

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

**TUESDAY, 19 NOVEMBER 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:

- Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
- 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:

- Michael Hauptman, Brawer & Hauptman Architects
- Warren Claytor, Warren Claytor Architects
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Christian Kaulius, Brawer & Hauptman Architects
- Laurie Phillips, Berkshire Hathaway
- Jeremey Newbery, Society Hill Synagogue
- Tom McCreesh, Temple University
- John Higgins, Temple University
- Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture
- Jeremy Lecompte
- Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio
- Danielle Redenbaugh
- Robert O'Donnell, Esq., O'Donnell Stacey
- Jamie Ober, KCBA Architects

## **AGENDA**

### **ADDRESS: 418 SPRUCE ST**

Proposal: Renovate rowhouse; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Society Hill Synagogue

Applicant: Christian Kaulius, Brawer & Hauptman Architects

History: c. 1829-30; Society Hill Synagogue/Spruce Street Baptist Church; Thomas U. Walter; 1851, new façade; 1968, restored by Henry J. Magaziner; 1985, rear addition

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

### **BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes the conversion of an eighteenth-century rowhouse to include classrooms, a nursery school, and restrooms. The rowhouse will connect to the Society Hill Synagogue building to the east through a proposed two-story link. No changes are proposed to the visible exterior of the rowhouse with the exception of the roof, which will be re-roofed with asphalt shingles. Existing windows and doors will remain. A narrow alley separates the rowhouse and synagogue.

The two-story link will have a simple glass exterior with clear finish aluminum mullions. The link will serve as a two-story lobby at both levels, house an elevator, and provide accessibility for the restrooms in the townhouse. No changes will be made to the visible exterior of the synagogue. On the interior of the link, limited alterations will be made to the synagogue's west wall.

Exterior signage is proposed to include pin-mounted letters on a stone veneer adjacent to the link's entrance.

A similar project for 418 Spruce Street was approved in concept by the Historical Commission at the 13 July 2007 meeting. That proposal was more extensive and required the demolition of the townhouse's rear ell, piazza, and rear wall of the main block. A three-story addition was proposed to the south and east of the remaining section of the rowhouse, infilling the alley and linking to the west façade of the synagogue. As the proposed scope of work in this application has significantly less impact on the building than the 2007 proposal, the applicant is requesting final approval.

### **SCOPE OF WORK**

- Construct two-story glazed connector link between synagogue and rowhouse.
- Demolish masonry wall between synagogue and rowhouse.
- Renovate interior with no work to front facades.

### **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
  - The demolition required to complete this project will have limited impact to the distinctive features and finishes of the synagogue's west wall. Based on drawings submitted, historic windows and window openings will be maintained.

- *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 height of the glass and aluminum link is shorter than the synagogue and rowhouse.
  - The front elevation of the proposed link is set back from the front elevations of the synagogue and rowhouse.
  - The proposed materials differentiate the two-story link from the historic masonry of the two buildings.
- *Standard 10: New additions or 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 impaired.*
  - The proposed link has a limited impact to the overall historic form and integrity of the synagogue and rowhouse. If this connector was removed in the future, the historic form and integrity of the buildings could be restored.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and 10.

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

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Michael Hauptman and Christian Kaulius of Brawer & Hauptman Architects represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Hauptman stated that the project has been a long time coming. He explained that the project was first reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission 12 years ago, but not implemented, and they are now presenting a more modest proposal. Mr. Hauptman noted that they are trying to be as gentle as possible to connect the two buildings and that the only thing you will see from the public right-of-way is a two-story glass link with a ground floor entrance. He stated that the link is about six feet wide and set back roughly four feet from the façade of the synagogue building. He continued that they will also be renovating the interior of the rowhouse which is in moderate condition with not a lot of original detail left as it has been apartments for a long time. Mr. Hauptman pointed out they are not doing much to the exterior of the synagogue except where the link touches.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant to describe exactly what will be done to west wall of the synagogue. Ms. Gutterman inquired what would be done to the east wall of the row house.
  - Mr. Hauptman responded that they are constructing a two-story building essentially. He continued that the way it will be structured is with ledgers on both buildings that are spanned across and he noted that the trick is how the floors and the roof touch the exterior of the synagogue building. Mr. Hauptman explained that they are doing it so that they meet the spandrels of the existing windows and detail it is a way that keeps the original windows intact.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant if there were any modifications to the synagogue's masonry.

- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant how the addition would be waterproofed.
  - Mr. Hauptman replied that it would be an aluminum storefront system that touches both walls.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant for confirmation that their plan would avoid cutting the masonry walls of either building.
  - Mr. Hauptman confirmed that that assertion is correct.
- Mr. Cluver noted that it looks as though a trough would need to be cut where the storefront meets the synagogue.
  - Mr. Hauptman replied he does not know if they need to do that and is hoping they can use some sort of gasket that fills in the courseline. He stated they do not intend to cut the masonry.
  - Mr. Cluver pointed out that the way it is shown in first application rendering, the mullion is tight up against the synagogue and then, as it comes down the wall and hits the base area, it cuts into it.
- Mr. Cluver inquired if seismic isolation is needed between the two buildings. He added that gaskets would help with this. However, ledgers on both sides may present a problem with seismic isolation.
  - Mr. Hauptman responded he does not know, as they have not yet investigated the seismic issues.
  - Mr. Cluver stated satisfying the seismic requirements may reduce the impact on the synagogue. They may need to add an independent column line running down the wall.
  - Mr. Hauptman responded that they hoped to avoid an independent column line because there is so little room, only a six-foot-wide space, between the two buildings.
  - Mr. Cluver stated that the structural engineer may indicate otherwise for the seismic requirements.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the storefront is a clear anodized aluminum.
  - Mr. Hauptman stated this was correct and this material and color was chosen because it was the most invisible.
- Mr. Hauptman pointed out that they are lowering the sill of a window to make it a doorway on the ground floor of the synagogue connection. He continued that on the upper floor there is an existing big window that they did not want to alter, so they are cutting an opening just adjacent to it. Mr. Hauptman indicated that it is “Door 218” on the plan and confirmed that the “Door 218” opening is the only new opening planned for the synagogue’s exterior west wall.
- Mr. Cluver noted that there is stone cladding proposed for the row house’s east wall.
  - Mr. Hauptman confirmed that this is correct.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that a clear glass door is proposed for the front façade of the link and a glass and metal door proposed for the back. He inquired if there was an intentionality to the difference between the two.
  - Mr. Hauptman responded that the back of the building is not visible, and they felt they decided that the less expensive, more secure door was better at the rear. He continued that this way there is a more secure door at the rear and the front door is as light and simple as possible.
  - Mr. Cluver asked if the front door will have an operator.
  - Mr. Hauptman responded that it would not.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a site plan showing how people get to the rear door.

- Mr. Hauptman responded there is a very narrow back yard that goes out to Lawrence Court.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired if there was ADA parking at the rear of the building.
- Mr. Hauptman responded that everyone parks on the street. He noted that the courtyard is private parking but not for congregants.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about mechanical equipment on the addition.
  - Mr. Hauptman responded that it would possibly be located on the back where you cannot see it. He explained they are starting to look into this now and most likely it will be a couple of small mini split systems that will go on the flat portion of the roof.
- Ms. Gutterman asked what type of glass is envisioned for the two-story link.
  - Mr. Hauptman stated they have not selected it yet. He stated that it will be as clear and colorless as they can get.
  - Ms. Stein suggested going with “Ultraclear” glass as this type will avoid a green tint in the glass.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about lighting. He noted that there appears to be a jog in the line of lights on the second floor in the rendering. Mr. Cluver pointed out that the lighting will play an important role in this small addition, especially at night. He encouraged the architect to do everything to keep the lighting clean. Mr. Cluver also inquired about exterior lighting.
  - Mr. Hauptman responded there was nothing planned for exterior lighting.
  - Mr. Cluver stated because this was a “tucked in” area, he could see a desire for exterior lighting.
  - Ms. Stein pointed out that exterior lighting would be a code requirement.
  - Mr. Cluver stated he was fine with exterior lighting if it is mounted on the building and kept minimal in profile, leaving it to the discretion the architect and staff to determine.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he thought it is a very nice, modest, simple addition. He noted that much depends on the implementation of all of the little details.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the elevator, asking if it is an addition itself or cut into the building.
  - Mr. Hauptman responded that there is a notch in the building right there and it is tucked into that recess. He added that there is currently a 1-story small addition on the first level there and they will remove this, restore it to its original form, and tuck the elevator in to that space.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out the unfortunate location of the rainwater conductor.
  - Mr. Hauptman responded that they will find a new location for it.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The addition or link will be limited to the connection of the historic synagogue’s west wall and the row house’s east wall.
- Addition will have limited impact on building’s historic fabric.
- Addition is differentiated from historic buildings through its scale, massing, and materials.

- Overall scope and key details of project are included in the application but many key details such as glass type, lighting, mechanical equipment, connections, and more must be worked out between architect and staff.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The demolition required by this application will have limited impact to the distinctive features and finishes of the synagogue and row house, meeting Standard 5.
- The proposed addition is a modest scale, its front elevation is set back, and the glass and aluminum materials differentiate it from the historic buildings, meeting Standard 9.
- The proposed addition has a limited impact to the overall historic form and integrity of the synagogue and rowhouse. If this connector was removed in the future, the historic form and integrity of the buildings could be restored, meeting Standard 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that exterior lights are not obtrusive; mechanical units are inconspicuous and acoustically shielded; the rainwater conductor is redesigned; the glass is clear; and points of intrusion into the historic buildings are minimized, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and 10.

<b>ITEM: 418 SPRUCE ST</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	6		1		

**ADDRESS: 2035 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Construct rooftop deck, pilot house, and exterior stair

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Richard G. Phillips, Jr.

Applicant: Kyle Lissack, Pinemar Inc.

History: c. 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to build a rooftop deck at 2035 Delancey Place, a five-story rowhouse located in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The deck will be constructed over the existing

low-pitch roof and will be set back from the front elevation approximately eight feet. The deck will be accessed by a pilot house and spiral stair.

An existing elevator shaft will be extended to enable access to the roof deck. Owing to the added height of the 10-foot pilot house, the rear brick chimney will be extended up above the pilot house to meet building code. The rear elevation is visible from Cypress Street, a service alley.

#### **SCOPE OF WORK**

- Construct rooftop deck and pilot house
- Extend elevator shaft to deck level
- Extend existing brick chimney
- Add spiral stair to allow egress between third floor and roof deck

#### **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spacial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
  - The rear roofline is proposed to be raised and the height of the mansard roof changed. This eliminates the historic roofline and alters the proportions of the mansard roof.
- *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.*
  - Construction of the roof deck and extension of the elevator shaft should not alter historic roofline. The new construction must be differentiated in material from the slate of the mansard.
- *Standard 10: New additions or 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 impaired.*
  - The proposed deck does not permanently alter the roof's historic roof and the proposed new construction could be removed in the future.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10 with the following changes to the proposed application:

- Existing roofline at the top of mansard remains in place.
- A different cladding material, such as stucco, is used for the extension of the elevator shaft and pilot house.
- A black metal picket railing is used in place of the glass railing.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 00:17:15

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Warren Claytor represented the application.

## DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Mehley if the staff had concerns about the relationship of the deck to the front of the house since it is only set back approximately eight feet. She pointed out that the Committee tends to object to decks on the front roofs. Ms. Gutterman stated that eight feet does not seem to be a significant setback for the deck and was curious if the staff discussed the dimensions of the setback and planned to go out to the field to do a visibility test with the applicant.
  - Ms. Mehley responded that they would require a test for visibility. She continued that the staff felt that because of the height of the building the deck would not be visible from Delancey Street.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Claytor where the mechanical equipment would be moved to since it is currently located where the deck will be constructed.
  - Mr. Claytor responded that it will be moved closer to Cypress Street.
  - Mr. Cluver asked if the mechanical equipment would be located next to the spiral stair.
  - Mr. Claytor confirmed that this was correct.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated the adjacent roof is slightly lower so he would like a check for visibility done. He noted he is concerned about the oblique view. Ms. Gutterman stated that one of the drawings shows that the deck is visible from 65 feet and she does not know what that means for visibility as it will also be dependent on the size of the roof deck. She noted that the deck is shown as 24 feet and it may need to be reduced to 15 feet so it is not so far over the roof ridge. Ms. Gutterman added that she understands the desire for the deck but she is concerned about the visibility from the street and the precedent.
- Mr. Detweiler stated that in looking at other roof decks on the street it does not seem that there are any that are that close except for one at the corner of 20<sup>th</sup> and Delancey. He continued that the proximity to the street is typically greater.
  - Mr. Claytor responded that on Drawing A3 they show a section with sight lines to illustrate that it is not possible to see it from the street.
  - Ms. Gutterman replied that the study shows it in front of the house. She pointed out that the concern was from the east or west and right now she does not have a comfort level that it would be inconspicuous if not invisible.
  - Mr. Claytor responded to clarify that the dashed line they drew on A3 shows what would happen if Delancey Street happened to be 65 feet wide.
  - Ms. Gutterman stated again that her concern was east and west of the property.
  - Mr. Claytor pointed out that the house is set in from the street corner and there are taller and larger pilot houses on Delancey Street.
  - Ms. Gutterman contended that it is not only the pilot house that is the concern, but it is also the deck.
  - Ms. Stein stated that one could pull the deck farther back from Delancey Street or one construct a mock up to demonstrate the visibility. The staff can review a mock up and, if it is visible, the deck would need to be pushed back.
  - Mr. Claytor responded that when they did their study, they physically had a person stand on the roof and that person was not visible. He added that they walked to the end of the block on Delancey Street and still could not see the person on the roof.
  - Mr. McCoubrey added that they are always concerned about the oblique views.



- Mr. Cluver inquired about the elevator extension. He noted that it is shown clad in the slate same as the rest of the mansard.
  - Mr. Claytor replied that they agree with the staff's recommendation to change that material and noted that they had updated the design. He showed the Committee the updated drawing noting that the slate remained on the mansard and the upper material on the elevator extension matched the rest of the pilot house.
  - Ms. Mehley stated that the updated version of the design was not received by the staff prior to the meeting.
  - Mr. Claytor noted that the revised design responds to the staff's recommendation to maintain the existing roofline at the top of mansard and use a different cladding material for the extension of the elevator shaft and pilot house. He noted that the slate had been replaced with a paneling system.
  - Ms. Stein asked that Mr. Claytor distribute copies of the revised design to the Committee members and provide a copy to staff.
  - Ms. Pentz inquired about the elevator extension with the slate at the mansard level.
  - Mr. Claytor responded that the portion of the elevator tower adjacent to the historic mansard roof already exists. He stated that this was part of project that was approved a few years earlier.
- Ms. Mehley stated that she provided the staff recommendations to the applicant in advance of the Committee meeting and that the applicant went ahead and responded to recommendations. She pointed out that the applicant has revised the design and this is the version that is now being passed around the table and shown to the Committee.
- Mr. Cluver stated that, in looking at the revised drawing, he noted there is the band of glass, the panel beneath it, and another band before you get to the slate mansard.
  - Mr. Claytor responded that it is due to the slight pitch of the roof.
  - Mr. Cluver inquired if the lower band is part of the new construction.
  - Mr. Claytor confirmed that this is correct.
  - Mr. Cluver asked why they did not keep wrapping that around and then have a taller panel on the Cypress Street side. He pointed out that the stacked panel of the same size is a little odd.
  - Mr. Claytor confirmed that they can but the elevator is its own extended element. He added that, if this is the staff recommendation, he noted that he does not have a preference either way.
  - Mr. Cluver remarked that the Committee cannot quite conceive of the last-minute change. He added that the general direction is the right one but it is an incomplete thought.
  - Mr. McCoubrey stated that they would like to see the design applied to the other elevations and drawings, so they could see how the paneling wraps around.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the notes say on the plan to extend the chimney on the Delancey Street side. He continued that it is not shown as extended much. He inquired how much extension is going to be needed on the chimney.
  - Mr. Claytor replied they only needed to extend it enough to meet code which is approximately one or two courses of brick.
  - Mr. Cluver asked if the drawing represents what Mr. Clayton believes is required by code.

- Mr. Claytor confirmed that this is correct.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he is curious about the concept of someone standing next to that chimney with the chimney opening below them.
- Mr. Claytor responded that it is a non-functioning chimney. He added that they did not want to create a lower area where someone could climb over.
- Mr. Cluver noted that they are extending the chimney to create part of the guard rather than a functioning chimney.
- Mr. Claytor confirmed that this is correct.
- Mr. Detweiler asked about the skirt wall and if there was any way to reduce the height of it. He inquired what was behind it.
  - Mr. Claytor replied that covers the change in the roof pitch.
  - Mr. McCoubrey stated that he thinks it should be pulled back from the edge of the mansard to align with the edge of the roof deck so there is a discontinuity and expression of the edge.
  - Mr. Claytor asked Mr. McCoubrey to confirm that he meant to recess the skirting back.
  - Mr. McCoubrey confirmed this.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the only access to the spiral stair is from the third floor.
  - Mr. Claytor confirmed that this is correct.
  - Mr. Cluver asked about the bath shown on Drawing 406 that has a landing out of it. He inquired if it just coincidentally has an emergency exit kind of landing and it is not intended to lower the window sill or anything like that.
  - Mr. Claytor stated there was no change to the window sill or exterior detail outside of this bathroom.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Laurie Phillips stated she wished to clarify that there are other decks on the main roof on this block of Delancey Street. She added that she specifically knows of one at 2014 Delancey Street.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The deck is proposed for the main roof with an approximately eight-foot setback from Delancey Street.
- The deck and pilot house will be constructed on top of a low-pitch roof.
- The deck and railing may be visible from the public-right-of-way east and west of the building.
- The detailing of the skirt wall and elevator extension at the rear of the building should be further refined.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The revised design presented at the meeting maintains the historic rear roofline and the proportions of the mansard roof, meeting Standard 2.
- Construction of the roof deck and extension will not alter historic roofline. The revised design shows that new construction will be differentiated in material from the slate of the mansard, meeting Standard 9.
- The proposed deck does not permanently alter the historic roof and the proposed new construction could be removed in the future, meeting Standard 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee offered its recommendation in two separate motions. First, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of all aspects of the application except the glass railing, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, with the following provisions:

- the roofline of the mansard stays intact;
- the extension for the elevator and the pilot house are clad in different materials;
- all mechanical equipment is located where it is shown in drawings;
- the extension of the chimney in the front will be as shown in drawings and not taller; and,
- the staff confirms that roof deck railing is not visible from the public right-of-way;

<b>ITEM: 2035 DELANCEY PL</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	7				

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** Second, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of glass railing, pursuant to Standard 9.

<b>ITEM: 2035 DELANCEY PL</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial of glass railing</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: 1416 DIAMOND ST**

Proposal: Demolish front façade, the only remaining portion of the building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Temple University Commonwealth System of Higher Education

Applicant: John Higgins, Higgins Consulting Service

History: 1886, John M. Sharp, builder

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

The building at 1416 Diamond Street was originally one of five three-story houses with brownstone façades comprising a row. Currently, only the front façade of the building is standing. Everything behind the front façade has been demolished. The rear of the building was demolished with a permit in 1996. The original application for that permit requested permission to demolish the entire building. However, the Historical Commission only approved the demolition of the rear ell. The 1996 building permit indicated that the south wall would be rebuilt with cinder block and that no alterations would be made to the front façade. Aerial photographs show that the main block of the building was sealed until about 2010, when it appears that the rear wall and rear roof of the main block partially collapsed. Subsequently, the remainder of the building except the front façade was demolished. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the facade imminently dangerous on 30 August 2019. The applicant is now applying to demolish the front façade owing to its dangerous condition. The property owner is Temple University, which claims that, as a state entity, it is not subject to local building permit requirements.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Demolition of front masonry facade.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.*
  - The application implies that the issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest to abate the imminently dangerous condition. However, the application does not address the feasibility of abating the dangerous condition by repair. Temple University has owned the property since 1970 and has, apparently, failed to maintain the building in good repair, as required by the preservation ordinance.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 NOVEMBER 2019**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:43:13**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Tom McCreesh and John Higgins of Temple University represented the application to the Architectural Committee.

**DISCUSSION:**

- The Committee asked if Temple University was the owner of the property throughout the period of the building's history that was presented in the staff's overview.
  - Ms. Schmitt responded that her understanding was that Temple University has owned the property since the 1970s.
- The Committee asked if there was a reason that the rebuilding of the south wall as approved by the 1996 permit application was not carried out.
  - Ms. Schmitt responded that there was no information in the file that explained the reason the work had not been completed in 1996 and asked if the applicants had anything to add.
  - Mr. McCreesh explained that unfortunately their files did not provide any further information. He also informed the Committee that he started working at Temple University in 2005, after the 1996 application.
  - Mr. McCreesh remarked that it was also his understanding that Temple University had owned the subject property since the 1970s. He stated that a rowhouse like the subject property did not fit into the university's mission, despite owning it for several decades.
  - Mr. McCreesh explained that the building partially collapsed in 1995, and the property owners applied for a permit to remove the collapsed portion of the back and rebuild it. He confirmed that the back of the building was rebuilt, as specified in the 1996 building permit application. Mr. McCreesh said that there was another collapse at the building in 2010, at which time it was determined that the structure could not be rebuilt.
  - Mr. McCreesh explained that since 2008, Temple University receives all construction permits from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and therefore the City of Philadelphia's Department of Licenses and Inspections does not have jurisdiction over any demolition or new construction at the subject property. He said that in 2010, Temple University applied for and received a demolition permit from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and took down the remaining structure with the exception of the still-standing front wall.
  - Mr. McCreesh informed the Architectural Committee members that he could not comment on any of the maintenance that had been performed to the building between 2010 and the present but that it was his understanding that the building had been parged and sealed tightly. He stated that, upon receiving notification from the Department of Licenses and Inspections that the building had been declared Imminently Dangerous, Temple University hired an engineer to prepare a conditions assessment, which was provided as part of this current application. Mr. McCreesh said that the report determined that the existing remnants of the building could not be salvaged and what was left of the façade needed to be demolished and the entire building would need to be rebuilt.

- Mr. D'Alessandro responded that he did not agree that the remaining fabric needed to be demolished. He reminded the applicant that Temple University had previously applied to demolish Baptist Temple, the Historical Commission denied the application, and now the building stands as one of the finest structures on the campus.
  - The applicant agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro regarding the Baptist Temple.
- Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that when Temple University wanted to demolish a row of buildings now referred to as 1810 Liacouras Walk, it had been determined that the facades of the row could be retained. He said that in this case he saw no reason why the subject property could not be restored.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if Temple University owned the buildings on either side of the subject property.
  - The applicant responded that Temple University does not own either of the adjacent properties.
- Mr. McCreesh suggested that the Architectural Committee consider Temple University's proposal to demolish the existing front façade but with the condition that the building be constructed with a historical façade within two years by the current owner or any future owner. Mr. McCreesh commented that the conditions assessment found that the existing brick does not have the compression strength required to hold itself up.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that different techniques could be used to support the masonry that remained.
  - Mr. McCreesh replied that he agreed that there could be some way to retain the existing fabric but he believed that the property owner wanted to take down the remaining façade. He again offered that Temple University would agree to the demolition with the condition that any new construction on the site be done to replicate the historic structure, as approved by the Historical Commission
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the extant fabric had already been laser scanned or otherwise documented by the property owner so that reconstruction could be accurately undertaken.
  - Mr. McCreesh replied that no laser scanning had been done to his knowledge, but it was something the property owner could certainly explore.
- Ms. Pentz said that she agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro's comments, but she also took the conditions assessment report seriously, which found the back-up brick to be in very poor condition. She suggested that the applicant make efforts to rebuild the back-up brick and stabilize what is left of the façade. Ms. Pentz also stated that characterizing the front as delaminating was completely different than saying the structure is not stable. She added that the fabric that remains on the site needed a building behind it to be stabilized. However, based on the current condition of the back-up brick, this material had been exposed to the elements for a long time.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that testing that had been conducted in preparation of the reports submitted by the applicant had used a standard for face bricks. However, what remains on site are not face bricks and never have been face bricks.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that he did not look favorably on the proposal to rebuild the original structure at some point in the future. He noted that, despite past approvals for various partial demolition and stabilization scopes, something was not working to have allowed the building to end up in its current state. Mr. Detwiler told the applicant that the Department of Licenses and Inspections determination of Imminently

Dangerous did not mean that a building had to be torn down, but rather the dangerous conditions must be remedied and repaired.

- Based on the current condition of the remaining masonry façade, Mr. Cluver questioned at what point would there be no more original fabric left. He agreed with Mr. Detwiler that it was unlikely that the building would ever be rebuilt if the owner's demolition application was approved. Mr. Cluver also noted that the building was an important piece of an intact row, so its presence in some form was important to the overall historic district. He added that, given the amount of fabric lost, he could be convinced that a reconstruction of the front façade could be appropriate, but he was concerned with the applicant's vague timing of such a proposal.
- Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. Cluver, adding that the accurate reconstruction of the historic façade would be required as part of the demolition approval. She stated that an open-ended promise to reconstruct the building at an unknown future date was unacceptable in her opinion and Temple University's failure to maintain the subject property was not a reason to demolish it.
  - The applicant stated that he had no response to Ms. Gutterman's comments but that he did not disagree with her premise. He informed the Architectural Committee that as a result of this situation, the owner had instituted a comprehensive review of their real estate portfolio to confirm the current conditions of their other unoccupied buildings. Mr. McCreesh said that Temple University had also asked him to review the status of all of their buildings listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
  - Mr. McCreesh said that while the owner planned to make these changes going forward, Temple University was of the opinion that the subject property was too far deteriorated and beyond saving. He reiterated the owner's willingness to subject a demolition approval on the condition that the historic building be reconstructed at some time in the future.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the conditions assessments discussed the condition of the brick but did not address the condition of the brownstone. He said that based on the photographs, the damage to the brownstone appeared quite deep.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building's deteriorated condition has occurred during Temple University's ownership, which dates back to the 1970s.
- Despite several previous approvals to stabilize it, significant portions of the building have been demolished. Over the years little to no effort has been made to protect the extant historic fabric.
- The application does not provide sufficient data to justify the demolition of the remaining masonry façade.
- The applicant's proposal to allow the demolition of the existing masonry façade on the condition that an accurate reconstruction be undertaken by either the current owner or a future owner is not acceptable.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposal does not comply with Section 14-1005(6)(d) because it fails to demonstrate how the demolition of the remaining masonry façade is in the public interest.
- The applicants have not demonstrated that the existing masonry façade cannot be reasonably adapted, that the sale is impracticable, or that all other potential uses of the property have been foreclosed upon.

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

<b>ITEM: 1416 DIAMOND ST</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</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	7				

**ADDRESS: 2200 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Construct rear deck; install windows and doors at rear bay

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jay and Stella Ludwig

Applicant: Alfred Dragani, Dragani Martone Studio LLP

History: c. 1877

Individual Designation: 9/12/1974

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

The four-story building at 2200 Delancey Place is situated at the corner of 22<sup>nd</sup> Street and Delancey Place. The building has been modified over time, with a number of alterations to the two-story rear bay, including the infilling of openings and stuccoing of the façade. A brick, one-story carport was constructed in the rear yard around 1979. The application proposes to reopen the first-floor openings in the stuccoed rear bay and install casement windows and a door, and to construct a deck on top of the carport, which is currently open to the sky.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct rear deck with ipe railings over existing carport.
- Install wood windows and doors at rear bay.

**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 deck would be located over a non-original carport. Though Ipe railings are proposed for privacy, the deck would not obscure original features of the building. The rear bay has been significantly altered over time, and this application proposes to reopen several infilled openings below existing transom windows at the first story. A large wood casement window would also be installed at the center of the bay. The application complies with this standard.

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 00:59:37

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Alfred Dragani represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Pentz asked for clarification regarding the locations of the mechanical units, noting that the drawing states that they would be located on the main roof.
  - Mr. Dragani responded that they would be moved to the rooftop mechanical space dedicated to condensing units. He noted that the equipment consists of two small condensing units.
  - Mr. McCoubrey observed that an enclosure currently exists on the mansard.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the railing could be more open.
  - Mr. Dragani answered that two factors are driving the design and that the first priority for the owners is privacy. He stated that the owners would like to utilize the space without being on display, since the deck is highly visible from 22<sup>nd</sup> Street. He explained that he tried to create a simple and austere expression of the railing in deference to the existing house. He added that the railing would be durable and would not weather poorly over time, noting that it consists of robust 4 x 4 posts.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether a masonry rail was considered.
  - Mr. Dragani replied that he had not considered masonry and clarified there would be complications in extending the existing masonry wall. The proposed railing, he continued, would be tucked behind the parapet.
  - Ms. Gutterman contended that the railing would be highly visible and that extending the masonry wall would appear as if it had been there for a while.
  - Mr. Cluver countered that he preferred a material other than the brick to allow the thickness of the brick to show itself. He added that the solidness of the railing will give it a cleaner appearance from the street.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired whether the existing brick wall had a cap.
  - Mr. Dragani responded that the top course is a rowlock.
- Mr. Detwiler requested clarification on some of the railing details, such as the spacing of the rails, adding that details should be provided to the Historical Commission.

- Mr. Dragani stated that he would include those details before the Historical Commission's meeting.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the head of the door would match the height of the existing transom.
  - Mr. Dragani affirmed that they would match.
- Mr. Cluver stated that, short of having a metal picket railing, the deck is as unobtrusive as it gets. He reiterated that he prefers the solidity of the proposed railing, adding that he agrees with the staff that the impact on the historic building is minimal.
  - Other Committee members agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey requested that the color of the stucco be neutral.
  - Mr. Dragani explained that the photograph does not represent the actual color, which is ochre. The stucco, he confirmed, would be neutral.
- Ms. Stein inquired whether the 4 x 4 posts would be ipe.
  - Mr. Dragani answered that the posts would be pressure treated wood with a finished face, though he suggested that he could change the design to include a solid ipe post. He further clarified that the posts adjacent to the house and at the southeast corner would be clad in ipe.
  - Ms. Stein emphasized the importance of not having any pressure treated wood visible from the street. She requested that any visible posts be covered in ipe or constructed of ipe.
  - Mr. Dragani agreed, adding that he would clarify the details for the Commission meeting.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the post would be anchored to the parapet wall.
  - Mr. Dragani affirmed that it would be anchored to the inside face of the parapet.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The deck would be constructed above a non-historic carport.
- The new openings in the rear bay would match the height of the existing transoms.
- The structural supports would be anchored to the inside face of the existing brick parapet.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed deck would not obstruct any historic fabric, satisfying Standard 9.
- The openings would extend to the height of the existing transoms to match the relative dimensions of the original windows.

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

- the vertical deck posts should be fabricated in or clad with ipe, not pressure-treated lumber;
- the new openings in the rear bay should match the height of the existing transoms; and
- details needed to convey the design intent of the deck system should be provided to the Historical Commission.

<b>ITEM: 2200 DELANCEY PL</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval, with conditions</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</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: 1432 DIAMOND ST**

Proposal: Rebuild demolished rear ell with addition  
 Review Requested: Final Approval  
 Owner: Lopsonzski 1432 W Diamond  
 Applicant: Shae Morong, Plato Studio Architect LLC  
 History: 1886; John M. Sharp, builder  
 Individual Designation: None  
 District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Contributing, 1/29/1986  
 Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**BACKGROUND:**

The building at 1432 Diamond Street comprises one half of a twin and is part of three identical twins on the south side of Diamond Street. The side and rear elevations are highly visible from N. 15<sup>th</sup> Street, owing to an adjacent vacant lot to the west where another twin historically stood. In June 2019, the staff of the Historical Commission approved a building permit for interior alterations. Work to the building began once the permit was issued in early July. During the interior work, part of the side façade of the rear ell collapsed. In August 2019, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building imminently dangerous and abated the dangerous condition by demolishing the rear ell. At this time, only a one-story portion of the ell’s rear wall remains standing, and the rear of the main block where the ell was attached is open to the elements.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct three-story brick addition in place of demolished rear ell.

**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.*
  - Although the proposed three-story rear ell would be clad in brick to match the now-demolished structure, the new ell would include a significant addition at the

rear that would extend the building beyond its neighbors. The proposed ell would also not replicate the original bay of the rear wall, an extant feature of all other buildings in the row. The application does not comply with this standard.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the application as proposed, but approval of the reconstruction of a rear ell that more accurately replicates the appearance and dimensions of the historic ell, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:12:05**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Plato Marinakos and Danielle Redenbaugh, property manager of Off-Campus Philly, represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Redenbaugh asked to read a statement from the property owner, Michael Lopsonzski, into the record:

“We will happily reproduce the rear bay and all details of the original building. We will use bricks that match the original facade (not sheets of faux brick veneer). We will bend over backwards to satisfy the Historical Commission. I value history and preservation. I am an avid antique collector and live in an historical home.

My only request, which is crucial for me, is this: I need the length of the proposed building to be granted. I will rebuild the building to look completely original, and it will be just a bit longer. If this request is denied, it will cause me massive financial harm. I believe my request is fair and reasonable. I will make the Commission very pleased with the reconstruction, but I will not get the financing I need to repair this building without it being slightly longer. I will not get the financing without this permission.

I ask that you please approve this and I can get the work started as soon as possible.

Many Thanks,  
Mike Lopsonzski, owner”

- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to clarify what they mean by “slightly longer” in reference to the length of the addition.
  - Mr. Marinakos answered that approximately 21 feet would be added to the length of the building. He argued that the lot is very deep.
  - Ms. Gutterman countered that a 21-foot addition is not considered “slightly longer.”
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the original ell was the same dimension as the adjoining ell to the east.
  - Mr. Marinakos affirmed that they are the same.
- Ms. Keller added that the buildings of the row all retain their original rear bays, and that design detail was not included in the application.
  - Mr. Marinakos replied that he would be happy to add the bay to match the original.

- Mr. Detwiler referred to the zoning plan, and inquired about the zoning requirements and whether the bay would extend beyond the proposed 21-foot addition, or if the rear wall of the addition would be brought in to accommodate the bay.
  - Mr. Marinakos stated that the addition would need to conform with the open space requirements, so the bay would need to be placed no further than the rear wall of the current proposal.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the addition shows three windows, which is what the historic ell had, but he argued that the ratio of brick to window is now different. He commented that it was difficult to understand how long the addition was, because the drawings are not clearly annotated.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the full length of the rear ell is identified as 51 feet, but there is no dimension to identify the length of the addition in the drawings.
- Ms. Stein asked to clarify the sequence of events leading up to this application: that the building was in renovation without an addition; during construction somehow the ell collapsed; and that the applicant is now requesting to reconstruct the original ell with a 21-foot extension.
  - Mr. Marinakos confirmed that Ms. Stein's summary is correct.
  - Ms. Stein further asked Mr. Marinakos to clarify whether at the time of construction, the renovation was being done to the existing ell with no addition.
  - Mr. Marinakos affirmed that there was no addition at that time.
  - Ms. Keller clarified that the renovations were permitted for the interior only.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the applicant was digging out the basement to make it deeper.
  - Mr. Marinakos replied that he was the architect and was not part of the construction team, adding that he is unsure of what exactly led to the collapse.
- Ms. Pentz commented that the drawings either call for underpinning or state that the rear has been underpinned but that it is unclear. She asked whether the building has been underpinned.
  - Mr. Marinakos answered that he is unsure, adding that a structural engineer could be asked about the underpinning. He stated that he was not part of that discussion.
- Mr. D'Alessandro observed that, from the photographs, it appears that the basement was in the process of being excavated, which caused the foundation to become unstable, leading to the collapse.
  - Ms. Keller replied that the staff's understanding is that excavation of the basement resulted in the collapse.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro noted that there is no structural report.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the building has been made weather tight.
  - Mr. Marinakos answered that he did not believe that it is weather tight and that the rear is currently open. Ms. Redenbaugh agreed.
  - Ms. Keller commented that the photograph included in the application shows the rear exposed and that she believes that is the current condition.
- Mr. Marinakos again discussed the feasibility of reconstructing the bay at the rear wall of the addition, stating that without a zoning variance the length of the addition would need to be reduced slightly to allow for the bay. He added that the owner wants to locate two bedrooms within the rear space.

- Ms. Gutterman responded that it was not part of the original design that was approved and somehow there was financing for that project, though she added that financing is beyond the Committee's purview. The fact that the building collapsed, she continued, is somewhat coincidental, but it does not mean that one should lose history because of it.
- Mr. Marinakos replied that he is trying to find some middle ground to satisfy the Historical Commission's requirements while getting additional length.
- Ms. Gutterman countered that Mr. Marinakos's proposal is not attempting to find middle ground but is favoring his client. She stated that the proper action is to reconstruct what was lost.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the ell's visibility.
  - Ms. Keller answered that there are two vacant lots adjacent to the building that cause the ell to be visible from 15<sup>th</sup> Street. Ms. Keller added that the rear of the building is visible, but there is no street or alley behind the row.
  - Ms. Gutterman commented that the property would be landlocked if there were a building on one of the vacant lots.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the remainder of the building is structurally stable.
  - Mr. Marinakos responded that according to the structural engineer, the rear ell could not be saved. He added that the City mandated the demolition of the ell.
  - Mr. Detwiler stated that his concern is that, in looking at a current photograph, one small column is holding the entire load of the building. He expressed additional concern over the building remaining exposed to the elements, noting that it is already late fall. He advocated for sealing the building immediately.
  - Mr. Marinakos stated that he could apply for a permit to weatherproof the remaining structure.
- Ms. Pentz remarked that it did not appear that underpinning had been done, adding that it badly needs to be done.
  - Mr. Marinakos replied that there was a separate permit for underpinning.
  - Ms. Keller noted that the staff signed off on an underpinning permit for the property on 17 October 2019, which was after the collapse and the demolition of the rear ell.
  - Ms. Gutterman asked whether there was an underpinning permit prior to the collapse.
  - Ms. Keller stated that there was no permit application for underpinning prior to the collapse.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the proposed ell would be higher than the original, noting that the original ell was slightly lower than the main block. He clarified that the applicant is adding height as well as depth.
  - Mr. Marinakos agreed that the ell would be the same height as the main block.
- **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- While a permit for interior renovations had been issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections, it appears from the photographs provided that the

basement was excavated, which resulted in the structural instability of the ell and its partial collapse in July 2019.

- The Department of Licenses and Inspections inspected the property and cited the partially collapsed ell for being imminently dangerous. The Department intervened and demolished the ell in August 2019 to abate the dangerous condition.
- The proposed addition would extend the ell 21 feet beyond the adjacent buildings in the row.
- The original ell was lower than the main block and featured a second-story bay on the rear wall. The proposed ell would extend to the full height of the main block and would not include the rear bay.
- To date, the rear wall of the main block remains exposed to the elements, because it has not been sealed.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition does not accurately replicate the dimensions or detailing of the original ell. The application does not meet Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as proposed, but approval of the reconstruction of a rear ell that more accurately replicates the appearance and dimensions of the historic ell, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following suggestions:

- a structural engineer should inspect the building to ensure that the main block is structurally sound; and
- the building should be weatherized immediately.

<b>ITEM: 1432 DIAMOND ST</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial as presented; approval of reconstruction</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</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	7				

**ADDRESS: 1613 W GIRARD AVE**

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: MN Realty LLC

Applicant: Gregory Schaub, Quaker City Consulting LLC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 5/28/1968

District Designation: None

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

**BACKGROUND:**

The current applicant obtained a building permit for interior work to this rowhouse in August 2018. While undertaking that work, a portion of a chimney was removed and a section of the side wall of the rear ell collapsed. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the rear ell Imminently Dangerous. The Historical Commission's staff approved the demolition of the rear ell, provided it was reconstructed to its historic form within 12 months. The applicant now proposes to remove the requirement to reconstruct and proposes instead to construct an addition that does not match the original. The rear ell of the building is visible from a public service alley. The proposed addition would be clad with siding rather than brick. It would be somewhat taller than the original and would not have a slope to the roof of the rear ell like the original. It would have two windows per floor of the rear façade rather than the one of the original. On the front façade, the proposal calls for installation of windows and a door. The proposed one-over-one aluminum clad windows do not replicate the original two-over-two wood windows. The proposed door matches the existing door but does not match the original door.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Rebuild demolished rear ell with addition.
- Install new windows and door at front façade.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

*Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*

- The proposed addition does not match the original in form and materials.
- The proposed door and windows does not match the originals in form and materials.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:25:46

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- The Committee asked the applicant why he was not following the plan that was originally approved.



- The applicants responded that he has supplied an engineering report that concludes that the original brick is not salvageable.
- The Committee asked why the new roof on the ell is so high and does not follow the original sloped shape.
  - The applicant responded that he is trying to get headroom of at least eight feet, six inches at the top floor. He is willing to work with staff to reintroduce the sloped roof and minimize the roof height so long as he can keep his proposed ceiling height.
- Committee members asked why he is proposing siding for the rear ell. They opined that this is highly inappropriate for this structure and that brick is the most appropriate cladding material.
  - The applicant responded that he is trying to save the client money and stucco has problems with cracking. He is willing, however, to install a panelized system on the side wall and brick on the back of the rear ell.
- The Committee asked if the applicant could restore the front façade with wood windows and a door to match the historic photograph.
  - The applicants responded that he thinks that the owner would be willing to agree to that.
- The Committee agreed to the idea of two windows on the rear façade as long as the bay is restored to its original design at the second floor.
  - The applicant responded that he could revise the drawings in consultation with staff.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed rear roof and parapet do not match the original design.
- The proposed front windows and door do not match the original design in material or shape.
- The proposed clapboard siding is highly incongruous with the original brick design.
- The rear ell is visible from a public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not meet the Standards 6, which mandates replacing damaged historic materials with those that match the original in design and materials.
- The Committee would recommend approval of a revised design that rebuilds the rear ell to match the original in every way but height, with the following provisions:
  - The rear ell could have a panelized side wall;
  - The rear ell must have a brick rear wall that returns at least one foot onto the side;
  - The rear ell roof can be raised, but only the minimum to allow for an eight-foot, six-inch ceiling;
  - The rear ell roof must have a sloped roof to mimic the original;
  - The rear wall of the rear ell may have two windows on the third floor but must have a restored bay;
  - The front façade should be restored with wood windows and a door to match the original configuration based on the historic photograph.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval of a revised application as outlined, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

<b>ITEM: 1613 W GIRARD AVE</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial as proposed, but approval if revised as outlined</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Nan Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Rudy 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	7				

**ADDRESS: 231 REED ST**

Proposal: Construct addition  
 Review Requested: Review In Concept  
 Owner: Christopher Columbus Charter School  
 Applicant: Robert O'Donnell, O'Donnell Stacey  
 History: 1893; Sacred Heart of Jesus Parochial School; William P. Regan, architect  
 Individual Designation: 1/1/3000  
 District Designation: None  
 Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**BACKGROUND:**

This in-concept application proposes to construct an addition to the former Sacred Heart of Jesus Parochial School. The property has been nominated for designation and is under consideration for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The review of the nomination is scheduled for the 13 November 2019 Committee on Historic Designation meeting, and the 13 December 2019 Historical Commission meeting. The applicant seeks an in-concept review by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission so that the property owner, Christopher Columbus Charter School, will have reasonable expectations regarding its expansion plans, should the Historical Commission designate the property. The plans for the addition were developed in 2013, and the charter school has been awaiting approval of the Philadelphia School District to proceed with the school.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Construct addition at side and rear of building.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the*

*property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*

- The proposed addition is connected to the historic building at the side and rear via a glass connector, allowing for retention and visibility from the public right-of-way of the original exterior walls. The new addition is differentiated from the old and is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing.
- *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 addition could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval in-concept, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the extensive plans for the development of the property already in place at the time the Historical Commission sent the notice of the nomination.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:44:10

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Robert O'Donnell and architect Jamie Ober represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Chantry informed the Committee that the property is nominated for designation but is not yet designated.
- Ms. Ober explained that the east and north walls will become interior walls, enclosed by the new glass atrium, and that the east wall would be retained, and the north wall would have its later additions removed. She stated that the west elevation, considered to be the front of the historic building, will be restored.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the return where the glass addition meets the historic building.
  - Ms. Ober responded that there is a setback where the glass meets the historic building.
  - Mr. Detwiler suggested that the glass be set back to an extent that allows the historic building to turn the corner.
  - Ms. Gutterman suggested that the setback be one foot at a minimum.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the new canopy on Reed Street should be held to the new addition and not touch the historic building.
- Mr. Cluver asked if there is an independent structure where the addition meets the historic building.
  - Ms. Ober confirmed this, and stated that she can provide a drawing to show this as part of the application submitted for final review.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the materials of the addition.
  - Ms. Ober responded that a glass atrium attaches to the historic building, and the addition is brick at the first floor and cementitious board on the upper floors. She explained that the architectural drawings are more up-to-date than the renderings.

- The Committee suggested that the renderings be updated as needed to reflect the more updated architectural drawings.
  - The applicants responded that this will be done for the application submitted for final approval.
- Mr. Cluver asked about retention of windows in the new atrium space.
  - Ms. Ober responded that many existing windows are infilled to various degrees, but that the majority of the window openings will remain, and new windows will be installed in the existing openings. She explained that many of the existing windows and frames are deteriorated and will require replacement.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the applicant consider repair instead of replacement.
  - Ms. Chantry suggested that window repair or replacement could be part of the application submitted for final review.
  - Mr. Cluver cautioned that there may be reasons such as light, acoustics, fire separation and other code restrictions to consider as it relates to retaining the windows in the new atrium space.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the recess of the addition at the first floor on Reed Street.
  - Ms. Ober confirmed the setback, and explained that there is an overhang of the second floor to allow for a recessed entry at grade so that it is fully accessible.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the location of mechanical equipment.
  - Ms. Ober responded that rooftop units will be limited to the far corner of the addition.
  - Mr. Detwiler asked that the mechanical equipment be shown in elevation.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the historic iron fence should be retained.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that any changes to the historic masonry walls, such as new door openings, should be called out in the drawings.
  - Ms. Ober responded that the existing building is not ADA-compliant, and a new entry will be cut into the existing east wall to allow for egress.
- Mr. Cluver and Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is a fine approach to an expansion of the school, and that the details should be clarified in the application submitted for final review.
- The Committee commented that the requested details and clarifications should be part of the application submitted for final approval, rather than required edits for this in-concept application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property has been nominated for designation and is under consideration for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
- The plans for the addition were developed in 2013, long before the Historical Commission had any jurisdiction over the property.
- An application requesting final approval must be submitted to the Historical Commission before a building permit can be issued. It should include details not included in the current in-concept application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition is connected to the historic building at the side and rear via a glass connector, allowing for retention and visibility from the public right-of-way of the original exterior walls. The new addition is differentiated from the old and is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing, satisfying Standard 9.
- The addition could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.
- The proposed work satisfies Standards 9 and 10 and can stand on its own without invoking the so-called “transition rule.”
- The following information should be included in the application for final approval:
  - The work to the existing windows on the north and east facades should be clarified.
  - The structure to support the addition should be shown.
  - The orthogonal drawings and the renderings should be reconciled to show the same scope.
  - The canopy over the new entrance should not extend onto the existing building.
  - The existing masonry should be cleaned and repointed.
  - The new mechanical equipment should be on the roof of the new addition.
  - The historic fabric at the site such as the iron railing should be retained.
  - Any alterations to existing masonry walls should be indicated.
  - Work related to the existing building should be indicated on the drawings.
  - Where the glass walls meets the existing building, there should be a setback of at least one foot between the face of the existing building and the glass.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

<b>ITEM: 231 REED ST</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval in-concept</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	7				

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

**PLEASE NOTE:**

- Minutes of the Architectural Committee are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, [www.phila.gov/historical](http://www.phila.gov/historical).

DRAFT