. Staff requests further explanation of the extent of those changes and if they are limited to the interior of the space.
- *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 amount of demolition of historic fabric has been reduced in the revised plans for alterations to the existing two-story rear addition.
  - The new third story appears to connect to the rear wall of the existing main house sensitively.

- The applicant has responded to comments from both the staff and the Architectural Committee to finish the new third-story addition with a treatment that is more sensitive to the existing main house through the use of a mansard.
- The applicant has revised the plans to leave the existing cornice of the two-story addition in place rather than relocating it to the new third-story addition, as previously proposed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the applicant confirms that the exterior of the existing sunroom will not be altered, with the staff to review and approve details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:59:35

**PRESENTERS:**

- Megan Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Lindsey Glasgow represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- The Committee asked the applicant if they had any response to the staff's question about the sun room.
  - Ms. Glasgow replied that they are considering applying to rebuild the sun room; however, that work would be applied for under a separate permit.
- The Committee told Ms. Glasgow that they appreciated her responding to the comments from their previous review, noting that the mansard appeared to be a better approach; however, the proposed roof height for the addition seemed very tall.
  - Ms. Glasgow responded that the mansard was seven feet lower than the roof of the main house, which was consistent with the next-door neighbor's house.
- The Committee commented that the proposed height of the mansard was still nine feet eight inches tall, which could be lowered.
  - Ms. Glasgow explained that they had made the height of the mansard the same height as the roof of the building next door.
- The Committee asked Ms. Glasgow whether her addition would touch the neighbor's rear addition, and Ms. Glasgow confirmed that it would.
- The Committee asked what would happen to the existing chimney.
  - Ms. Glasgow responded that the chimney would be demolished. She added that the previous plan had proposed demolition of the east wall of the existing rear ell, which had been revised to remove the existing windows but retain the wall.
- The Committee members told Ms. Glasgow that, overall, they found the use of a mansard to be a better treatment for the addition. However, as proposed, it was too tall and needed to be shorter. The Committee added that the dimensions of the proposed third story appeared stretched.
- The Committee asked the applicant what materials were going to be used for the cornice and windows on the rear addition.
  - Ms. Glasgow replied that the cornice would be made of wood and the windows would be a composite material. Ms. Glasgow reminded the Committee that the windows were being handled at the staff level.
- The Committee said that simple rectangular windows at the garage door and the gate would be more appropriate than the arched ones that were proposed.
  - Ms. Glasgow responded that she would be happy to make that change.

- The Committee did not think the unobstructed expanse of garage door proposed at the rear was successful. They noted that the pier did not work to break up the stretch of door.
- The Committee asked about the railing detail on drawing A5, noting that it was very busy with so many elements including posts, lighting and wood caps. The Committee asked the applicant to explain the reason for proposing a curb instead of just having a railing.
  - The applicant responded that she thought the reason was perhaps for drainage, but that it could be lowered.
- The Committee commented that the light proposed for the top of the post would draw attention and suggested that any light be mounted in a way that would be more inconspicuous.
- The Committee asked the applicant to confirm whether the existing garage door lintel was being removed entirely.
  - Ms. Glasgow confirmed the entire mechanism and lintel were being removed. She further clarified that the entire southern wall was being removed and rebuilt because the existing condition was very poor.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The mansard roof proposed for the third story addition was an improvement over the previous proposal, however it should be lowered.
- No work to the sunroom would be approved as part of this application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The revised treatment of the third-story addition with a mansard roof and the reduction in demolition of historic fabric complied with Standards 9 and 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that no work was done to the existing sun room without an approval and the height of the mansard be lowered by at least one foot, with the staff to review the lighting, railing, and curb details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

<b>ITEM: 2016 Spruce Street</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval with conditions</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
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: 7105 RIDGE AVE**

Proposal: Construct three-story building at rear of property

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AETT LLC

Applicant: Richard DeMarco, Lauletta Birnbaum LLC

History: 1851

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Ave Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018

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

**BACKGROUND:**

Designated as part of the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Historic District in 2018, the property consists of a two and a half story building fronting Ridge Avenue with a large rear yard, a portion of which currently serves as a parking area. No work to the historic structure is proposed in this application.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct three-story, multi-family residential building at rear yard.

**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 three-story building would be limited to the rear yard and would be minimally visible from Ridge Avenue. A parking area would further separate the proposed new construction from the historic resource. The building would be compatible in massing, size, and scale.
- *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 building could be removed in the future without impacting the historic structure.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the windows visible from Ridge Avenue are one-over-one or six-over-one aluminum clad or composite double-hung sash windows and that the street-facing façade is not clad in vinyl siding, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 02:14:19

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Richard DeMarco, architect Dart Sageser, and developer Eric Marshall represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. DeMarco stated that no work to the historic building is proposed and that the new construction would be limited to the rear of the property. He commented that the property consists of a deep lot. He agreed to the suggestions noted in the staff recommendation.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the proposed roofing material.
  - Mr. Demarco answered that it would be asphalt.
- Ms. Stein asked whether this would be the first structure at the courtyard area or if there are other secondary structures in the space.
  - Mr. Sageser explained that there is an adjacent secondary structure immediately to the south. Mr. DeMarco explained that any structures are located on the site plan. Further down the road, he continued, is a pet store with a large rear addition. He added that there is a parking area to the north of 7105 Ridge Avenue.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the staff recommendation was intended to request that all windows be changed.
  - Ms. Keller responded that the recommendation is to change the configuration of the windows visible from Ridge Avenue.
  - Ms. Gutterman asked whether visibility is behind the request to change the cladding material to stucco.
  - Ms. Keller affirmed.
- Ms. Stein questioned the visibility of the proposed new construction, stating that there are duplexes around the perimeter.
  - Ms. Keller stated she did not know what the visibility was from the duplexes on Domino Lane.
- Mr. Detwiler asked what the visibility would be from the west side of the building, noting that the applicant only shows the proposed construction from the east side. He added that there would likely be some visibility between buildings.
  - Mr. Sageser answered that he can change the configuration of windows that would be visible from that side as well.
  - The Committee agreed that it would be better to make the change. Ms. Gutterman added that the geometry of the windows is troubling and recommended that all windows have the same configuration. She contended that part of the awkwardness of the current configuration is the juxtaposition between the size of the fixed pane and the narrowness of the operable part.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the sill heights, noting that the architect indicated that the sill heights would be taller in the bedrooms.
  - Mr. Sageser responded that the sill heights would be 36-inches in the bedroom and 24-inches in the living room.
  - The Committee commented that the sills would not align at the exterior.
  - Mr. Cluver observed that four different sizes of lights are proposed on a single façade.
  - Mr. Sageser agreed to change the window sizes to include one size for the living rooms and one size for the bedrooms.
  - Mr. DeMarco stated that the design could be changed so the sills are the same height, adding that a single window could either be used alone or paired, depending on its location.
  - Ms. Gutterman asked whether the sill heights would be 24 inches or 36 inches.
  - Mr. DeMarco answered that they would be 36 inches.
  - Mr. Sageser stated that the head heights would align.

- The Committee asserted that Mr. DeMarco and Mr. Sageser are discussing two different issues, observing that Mr. DeMarco is suggesting that the sill heights would align, while Mr. Sageser is stating that the head heights would align.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether Mr. Sageser is holding firm to the different sill heights.
- Mr. Sageser affirmed. From an architectural standpoint, he added, larger windows would be used in the living room. He opined that smaller windows exist at the third story of the historic structure.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed appreciation for the addition of the porch at the south elevation, which helps reduce the scale of the building. He remarked that he remains concerned that the opposite elevation will appear as a giant mass that is visible from Ridge Avenue when approaching from the north. He added that it is hard to envision the design of that façade without a drawing.
  - Mr. Sageser replied that in looking at the existing site plan and aerial, the historic structure on the property has an addition that extends almost to the property line. He then argued that given the angle of the property from Ridge Avenue, it would be very difficult to see the rear portion, which is why little attention was given to that particular elevation.
  - Mr. Detwiler contended that the center photo of the site plan shows a building with a red roof behind the historic structure, which is visible from the north on Ridge Avenue. He argued that at least part of the proposed building would be visible.
  - The Committee agreed that the building would be visible on the north side of the historic structure from Ridge Avenue and asked that the elevation be included in the application.
  - Mr. Sageser responded that the north elevation will essentially look like the south elevation.
  - Ms. Gutterman argued that no offset is proposed.
  - Mr. Detwiler asserted that because the building would be visible from that view, he had concerns that the mass of the elevation would be out of scale.
  - The Committee observed that on that elevation there would be bathroom windows with sill heights that differ from the other two previously discussed.
- Mr. D'Alessandro requested a description of the air conditioning units.
  - Mr. Sageser stated that the units are 16 inches high and 42 inches wide. He added that the units appear black in the drawing, but they would be colored to match the Hardie-Plank siding.
  - Mr. Cluver asked whether the units would project from the building or if they would be recessed into the rooms at the interior.
  - Mr. Sageser answered that they would not project from the building.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the materials proposed.
  - Mr. Sageser clarified that HardiePlank siding is proposed for the cladding and that the windows would be composite.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the side elevation step back to allow it to be minimally visible from Ridge Avenue, adding that it would alleviate the appearance of a large block.
  - Mr. Sageser agreed it could be stepped back slightly.
  - The Committee requested a step back of at least one foot.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application includes elevations only of the south and west elevations. The north and east elevations are not included.
- The proposed building would be visible from both the north and south side of the historic structure when viewed from Ridge Avenue.
- The windows vary in size and configuration across a single façade.
- No work is proposed to the historic structure.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new construction would be compatible in massing, size, and scale, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed building does not attach to the historic structure and could be removed from the site in the future without an adverse impact, satisfying Standard 10.

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

- the larger fixed window is changed to be more consistent with the other windows;
- the windows are a composite material and not vinyl;
- the siding is either HardiePlank or stucco;
- the PTAC units do not project from the face of the building;
- the north elevation steps back at least one foot where Unit 3 is identified in plan; and,
- drawings of the north and east elevations are provided to the Historical Commission.

<b>ITEM: 7105 Ridge Ave</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval, with conditions</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
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: 565 N JUDSON ST**

Proposal: Construct three-story building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 1601-03 Ridge Avenue LP

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects, LLC

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: None

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application for new construction at 565 N. Judson Street follows two previous applications to the Historical Commission that were reviewed in March 2017 and January 2019. The Historical Commission maintained full jurisdiction over those reviews because each proposed to construct an addition to the adjacent historic structure at 563 N. Judson Street. The current application proposes only to construct a building on the vacant lot and does not include any work to the adjacent property. Consequently, the Historical Commission maintains review and comment authority over the application.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct three-story, single-family 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 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 three-story building would be incompatible with the massing, size, and scale of the two-story buildings that comprise the row. The architectural features, including the window configurations, materials, cornice, and projecting bay, are insensitive to the historic context, both of Judson Street and of the Spring Garden Historic District.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff comments that the proposed construction at 565 N. Judson Street is incompatible with the Spring Garden Historic District, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 02:30:55

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gabriel Deck represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the property has had a long history of reviews before the Committee and Commission and recalled that the Historical Commission approved an application for a two-story building on the site in the past. He added that there was great care taken in that proposal to meet the cornice line of the adjacent

- building. He contended that Judson Street is a very special street consisting of small two-story houses. The proposed three-story building, he continued, is significantly larger than those that currently occupy the block.
- The Committee concurred that the proposed design would drastically differ in massing and material from anything on the street.
  - Mr. Detwiler asked how the first floor is located relative to the adjacent building.
    - Mr. Deck responded that the first-floor level is four feet above grade. The height, he continued, was designed to provide natural light into the cellar space below. He added that the lot is very small, measuring at about 12 feet wide and 43 feet deep, though the depth includes half of the three-foot alley at the rear of the property. He noted that he is proposing a footprint that is by-right with the zoning district and that the house footprint will measure approximately 420 square feet. In an effort to create something livable, he argued that he had to go to a three-story structure. The house, he added, fits two bedrooms and two bathrooms with the living, kitchen, and dining across two floors. He explained that the cellar contains the living space, which he reiterated is lifted above grade to allow for natural light. The first floor, he continued, contains the kitchen and dining, and the second and third floor each have a single bedroom and single bathroom. Mr. Deck then agreed that the bay projections do not match any feature of the block and that they project over the property line. He contended that they remain within the allowances of the zoning code and are designed to provide more space at the interior. Even with the three-foot bay projects, he noted, the bedrooms are not quite 13-½ feet wide; without the bays, the bedrooms would measure around 10 feet wide.
  - Ms. Gutterman asked how much taller than the adjacent building the proposed structure is and whether there is a pilot house.
    - Mr. Deck answered that there is no pilot house and that the roof deck would be accessed by an exterior spiral staircase. He stated that the houses on Judson Street are only two stories, adding that he does not have a measurement of their height. He estimated that the new construction would be approximately 12 feet higher.
    - Mr. Detwiler referred to the elevation drawing in the application and asked whether the measurements provided would total approximately 14 feet above the adjacent building.
    - Mr. Deck agreed but noted that the property is on the corner and argued that the City Planning Commission has allowed for more height at corner properties. He suggested that it is somewhat more appropriate to allow for the height because of the corner. He added that it allows for a more reasonable layout of the single-family residence.
  - Ms. Stein stated that it is either too much building for the site or the wrong site for the client who wants the building. She called the design out of balance with the context, pointing specifically to the third story and the projecting bays. She argued that the features would be very pronounced in a neighborhood that does not have similar projections. She remarked that someone is trying to overbuild the site. From the community and Committee's point of view, she continued, it is not about how much space you can fit onto the site, it is about how appropriate the design is for the neighborhood and the historic district. She concluded that the proposed building is not appropriate.

- Mr. Detwiler suggested the possibility that the mass could be reduced, working within the existing design. He referenced the section drawing included in the application and observed a triangular space at the stair that could be stepped down to minimize the height. He agreed with Ms. Stein's comments about there being too much building for the site and street. He acknowledged that the site is challenging, noting that other applicants combined 565 N. Judson Street with the adjacent building at 563 N. Judson Street, because the site is so small. Mr. Detwiler remarked that the proposed building is a story too tall.
  - Mr. Deck commented that the stairs are code compliant, though they are the maximum rise and run allowed, and that they are pushed to the front of the building to maximize the footprint of the living space. He stated that the design choices, including the placement of the stair and the lack of a pilot house, were made in an effort to create a reasonable living area.
  - Mr. Cluver responded that those choices beg the question as to whether this site should be built on as a standalone building. He questioned whether it is a building site if a reasonable program cannot be accommodated.
  - Mr. Deck replied that his client does not own the adjacent building at 563 N. Judson Street and that the lot at 565 N. Judson Street is all he has on which to build his residence.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Ms. Keller if a building existed on the site historically.
  - Ms. Keller answered that there was a building on the site historically but that it was demolished before the district was created.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Patrick Boyle of the Spring Garden Civic Association stated that Patricia Freeland submitted a letter on behalf of the association. He commented that the Spring Garden Civic is strongly opposed to the structure, height, and design on the small lot. He called Judson Street a quaint street of two-story buildings across from the art museum. He asserted that the proposed building would overdevelop the site. He noted that a handful of neighbors are present to oppose the application.
- Neighbor Dan Rocha stated that, for the sake of argument, he would assume the owners have a right to build on the lot and that they also have the right to extend the second and third floors over the sidewalk to compensate for the size of the lot, which he argued is barely large enough to park a car. He commented that the building will block the light and air of his neighbors and claimed that the owners should not have the right to construct "the monstrosity" that is proposed, which he contended would ruin the fundamental character of the street and neighborhood. He further remarked that he walks and bikes daily down the street and that it is common to encounter visitors attending the art museum or events on the Parkway. He opined that they stop on the street, photograph the buildings, and remark on the charm and beauty of the houses. He added that to illustrate the character, he took photographs of the street, which he distributed to the Committee. He asserted that the photographs provided in the application to show context are deliberately misleading and do not capture the character of the street. Mr. Rocha noted that across 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, a developer constructed four-story townhouses with no neighborhood opposition. He argued that the design matches the district seamlessly and distributed photographs of them. He then asked that the developer "go back to the drawing board and show some respect and sensitivity to the neighborhood." He asked that this site not become a "jarring monument to greed over sensitivity" and asked that the permit to build the house be denied.

- Neighbor Christine Petty Tabor stated that her property is located directly behind the lot. She distributed photographs from the interior of her house looking toward the lot. She argued that she had to repair her sunroom and that the cost was astronomical because of the Historical Commission's requirements. She then stated that she assumed that same process would apply to other properties in the neighborhood. She contended that she is not a "special person" but commented that she spends a lot of time in the rear of her property and that the proposed building would eliminate all the light to her building. She distributed a letter from a neighbor not in attendance who opposed the application.
- Neighbor Doug Tabor distributed a series of historic photographs of the street and site and included a view of the building that stood at 565 N. Judson Street. He noted that the house had been demolished by 1959. He stated that at some point after the building was demolished, the owners at 563 N. Judson Street took over the lot and converted it into a garden. He commented that the owners maintained the lot as a garden through 2001 when the Spring Garden Historic District was created. He asked to differentiate between a parcel and a site. He contended that there were two parcels involved, because there were historically two houses. However, he argued that the two parcels were combined into one site in the eyes and minds of the neighbors and occupants of the adjacent house. He urged the Historical Commission to take that point of view that, although there are two parcels, it was maintained as a single site. He argued against considering 565 N. Judson Street an "undeveloped site," contending that there was a house with a garden present. He suggested that the Historical Commission can take jurisdiction over the construction and maintain the historic standards of the block.
- Neighbor David Wilkes noted that there is a sense of stewardship and care for the property by the neighbors of the block and surrounding area. He added that the project does not complement the fabric of the street or community.
- Neighbor Roberta Reiner stated that she thought constructing on an 11-foot wide lot was not allowed. She contended that the lot is attached to the house next to it, because the district inventory records the property as 563-65 N. Judson Street. She remarked that the building would be out of place on the street.

#### **ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission has review and comment authority only, because the property is a unique tax parcel and no building existed at the time the Spring Garden Historic District was designated.
- The proposed building is three stories in height with an elevated basement and projecting bays.
- The building would stand approximately 14 feet above the adjacent building at 563 N. Judson Street.
- A roof deck is proposed, but access would be via an exterior spiral stair rather than a pilot house.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is incompatible with the massing and materials of Judson Street and of the Spring Garden Historic District. The application does not comply with Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee commented that the building is incompatible with the Spring Garden Historic District, and Judson Street specifically, in its massing and materials, pursuant to Standard 9.

<b>ITEM: 565 N Judson St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Review and Comment</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
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

Mr. Detweiler excused himself from the meeting after the completion of the review of the 565 Judson Street application.

**ADDRESS: 1733 SPRING GARDEN ST**

Proposal: Construct exterior stair  
 Review Requested: Final Approval  
 Owner: 1733 Spring Garden LLC  
 Applicant: Dale You, 1733 Spring Garden LLC  
 History: 1875; 1st story addition between main building and rear; 1886 Carriage House  
 Individual Designation: None  
 District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000  
 Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**BACKGROUND:**

Located at the northeast corner of N. 18<sup>th</sup> and Spring Garden Streets in the Spring Garden Historic District, the property at 1733 Spring Garden Street extends to Brandywine Street and features a four-story mansion with a historic two-story extension and detailed bay, and a detached carriage house. The courtyard between the house and carriage house is enclosed by a historic wall and fence.

This application proposes to construct an exterior stair that would provide egress from the third floor of the main building to the courtyard. The stair would be accessed from a new door that would be cut in the brick façade of the third-floor rear wall and open onto the roof of an existing historic bay window, which would be enclosed by a metal railing. The application does not include a drawing of this elevation nor does it demonstrate why access cannot be provided by cutting down the existing third-floor rear window. Likewise, details of the attachment of the stair to the bay window and possible necessary modifications to the bay window are not provided. The proposed stair also appears to require the removal or relocation of mechanical equipment and ductwork, the details of which are not included.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Cut doorway
- Construct exterior stair

**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.*
  - Depending on the attachment details of the proposed stair as it relates to the historic bay window, the stair may be easily reversible.
  - The application may comply with this guideline.
- *Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline: Recommended: Adding a new stairway or elevator to meet life-safety code requirements in a manner that preserves adjacent character defining features and spaces; Using existing openings on secondary or less-visible elevations or, if necessary, creating new openings on secondary or less-visible elevations to accommodate second egress requirements.*
  - The application proposes work to a secondary, but highly-visible elevation.
  - The application partially complies with this guideline.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the applicants demonstrate that the existing window cannot be cut down to a door; that a new door is minimal and compatible in design and material with the historic building; that the mechanical equipment is removed or relocated to an inconspicuous location; and that the railing and stair are attached in such a way that minimizes damage to the historic bay window, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 02:59:48

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carolina Pena represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Pena explained that there is currently a daycare center in the basement level, first floor, and second floor and the owner would like to expand the daycare use to the upper floors. She continued that to do this, two means of egress from those floors. Ms. Pena stated that they went to the Board of Building Standards and asked for relief from doing the two means of egress because the architect and owner feel that it would be a shame to destroy the historic interiors of this building and they do not want to damage. She added that it is for this reason they believed it would be better to put the stair on the outside and the Board of Building Standards agreed to allow putting a fire escape on the exterior.
- Mr. Cluver inquired if the fire escape allows egress from the third floor and that from the fourth floor you come down a back stair to the third floor to access the fire escape.
  - Ms. Pena confirmed this was correct.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the fire escape would be accessed from the second floor.

- Ms. Pena stated that the fire escape could not be accessed from second floor. She explained that they provided a fire alarm systems and sprinkler system and the Board of Building Standards felt this was good enough for the second floor but that the problem was the third floor and it would be too long a distance for kids.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if interior options were thoroughly investigated because placing the fire escape on the rear of the building has a substantial impact on the building's exterior in a negative way.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the actual code requirement for the second stair.
  - Ms. Pena replied it is the number of stories above grade and the use. Ms. Pena added that it really means anything above the third story has to have two means of egress.
  - Mr. Cluver clarified that a second means of egress is actually required for anything above second floor.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired if this is a change of use.
  - Ms. Gutterman responded that she thought it was an extended use as this is already a school and they are proposing to expand it and thereby in order to expand it they need second means of egress.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired if they the school was using the basement now as classroom space.
  - Ms. Pena replied it is being used by the school and has two means egress. She clarified that the basement, first floor, and second floor are currently being used by the school and the school would like to expand its use to the upper floors. Ms. Pena added that the owner has spent a fair amount of money fixing up the building including repointing the building's exterior and redoing the slate mansard roof.
- Mr. Cluver commented that even if you created an internal stair to the third floor you would be creating a three-story unprotected shaft and that is not a great idea either.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the proposed stair would unfortunately be a massive, visible element.
  - Ms. Pena responded that they understand that it is not original to the building and looks like something that does not belong there. She explained that they plan to paint it to try to make it blend as much as possible.
- Mr. Cluver asked if there was a reason they are putting in a new door opening versus putting the door in the existing window opening.
  - Ms. Pena responded that is what they plan to do.
  - Mr. Cluver stated that is not what they are showing in the plans.
  - Mr. Pena responded that what is currently shown on the plans is not correct and that the door should be shown in the existing window opening.
  - Mr. Cluver and Ms. Gutterman asked about the railing as the existing railing probably is not tall enough to meet code.
  - Mr. Pena noted that it will probably have to be 42 inches high.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired why the third floor main stair was not enough.
  - Mr. Cluver replied because they need a second means of egress. He noted the proposed interior stair goes from the fourth floor down to the third floor and then exits out to the fire stair.
  - Ms. Pena responded that the reason for the fourth floor to third floor interior stair was to avoid altering the mansard roof.

- Mr. Cluver stated that if you accept the premise that this needs to be done, then the applicant is doing it the way it needs to be done. He added that there is a long and ignoble history of putting fire escapes on historic buildings.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented on the scale of the fire escape.
  - Mr. Cluver noted there is a difference between what is required by code for a fire escape now versus what could be done in the past. He explained that most of the fire escapes built a hundred years ago would not be permitted today.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that there are a lot of messy details that the staff has pointed out.
  - Ms. Pena acknowledged this and stated that this is something that they can worked on with the staff. She noted that their structural engineer will be working on this to design the final structure.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that there is a whole courtyard at the rear of the building and asked why it cannot return back instead of going on to an existing roof.
  - Ms. Pena responded that they are trying to minimize the amount of structure and footprint.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro replied that it is going onto existing historic fabric and that is the problem.
  - Mr. Cluver noted this was a valid point that if it extended out further at the top and it could spiral down behind the space of the small addition.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Patrick Boyle, representing the Spring Garden Civic Association, spoke against the proposed application. He stated that Patricia Freeland submitted a letter on behalf of the association. Mr. Boyle stated that the organization appreciates the school and work the owner is doing to maintain the property but strongly opposes the proposed fire escape. He noted that there is a carriage house at the rear of this property and this could potentially be used to expand the school instead of the proposed expansion to the upper floors. Mr. Boyle pointed out that the property is located at a highly visible location and the Spring Garden Civic Association feels this change have a negative impact on the historic character of the neighborhood.
- Giuliano Pignataro stated that he was attending the Architectural Committee meeting on another matter but wanted to speak since his daughter attends the school located at 1733 Spring Garden Street. He stated that the owners have been incredible historic stewards of the building. He advocated for the approval of the project.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- In order for the owner to expand the existing daycare, a second means of egress must be created from the third floor.
- Although it is not shown in the drawing, the plan is to use the third floor window to create a doorway to the fire escape.
- An interior stair on the third floor cannot be created without damaging interior historic fabric.
- The architect explored different options on the interior and exterior to add an egress stair and concluded the exterior stair had the least impact on the historic building. The Committee concluded that the applicant should assess if there is a way to make the exterior footprint of the stair smaller and less visible.



The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Standard 10 may apply if the application is updated to reflect the following:
  - A third-floor egress doorway is created by modifying the existing window opening;
  - The third-floor sill and window that are removed are retained;
  - Mechanical equipment is removed or relocated to an inconspicuous location; and,
  - The railing and stair are detailed and attached in such a way that minimizes damage to the historic bay window and other historic fabric.
- The application proposes work to a secondary, but highly-visible elevation; therefore, the application partially complies with this Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the design is modified so that

- the third-floor egress doorway is created by modifying the window opening rather than cutting a new opening in the wall;
- the sill and window that are removed are retained on site;
- the mechanical equipment is removed or relocated to an inconspicuous location; and,
- the railing and stair are detailed and attached in such a way that minimizes damage to the historic bay window and other historic fabric,

with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

<b>ITEM: 1733 Spring Garden Street</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval with conditions</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman		x			
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein		x			
Total	3	2			2

**ADDRESS: 2201 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Construct exterior stair

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barbara McGinley Living Trust; Barbara C. McGinley Trust

Applicant: Michelle Kleschick, Parallel Architecture Studio LLC

History: 1879

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to construct an exterior egress stair at the rear of this corner property. The new owners of the single-family residence intend to convert the building into a three-family dwelling, and are seeking the exterior stair owing to the increased occupancy and as a means of egress in the event of an emergency.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Construct exterior egress stair at rear of building from third through fifth floors.
- Install casement window in mansard dormer at rear.

**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 construction of the exterior stair will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The stair will be differentiated from the old and will read as a modern intervention to provide egress.
- *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 exterior stair could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.
- *Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline: Recommended: Adding a new stairway or elevator to meet health and safety codes in a manner that preserves adjacent character-defining features and spaces.*
  - The addition of the exterior stair does not negatively impact character-defining features and spaces.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 03:17:15

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.

- Architect Carolina Pena represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Culver asked Ms. Pena about the egress stair at the top floor. He pointed out that the apartment is a two-story unit with an internal stair and inquired what is requiring an exit from the fifth floor on the exterior if there is already an internal stair.
  - Ms. Pena responded that it is because there is too great an egress distance to the fourth floor. She clarified that the top floor apartment is a bi-level unit on the fourth and fifth floor. Ms. Pena explained that she was required to have a second means of egress on all floors even though it is the same unit.
  - Mr. Cluver commented that his recollection is that as long as there was an internal stair within a unit, there only needed to be one other means of egress for the entire bi-level unit. Mr. McCoubrey added that he recalled this code requirement as well.
  - Ms. Pena stated that under the new code you are required to have the egress on the fifth floor, but she will review this code requirement again to determine if this is correct. She stated that if only one means of egress is required to the bi-level unit, the fire stair to the fifth floor will be eliminated.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if there is an internal stair from the second floor down. Can there be an internal stair from the third to second floor? She added that she understands that it means less internal space.
  - Ms. Pena agreed that it would mean a loss of square footage.
  - Ms. Gutterman responded that the impact on the building also needs to come into play. She inquired if part of the issue was the way the building is set back at the rear.
  - Ms. Pena noted that the building does set back at the rear.
- Ms. Gutterman stated it would be better to do a pilot house on the terrace instead of an exterior egress stair.
  - Ms. Pena responded that that is certainly something that they can explore instead of having the exterior stair. She continued that they could explore building an enclosure for the stair that would match to color of the brick.
  - Ms. Gutterman suggested materials such as stucco and masonry. She added that she does not like fire escapes because they are large.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired if the fire escape or exterior egress stair is needed because this is becoming a multi-family dwelling.
  - Ms. Pena confirmed this is correct.
- Ms. Stein stated that she thought this was a case where the stair should be done inside the building, owing to the location in the neighborhood and that it is possible inside this building.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that if the exterior stair from the second to third story was reversed it would be less visible.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building is located at a highly visible location at the corner of Delancey Place and S 22<sup>nd</sup> Street.

- The exterior stair may not be required by code between the fourth and fifth floors, owing to the fact it will be a bi-level unit with an interior stair.
- There is sufficient square footage on the inside of the existing building that an interior stair could be created.
- Creating a new enclosed area for the stair at the rear of the building may also be an option that should be explored.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The construction of the exterior stair will destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property; therefore it does not meet Standard 9.
- The exterior stair could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would not be completely unimpaired; therefore the construction of the exterior stair would only partially meet Standard 10.
- The addition of the exterior stair negatively impacts character-defining features and spaces; therefore it does not meet the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

<b>ITEM: 2201 Delancey Place</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Stein</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

**ADDRESS: 6626 GERMANTOWN AVE**

Proposal: Construct multi-family building at rear of property

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Hebron Tabernacle of America

Applicant: Stuart Udis, PA Realty Advisors LLC

History: 1905; Pelham Pharmacy; David Knickerbocker Boyd, architect

Individual Designation: 3/8/2019

District Designation: None

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to construct a four-unit residential building at the rear of the former Pelham Pharmacy building. The historic building is situated at the corner of Germantown Avenue and W. Phil Ellena Street, and contains an area of undeveloped land at the rear along W. Phil Ellena Street. The property was designated in March 2019 for significance related to its architect and for exemplifying the historical heritage of the planned Pelham development. The designation includes the entire tax parcel which encompasses both the historic building and the undeveloped land at the rear.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an application in August 2019 which proposed the construction of three townhouses at this site. The Committee recommended denial of the application, and provided suggestions for improving the proposal, including a change in materials, setback from street, massing, and spatial relationships. The applicant withdrew that application after the Committee review to incorporate the Committee's comments into a revised design.

The current application proposes a 10-foot front yard setback, which removes the front porches and rear parking from the earlier in-concept application. It also now proposes a larger side yard setback and decreases the overall lot coverage. The materials have been changed from white brick and vertical board to red brick and gray stone veneer. The proposed building reads as a twin rather than three townhouses, as it was designed in the in-concept application.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Construct multi-family building fronting W. Phil Ellena Street on undeveloped land at rear.

**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 massing, scale, and materials are compatible with the historic property. The setback from the street and darker material choices allows the new building to be deferential to the historic building. The staff suggests the mansard roof should have a steeper slope to reduce its visual impact.

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:25:40**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Equitable owner Stuart Udis represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Cluver commented that the mansard appears top-heavy owing to the parapet.
- Ms. Stein asked about the material on the sides of the building. She stated that it should not be vinyl siding.
  - Mr. Udis responded that the sides and rear will be clad with HardiPlank fiber cement siding.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the vertical stone band on the front façade is not a successful design element and should be omitted.
  - Mr. Udis responded that it was intended to tie in the schist found on other buildings on W. Phil Ellena Street, but that the stone could remain on only the base.
- Ms. Stein asked about access to the roof deck.
  - Mr. Udis responded that there is an interior stair at the third floor and that the pilot houses from the prior application were removed owing to visibility.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the roof deck is quite large. He suggested that the deck should be held back to start at the top stair, and have a metal railing. He stated that this will allow the mansard to drop in height.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the smaller second-floor windows could be made larger if a change was made on the interior. He also suggested that the entrance doors could be redesigned to be a door and window combined into a single element.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the dormers do not need to align with the windows below, but that they could be moved in slightly on either side. He commented that the fronts of the dormers should be trim elements rather than siding.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the interior entrance vestibule.
  - Mr. Udis responded that each building is a two-family dwelling with a shared entrance.
- Mr. Cluver thanked Mr. Udis for incorporating many of the Committee's comments from the prior review. He opined that the revised design is greatly improved because of it.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The historic building contains an area of undeveloped land at the rear along W. Phil Ellena Street, which is part of the historically designated tax parcel.
- The application is revised from the August 2019 application to reflect comments received from the Committee.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed massing, scale, and materials are compatible with the historic property, satisfying Standard 9. The setback from the street and material choices allows the new building to be deferential to the historic building.

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

- the mansard is reduced in height;
- the roof deck is pulled back from the front of the building so that it aligns with the top of the step, and has a simple metal guardrail;
- the dormers are moved away from the edge of the building and the fronts are trim rather than siding;
- the vertical stone element is omitted from the front façade;
- the size and positioning of the front façade windows is reconsidered;
- elevations are provided of the sides and rear with materials specified.

<b>ITEM: 6626 Germantown Ave</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval with conditions</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

**ADDRESS: 1520-28 SPRUCE ST**

Proposal: Demolish non-historic penthouse; construct two-story penthouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Spruce Street Commons

Applicant: Ronald J. Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1917; The Touraine; Frederick Webber, architect

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to demolish an existing penthouse and construct a two-story penthouse on approximately the same footprint on the roof of the Touraine apartment building. The Historical Commission did not review the existing penthouse because it was constructed prior to the designation of the building. Both the existing penthouse is visible and the proposed penthouse would be visible from several vantage points, as the location is at the far southern end of the building.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Demolish non-historic penthouse.
- Construct two-story penthouse.

**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 penthouse would not destroy historic materials and features that characterize the property. It would be differentiated from the historic building.
- *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 penthouse could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.
- *Roofs Guideline, Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*
  - The penthouse would not be conspicuous from the public right-of-way and would not damage or obscure character-defining features.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 03:44:10

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Ronald Patterson, architect Sergio Coscia, and developer Giuliano Pignataro represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Cluver thanked the applicants for a thorough and complete application which showed existing and proposed footprints and heights.
- Mr. Coscia distributed additional detailed renderings.
- Ms. Stein asked about the structural supports.
  - Mr. Coscia explained that the current penthouse has the same structural buttresses as proposed, but the new penthouse will have several additional buttresses. He explained that the current structure does not land on any existing columns. He stated that the new structure is hung and does not bear on the roof itself.
- Ms. Stein asked about the change in materials.
  - Mr. Coscia responded that the stucco areas are not visible from the public right-of-way, and that the visible material is gray in color.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**



The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing penthouse was constructed prior to the historic designation of the building, and is considered to be non-historic.
- Both the existing penthouse is visible and the proposed penthouse will be visible from several vantage points.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Satisfying Standard 9, the proposed penthouse would not destroy historic materials and features that characterize the property. It would be differentiated from the historic building.
- Satisfying Standard 10, the penthouse could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.
- The penthouse would not be conspicuous from the public right-of-way and would not damage or obscure character-defining features, per the recommended Roofs Guideline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Roofs Guideline.

<b>ITEM: 1520-28 Spruce St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval</b>					
<b>Moved By: Cluver</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro</b>					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

**ADDRESS: 106-08 AND 110 GRAPE ST**

Proposal: Demolish buildings  
 Review Requested: Final Approval  
 Owner: Dan Nedusin  
 Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office  
 History: 106-08 Grape Street, c. 1930; 110 Grape Street, c. 1835  
 Individual Designation: None  
 District Designation: Main Street Manayunk, 12/14/1983  
 Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**BACKGROUND:** This application proposes to demolish a one-story garage at 106-08 Grape Street and a three-story residential building at 110 Grape Street.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance prohibits the Historical Commission from approving a complete demolition of a contributing resource in a historic district unless the

Historical Commission finds that issuance of the demolition permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, i.e. that compelling the preservation of the building would cause the owner to suffer a “financial hardship.” This application claims that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. The financial hardship application will be reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship as well as the Historical Commission.

The Manayunk Development Corporation (“MDC”), a non-profit charitable organization, submitted the application. The application includes a cover letter from the MDC that explains that the MDC, a 501(c)(3) charitable entity, seeks to develop the site as office, meeting, and retail space. The cover letter concludes that “Considering the building’s weak contributing stature, its severe deterioration and the community benefit of the proposed redevelopment, the Commission is urged to allow demolition of 110 Grape Street.” The application includes an affidavit from the current owner, which is not the Manayunk Development Corporation, but is instead a for-profit real estate company. The application includes architectural plans for a new building to be constructed on the cleared site, but they appear to be included for information only and not for review for approval. The building permit application included with the application describes the work as demolition only and does not mention any new construction. The application includes a report from a historic preservation consultant that opines that 106-08 Grape Street is classified as non-contributing in the historic district and 110 Grape Street is classified as contributing. The report concludes that the building at 110 Grape Street lacks historical significance and integrity. The application includes an engineer’s report that concludes that the building at 110 Grape Street is severely deteriorated and suffers from structural defects. Finally, the application includes a financial analysis that seeks to demonstrate that the building at 110 Grape Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

The MDC submitted a similar application without the financial analysis to the Historical Commission in the spring of 2019. The Historical Commission tabled that application for a period not to exceed six months to give the applicant an opportunity to supplement it with the requisite financial analysis. The applicant failed to submit the financial analysis during the tabling period and the Historical Commission had no choice but to deny the application in September 2019. The applicant subsequently resubmitted the application with a financial analysis.

The building at 110 Grape Street is a small, two-and-one-half story rowhouse built about 1835. It is about 1,457 square feet in size. A garage was inserted into the front façade at some point in the twentieth century. The house has been vacant for decades and is in very poor condition.

The application includes a construction cost estimate for a mixed-use commercial and residential project of \$1,155,052, or \$792.76 per sf. The financial analysis consists of a discounted cash flow analysis over 10 years with various assumptions about interest rates to borrow, rental rates, vacancy rates, operating expenses, and appreciation rates. Using the construction cost estimate of \$1,155,052, the analysis predicts negative cash flows every year and a net present value for the project of negative \$796,179.

After receiving and reviewing the financial analysis, the staff informed the applicant that it considered the estimated construction cost of \$1,155,052 to be unrealistically high. Subsequently, the applicant adjusted the construction cost to \$700,000, or \$480.44 per sf.

Using the new construction cost, the revised analysis predicts negative cash flows every year and a net present value for the project of negative \$458,695.

The staff considered the second construction cost estimate, \$480 per sf, to be high as well. The staff undertook a sensitivity analysis to determine the impacts of adjusting the various assumptions, especially the construction cost estimate. To do so, the staff reverse-engineered the financial analysis using MS Excel. Using a more reasonable construction cost of \$350 per sf or \$510,000 total and discounting the purchase price to \$0 to reflect a property of no value, but leaving the other assumptions constant, the staff found that the project over 10 years would still produce negative cash flows every year and a negative net present value for the project. The staff concluded that the financial analysis demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The staff recommends that the Historical Commission:

- acknowledge that the Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code does not provide a mechanism for reviewing this application proposing demolition;
- invoke Section 18 of the Rules & Regulations and apply the “financial hardship” provisions of the Rules & Regulations to this application even though it was designated under Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code;
- concur with the classifications provided by the inventory for the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District that the property at 106-08 Grape Street is Non-contributing and the property at 110 Grape Street is Contributing, even though that inventory was not adopted by and is not binding on the Historical Commission;
- acknowledge that the complete demolition of the contributing resource triggers the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance;
- decline to apply the provisions of Section 10 of the Rules & Regulations, titled “Financial Hardship and Non-Profit Organizations,” because a non-profit does not currently own the property;
- decline to take the poor condition of the building at 110 Grape Street into account when determining whether the building can or cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted because the current owner has owned the property since 1991 and has had a responsibility to keep the building in good repair;
- find that, despite its inflated construction costs, the financial analysis demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; and,
- approve the application, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:55:15**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney William O’Brien, and Lisa Lamprou and Gwen McCauley of the Manayunk Development Corporation represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Chantry explained that the Architectural Committee is to formulate a recommendation as to whether the demolition of a Contributing building in a historic district satisfies the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic

Properties. She stated that a review of new construction at this site is not before the Committee today.

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the classifications in the district for both buildings.
  - Ms. Chantry explained that the Main Street Manayunk Historic District is unusual for the Historical Commission's historic districts. It was created by City Council, before the Historical Commission was given the authority to create historic districts. There was no inventory created at the time that City Council voted to create the historic district and give regulatory authority to the Historical Commission. Over the years, the Commission has relied on the Main Street Manayunk National Register historic district inventory as a guide to make decisions about Contributing and Non-contributing attributions. The district inventory is old, and some of the categories that were used at the time do not reflect current practice. That inventory assigns a Contributing attribution to the building at 110 Grape Street, but there is a range of Contributing and this building is on the lower end of the spectrum. The garage building at 106-08 Grape Street is classified as an intrusion, the equivalent of a Non-contributing attribution.
- Mr. O'Brien described the Manayunk Development Corporation (MDC), its history and achievements, and its vital role in the continued growth of Manayunk. He explained that the MDC seeks to utilize this site for its permanent home, which will involve the construction of a contextual four-story mixed-use building. The review of the design of that building is not before the Committee today, but rather, will come before the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission at a later date, should approval be granted for the demolition of the building at 110 Grape Street.
- Mr. O'Brien directed the Committee's attention to the report by Heritage Consulting Group, which concludes that the building is of perhaps marginal Contributing value, and the structural engineering report, which concludes that there are many serious structural issues that affect this building. He explained that the footprint of the building proposed for demolition is approximately 600 square feet. He stated that the condition of the building is so poor that the cost to repair it far exceeds a profitable rate of return.
  - Ms. Gutterman responded that the cost analysis is not part of the Architectural Committee's purview.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern that approval of this application would result in an approval of the proposed new construction massing included in the application.
  - Ms. Chantry responded that this application is solely for approval of demolition of the building at 110 Grape Street. The current application has nothing to do with the new construction, as was stated earlier.
  - Mr. O'Brien stated that the conceptual new construction drawings were included to show that the intention is not merely to demolish a building and let the property sit undeveloped.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the cost estimates are remarkably high. He acknowledged that there is a certain inefficiency of scale, and also the building has been allowed to deteriorate to such a degree that there is a lot of work needed to rehabilitate it. He stated that a property owner may be willing to put this kind of money in a single-family residence, in which the costs may defy a pro-forma. He asked if there has been an attempt to market the property as a single-family residence.
  - Mr. O'Brien responded that the pro-forma was run on both residential single-family and commercial. He recalled that, at the Committee's February 2019 meeting, Mr. Nedusin had stated that his company markets its own properties, of

which it has many, and that the space has always been advertised on their website as available. Mr. O'Brien commented that no one has expressed interest in the property, except for a developer in 2008 who wanted the property for the purposes of demolition.

- Mr. Cluver asked about the uses of the surrounding buildings.
  - Ms. Lamprou responded that the nearest buildings are commercial on the ground floor with residential above, except for the Grape Room, which is a bar/restaurant and live music venue.
  - Mr. Cluver remarked that there are other nearby properties that have made it work, but that this property is burdened by the sheer cost of the rehabilitation that is required. He stated that the Committee does not have an understanding for how much of that is a self-induced hardship.
  - Mr. O'Brien reiterated that the MDC is the equitable owner, and not the current owner or prior owner, and the MDC is not responsible for the current condition of the building.
  - Ms. Gutterman observed that the other nearby buildings are significantly larger than the subject building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the length of vacancy in the building.
  - Mr. O'Brien responded that it has been vacant for decades.
- Mr. Cluver asked if this could be considered a demolition by neglect. He stated that he does not deny that the building needs a lot of work, and that the MDC needs a permanent home, and that the building is of questionable significance.
- Ms. McCauley referenced the new construction at 107 Cotton Street, which was approved by the Historical Commission. She explained that the goal is to build something with similar characteristics to that building.
- Ms. Lamprou stated that the MDC appreciates the historic character of the Main Street Manayunk historic district, but that this building has been neglected for many years and will continue to sit vacant and not contribute to what makes the area special. She stated that she owns a nearby property on Main Street and that the small-town charm is what attracts people to Main Street Manayunk, and that the MDC is not trying to change that. Ms. McCauley remarked that the building cannot contribute to the historic district in its current state.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the Committee would review an application for demolition which does not also include the proposed plans for redevelopment of the site.
  - Mr. Farnham responded that the MDC is not the owner of the property yet, and likely would not want to commit to designing a building until there is assurance that the existing structures can be demolished. He also noted that the determination of the feasibility of reuse of the existing building, the essence of the hardship review, has nothing to do with what might be built on the site later.
  - Mr. Cluver asked if the Committee could recommend that no demolition is allowed until there is an approved plan for new construction.
  - Mr. Farnham clarified that the building permit application before the Committee is for complete demolition only. It does not have any association to new construction on the site. There is an obligation for a new construction proposal to be presented to the Committee and approved by the Commission before a building permit for new construction will be issued. He reassured the Committee that it is not in danger of accidentally approving a design for new construction as part of this application.

- Mr. Cluver commented that the Committee is concerned about approving a demolition and then having the site sit empty for more than two decades.
- Mr. Farnham responded that the hardship question is completely distinct from the new construction question; they cannot be linked. He noted that the financial hardship application must be reviewed by both the Architectural Committee and the Committee on Financial Hardship. The Architectural Committee's role is to determine if the demolition of a Contributing building in a historic district does or does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He stated that the recommendation of the Committee could be for denial, unless the Commission finds that there is no feasible reuse for the building.
- Ms. Gutterman explained that the purview of the Architectural Committee is limited, and that the Commission has the authority to account for factors that are not part of the Committee's consideration. She stated that the application for demolition of a Contributing resource in a historic district does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The classifications provided in the inventory for the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District correctly attribute a Non-contributing status to the property at 106-08 Grape Street and a Contributing status to the property at 110 Grape Street.
- The poor condition of the building at 110 Grape Street could be considered demolition by neglect because the current owner has owned the property since 1991 and has had a responsibility over the past 28 years under the Property Maintenance Code as well as Section 13.2 of the Rules & Regulations to keep the building in good repair. The MDC is the equitable owner.
- The complete demolition of the contributing resource triggers the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Demolition of a Contributing resource in a historic district does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

**ITEM: 106-08 and 110 Grape St**  
**MOTION: Denial**  
**MOVED BY: Gutterman**  
**SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro**

<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz					x
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:05 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](http://www.phila.gov/historical).