

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

**TUESDAY, 25 FEBRUARY 2020
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:25

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

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

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
- James Connors, SGRA
- Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects
- Robert Kramer, Society Hill Civic Association
- Jackie Gusic, InHabit LLC
- Alexandra Kaye, Penn Law
- Jennifer Robinson, Preservation Alliance
- Mary M. Kistler
- Ray Rola, Ray Rola Architects
- Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
- Kathy Dowdell
- Gerry Gutierrez, Group G
- Carolyn Crego
- Lavi Shenkman
- Jack Burns, JBA
- Kirsten Kimberg

Charles Harb
Michelle Kleschsich
German Yakubov, Haverford Square Designs LLC
Mary MacLeod

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 737 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct six-story building with penthouse and decks
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Sarah Investment LLC
Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.
History: 1955
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a six-story plus penthouse mixed-use building on the site of a non-contributing building in the Society Hill Historic District. The staff of the Historical Commission approved the demolition of the non-contributing building in October 2019. The north side of the block, where this site is situated, consists entirely of three and four-story historic buildings clad in red brick, brownstone, stucco, and other masonry. The proposed building's façade on Walnut Street features large industrial-style windows and metal panels. The east and west party walls, which would rise three stories higher than the adjacent historic buildings, would be clad in patterned Hardie Board panels.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six-story mixed-use building with commercial ground floor and set-back seventh floor 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 shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportions and massing to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed building is differentiated from the old, but is incompatible with the historic context of this block and the historic district in terms of materials, features, size, scale, proportions, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Stuart Rosenberg and James Carver represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Baron noted that this row of buildings on Walnut Street along with those on Sansom Street represent the very beginning of rowhouse development in the City of Philadelphia. This row, constructed in 1799, survives basically intact. The scale of the row has also been largely preserved. He explained that he had met with the applicant and suggested that they honor the basic scale and design of the row even while building somewhat taller toward the back of the lot.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that there is a large variety of heights in nearby structures on Sansom and even across the street. He noted an eight-story building on Sansom Street.
- The Committee members noted that the Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over this site and asked that Mr. Rosenberg respect the cornice line above the third floor of the historic row on Walnut Street. They suggested that he set back any upper floors above that line and also reduce the overall height of the proposed building.
- The Committee members opined that the industrial aesthetic of the proposed building might be more appropriate for Old City. They asked that the applicant use red brick rather than metal panels on the facades and scale the windows based on the punched openings found on buildings in this row and in the Society Hill Historic District.
 - Mr. Rosenberg responded that community members seemed to prefer the industrial design but that he will adjust the design.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Robert Kramer of the Society Hill Civic Association said that his association does not support this design. He stated that the building looks too tall, particularly because of its narrow width. He said that he supports the staff recommendation and Architectural Committee's comments.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- the site is part of a significant streetscape;
- the proposed design is too tall;
- the proposed building elements are too large in scale; and,
- the proposed industrial windows and multicolor metal panels are not appropriate for the setting.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- the proposed building does not satisfy Standard 9 because of its inappropriately large massing, the inappropriate scale of its openings, its metal and glass industrial materials, and its lack of relationship to its streetscape environment.

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

ITEM: 737 Walnut St					
MOTION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.					
MOVED BY: Nan Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Amy Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 530 N 19TH ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Benjamin A. Horst and Denny R. Kwak
 Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects LLC
 History: 1859
 Individual Designation: None
 District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
 Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house on top of the main block of this twin house. An application proposing a roof deck and standard-height pilot house, in addition to other exterior alterations, was reviewed by the Historical Commission in January 2020. At that time, the Commission voted to approve most elements of the application, but deny the deck, pilot house, and deck railing, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9. This current application has been submitted in response, and proposes a pilot house that has been reduced in footprint and height, and a deck railing that has been set back from the north property line to the location that the staff has identified as “inconspicuous” from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install roof deck and low pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportions and massing to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed deck and low pilot house complies with Standard 9. The height of the pilot house has been reduced and the railing has been pulled back so that both are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

- *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 deck and pilot house would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and would not damage or obscure character-defining features.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:19:23

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gabriel Deck represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee members asked the applicant to explain how he had reduced the size of the stair house.
 - Mr. Deck explained that he had created a stair to a landing that was set in an open well in the roof. The well will be drained.
- Mr. Cluver asked why the deck rail extends forward of the stair house.
 - Mr. Deck explained that he wanted to provide a rail around the HVAC unit.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the deck rail could be made less visible if it was held behind the stair house, even if the deck was made wider to recover the missing space.
 - Mr. Deck said that he found that acceptable.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The reduced stair house would be inconspicuous
- The deck railing would be conspicuous.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Owing to its conspicuousness, the deck as proposed does not satisfy Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.
- If the deck rail and HVAC unit is moved behind the front face of the stair house, it would become sufficiently inconspicuous to meet the standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval of a wider deck provided the deck rail and HVAC unit are set back behind the front face of the stair house, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 530 N 19th St					
MOTION: Denial as proposed, but approval with revisions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 510 E WILDEY ST

Proposal: Demolish chimney; alter rear ell; construct addition
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Mary MacLeod
 Applicant: German Yakubov, Haverford Square Designs LLC
 History: 1855; William Cramp frame house
 Individual Designation: 2/28/1967
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The William Cramp frame house is part of a row of four mid-nineteenth-century frame buildings located on E. Wildey Street in Fishtown. Each building includes a two-story main block with a front-sloping half-gable roof and a two-story rear ell. At some point in the past, all four frame buildings were clad in stucco. The massing and form of the buildings largely remain intact, though the majority of the buildings have acquired one-story additions to their rear ells.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Level roof over two-story portion of rear ell;
- Demolish one-story rear addition;
- Construct two-story addition with balcony;
- Demolish chimney; and,
- Install windows.

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.*
 - This application proposes to level the roof over the two-story portion of the rear ell to create useable space at the interior. The roof currently peaks at the east where it attaches to the rear ell of 512 E. Wildey Street and slopes west. At the

lowest point, the interior height is currently 5-feet 7-inches. To achieve additional height at the interior, the roof would be demolished, and the east wall raised. The existing exterior east wall would remain. Most of the rear ell is not visible from the street. The work would alter the roofline but would maintain the existing fabric of the east wall and complies with this standard.

- The application further proposes to demolish the non-original one-story rear addition and to construct a two-story addition in its place. The proposed two-story addition complies with this standard.
- The chimney, located on the main block of the building, would be demolished. The removal of the chimney does not comply with this standard.
- New one-over-one double-hung windows would be installed at the front façade. Wood windows in the historic configuration should be installed to comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the removal of the chimney, but approval of the remaining work, provided that a material such as HardiePlank siding is used to clad the addition and that the front façade windows are an appropriate material and configuration, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:31:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- German Yakubov and owner Mary MacLeod represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked the applicant to explain the reasoning behind the chimney removal and inquired whether the removal is critical to the project.
 - Mr. Yakubov answered that he could revise the plans so that the chimney is removed at the interior but remains above the roofline.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the plan for the gable roof at the rear.
 - Mr. Yakubov explained that the roofline would be leveled. In its current state, he continued, the ceiling height at the peak reaches nearly 9-feet, but it slopes to 5-feet 7-inches at the other end. He noted that the owner is 6-feet tall and has been in the property for 20 years. He contended that the area has always been a dead space for her and asserted that he would like to change the slope of the rear roof by maintaining the height at the peak but introducing a ¼-inch slope.
- Ms. Stein stated that the drawings note that the construction would be entirely new.
 - Mr. Yakubov clarified that the building interior is in poor condition, originally being constructed of lumber, which has since deteriorated owing to water damage. He noted that the deteriorated wood would need to be replaced and reiterated that the rear roof slope would need to be changed so that the ceiling height would no longer be 5-feet 7-inches and would instead be 8-feet 8-inches. He contended that it would make the interior space much more usable while having the smallest impact on the building.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the rear ell is partly visible from the street and one can see the slope and how it relates to the adjacent property. He added that he understands the need and benefit of increasing the ceiling height but cautioned that one approval could cause other property owners to make similar requests.

- Mr. Yabukov responded that the adjacent street, Eyre Street, is a tiny street large enough for one car that has been closed off due to construction on I-95 and is rarely traveled. He contended that the view would mostly be obstructed and that the rear building in its current state is not functional, though it may have been functional for residents in the past.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Yakubov to clarify the balcony projection into the airspace between the two buildings.
 - Mr. Yakubov replied that the balcony projecting between the buildings will not be visible from a public right-of-way.
- Mr. Detwiler contended that in changing the slope of the rear portion of the building, the applicant would be altering a character-defining feature of the four rowhouses. He referenced the aerial photograph in the application showing the rears of the properties, stating that the configuration of all four buildings is so intact, though he acknowledged that the houses are very small.
 - Mr. Yakubov argued that, because they are tiny, only one of the four is occupied, which is the one farthest from Eyre Street. He noted that the owner of 508 E. Wildey Street lives across the street and uses the building as a storage shed. The adjacent building at the corner, he continued, is in horrible condition and its owner also uses it as storage. He asserted that while the buildings may appear to have great character, they will not last without a use beyond a storage unit. He commented that the owner of 508 E. Wildey Street would follow a similar path if the Historical Commission approves this application to make the building at 510 E. Wildey Street livable. Mr. Yakubov then noted that a gutter has been leaking water into the front of the building and is deteriorating the front façade. He further stated that the neighbor stuccoed his building because it was the most economical method of remedying the same problem, though he added that the buildings are rotting within.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether the entire rear wall of the main block would be removed.
 - The Committee and applicant discussed whether or not the wall still exists, and the Committee requested the inclusion of plans of the existing building in a revised application.
 - Mr. Yakubov stated that part of the wall may be identified as being demolished but that it would be replaced and would not change the height of the rear structure.
- Mr. Cluver asked how the balcony relates to the end of the neighbor's half gable roof.
 - Mr. Yakubov answered that the balcony would terminate at the property line.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that the plans do not show the relationship to the surrounding buildings and commented that they are difficult to understand. He then asked Mr. Yakubov to describe the relationship of the rear face of the balcony to the rear wall of the property at 512 E. Wildey Street.
 - Mr. Yakubov explained that the balcony will extend beyond the rear wall of the corner property.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that the projection would create a strong visual impact and questioned whether it provides much benefit.
 - Mr. Yakubov responded that the balcony could potentially be configured to project only at the alley side where it would not be visible, but there would not be any sun between the buildings.
- Ms. Stein asked how much of a rear yard would be retained.

- Mr. Yakubov responded that the rear yard would be nine feet deep, though without accounting for the balcony it would be 12 feet.
- Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification on whether the applicant would extend the building into the rear yard.
 - Mr. Yakubov explained that there is an existing one-story shed and that the addition would be constructed within the footprint of the shed.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the one-story addition would become a two-story addition that would then be an extension of the main house rather than maintaining a differentiation between the main house and addition. He suggested creating some kind of distinction between the addition and main house. He then inquired whether the side wall would be demolished.
 - Mr. Yakubov answered that it would be rebuilt, because the existing beams are rotted.

FAILED MOTION: The Architectural Committee failed to vote to recommend denial of the removal of the chimney, but approval of the remaining work, provided that a material such as HardiePlank siding is used to clad the addition and that the front façade windows are an appropriate material and configuration, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 510 E Wildey St					
FAILED MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: D'Alessandro					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey		X			
John Cluver		X			
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler		X			
Nan Gutterman		X			
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	2	4			1

- Mr. Cluver stated that his opposition to the proposed work stems largely from the visible balcony.
 - Mr. Yakubov asked what else could be done to the application to limit the impact while maintaining the usability of the structure.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that Mr. Yakubov would need to consider the roof slope and stated that she understands the desire for 8' ceilings but questioned the need for 8'-8" ceilings. She added that she is troubled by how flat the roof would be, though she acknowledged that it may not be possible to maintain that character-defining rear slope, since a 5'-7" ceiling height is not livable. She contended that too much of the building's historic fabric has been compromised to achieve livable space. She agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's earlier suggestion that the design should include some differentiation between the main block, the historic portion of the rear, and the proposed rear addition as a way to retain the defining features of the building.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the pitch of the roof is important relative to the main block and considered whether additional height could be achieved by raising the ridgeline

shared by 510 and 512 E. Wildey Street approximately two feet. He suggested that the roof slope would be maintained, and it would create usable space at the interior. He acknowledged that it would be reliant on the next door neighbor's cooperation.

- Mr. Yakubov asked whether an application proposing to raise the roofline of both properties but retaining the slope would be reviewed favorably.
- The Architectural Committee contended that there is a particular relationship between the height of the main block and height of the rear structure and discouraged the idea.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the interior height could be closer to 6'-8", which would still maintain the characteristic slope, but would offer some height.
- Mr. McCoubrey recommended that the addition have a different slope to distinguish it from the original structure.
- Mr. Yakubov responded that he appreciates the suggestion but questioned how one would perceive the differentiation with the flat-roofed addition in front of the historic structure when viewed from Eyre Street, which is the only point of visibility to the public.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the fundamental issue at hand is that, while the rears are predominantly invisible, they are still character-defining features. He referred to the buildings as four precious houses with their rear ells intact. He stated that the Committee is searching for a way to preserve the sense of the rear ell, while understanding that there may need to be some modification to make the space livable. He added that the goal is to ensure that the rear ell is still expressed in its volume and is differentiated from an addition.
- Ms. Gutterman asserted that the slope needs to be studied to find whether a lower height could work at the interior while maintaining more of a slope at the exterior.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The four frame buildings in the row have a main block and sloping rear ell; the volume of each building is character defining.
- The current interior height, at the lowest point, is only 5'-7".
- The application proposes to flatten the roof slope in order to create more livable interior space.
- A two-story addition would replace the existing one-story shed addition at the rear of the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work would cause the loss of significant historic fabric and would alter the slope of the roof without differentiating between the historic ell and new addition. The work does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 510 E Wildey St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
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: 229 ARCH ST

Proposal: Construct addition over parking lot
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Berger Development LP
 Applicant: Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Role, Architect
 History: 1913; Berger Brothers Company; Valentine B. Lee, architect; expanded, 1918
 Individual Designation: 1/6/1977
 District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003
 Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The building fronting 229 Arch Street, historically known as the Berger Building, was built in two sections. The first was constructed circa 1913 and the second circa 1918. A four-story addition was constructed at the rear of the building in 1990 connecting it to 124 Bread Street, historically known as the Johnson Warehouse, and 234 and 236 Cherry Street. All lots and buildings were consolidated in the early 1990s into a single tax parcel known today as 229 Arch Street.

This application proposes to construct a four-story addition over an existing parking lot at the rear of 229 Arch Street. The new construction will include three stories of residential living space over an open level of parking.

The new addition will connect to existing buildings at the north, south, and west elevations (see Image 2). It will cover the east wall of the 1990s addition and be connected internally. The east wall of the 1990s addition will not be demolished as part of this project. The new addition connects to the historic Berger Building and Johnson Warehouse to the north and south. These connections will be as party walls only, with no internal connections. The new addition will only be visible from Bread Street.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct a four-story addition in existing parking area.
- Create open parking area on first level with three levels of residential living space above.
- Clad exterior façade with red brick to match existing.
- Install double-hung wood windows with a six-over-six sash configuration.
- Create window openings detailed with cast stone lintels and sills.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The proposed addition has limited impact to the Berger Building and Johnson Warehouse.
 - The rear of the Berger Building has been altered previously with a stair tower and 1990s addition.
 - There are no existing openings on the south elevation of the Johnson Warehouse that will be impacted by the new addition. Historic maps show this was once a party wall to a building that has since been demolished.
- *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 six-over-six window sash configurations reflect an earlier time period than the construction dates of the historic buildings on the parcel.
 - The red brick is proposed to match the historic
 - The open parking area is incompatible with the historic property and district.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The new addition will be primarily connected to the 1990s addition. It will use the Berger Building and Johnson Warehouse as party walls. In the future, this addition (and the 1990s addition) could be removed and the essential form and integrity of the historic buildings would be unimpaired.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the first level parking is screened with brick or compatible material; the red brick cladding on the addition is compatible but not matching; and the proposed windows are a one-over-one double-hung, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:58:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Raymond Rolla and owner's representative Arthur Ruppel represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Rolla stated that they are not opposed to changing the windows to one-over-one. He noted the owner was not sure about the screening of the first-floor parking area on Bread Street, owing to a concern about the narrowness of the sidewalk, given that it is only three feet wide. Mr. Rolla added that visually there would be no way to see pedestrians walking along that sidewalk if the garage was enclosed.

- Ms. Gutterman responded that, if the screening material were mesh or a low wall with a railing, it would screen the parking and would make it look more like a building rather than covered parking.
- Ms. Stein asked about the entrance through the parking garage.
 - The owner responded that there is an entrance out to the parking garage through the building, but you cannot enter the building through the parking garage; rather you enter through Arch Street. He noted that the main entrance is on Arch Street.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about an entry area visible within the parking area on the plans.
 - Mr. Rolla responded that this is now an existing trash area. He noted that it used to be an entrance but is no longer.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if he lived in this building how would he get to his apartment.
 - Mr. Ruppin replied that he would have to walk out of the parking area and to the Arch Street entrance.
- Ms. Gutterman asked why trees have to be removed as shown on drawing D1 if they are not doing construction in that area.
 - Mr. Rolla pointed out they are building over the entire current parking lot; the trees need to be removed for the new construction. He added that the only area they are not building over is a small area by the elevator.
 - Mr. Ruppin stated that they had donated funds to the local civic association for trees to be planted on Arch Street, and if needed, they will donate funds to have trees planted on Bread Street.
- Ms. Stein asked what the gray area/bar was on elevation C1.
 - Mr. Rolla replied that it is an existing stair tower. He stated that it is constructed of brick.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the proposed building was going to be flush with the adjacent existing buildings.
 - Mr. Rolla confirmed this and noted they are going out to the property line and the new building will be flush with the stair tower and the other building at the rear.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired if there is any cornice that wraps the existing building.
 - Mr. Rolla pointed out that there is no cornice where they are building against the modern building, the 1990s addition, and it will not cover any cornice area on the other buildings.
- Mr. Cluver said that he agrees with the staff recommendation that there needs to something that cleans up the street level. He suggested a lower site wall for a long part of it, something that gives it a sense of rhythm or scale and not just open area with an occasional column in it. Mr. Detwiler and Mr. McCoubrey agreed. Mr. Cluver added that it could be a watertable with a couple of openings in it.
 - Mr. Detwiler pointed out that both adjacent buildings have bases to them and the first story has the line coming across. He continued that it needs something that starts to engage, whether that is screening or something else.
 - Mr. Rolla agreed with that suggestion.
 - Mr. McCoubrey observed that there is only one access point into the garage and the two flanking bays could have low walls that engage the screening. He continued that, similarly, the bay where the old entrance is could have screening as well. Mr. McCoubrey added that, as you are walking down the sidewalk, a wall would give a sense of separation.

- Mr. Cluver interjected that he understands that the applicant does not want a full height wall and does not want it to be an unsafe space but there needs to be some design that can be done there to find that balance.
- Ms. Stein asked where the accessible entrance is on this building.
 - Mr. Rolla replied that it is the main entrance at 229 Arch Street.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the infill of the new addition may feel oppressive as one moves down Bread Street and wondered if this infill addition should be set back from the existing façades by one or two feet.
 - Mr. Detwiler added that he wondered about this too, if setting it back even one foot would differentiate it.
 - Mr. Rolla stated that there is a parking lot across the street on east side of Bread Street and offers open space. He also noted that the parking is crunched to the inch in terms of how many parking spaces for cars they need to maintain. Mr. Rolla said that he agrees with the low wall, which will add an architectural rhythm.
 - Mr. McCoubrey said that there should be some kind of reveal or some detail that differentiates the new construction from the flanking, existing buildings where the new building engages the existing buildings.
 - Mr. Rolla agreed.
 - Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that Bread Street is a narrow little street and holding the street façade is important.
 - Mr. Ruppin said that reducing the building size through a setback will make the units less economically viable.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- There should be a clear delineation between the first-level parking and the sidewalk and streetscape through a low wall or other screening design.
- The trash area on the first level should also be screened and not seen from the sidewalk and Bread Street.
- The red brick cladding along Bread Street should be compatible but not matching.
- The windows should be one-over-one, double-hung configuration.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition has limited impact to the Berger Building and Johnson Warehouse. The rear of the Berger Building has been altered previously with a stair tower and 1990s addition. There are no existing openings on the south elevation of the Johnson Warehouse that will be impacted by the new addition. Historic maps show that this was once a party wall to a building that has since been demolished. Therefore, the application satisfies Standard 2.
- By changing the proposed six-over-six window sash configurations to one-over-one, double hung windows, updating the brick façade to be compatible but not matching, and screening the open parking area with a low wall or other type screening design, the design will satisfy Standard 9.
- The new addition will be primarily connected to the 1990s addition. It will use the Berger Building and Johnson Warehouse as party walls. In the future, this addition

and also the 1990s addition could be removed and the essential form and integrity of the historic buildings would be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the first level parking is screened with a low base or other screen; the trash area is enclosed with screening; the red brick cladding is compatible but not matching; and the windows are a one-over-one, double-hung, aluminum-clad windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 229 Arch St					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 123-29 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Install metal entry arch and exterior lighting
 Review Requested: Review In Concept
 Owner: 123-29 Chestnut Street Associates
 Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Group G LLC
 History: 1903; Corn Exchange National Bank; Newman, Woodman & Harris, architects; alterations/additions, Horace Trumbauer, 1912, 1929, 1931
 Individual Designation: 10/7/1976
 District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003
 Preservation Easement: Yes
 Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to create a main entrance for the offices at 123 Chestnut Street. The building is occupied retail and offices uses. The entrance to the upper business floors is located on 2nd Street and is the focus of this application. The intent of the proposed design is to direct attention to this primary entry point for visitors and delivery people.

The proposed construction would take place at the sidewalk area only. Excepting the restoration of the doors and molding, the proposed work would not alter the historic fabric.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct limestone base with card access reader.
- Restore wood entry doors.
- Install three stainless steel tube arches.

- Install bollards in sidewalk.
- Install bluestone paving in the sidewalk area near entrance with stainless steel lettering embedded into the bluestone.
- Install exterior lighting.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The proposed work would not remove distinctive materials or alter character-defining features. It would have minimal impact to the spaces and spatial relationships of the historic property, satisfying Standard 2.
- *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 work including the paving elements, bollards, and limestone base is differentiated from but compatible with the historic building, satisfying Standard 9.
 - Additional information about the lighting design and scheme, materials, and detailing of the vertical elements should be provided to determine if the proposed work is compatible with the architectural features of the historic building.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in 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 work is fully reversible. Since the construction is focused on the sidewalk area, if it were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the design of the vertical tube arches and exterior lighting is further developed to ensure compatibility with the historic building and district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:17:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gerry Gutierrez and owner's representative Lavi Shenkman represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Gutierrez described the time and effort that was put into planning for the building's the proposed entry way. He explained that they did not develop the proposed entry design quickly; the design involved 18 months' time and included discussions with the owner/developer and current tenants. Mr. Gutierrez noted that he is a 10-year resident of the Old City neighborhood and a 25-year tenant at 123-29 Chestnut Street and is very familiar with the building. He continued that he

- recognizes the importance of the building but, given the uses of the building, especially the second-floor health and wellness offices, the owner and tenants have been challenged by the address 123 Chestnut Street. He stated that receiving deliveries is challenging and they often end up at the wrong location. Mr. Gutierrez said that they often field calls from visitors, vendors, and consultants to direct them from Chestnut Street to the correct main entrance to access the upper-floor offices. He added that this is a source of great frustration and sometimes anger for visitors to the health and wellness offices as well as his own clients, who have expressed frustration. Mr. Gutierrez said they approached the project as part of a master plan to improve and enhance not only the interior spaces. He explained that they developed over a dozen options for an entrance element that would call attention to the entrance to the upper floors. Mr. Gutierrez said that they sought to call attention and continue to be respectful to the existing building and to enhance the main entrance. He continued that one of the constraints on them is the constant traffic going up and down 2nd Street. Mr. Gutierrez said that they were sensitive to the primary view from the southwest corner of 2nd and Chestnut Street because people coming from that direction often have to look over buses and vans. He continued that they also had to consider the pedestrian pathway from the opposite side looking diagonally from the west side of 2nd Street. Mr. Gutierrez added that there are many considerations in addition to this including material and scale considerations. He noted that they did not consider any solution that would attach itself to the building such as a canopy.
- Ms. Gutterman interjected that because of time considerations she requests that Mr. Gutierrez describe in a couple sentences the design that is being presented for the Committee's approval but not the history of the design. She added that many of them are architects and they understand that nothing is simple in design.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked why the address is 123 Chestnut Street rather than a 2nd Street address.
 - Mr. Detwiler said that he had a client that had the same problem and changed the address. He added that it is not terribly difficult.
 - Mr. Shenkman responded that they do not want to change the address for many reasons. He said that they have more than 10 tenants in the building and some are medical service providers. Mr. Shenkman explained that for them to change their office addresses would create Health Insurance Portability & Accountability Act-related red tape. He continued that they surveyed and sat down with all of the tenants as part of this master planning process and changing the address was entertained and discussed but not pursued. Mr. Shenkman said that the building is magnificent. He noted that the building is not a tourist attraction, but they see people at the corner of 2nd and Chestnut Streets taking pictures of it every day. Mr. Shenkman said the address 123 Chestnut Street is important. He pointed out that the building has two separate building entrances specifically for retail tenants on Chestnut Street.
 - Mr. Detwiler said it was possible to get an "aka" address and maybe that this could be used for deliveries. He added that he understands what they are saying but contended that the existing entrance is fairly prominent. He stated that he does not know if this building needs tubes to call attention to the entrance. Mr. Detwiler continued that, if you are finding that people are going to other doors, install signs directing delivery people. He added that this bold solution is not in keeping with the building.

- Ms. Gutterman said that the Committee members needed to move to the discussion of the application, owing to time constraints. She stated that she agrees with Mr. Detwiler and that it is too much architecture for this magnificent building and that she thinks it is inappropriate in scale and materials. Ms. Gutterman stated that she understands the applicant may need to do something at this entrance. She continued that she also thinks it is too close to the building and it disrupts the beautiful arch and the fabric of the building. Ms. Gutterman added that she does not think the proposal is at all compatible with the historic fabric.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro said he agrees with Ms. Gutterman.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the door in question has a door operator.
 - Mr. Gutierrez replied that it does not. He said that the door is electromagnetically secured so the card reader releases the latch.
 - Mr. Cluver said that the door looks like it is comprised of two narrow leaves. A door operator should be added.
 - Mr. Gutierrez responded that they are considering an interior door operator.
 - Mr. Cluver said that one of the things he likes about the proposed design is the way a door operator push button can be integrated discretely.
 - Mr. Gutierrez stated that the button is a good idea because many older patients come to the building.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that the button could be added without the arches.
 - Mr. Gutierrez replied that the door operator is a separate issue.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the design needs to attract attention but be subtle at the same time. He said that the redeeming fact of the proposed design is that it is not touching the building at all. Mr. Cluver pointed out that if this design did not perform as intended and was a distraction, it could be removed.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that it could be three vertical bars and not an arch. She added that she is as much troubled by the arch as its proximity to the building. Ms. Gutterman continued that she is troubled by the impact of the proposed design on the entrance.
- Ms. Stein stated that the proposed design would block views of the historic ornament of the building. She added that it seems like too much architecture.
- Mr. Cluver said that he would be dead set against this design if this was at the corner, but, since it is part way down the block, it is more palatable to him. He stated he is not as troubled by the proposed design.
- Mr. Gutierrez said he would like to respond to the comments, specifically those about the arches. He noted that the arches are intentional; they call attention to the entrance and refer to the existing ornament on the building.
- Ms. Gutterman opposed the design. She said that the proposal is “over-designed” for this building.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he is not opposed to the base.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed and added that she is not opposed to a vertical element, but she does object to the arch, its proximity to the historic building, and its impact to the building.
 - Mr. Gutierrez asked if the Committee would support the project if he removed the semi-circular portion of the arch.
 - Ms. Gutterman replied that it might be more acceptable.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the vertical elements could be flag poles.
- Ms. Mehley asked for clarification on some of the feedback discussed. She inquired if the Committee found the design of the base acceptable.

- Mr. McCoubrey objected to the base at the sidewalk level and noted that its size could be reduced.
- Ms. Gutterman agreed. She objected to the proposal's proximity to the building.
- Ms. Stein noted the Committee had not discussed the "vertical banner flag signs with metal pipes." She commented that they need to be depicted in the plans and then reviewed by the Committee.
 - Mr. Gutierrez replied the banners are not part of this application.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the existing sidewalk paving in front of the building.
 - Mr. Gutierrez replied that it is a concrete sidewalk.
- Mr. Detwiler did not object to the sidewalk paving proposal.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jennifer Robinson of Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that her organization holds an easement of the property. She said that she met with the applicants and one of her easement committee members, architect Eric Leighton, in December 2019 to discuss the preliminary plans in preparation for their Easement Committee meeting in January 2020. Ms. Robinson noted that the easement committee members were very divided over the proposal but ultimately gave an approval in-concept for the arches, limestone base, and paving alterations because they were not attached to the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The metal arches are not compatible with the historic building, as they obscure architectural detail and is located too close to the building.
- The overall design competes with the historic character of the building.
- The limestone base with the security reader is too large.
- The sidewalk paving is acceptable in-concept but should be further refined with the revision of the overall design.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work does not retain and preserve the historic character of the property, owing to the arch design, which will obscure architectural features and alter spatial relationships; therefore, it does not satisfy Standard 2.
- The proposed work, specifically the arches and limestone base, are not compatible with the historic building; therefore, it does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed work is fully reversible. Since the construction is focused on the sidewalk area, if it were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ITEM: 123-29 Chestnut St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
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: 6100-02 ARDLEIGH ST

Proposal: Expand and enclose shed
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Ian Pappajohn and Meg Richter
 Applicant: Jackie Gusic, InHabit LLC
 History: 1852; Henry Cope House
 Individual Designation: 5/7/1981
 District Designation: Awbury Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010
 Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to expand and enclose an existing open shed at the rear of this property located in Awbury Arboretum. Visibility of the shed from the public right-of-way is minimal, owing both to its location on the site, and also its wood construction blending with the numerous trees in the Arboretum. The shed is not referenced in the historic district inventory for this property, although the main house, remnants of an ice house, and an iron gate with posts are all explicitly called out as being significant to the property.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Expand and enclose existing shed.

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 work 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 expansion and enclosing of this shed is not an alteration to historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. The proposed wood siding is appropriate for this application. The staff recommends a neutral color, so as to maintain the inconspicuousness of the shed on the site.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:37:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jackie Gusic represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked if the proposed project is intended to look like the example provided in the application.
 - Ms. Gusic responded that it will look similar to the example. The shape is not the same, and the roofline is different and will have a clerestory along the ridge. She stated that the top of the clerestory is 12-foot 8-inches, and its purpose is to allow natural light into the shed.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he found it difficult to understand the proposal.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the existing shed is being demolished or added to.
 - Ms. Gusic responded that it is being added to. She explained that the existing frame will remain, and 12-feet 6-inches will be added. She stated that the existing shed is more of a post structure with a roof. The roof of the existing shed will be removed, but the structural posts and beams will be retained.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the roof slope is shallow and that perhaps a different approach would be more appropriate.
 - Ms. Gusic responded that she is mirroring the slope on the addition, and because the addition is longer than the existing shed, the clerestory provides the break.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested a salt box design where the addition has its own slope, and the clerestory would be on only one side. He suggested that the height be determined by the slope.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, and stated that it will help to differentiate the original piece from the addition. He stated that the clerestory can be used as the height. He stated that the clerestory windows should be operable.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the foundation.
 - Mr. Gusic responded that it will be a rat slab with pressure-treated sleepers and wood floor.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that a maintenance crew with weed whackers will damage the exterior of the shed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The shed is not referenced in the historic district inventory as having historic significance to the property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The expansion and enclosing of this shed is not an alteration to historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. The proposed wood siding is appropriate for this application. Therefore, the proposed work satisfies

Standard 9. However, a redesigned roofline will help to differentiate the original section from the addition and will allow it to more closely resemble the example provided in the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval provided it is revised with a single clerestory with operable windows and a steeper roof for the addition, with the staff to review details.

ITEM: 6100-02 Ardleigh St					
MOTION: Denial as proposed; approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 336 S 17TH ST

Proposal: Construct pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lia Gentile

Applicant: Jack Burns Jr., Jack Burns Architecture

History: 1840; alterations, c. 1900

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND: This application proposes to construct a roof deck with a 7'-3" setback from the front façade and a pilot house. There is no setback proposed at the rear of the roof. A standing seam metal roof and Hardie cement siding are proposed for the pilot house. A metal picket railing system is proposed to enclose the deck.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construction of a new roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Roofs Guideline: 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.*

- Though the work proposed in this application does not appear to damage or obscure character-defining features, the railing and pilot house would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way, owing to the building's location at the corner of 17th and Panama Streets. Therefore, the work proposed in the application does not satisfy the Guideline.
- *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 work 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.*
 - Owing to the inconspicuousness of the proposed railing and pilot house, the work proposed in this application would not protect the integrity of the property and its environment and therefore would not satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:47:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jack Burns represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked if any mechanical equipment was going to be located on the roof.
 - Mr. Burns confirmed that no mechanical equipment was proposed at the roof.
- Mr. Cluver asked the staff if the Architectural Committee had previously reviewed another roof deck a few doors down from this proposal and whether that application had been approved.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that the Architectural Committee had reviewed an application for a roof deck for a building two to the south of this building and had recommended denial. She explained that the Historical Commission ultimately recommended approval of the application after some revisions were made to the plans.
 - Mr. Burns elaborated on the modifications that had been made to the previous application for the neighboring property, which reduced the size of the deck and lowered the height of the pilot house. He added that the current proposal for his current client's deck essentially proposed something similar to that approved previously by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the dilemma for the current proposal is that the property was located at the corner. He suggested that if the roof deck was pushed back to align with the pilot house, it would still allow for a nice sized roof while limiting its visibility from the street.
- Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that the pilot house did not need to be as tall as was proposed.
 - Mr. Burns referred Mr. D'Alessandro to the section drawing on HC-103 that showed the pilot house was not visible. He commented that the goal was to keep the railing materials as light and airy as possible.
- Ms. Gutterman responded that if the entire deck was pulled back from the front to align with the pilot house, the railing would become far more inconspicuous, the Architectural Committee's goal.

- Ms. Gutterman reiterated Mr. D'Alessandro's suggestion to consider lowering the eave of the pilot house. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the height of the pilot house could be reduced.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicant to clarify the proposed structure of the deck.
 - Mr. Burns said that they have had success with past projects where the new deck load was supported by the exterior walls rather than the existing roof. He noted that this also allows access to the roof in the case that a repair is needed.
- Mr. Cluver referred the other members of the Architectural Committee to drawing HC-111.
 - Mr. Burns explained that if the deck was to be pushed back to align with the pilot house, there would be three structural members supporting the new load.
- Ms. Stein observed that these structural members would be visible from Panama Street since they would be situated above the parapet.
 - Mr. Burns agreed with Ms. Stein's observation.
- Mr. Detwiler referred the applicant to drawing HC-110 and asked if it was necessary to extend the proposed structural element visible in the drawing all the way to the edge of the building.
 - Mr. Burns responded that he believed that structural member could be cut back to make it less visible.
- Mr. Cluver remarked that the Architectural Committee's preference would be to have the structural members extend only as far as necessary rather than from party wall to party wall.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant if there was any kind of parapet along Panama Street.
 - The applicant responded that there did not appear to be a parapet.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicant if the deck could be pushed away from the back edge of the roof, away from the rear wall of the building.
 - The applicant replied that they could investigate this suggestion.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building's location at the corner of 17th and Panama Streets increases the visibility of a roof deck from the right-of-way.
- The specific location of the roof deck and height of the pilot house as proposed make the roof deck visible from the right-of-way; pushing the deck back to align with the pilot house would make the deck more inconspicuous, as would minimizing the height of the pilot house to the greatest extent possible.
- The structural beams would be less conspicuous if they were shortened away from the Panama Street side of the roof to the greatest extent possible.
- Pulling the rear of the deck away from the back or west wall would help make the deck more inconspicuous and should be investigated by the applicant.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The roof deck and pilot house as proposed were not sufficiently inconspicuous and therefore failed to satisfy to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval provided the deck is set back from the front façade to align with the pilot house; the height of the pilot house roof is minimized; the structural beams are revised on the Panama Street side to reduce visibility; and the back of the deck is moved away from the rear wall, with the staff to review details.

ITEM: 336 S 17th St					
MOTION: Denial as proposed; approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1829 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Legalize windows and stucco at rear
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: L&Y Investment LLC
 Applicant: Yan Chiu, RJ Construction LLC
 History: 1870
 Individual Designation: None
 District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
 Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND: This contributing Italianate townhouse within the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District dates to about 1870.

In August 2019, the applicant requested that the Historical Commission approve a building permit application in order to close out a violation with the Department of Licenses & Inspections related to the application of stucco at the side and rear. During the review of that permit application, the staff learned that, in addition to the stucco work, the windows and door at the rear of the property had also been replaced without a permit. The applicant was advised that the Historical Commission would need to review the entire scope of unpermitted work for approval.

The Historical Commission’s file for this property includes three approved building permit applications for interior work from 2017 and 2018. None cover the exterior work. The applicant seeks to legalize the stucco that was applied to the rear and side of the building, as well as the windows and door at the rear.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Legalize stucco at the side and rear of building.

- Legalize replacement windows at the rear of property.

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 brick cladding is a character-defining feature of this property. The Historical Commission would not have approved an application to apply stucco at the rear and side. The stucco fails to meet this standard.
- *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 windows and door that were installed do not replicate the historic features in design, color, texture, and materials and therefore fail to satisfy this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:04:06

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked the staff if it was the new stucco that was falling off or if the new coat was pulling off previous stucco campaigns.
 - Ms. Schmitt replied that she did not know.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that it appeared that the entire rear of the building looked like it had been stuccoed, adding that the building appeared to have a brick base with wood framing above.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee should never recommend legalizing illegal work. Others disagreed, stating that the Committee should apply the Standards to the proposal as it does in every other case.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the Architectural Committee could approve the removal of the existing stucco.
 - Ms. Schmitt replied that such an approval would allow the owner to at least move forward with their application for a make-safe permit.
- Ms. Gutterman cautioned that the Architectural Committee needed to be careful with a recommendation for approval, suggesting that a contractor should explain how they proposed to make the building's conditions safe.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that she had recently been working with the owner's contractor and it was unfortunate that he was not at the meeting to provide such information.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the application of stucco to the building was inappropriate within the context of historic preservation standards and guidelines and it should be removed for this reason as well as any other applicable reasons.
- Ms. Stein asked if the rear of the top floor had always been stuccoed.

- Mr. McCoubrey referred Ms. Stein to the photographs in the application that showed the rear of the building as brick without any stucco on it.
- Ms. Schmitt said she believed that all of the stucco work documented in the current conditions photographs was done without approval from the Historical Commission.
- Ms. Stein asked the staff if there was also stucco at the sides of the building which were not visible in the photographs provided by the applicant.
 - Ms. Schmitt replied that she believed there was.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property owner needed to have a contractor specify precisely what work was necessary in order to comply with the make-safe permit required by the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Stucco over this brick building was an inappropriate alteration and therefore did not satisfy Standards 5 and 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

ITEM: 1829 Spruce St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
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: 2132 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Replace roofing, skylight, and roof hatch

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jonathan and Kirsten Kimberg

Applicant: Kirsten Kimberg

History: 1889; Furness, Evans & Co., architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND: This Victorian Eclectic townhouse within the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District is attributed to architect Frank Furness and is classified as significant in the district.

In 2013 the owner submitted an in-concept application for guidance about appropriate substitute roofing materials to replace the surviving historic terra cotta roof tiles. The application was withdrawn prior to the Architectural Committee meeting. The staff approved an application in 2015 for work to the existing skylights.

The applicant is now applying to replace the existing terra cotta tiles at the front section of the roof with Certainteed Carriage House asphalt roofing shingles in a color called Brick Red. The replacement of an existing skylight and roof access hatch are also proposed. The skylight and hatch are not visible from the street.

The applicant argues that there would be a savings of approximately 61% according to quotes received for the in-kind replacement of the terra cotta tiles versus the use of the Certainteed Carriage House shingle. The applicant has provided information about the dimensions and appearance of the existing terra cotta tiles. The proposed Certainteed Carriage House shingle does not exactly match the terra cotta but it generally replicates its appearance.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Replace terra cotta tile roof with Certainteed Carriage House shingle in Brick Red.
- Replace sky light and roof access hatch.

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.*
 - Standard 6 requires that the replacement element match the historic material "where possible." Of course, anything is possible with enough money. The standard includes the phrase "where possible" to allow for some discretion with regard to replacement materials. The question in this case is whether the public benefit of the replacement with real terra cotta justifies the significantly higher cost.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the replacement of the skylight and roof access hatch. The staff defers to the Architectural Committee regarding whether it is "possible" to replace the existing terra cotta tiles with new terra cotta.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:08:34

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Owner Kirsten Kimberg represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked whether this property extends to the corner.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that it does not. The building in question is the twin of the building on the corner.
- Ms. Kimberg noted that the roof of her building is minimally visible from the public right of way.
- Ms. Kimberg clarified her submission stated that the asphalt shingles would be a 61% savings, but that she found the written quote and it would actually be a 50% savings, which still amounts to a \$20,000 difference. She opined that it would be a hardship to have to install real tiles instead of asphalt shingles.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether there are two different existing roofing materials.
 - Ms. Kimberg responded affirmatively, noting that a portion of the terra cotta tile was reroofed with asphalt shingles 40 years ago or so.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the issue is that the roof is leaking.
 - Ms. Kimberg responded affirmatively, noting that the asphalt portion of the roof is actually leaking more than the terra cotta. She noted that there are some broken tiles and that the valley is in poor condition.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether the tiles could be removed, the underlying material repaired, and the tiles reinstalled.
 - Ms. Kimberg responded that the contractor has estimated that approximately half of the tiles could be reused, but that the tiles are brittle and many are chipped. She noted that there have been shoddy repairs made previously, and tar has been slapped on some of the tiles. She noted that they would need to seek out reclaimed tiles to combine with the salvaged tiles from the building, and they still do not know that that many could be saved from the building, so the price could increase considerably.
- Ms. Kimberg noted that the property has been in her husband's family for 60 years, but that she and her husband did not have say in repairs that were made prior to 2010.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the issue boils down to an initial cost versus long-term cost. He noted that, while the asphalt is 50% less expensive, the terra cotta tile would last more than twice as long, making it cheaper in the long term. He noted that future generations would be the beneficiaries of that benefit, however.
 - Ms. Kimberg responded that that is true, but that the existing tiles are 131 years old, and it is unknown how old any reclaimed tiles they could acquire would be. She questioned how much longer the tiles could last.
 - Committee members noted that a company such as Ludowici could make new terra cotta tiles to match the historic tiles.
 - Ms. Kimberg responded that the cost of new tile would approach \$65,000, and the only way to reduce the cost would be to order in bulk directly from the manufacturer. She explained that she received a quote five years ago of \$25,000 for the exact amount of tiles needed for the roof, or approximately \$13,000 to buy the tiles in bulk. She noted that that price is for materials only

and does not include labor. By comparison, she explained, if she ordered the CertainTeed Grand Manor shingles, the entire cost for materials is \$1,330.

- Ms. Kimberg noted that the only source of income she and her husband have are two apartments in the building. She explained that they would like to use the savings from the roof to make other needed repairs to the building, and that they hope to one day pass the property down to their daughter.
- Ms. Kimberg presented samples of the existing historic terra cotta tile and the proposed CertainTeed Grand Manor shingles.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro opined that, while not identical, the proposed shingles generally replicate the overall appearance of the historic tile.
- Mr. Detwiler thanked Ms. Kimberg for the diligent research she had conducted, particularly as a homeowner. Mr. Cluver agreed.
 - Ms. Kimberg responded that they have been researching materials and products from all over the world for eight years, and they need to move forward.
- Mr. McCoubrey recalled that the Grand Manor shingles were used on the Wissahickon Inn, now Springside Chestnut Hill Academy, in place of either terra cotta tile or slate roofing.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the roofing material is not a primary feature of this building. He noted that there are other properties where the terra cotta tile roof is much more prominent and that he would be extremely reluctant to allow an alternative material in such an instance. In this case, however, he opined that the public is only offered fleeting glimpses of the roof, and that the material is secondary to the overall shape and other characteristics of the building. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.
- Mr. Cluver reiterated that, if possible cost-wise, new terra cotta tiles would be a preferable and more cost-effective long-term investment, but that in this case, given the limited visibility of the roof from the public right-of-way, he would accept the proposed alternative material.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, but noted that the asphalt shingles should be installed as though it were tile, with the metal capping maintained or replicated, and that the valley cut and open, not covered with shingles. He noted that the flashing should match the historic material.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The roof of 2132 Spruce Street, which contains both existing asphalt shingles and historic terra cotta tiles, is in poor condition and should be replaced.
- The visibility of the terra cotta tile roof from the public right-of-way is limited, making it a secondary feature to the overall form of the building.
- The public benefit of the replacement with real terra cotta does not justify the significantly higher cost in this case.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- From oblique angles, the proposed CertainTeed Grand Manor shingles sufficiently replicates the appearance of the historic terra cotta tiles, satisfying Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the capping and flashings match the historic details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ITEM: 2132 Spruce St					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 4300 OSAGE AVE

Proposal: Construct three-story building with garages on subdivided parcel
 Review Requested: In-Concept
 Owner: Osage Realty Investment LLC
 Applicant: Michelle Kleschick, Parallel Architecture Studio, LLC
 History: 1871; Pliny Britt Fuller House; Hummell & Trexler, developers
 Individual Designation: 10/9/2015
 District Designation: Satterlee Heights Historic District, Significant, 7/13/2018
 Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

Located at the corner of Osage Avenue and 43rd Street in West Philadelphia, the property at 4300-02 Osage Avenue was individually designated as historic in 2015 and again in 2018 as part of the Satterlee Heights Historic District. In addition to other Criteria, the corner property with its large, open lot, was designated under Criterion H as a distinct visual feature in the area. The Satterlee Heights Historic District is composed of four sets of 1870's Second Empire twins on the south side of Osage Avenue between 43rd and 44th Streets. The buildings in the district are set back from the street and are distinguished by their brownstone facades, large porches, and expansive yards with mature trees, which give the district its distinctive picturesque suburban character.

In August 2019, the owners subdivided the property at 4300-02 Osage Avenue into two lots, the sloped side yard, which became 4300 Osage Avenue, and a lot with the house, which became 4302 Osage Avenue. This application proposes to construct a large, three-story, red brick building on an elevated basement in the recently subdivided side yard. The entrance and three garages would be located on 43rd Street, which is treated as the proposed building's primary elevation. While the application does not provide a site plan that shows the relationship of the proposed construction to the existing historic building, based on measurements of the parcel, it appears that the 82-foot long, blank party wall of the proposed building would be located approximately 6 feet from the porch of 4302 Osage Avenue. With an only eight-foot setback

from Osage Avenue, the proposed construction would project approximately 20 feet beyond the plane of the existing buildings in the district. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct three-story building on subdivided parcel.

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 work 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.*
 - By eliminating the historic side yard and obstructing the view of 4302 Osage Avenue, the proposed construction destroys spatial relationships that characterize the property and the historic district. The new work is not compatible in features, size, scale, proportion, or massing to the historic property and district, destroying the integrity of the property and its environment. The new construction is adjacent to and proud of the historic building's primary elevation and negatively impacts its historic character. The new construction is larger than the historic building and visually overwhelms it, diminishing its historic character.
 - The application fails to comply with this standard.
- *Setting (District/Neighborhood) Guideline: Not Recommended: Introducing new construction into historic districts which is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting, or which damages or destroys important landscape features.*
 - Occupying and eliminating what has historically been open, green space with large, mature trees, the proposed construction destroys historic relationships within the district and important landscape features. The proposed construction is visually obtrusive and takes no cues from the buildings in the historic district.
 - The application fails to comply with this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Setting Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:26:47

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Michelle Kleschick represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein opined that the application does not have sufficient information for a full review, particularly as the proposed construction relates to the adjacent property and the larger district context.
 - Ms. Kleschick responded that there is a site plan that shows how the building is positioned on the lot.

- Ms. Stein opined that the proposed construction appears to be highly inappropriate in terms of scale, design, and features. She noted that it is designed like an urban apartment building, where the context is picturesque suburban buildings with open green space and large porches.
 - The applicant responded that they looked to the red brick buildings on 43rd Street for design cues.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that 43rd Street is not part of the historic district; the district is formed by buildings on the south side of Osage Avenue.
- Ms. Gutterman argued that proposed design is not sympathetic to the adjacent historic building or to the district context.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the porch of the property now known as 4302 Osage Avenue wraps around to the side elevation and overlooks the historic side yard at 4300 Osage Avenue, and that there is a clear rhythm and space that characterizes the buildings in the district. He noted that it is difficult to see how this property could appropriately accommodate new construction.
- Ms. Stein noted that the rendering makes it clear how the proposed construction would obscure the historic building.
- Mr. Cluver noted that, with the proposed construction being right on the property line, the design presents a completely flat, windowless façade to the historic building and to the street since it projects beyond the buildings in the district.
- Ms. Stein questioned the proposed retaining wall.
 - Ms. Kleschick responded that there is an existing retaining wall.
 - Ms. Stein noted that the rendering suggests that green space would be retained, but that does not seem to be the reality in looking at the drawings.
- Echoing the sentiments of the other Committee members, Mr. Detwiler also opined that the cutting down of the sloped yard to grade to accommodate the garages is inappropriate and changes the character of the property.
- Mr. Cluver opined that, in looking at the size of the new parcel, which was until recently the side yard of the adjacent property, he is not sure any new construction would be appropriate on this parcel.
 - Other Committee members agreed, noting that a small, individual unit tucked to the far rear of the property might be the most that is acceptable.
- Mr. Cluver noted that there appear to be at least a few heritage trees that would also be cut down for the proposed construction.
- Mr. Cluver agreed with the wording of the nomination that the lot, which was historically a side yard, is an integral component of the landscape and district and its setting.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the Historical Commission reviews subdivisions.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission does not review proposed subdivisions, but that it retains jurisdiction over subdivided properties that might be created from a historic property.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that just because a property has been subdivided does not mean that the new lot is suitable for building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Architect and neighbor Kathy Dowdell agreed with Mr. Cluver that any consideration of the content of the building is not the matter at hand. No construction should be permitted on this parcel. Reading from the nomination, she explained that the open and green lots are character-defining features of the designated and protected resource. The 4300 block of Osage Avenue is the only intact block of the historic

Satterlee Heights development, which is characterized by double-width parcels. She opined that the fact that the property at 4300-02 Osage Avenue was allowed to be subdivided at all is a failure of the City Planning Commission for not understanding the context of this district. She argued that the significance of the district is in large part tied to the sizable parcels that speak to the development of the area from farmland to a low-density suburb. She noted that this block is one of the most unique in West Philadelphia. She added that this property is very steep and would be difficult to build on, but that any discussion of what an “appropriate” design would be for this parcel is irrelevant. She stated that the concept is flawed. There should not be a building on this parcel.

- Neighbor Charles Harb opined that buildings are not the only historic resources, but that their setting is also critical to their significance. He stated that the proposed construction violates the setting of the historic building and the overall context of the district.
- Elizabeth Stegner of the University City Historical Society (UCHS) explained that the property was individually-designated in 2015 and again in 2018 as part of the Satterlee Heights Historic District. She noted that she does not understand how the property of 4300-02 Osage Avenue was allowed to be subdivided into two parcels subsequent to the designation. She noted that UCHS does not oppose new construction in the neighborhood, but that the proposed construction is inappropriate and violates the character of the historic district and the historic property.
- Neighbor Terry Mond of 4308-10 Osage Avenue commented that it was kind of the Architectural Committee to soften its response and simply say that at first glance the proposed building looks like it does not belong in the neighborhood. She noted that her husband worked hard to get the district designated in order to avoid this very sort of proposal. She stated that the proposed construction is extremely disrespectful to the district.
- Neighbor Daphne Hawkins-Parker of 4316 Osage Avenue echoed the opposition to the proposed project. She explained that, when the neighbors worked together to support a district nomination, they were told that the block was zoned RSA-5 that would only allow for 50% of the lot to be built upon with a minimum setback of 15 feet.
 - The Committee members noted that zoning classification is not relevant to the Historical Commission’s review.
 - Ms. Kleschick responded that the property is zoned RTA-1.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- By eliminating the historic side yard and obstructing the view of 4302 Osage Avenue, the proposed construction destroys spatial relationships that characterize the property and the historic district.
- The new work is not compatible in features, size, scale, proportion, or massing to the historic property and district, destroying the integrity of the property and its environment.
- The new construction is adjacent to and proud of the historic building’s primary elevation and negatively impacts its historic character.
- The new construction is larger than the historic building and visually overwhelms it, diminishing its historic character.

- Occupying and eliminating what has historically been open, green space with large, mature trees, the proposed construction destroys historic relationships within the district and important landscape features.
- The proposed construction is visually obtrusive and takes no cues from the buildings in the historic district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- For the reasons stated above in the findings, the application fails to satisfy Standard 9 and the Setting Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Setting Guideline.

ITEM: 4300 Osage Ave					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:46:50

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:54 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.