

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

**TUESDAY, 23 MARCH 2021
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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		
Allison Lukachik	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, all Commissioners, staff, applicants, and public attendees participated in the meeting remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jon Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Shannon Garrison, 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:

Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Adam Zangrilli
Monica Wyatt
Andrew Clayton
Rob Fluehr
Chelsea Hengstler
Jeremy Tobacman
Jean Galbraith
Ian Toner
Alex Balloon
Charles Overholser

Kate Cleveland
Agata Reister
Catharine Lowery
Beth Johnson
Charles Loomis
Brooke Geeting

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 312-14, 316, AND 318 RACE ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing buildings and rear ells; construct new building and additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Race Street Apartments LLC

Applicant: Monica Wyatt, Studio 111 Architects and Associates

History: 1831

Individual Designation: 6/5/1980

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes work to three properties within the Old City Historic District. The building at 312-14 Race Street, considered contributing in the district, dates to 1831 and historically functioned as a hotel. It consists of a four-story main block with two rear ells that are minimally visible from the public right-of-way. The buildings at 316 and 318 Race Street are classified as non-contributing and were both constructed in the 1950s.

This application proposes to demolish the non-contributing buildings and the two rear ells of the contributing building at 312-14 Race Street. A new four-story building with a setback fifth story would be proposed to replace the non-contributing structures. The new building would span the three properties at the rear.

The applicant is seeking recommendations on the appropriateness of the proposed demolition and height of the potential new construction.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing buildings at 316 and 318 Race Street;
- Demolish rear ells of 312-14 Race Street; and
- Construct five-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - Demolition would be limited to the non-contributing buildings at 316 and 318 Race and the largely non-visible rear ells of 312-14 Race Street. Visibility of one of the existing ells is limited to the view through a narrow private alley off Orianna Street. The work complies with this standard.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 MARCH 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- The proposed new construction would be limited to four stories along Race Street to maintain the scale of the streetscape. An additional story would be set back from the front façade of all three structures and would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The fifth-story addition at 312-14 Race Street would minimally intersect the rear of the existing building's main block. The massing, size, and scale of the new construction and addition comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:14:52

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Monica Wyatt represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the applicant is proposing any demolition to the rear of 312-14 Race Street.
 - Ms. Wyatt replied that she is proposing to demolish the two rear ells of the building. She explained that the building consists of a four-story brick main block with two three-story ells. She noted that a one-story structure infills a portion of the space between the ells. She elaborated that the ells are quite narrow and their size poses issues in meeting modern code requirements. The width, she continued, is too narrow to allow reasonably-sized rooms with a hallway.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that her concern relates to the removal of historic fabric in order to construct something new. She stated that she was unsure from the application how much of the 312-14 Race Street building was proposed for demolition.
 - Ms. Wyatt answered that the drawing in the application shows that the main block of the building at 312-14 Race Street would be retained. She clarified that she is requesting permission to remove the rear ells, which are not visible from the street.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the entire main block of the original building would remain.
 - Ms. Wyatt affirmed that she intends to retain the entire main block.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that, in looking at the historic photograph that shows 316 Race Street, the existing building seems to have the same mass as the historic building. He questioned whether the existing building is a completely new building or if it is a new skin on the façade.
 - Ms. Keller responded that she would need to check but that the district inventory indicated that the structure was built in 1959 and is classified as non-contributing. She added that her impression from the inventory description was that it was a new building at the time of its construction in the 1950s, though she noted that she could check historic documentation.
 - Mr. Detwiler reiterated that it appears to have been reskinned in looking at the current and historic photographs side-by-side. He added that the westernmost corner of the second story has a slight offset, which seems to suggest it is a skinned façade on an earlier building. He commented that if the brick were ever to be removed, there would be the potential to restore the original façade. He stated that he prefers that the building is not demolished.

- It was noted again that the building is classified as non-contributing in the historic district. The demolition of the building can be approved at the staff level.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the width of the rear ells at 312-14 Race Street. If it is not feasible to reuse the rear of the building, she continued, there is probably a way to demolish the ells through the financial hardship process.
 - Ms. Wyatt answered that the dimensions are provided in the application, noting that the southwest ell is approximately 11-feet wide from masonry to masonry and the southeast ell is 11-feet 3-inches. She stated that the usability of the interior would be diminished with the addition of the required finishes. She contended that approximately 10 inches would be lost to interior finishes, with additional space lost for a hallway. She argued that the space would be diminished to the point where it is unusable. She then noted that the photographs provided in the application show that the existing openings have been infilled with masonry and that much of the brick of the ells is in poor condition.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that in the past the Historical Commission has allowed the removal of ells when not visible from a public right-of-way. In this case, he continued, the ells appear quite compromised.
 - Mr. Farnham stated that the preservation ordinance defines demolition as the removal or razing of a building in whole or significant part. The Historical Commission may approve the removal of a part of a building without a finding of financial hardship if the part is not deemed significant. He contended that the question here would be whether or not these ells constitute a significant part of the building. If they do not, he continued, then this Committee could recommend in favor of their removal and the Commission could approve the removal without triggering the hardship provision in the ordinance. The Historical Commission has routinely approved the removals of rear ells, especially if they are not visible from the public right-of-way or in poor condition. Not all removals are demolitions in the eyes of the ordinance, and therefore not all removals require findings of financial hardship.
 - Mr. Detwiler remarked that he is of the opinion that ells are often significant to the mass of the structure, though they are secondary in many cases. He argued that in looking at the aerial photograph, the ells comprise a significant portion of the building. He added that he understands that they are landlocked and not visible and suggested that a portion, such as the ends of the ells, could be retained and then the area in between the end walls and main mass of the building could be infilled, which would leave evidence of the articulation.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that a stair appears in plan at the rear of the main block and asked what purpose it serves. He inquired whether it extends from top to bottom of the main block.
 - Ms. Wyatt responded that it is an original stair, though it is sinking into the basement and needs significant repair work. Regarding the earlier comment regarding the rear ells being landlocked and not visible from the public way, she stated that the courtyard currently has no egress to a public right-of-way. She commented that by code, the current configuration could not remain in place. At the very least, she continued, a portion of the southwest ell would need to be demolished to allow access from the courtyard to the egress alley that leads to Orianna Street.
- Mr. D'Alessandro requested that sections and additional documentation be provided with the in-concept application, adding that the verbal explanation is not sufficient.

- Ms. Wyatt responded that the goal of the application is to understand how she can proceed without investing a lot of time and money in designing a building that would not be approved.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the application proposes to demolish everything from the rear masonry wall back. She commented that she did not feel it was an acceptable compromise for this historic resource. She asked that more of a compromise be reached that involves the possibility of infilling between the ells while maintaining the exterior walls.
- Ms. Stein commented that the proposed massing for the non-contributing properties at 316 and 318 Race Street was appropriate.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the height of the existing ells.
 - Ms. Wyatt answered that they are three stories in height with a one-story connector in between, though she noted that the one-story connector is not original and did not exist in the 1860s.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application is in-concept, and the applicant is seeking guidance on the removals of the rear ells at 312-14 Race Street.
- The application proposes to demolish the existing rear ells of 312-14 Race Street in their entirety; no demolition is proposed to the main block of the building.
- The applicant is also seeking guidance on the appropriateness of the massing for future new construction at all three properties.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The rear ells of 312-14 Race Street are not visible from a public right-of-way but are a significant feature of the building.
- The rear ells are in poor condition and may be compromised.
- While complete demolition may not be appropriate, a proposal that retains portions of the ells may be acceptable.
- The massing of the proposed new construction at 316 and 318 Race Street is appropriate for the Old City Historic District.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the demolition provision at 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance.

ITEM: 312-14, 316, and 318 Race Street MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 341 S 25TH ST

Proposal: Construct third-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Brooks Tanner and Penelope Carter

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: c. 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a third-story addition with a 5-foot setback on a two-story contributing building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. At its 12 February 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application of this same proposal. At the time, the Commission commented that the setback addition was compatible in size, scale, massing, and material. The addition would be clad in fiber cement clapboard siding and would feature six-over-six aluminum clad double-hung sash windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct third-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition would be differentiated from the historic building through a 5-foot setback and the use of clapboard siding. At its 12 February 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission found that the addition would be compatible in its massing, size, scale, and materials. The work complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's comments at its 12 February 2021 meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 MARCH 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:36:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Catharine Lowery and Ian Toner represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman stated that there is no drawing showing the addition's visibility from the south. She agreed that the materials are correct and acknowledged that it has been set back from the façade; however, she expressed concern that the setback may not be enough to make the addition inconspicuous.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the interior ceiling height at the proposed third story.
 - Ms. Stein questioned whether the addition could be lowered by about one foot, noting that there is 11 feet between the floor and parapet at the front. She commented that the height is awkward in elevation.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the scale is incompatible, observing that the addition towers over the building. He added that it seems much larger than it needs to be. He suggested that the roof pitch forward or incorporate a flat gable.
 - Other Committee members agreed.
- Ms. Stein commented that she does not take issue with the proposed five-foot setback, adding that it is enough to differentiate the addition from the two-story building. She added that her concerns relate to reducing the height of the addition and its presence from the street.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that there is a wonderful small scale to the row and that the overbuild is too tall for the structure below.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern over the amount of setback and the horizontal siding. He commented that the addition should be clad in stucco or have a masonry appearance.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that he does not find the siding to be problematic, though he argued that the addition stands too far forward on the building and would be too conspicuous from the street. He suggested that it be set back six to eight feet.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant to respond to the Committee's comments.
 - Ms. Lowery replied that the interior ceiling height at the high point at the front is at about nine feet, which then slopes back to 8.5 feet. She agreed that she could investigate the ceiling shapes that were suggested or could slope the roof toward the front, which is 11 feet above the existing second story. Regarding material, she commented that she considered stucco but contended that there are buildings in the immediate neighborhood with clapboard siding, though she noted that those buildings were on Waverly Street, just outside the district.
- Mr. Detwiler asked why the addition overhangs by one foot in the rear.
 - Ms. Lowery answered that the client was adamant that as much space be incorporated as possible. She pointed to the floor plan and noted that the space is tight. Instead of a 7-foot 4-inch room, she added, there would be an 8-foot 4-inch room, which is considerably more comfortable and useable.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the addition can be reduced in height, noting that there is a one-foot roof structure and a one-foot floor structure. She questioned whether it could be lowered by a foot, adding that the reduction by a foot would

address the Committee's concerns. She then remarked that by constructing the addition on top of the existing roof increases the height substantially.

- Ms. Stein agreed, adding that retaining the roof also extends the stair at the inside, which is part of the reason for the overhang.
- Ms. Lowery stated it is typically easier to retain the existing structure but commented that she could explore lowering the height.
- Mr. Toner explained that when he designs an addition for a finished and occupied home, he typically builds the addition above the roof to avoid exposing the interior to the elements during construction. When a home is unoccupied and the entire interior is to be remodeled, he stated that he would normally remove the roof and set the addition lower. He agreed that it results in a better finished design but countered that it removes more of the original structure and potentially exposes the interior to weather during the removal period.
- Mr. Detwiler contended that a third of the mass of the building is being added, and it would have a significant impact on the existing fabric. He stated that his preference would be to work with the existing roof structure so that it supports the load above. He suggested potentially incorporating a clipped ceiling so that the height could be reduced at the front of the building. He argued against the rear overhang and recommended that it align with the existing rear wall.
- Ms. Lukachik stated that the load of the addition will impact the rear wall and the bearing walls. She contended that the applicant will need to bring interventions to accommodate the load and suggested that the depth of the structure be reduced.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that his main issue centers on the height of the front cornice of the addition and asked that it be lowered. He opined that any number of interventions could be done to achieve a reduced mass and make the scale of the addition more compatible with the existing two-story structure.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested a dormer overbuild, adding that the windows are too tall for the front of the addition.
 - Ms. Lowery responded that the third-story windows are currently the same size as the first-story windows but that she could consider reducing the size.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission reviewed the same application in-concept at its 12 February 2021 meeting and commented that the addition was appropriate in size, scale, massing, and material.
- The third-story addition would be set back five feet and would include a one-foot rear overhang that would not be visible from a public right-of-way.
- The in-concept application proposed six-over-six aluminum clad double-hung sash windows at the front façade of the addition and fiber cement clapboard siding. The current application proposes the same materials and maintains the same overall appearance.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- It did not agree with the Historical Commission's decision that the addition was appropriate in size, scale, massing, and material, which it made during its February 2021 in-concept review of the application.

- The size and scale of the addition is incompatible and its height should be further reduced by either lowering the overall height of the addition or modifying the design by sloping the roof toward the front façade or incorporating a dormer overbuild.

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

ITEM: 341 S. 25th Street 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 25 SUMMIT ST

Proposal: Construct two-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michele and Andrew Clayton

Applicant: Charles Overholser, McCoubrey/Overholser, Inc.

History: 1928

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Constructed in 1928, the existing building at 25 Summit Street is the remaining east wing of a large, three-story villa constructed c. 1858 in the Chestnut Hill section of Philadelphia. The original building was added to and altered numerous times between 1895 and 1950, when it was demolished. The foundation of the original house became the walled garden on the southwest side of the existing building. Additional alterations were made to the property in 1974. This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition to the 1928 wing. At the first floor, the addition would extend approximately 21 feet in width and depth, over an existing garage. At the second floor, the addition would be set in from the sides and extend approximately eight feet from the rear façade. The addition would require the removal of approximately 16 feet 10 inches of masonry at the rear of both floors. The addition would be clad in composite siding, with Azek trim and aluminum clad windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove portion of rear wall
- Construct two-story addition

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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 will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition removes some historic material, but is differentiated from and compatible with the old and is appropriate in massing, size, scale and proportion to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. The application complies with this Standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:54:22

RECUSAL:

- Mr. McCoubrey recused owing to his connection to the contracting company.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Kate Cleveland represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein questioned the significant removal of stone, particularly at the second floor. She noted there would be a way to achieve the same program without the removal of as much masonry.
 - Ms. Cleveland responded that the location of the existing window in the current bathroom could easily accommodate a door into the new tub area, but that the second window would open into a closet of the proposed addition. She explained that they are trying to accomplish two things: first, to regain additional natural light, and second, to reduce the structural problems that would result if they left significant amounts of stone at the second floor above the new opening at the first floor. The area where the stone would be removed would be encased in the new addition and in the interior of the building, out of public view.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein that the least amount of masonry removed is best. He argued that it would be better to cut down the existing windows and structurally support the remaining wall from below. He noted that the applicants could modify or add additional windows to the north elevation of the addition to gain more light.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that he is not a fan of the shutters proposed on the north addition.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the connection between the second-floor roof of the addition and the existing soffit, suggesting that the gap be reduced and tightened up.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the transom bars and muntins of the doors and windows on the west elevation should align.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the proportions of the millwork and columns, noting that they seem wide and heavy.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that the corner boards of the second story are too wide and the trim boards could be reduced. He noted that he is okay with the

- proportions of the pilasters and columns, as well as the siding, but suggested that the corner boards be reduced to six or eight-inch boards.
- Ms. Cleveland responded that they have drawn the siding as having a seven-inch reveal.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that four to six inches would be more appropriate for the corner boards.
 - Mr. Detwiler recommended considering Boral trim rather than Azek as it is more stable.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes to remove historic stone at the first and second floors of the rear wall of the building.
- The overall massing of the addition are appropriate, but details including window and door muntin alignment and trimwork sizes and proportions should be modified.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- With some revisions to the design, the proposed addition would be differentiated from and compatible with the old, would be appropriate in massing, size, scale and proportion to protect the integrity of the property and its environment, and would satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided additional stone is retained at the second floor, with existing window opening utilized for new doorways; the muntins and transom bars of the windows and doors on the west elevation are aligned; the corner boards of second story are reduced; the siding has a six-inch exposure; and the shutters are removed on second story of the proposed addition, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 25 Summit St MOTION: Approval, with conditions MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey				X	
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Guttermann	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				

ADDRESS: 541 N 23RD ST

Proposal: Construct roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Thomas and Kathleen Klemm

Applicant: Elizabeth Johnson, Brighton Architecture + Design

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 541 N. 23rd Street is classified as contributing in the Spring Garden Historic District. The applicant is proposing to construct two new roof decks in the exact locations of the two existing roof decks. Both decks were constructed prior to the designation of the Spring Garden Historic District. No zoning or building permit was found for the decks, but they are visible in aerial photographs as far back as 1996. The historic district was created in 2000 and the decks are noted in the district's inventory. The lower deck is situated on the rear ell and is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The upper deck is located on the flat roof of the main block, and while it is set back from the front façade, it is built to the very edge of the side of the house, making it visible from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct roof decks.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The deck on the main block is visible from the public right-of-way due to the fact that it is not set back from the side of the house. It therefore fails to satisfy this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the upper roof deck as proposed, but approval of a roof deck set back from the edge of the side of the house, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:14:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Beth Johnson and deck contractor Chelsea Hengstler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked the staff to clarify that, if the applicant had decided to simply perform routine maintenance on the deck, including the replacement of boards, recoating of surfaces, etc., then the work would not require the Historical Commission's review.

She continued by asking whether it was due to the applicant's proposal to replace the decks entirely and in-kind that the application had to be referred to the Historical Commission.

- Ms. Schmitt confirmed this was accurate.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the existing decks were grandfathered.
 - Ms. Schmitt confirmed this was accurate.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant whether she still wanted to proceed with the proposal to replace both decks entirely rather than just perform maintenance to the existing decks.
 - Ms. Schmitt confirmed this was accurate.
 - Ms. Johnson responded that they did wish to move forward with the application to replace the existing decks in-kind.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the existing conditions of the decks were so poor as to require total replacement.
 - Ms. Hengstler replied that the deck appears to have been constructed no later than 1996, meaning that the existing pressure-treated wood was due for replacement. She explained that her company would not recommend installing new materials on top of a 20-year-old frame for safety reasons. Ms. Hengstler also stated that the size of the upper deck was a selling point for the current owners, and they wanted to have full use of it going forward.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the railing would need to be pulled back from the side of the roof. However, it would need to be studied before the precise distance could be determined in order to make the deck inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification about whether the stucco at the party wall extended up and covered the deck structure.
 - Ms. Hengstler and Ms. Johnson responded that the distortion of the aerial view perhaps made it seem that way but the stucco was only applied to the side of the building.
- Ms. Lukachik asked whether the height of the existing railing was the same height as was being proposed.
 - Ms. Hengstler confirmed that that was accurate.
- Ms. Lukachik asked whether the all of the dimensions for the replacement deck were proposed to match those of the existing.
 - Ms. Johnson confirmed this was accurate.
 - Ms. Hengstler added that the materials proposed for the new railings were much sleeker and would not be as bulky as the existing wooden railing.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how about the size of the upper deck.
 - Ms. Hengstler replied that the deck measure 15 feet by 15 feet and 7 inches.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicant to speak of any structural issues with the existing decks.
 - Ms. Hengstler responded that the existing framing was showing signs of wear and tear, including deterioration of the pressure-treated wood and the decking. She further explained that, if the decking was removed, the joists would no longer be level, and therefore the recommendation was to replace the entire deck including the framing.
- Mr. Detwiler asked the other members of the Architectural Committee how much of this work could be considered general maintenance, pointing out that they could not recommend approval of the existing upper deck in its current location.

- Ms. Gutterman reminded Mr. Detwiler of Ms. Stein's comments at the beginning of the review confirming that a proposal to completely reconstruct the existing decks must be reviewed as a new application.
- Ms. Lukachik asked if there was a scenario where the joists could be replaced as needed, with new decking and railings, so that the work remained more in line with maintenance.
- Ms. Stein summarized that the applicant could decide to replace the existing deck entirely and pull the it back by the necessary distance to make it less conspicuous from the public right-of-way, or the applicant could move forward with repairing the existing deck as needed. Ms. Stein asked the applicants how they wanted to proceed.
 - Ms. Hengstler replied that she would take both options back to her client to discuss with them.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicants could work with the staff to make a mock up in order to determine how far the deck would actually need to be pushed back in order to make it less visible because it could be less than five feet.
- Mr. Farnham noted that, if the owners decided to move forward with repairing the existing decks rather than replacing them, it was likely that they could withdraw the current proposal and work with the staff on the approval.
- Mr. McCoubrey clarified that because the lower deck and the stair leading to the upper deck were not visible from the public right-of-way, the Architectural Committee could recommend approval for that scope of the application.
- Ms. Stein commented that the recommendation could be split into two parts to address the upper deck and the lower deck and stair separately.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The upper deck was in place at the time of designation, and is therefore grandfathered in.
- The deck can be repaired under the ordinary maintenance provision in the historic preservation ordinance.
- If the deck is completely replaced, the Historical Commission and Architectural Committee must review it as a proposal for a new deck.
- Owing to the deck's current location at the very edge of the side wall, it is conspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The lower deck and staircase are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The upper deck may be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way-by if it is relocated away from the side wall.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As proposed, the upper deck would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way and therefore would not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.
- The lower deck and staircase would inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and therefore would satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the upper deck as proposed, but approval of the lower deck and staircase, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 MARCH 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ITEM: 541 N 23rd ST**MOTION: Denial of upper deck; approval of lower deck and staircase****MOVED BY: Stein****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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 244-58 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct 11 single-family residences

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Shirley Snyderman

Applicant: Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design LLC

History: 1960

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-contributing gas station on this property located within the Old City Historic District, and construct 11 single-family residences on the site. Rowhouses stood on this site until at least the 1960s. The proposed buildings would be four stories in height with roof decks and pilot houses. Parking for nine of the houses would be accessed through a shared interior driveway, while the remaining two houses fronting Vine Street would utilize existing curb cuts for garage access.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing gas station structures.
- Construct 11 single-family residences.

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 proposed new construction is compatible with the materials, features, size, scale, proportions and massing of the surrounding context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 MARCH 2021****PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV****PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:34:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Agata Reister represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked if a complete set of floor plans was submitted because her set did not show the entire project.
 - Ms. Reister replied the plans included are representative of the interior layouts of the units, but do not show the interiors of all units.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that it would be nice to have a larger floor plan showing exactly how this building relates to each street.
 - Ms. Reister replied that she would update the submission with all the floor plans.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he appreciates the effort to get the cars inside rather than having garage doors on the outside.
- Ms. Gutterman asked why the pilot houses are so tall.
 - Ms. Reister replied they are actually the minimum at 10 feet but she could probably lower them by a few inches. She noted they have a slight parapet wall and she tried to keep it to a minimum to avoid having a sloped roof with gutters.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the proximity of the railings to the front of the houses.
 - Ms. Reister responded that they are proposing a five-foot setback for the decks, as allowed by the zoning code.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he appreciates that they are using a fair number of windows to break up some of the mass of this massive construction but wishes that the New Street elevation had some more articulation to it. He continued that the other facades appear more developed but the New Street façade is a bit too blank. Mr. Detwiler recommended adding more articulation on that façade.
 - Ms. Reister agreed that they can work on that elevation. She noted that the New Street façade is relatively small but she can add more windows to it. Ms. Reister continued that her thought was that it was an 18-foot façade and it was a short transition so that is why it includes fewer windows or no windows.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that it would be great if the first story treatment wrapped the entire side of New Street as well but noted that he appreciated that it wraps as much as it does. He asked Ms. Reister to consider this.
 - Mr. McCoubrey said that there is an opportunity at the New Street facade to step the base and then step it back up and make a kind of a gate feeling as you enter the parking drive. He explained that instead of carrying the stone straight across, it could step down if you wanted to run it along New Street.
 - Ms. Reister explained that when they were designing the building they did extend the stone along the New Street façade but decided it felt out of place when the material turned the corner from New Street to the garage area.
 - Mr. Detwiler said he thinks they could wrap it right to the right to the garage door as shown on A-2.2. He added that it is such a big façade, and he thinks it would be helpful to break it down. Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that the first-floor treatment does not need to be full height to the second story of New Street; rather it could be a water table below the window line or something similar, but that there should be more articulation there.

- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the main front elevations shown on A-2.0. He pointed out the switch between a spandrel panel system and then masonry between second and third-floor windows. He inquired about the reason for the change.
 - Ms. Reister replied they would like to propose a panel that is not so much of a contemporary panel but something that is more of an extruded metal with reveals in order to break up the façade in general. She continued that it is a larger development on that street, so that they felt that that was a nice little touch.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested stucco or a different brick pattern, versus the metal.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he appreciates that the design is traditional with aligned windows following a rhythm. He continued that they should make every attempt to line up windows where they can, pointing out that some of the fourth-story windows are not quite lined up. He added that this is most likely reacting to the interior program.
 - Ms. Reister responded and said she will study this further and see what can be done.
 - Mr. Detwiler said that any attempt to better organize the windows would be appreciated. He noted that they could possibly be ganged together and have one big header and one big sill with a wood mass between them.
 - Ms. Reister replied that she understood but stated that the interior floor plan drove the positioning of the windows. She agreed to study the window layout further.
- Ms. Stein pointed to the N. 2nd Street façade and encouraged the architect to exclude the use of gutters and downspouts on the building's exterior because it is not common in Old City, owing to the large scale of the buildings. She said that this building is very large and things like gutters could be placed at the back of the property in the internal parking area so they do not appear on the primary facades.
 - Ms. Reister responded that this was done on the N Philip Street façade. She stated that they will likely propose internal gutters, owing to the pilot houses bisecting the roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he wished to follow up on comments about the windows. He noted that he is concerned about the proportion of the ground-floor windows being skinny and tall. Traditionally you would have nice material there and a window that may be of a bigger scale. Mr. McCoubrey suggested looking at two windows there rather than three.
 - Mr. Detwiler added that they could be wider like the ones above.
 - Ms. Reister responded that she did start with that initially, but it seemed very repetitive, so she may wish to present both first-floor window options at the Historical Commission meeting and have the members opine on which is the best design solution.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that he is not in favor of what looks like wood clapboard on the inside of this complex. He added that it makes it look like it is a wood frame building and he would prefer to see a siding or paneling system that does not look like wood clapboard. Mr. McCoubrey said this could be a panel system or metal system.
 - Ms. Reister replied that they can accommodate this recommendation and make this change. She asked if the Committee would accept a panel system that is more on the contemporary side.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that that would be acceptable.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested stucco.
 - Ms. Reister stated that they would prefer a panel system in lieu of stucco. She cited issues with stucco on other projects and buildings of this height. Ms. Reister

explained that there is too much movement between the seasons for the stucco to perform properly.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The new construction proposed will replace a non-contributing building in the Old City Historic District.
- The proposed building is generally compatible with the historic district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application meets Standard 9, but the following should be considered:
 - Determine if two windows are better than three at the first story.
 - Determine if the fourth-floor windows can be better aligned with the windows below or have a more regular pattern between them.
 - Incorporate a cladding treatment on New Street elevation at the first story to provide more of a base design and also to wrap the corners to the garage doors.
 - Add more articulation to the New Street façade.
 - Reduce the height of pilot houses to the minimum allowed by code.
 - Convert to an internal downspout system. Downspouts should not be visible on primary facades.
 - Revise the interior courtyard siding from clapboards to a panel system.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided the suggested design improvements are considered, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 244-58 N 2nd St					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1505 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Linggan Realty 89

Applicant: Adam Zangrilli, Zangrilli Design

History: 1859; storefront, new brickwork, stucco and cornice, 1923

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

The building at 1505 Spring Garden Street is a three-story building with a two-story rear ell. At its February 2021 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application proposing to construct an addition so that the rear ell and most of the main block rose four stories in height. The addition was set back nine feet from the front façade, where a deck was proposed. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval of a rear addition with no massing or deck on the main block, pursuant to Standard 9. The applicant submitted a revised scope for review by the Historical Commission at its March 2021 meeting, which the Commission voted to remand to the Architectural Committee for review. This revised application removes the roof deck and extends the setback of the rooftop addition from nine feet to eighteen feet, in response to the Architectural Committee's comments at its February meeting regarding potential visibility from the public right-of-way.

Several other buildings on this row have full three-story rear ells, but only one has a fourth story, which is the property next door with the mansard addition, constructed about 1885. The only work to the front façade called out in the application is the replacement of the non-historic storefront windows and door, for which the staff can work with the applicant on the details.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct third and fourth floor addition.

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 revised massing will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way and will not detract from the historic character of the row.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:54:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Adam Zangrilli represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 MARCH 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the revised massing of the addition, noting that the Committee's recommendation from its February 2021 meeting was that the addition be limited to the rear ell, but this revised application shows approximately seven feet of addition on the main block. She stated that there are two separate issues. One is the issue of visibility to the public, and the other is the issue of the impact to historic fabric.
 - Mr. Zangrilli responded that the addition will not be visible from across Spring Garden Street. He stated that the rear addition is only 230 square feet, and 33 percent will be taken up with the stairway and circulation, so the small amount of massing on the main block is needed for it to make financial sense for the property owner to undertake this work. He stated that he was under the impression that the issue was about visibility from the public right-of-way, which his revised massing addresses. He asked that the Committee take into account the surrounding context and the condition of this building.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that the sightlines depicted in the drawing would change if viewed from further back than the curb across the street.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that Mr. Zangrilli is proposing to add weight to a wall and she does not know if it can take that weight.
 - Mr. Zangrilli responded that a structural engineer will, of course, verify the structural design, minimizing any impact to the main building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the design of the proposed addition and the location of mechanical equipment. She critiqued aspects of the drawings. She stated that she needs to react to what is before her today, not what is intended to be done. She stated that she has difficulty reviewing this as a concept.
 - Mr. Zangrilli responded that the windows in the front of the addition would be similar in width to the windows in the existing façade, although they would not be seen by the public. He explained that he put together a conceptual package rather than a full architectural set, so that the client has assurance that it makes financial sense to pay for the full architectural and structural drawings. The roofing material would be an asphalt shingle. The panels would be a resin-type panel. Any condensers would be located in the rear yard.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the application is submitted as in-concept or final review.
 - The Committee members responded that it is submitted as a final review.
- Ms. Lukachik explained that it would be helpful to have a few additional plans to help to understand the intent and structural concerns. She asked about the rear wall of the main block and if it is proposed for complete removal.
 - Mr. Zangrilli responded that the rear wall of the main block would become interior space.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the rear wall of the main block is an important feature of the building. Even though it is not visible, it is removal of a significant portion of the building. He asked to see a scheme that retains the rear wall of the main building, with openings put through it to work with the plan. He stated that his primary concern is the removal of the rear wall of the main block of the building. There should be an attempt to retain as much of the main block as possible.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented on the method of getting from the third to fourth floor, stating that it cannot be built the way it was shown. He suggested that the applicant come back for review once the design is finalized.

- Mr. Zangrilli agreed regarding the stairs, and explained that he had limited time to put together this revised scheme. He stated that he is currently working on the stair configuration. He stated that these are all resolvable issues that will be part of the complete architectural set, but the question is if the concept is approvable.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she did not have enough information to approve an in-concept application. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.
- Mr. Zangrilli reiterated that he was seeking approval of the concept so that he could move forward with producing a full architectural set for which he would have to bill the client, something that he was trying to hold off on doing until he knew that the concept would receive approval.
- Mr. McCoubrey responded that there were no assertions made that a fourth floor is not approvable.
- Mr. Detwiler discussed visibility of the proposed addition, stating that it will be visible from vantage points that are not directly across Spring Garden Street. He suggested a material other than resin panels, perhaps stucco or Hardi panels.
 - Others disagreed that the addition would be visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Stein stated that the proposed massing was acceptable.
 - Ms. Lukachik and Mr. Detwiler agreed.
 - Ms. Gutterman disagreed.
- Ms. Stein stated that the application needs additional drawings and is currently incomplete because the drawings do not accurately depict the structure, rear wall, and interior stair.
- Some Committee members stated that the application was denied.
 - Mr. Farnham clarified for the applicant that the Architectural Committee is an advisory body and makes a non-binding recommendation to the Historical Commission. It is the Commission that will make the actual determination of approval or denial of the application. The Committee cannot deny the application.
 - Mr. Zangrilli responded that he can revise the drawings for review by the Historical Commission, and that all recommendations received today including the retention of the rear wall of the main block are achievable.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Additional and revised drawings are necessary to be able to review the application sufficiently.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As proposed, the extent of demolition at the rear is too great and therefore the proposal fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1505 Spring Garden St.
MOTION: Denial
MOVED BY: Gutterman
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 2227 PANAMA ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition with deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jeremy Tobacman and Jean Galbraith

Applicant: Charles Loomis

History: 1963

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a fourth-floor addition with roof deck and pilot house on a rowhouse that was built in 1963 and is classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The staff approved a fourth-floor addition at the adjacent property in 2019, but determined that this proposal, which includes a roof deck and pilot house as well as an addition, exceeds the staff's approval authority.

The addition, deck, and pilot house will be visible from the public right-of-way. The standard established by the Roofs Guideline, inconspicuousness, is not the standard that should be applied in this case because the property is classified as non-contributing in the historic district. The inconspicuous standard is designed to protect historic buildings that contribute to districts. Additions and roof decks can be visible on non-historic buildings and new construction without adversely affecting their surrounds. Conspicuous additions and roof decks are generally prohibited on contributing buildings because they change the spatial characteristics of the historic buildings, and therefore the viewer's perceptions and understandings of those buildings. The question in this case is whether the addition and deck would adversely impact the historic district, not the building itself, which has no historic value. Given that this building is part of a row of non-contributing buildings and is relatively short and squat compared to the historic buildings around it, adding height and mass to this building will not adversely affect its surroundings. Even with the proposed additions, it will not be as tall as the surrounding historic buildings. The character of the environment will be protected.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rooftop addition with deck and pilot house on non-contributing building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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 building is not historic, so no historic materials would be destroyed with the construction of the addition and deck. The size, scale, proportions, and massing of the proposed addition and deck are compatible with the surroundings and will protect the integrity of the historic district.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:15:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Charles Loomis and property owner Jeremy Tobacman represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Stein expressed concern about the massing and scale of the pilot house and deck. They stated that they are not concerned by the addition of the fourth floor.
 - Ms. Chantry explained that the staff approved the addition on the adjacent building, but decided to forward this application to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission for review, owing to the pilot house and deck, even though it is a non-contributing property in the historic district.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the pilot house and the ability to reduce its visibility from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Loomis responded that he has done what he could to minimize the pilot house, working within the site and building constraints, and keeping the pilot house as close to the rear of the building as is allowed. The height is seven-feet, six inches. The zoning code would allow for it to be taller, but efforts were taken to minimize it. Given the larger rear yard, it is a distance away from the Delancey Street properties at the rear.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the pilot house includes mechanical units within its mass, and asked if it is possible to reduce the mass by making that mechanical equipment sit on the roof deck rather than being enclosed in the massing of the pilot house.
 - Mr. Loomis responded that it is not designed as a package unit system, but he can consider the revision.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the parapet could be removed.
 - Mr. Loomis noted that the parapet height is quite minimal.
- Mr. Detwiler discussed the front façade of the addition. He referenced the fourth-floor addition next door, and suggested that this addition become more like a dormer, similar to the addition next door. He suggested it would read as more transitional from what is below.

- Mr. McCoubrey agreed. He suggested pulling in the side walls slightly and having some articulation of the roof at both party walls, and having the front window read more like a dormer, to help diminish the visual impact.
- Ms. Lukachik asked about the projection on the west elevation. She asked if it needs to project so high, almost like a chimney. Mr. Detwiler asked if it would be possible to make it more like a skylight, with the railing wrapping around it.
 - Mr. Loomis responded that it is part of a light monitor that is providing light into the building.
- Mr. Tobacman, the property owner, thanked the Committee for its careful consideration of the application. He explained that his family is seeking additional space and roof deck access.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The house was built in 1963 and is classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- A reduction of the overall massing in the ways suggested during the review will allow for a proposal that satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval of a revised design provided the addition is further studied to make it look more like a dormer rather than an extended room, and consideration is given to reducing the massing of the pilot house, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2227 Panama St.					
MOTION: Denial as proposed, but approval of a revised design with conditions					
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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:32:45

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:33 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.