

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

**TUESDAY, 27 APRIL 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
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Robert Gurmankin
Steve Black
Briana Wilkins, Parkway Corporation
Robert Hicks, Parkway Corporation
Jay Farrell
Gary Vernick
Hal Schirmer, Esq.
Neville Fernandes
Linda Polgar
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Sean Law
Adam Hunt
Michael Kessler
Becky Sell, Ascent

Raymond Rola
Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO Design
Steven L Gelbart
Evan Haberman
James Henriques
Mark Hansen
Doug Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architects
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
Richard W. Thom
Harrison Haas, Esq., Cozen O'Connor
Michael Koep
Ivy Solomon
German Yakubov
Brian LaBrose
Brian Berson
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architects
Rich Leimbach
Eleanor Krause

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2000-24 ARCH ST

Proposal: Relocate gas station to Aviator Park
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 2000 Arch Associates LP
Applicant: Becky Sell, Ascent
History: 1930; Gulf Gasoline Station
Individual Designation: 8/6/1981
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to relocate an historic Gulf gas station that stands along the west side of 20th Street, south of Arch Street. The gas station is the only historic resource on the property at 2000-24 Arch Street, which was designated in 1981. The very large lot was used as a car rental facility for many years. When the facility closed, the non-historic buildings at the site were demolished. With the exception of the gas station, which is located at the edge of the site high above the remainder of the site at a different grade, the lot is now dedicated to surface parking. The new owner plans to redevelop the site.

Section 14-203(88) of the preservation ordinance indicates that the removal of a building from its site is considered a demolition in the legal sense. Therefore, owing to the limitations of approvals of demolitions at Section 14-1005(6)(d) in the preservation ordinance, the Historical Commission may approve this application only after finding that there is no feasible reuse for the building and/or that the relocation is necessary in the public interest.

The small gas station was constructed in 1930 and has been vacant and unused for many decades. The building is in poor condition. A former owner of the property sought the Historical Commission's approval to demolish the building in the mid 1980s. The Historical Commission worked with the owner for several years seeking a new site for the small building. The building was unsuccessfully offered to Gulf, the Smithsonian Institute, Henry Ford Museum in Michigan,

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 APRIL 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

SEPTA, and the Fairmount Park Commission. Although some potential relocation sites were identified, for example at a recycling center in Fairmount Park, moving the building more than a short distance was ultimately deemed infeasible, owing to obstacles including bridges, underpasses, and utility lines. Eventually, in 1988, after exhausting options for relocation, the Historical Commission approved the demolition of the building, provided the owner continued to seek a relocation site until it was demolished. Despite the approval, the building was not demolished, and it stands today at its original site.

The current plan calls for moving the building two blocks to the north, to Aviator Park at Logan Circle, where it would be held under the auspices of the Department of Parks and Recreation. The rehabilitation of the building for its new use as a park amenity will be proposed as a subsequent application in a later phase of the project. The application claims that the relocation is necessary in the public interest, in that it would ensure the preservation of the historic resource while providing for its use and appreciation by the public. In addition, decades of failed attempts to find a reuse for this building have demonstrated that its reuse is not feasible in its current location.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance; the building has no feasible reuse in its current location; the relocation is necessary in the public interest for the preservation and adaptive reuse of the historic resource.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:25

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Consultant Becky Sell and property owner's representative Briana Wilkins represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Sell stated she is working on behalf of Parkway Corporation, the owner of the property at 2000-24 Arch Street.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the application is very thorough and moving the building to preserve and reuse it will be a wonderful outcome for "the lonely little gas station."
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the building is stable enough to be moved.
 - Ms. Sell responded that the building is able to be moved without damaging it. The building will be wrapped in cables, the interior will be stabilized, and the window and door openings will be shored.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that the pent eave will be removed before the move, and then reinstalled later.
 - Ms. Sell stated that all of the parts of the building will be catalogued before the move. The pent eave will be moved to and stored at a secure, fenced area at the new site. If there are security concerns at the site, the removed materials will be relocated to a storage facility. The pent eave will be reinstalled later. Deteriorated elements of the pent eave will be replaced in kind. The light fixtures that ring the pent eave will be repaired. A few that were damaged in a fire in the 1990s will be replaced in kind.
- Mr. Cluver noted that a mature sycamore tree will need to be removed at the new site.

- Ms. Sell stated that there will be some changes to walkways and trees at the new site to accommodate the relocation of the building.
- Ms. Wilkins stated that Parkway Corporation, the owner of the Arch Street property that includes the gas station, has been working closely with the Department of Parks and Recreation to plan for the move. The relocation of the gas station is part of a larger effort to animate Aviator Park.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the application was extremely thorough and well prepared. He congratulated the applicants on their work. He asked if they knew where the gasoline pumps were originally located in relation to the gas station building.
 - Ms. Sell directed him to a photograph in her application that showed the pumps.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested adding something at the new site to indicate where the pumps would be located.
 - Mr. Farnham replied that, while not part of this application, he has reviewed preliminary plans for the reuse of the building as a café that is gas station themed and includes gas pumps, lighting, signage, and other elements that evoke a 1930s gas station.
- Ms. Stein noted that the application calls for the installation of a foundation and utilities, but not the restoration of the building. She asked how the site will be left at the end of this part of the project.
 - Ms. Sell and Ms. Wilkins stated that the site will be fenced off during the site preparation and relocation and restoration of the building. They noted that Parkway Corporation and the Department of Parks and Recreation are working to ensure that the site is safe and that the work is completed in a timely manner.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the tiles on the pent eave will be documented before they are removed.
 - Ms. Sell responded that all materials will be documented and catalogued before they are removed.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the restoration plans would also be reviewed by the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. Farnham replied that the restoration plans will be reviewed by the Historical Commission. He noted that they may be reviewed by the staff only if they propose a true restoration.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The gas station building has been vacant and unused for many decades.
- The building has no feasible reuse in its current location.
- The building can be safely moved to its new location.
- The new location will allow the public to experience and use the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The relocation of the building is necessary in the public interest for the preservation and adaptive reuse of the historic resource.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance.

ITEM: 2000-24 ARCH ST					
MOTION: Approve					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 207-09 and 211 VINE ST

Proposal: Construct 6-story multi-family building and two townhouses, remove rear ell

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Greythorne Development Corporation

Applicant: Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO design

History: 209 Vine Street, 1825

Individual Designation: 10/1/1981

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

207 Vine Street: Non-contributing

209 Vine Street: Contributing

211 Vine Street: Non-contributing

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

Located at the northeast corner of Vine Street and N. American Street, the properties currently known as 207-09 and 211 Vine Street extend the full block from Vine Street to Wood Street, and include a combination of parking lots, non-contributing buildings, and the individually-designated and contributing building historically known as 209 Vine Street. The northern boundary of the Old City Historic District is along Wood Street.

This application calls for the construction of two townhouses on the existing parking lot at 207 Vine Street; the removal of the majority of the rear ell of 209 Vine Street and the rehabilitation of its front façade; and the demolition of the non-contributing buildings at 211 Vine Street and construction of a six-story building.

The new townhouses at 207 Vine Street would feature three-story brick facades with regular fenestration. A fourth floor clad in standing seam metal siding would be set back from the front façade and feature a series of terraces and decks.

At 209 Vine Street, the application calls for the rehabilitation of the front façade and main block, but the staff notes that the elevation drawings do not accurately reflect the existing or restored conditions. The final details could be worked out at the staff level.

The applications also proposes to remove the historic building's rear ell, which has been heavily modified since its original construction. The c. 1825 main block originally featured two-story ell and narrow piazza. Between 1910 and 1917, a tapered two-story addition had been appended to the rear of the main block, and a third-story with a mansard roof added to the two-story ell. It is not clear when other alterations were made, but no curved or tapered corners are presently visible, nor does the mansard roof remain. In 1983, a zoning permit was issued for the demolition of a two-story portion of the rear and construction of a three-story addition. The majority of the existing ell is covered in rough stucco. The proposed new construction would eliminate the visibility of the rear of the building from the public right-of-way.

The proposed six-story building would extend from the corner of Vine Street north along American Street and onto Wood Street. The Vine Street elevation would be clad in brick with cast stone belt courses and feature four columns of industrial-size window openings. The brick cladding would turn the corner onto American Street for two bays, and then transition to two floors of brick cladding with charcoal grey cement board and batten panels above for both the American and Wood Street elevations. The American Street elevation would feature ground-floor windows as well as garage openings, and floors four through six would feature balconies with glass railings.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing buildings
- Remove rear ell of historic building and rehab facade
- Construct townhouses
- Construct six-story building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - This application proposes to demolish non-contributing buildings and the heavily altered rear ell of an historic building and avoids the removal of historic materials and features that characterize the properties, satisfying this Standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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 new construction would be independent of the existing historic building, and the materials, size, scale, proportion, and massing of the new construction is consistent with the Old City Historic District, which is characterized by a variety of architectural styles ranging from 2 ½ to 3 ½ story red brick residential buildings to early twentieth-century mid-rise commercial and industrial buildings. The immediate context along Vine Street is that of three to four story historic buildings interspersed with new construction and vacant lots where new construction has recently been proposed. Along this stretch of American and Wood Streets there are additional vacant lots and new construction. The application satisfies this Standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:25:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carey Jackson Yonce represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman questioned the proposed design of the townhouses at 207 Vine St, noting that the plans do not appear to correspond to the elevation drawings.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that the pergolas are set back far enough that they will not be visible from Vine Street.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that, nevertheless, the pergolas are absent from the elevation drawings.
 - Ms. Stein agreed with Ms. Gutterman, noting that the rendering of the front façade shows setbacks does not show decks, and opined that they do not appear to have been modeled.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that he thinks it is an accurate view, but that the intent is that the pergolas and other rooftop structures will not be visible from the street.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that bases or watertables are one of the character-defining features of many buildings in the Old City Historic District. She opined that the lack of bases on the proposed new construction was out of keeping with the district.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that they started with the design of the corner building, for which they were going for a lofty industrial look and for which a masonry base is less relevant, and wanted to use a similar language and materials for the townhouses, but with less detail, so one can tell that they were part of same project but not an exact copy of the design.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the garage doors along American Street and opined that garages have a deadening effect on the pedestrian experience.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that he understands the potential deadening effect, which is why they made individual garage doors where they could, as well as providing glazed garage doors and lots of other glazing along American Street.
 - Mr. Cluver asked if there is a way to enter the private garages off the ramp and to create a single 16-foot wide opening for the garage entrance.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that they can look into that question and conduct a turning-radius study.
- Ms. Lukachik questioned whether the increased snow load for the roof of the main block of 209 Vine Street that is to remain has been investigated. She noted that the snow load will be more significant with the adjacent new construction and may require reinforcement or other interventions.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that the structural engineer has not specifically addressed the snow load at this time, but the overall intent is to completely gut and renovate the structure as three residential units. He noted that they plan to work with the Historical Commission's staff on the details of a complete façade restoration.
 - Ms. Gutterman questioned whether they are keeping the interior floor levels of 209 Vine Street.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that they are retaining the historic floor levels.

- Mr. McCoubrey questioned the material of the party wall of the proposed six-story building.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that they are proposing a board and batten treatment.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that board and batten does not seem appropriate for the historic district, and suggested that masonry or stucco are more appropriate materials for the district.
 - Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey opined that metal panels would be preferable to board and batten.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that they are open to metal panels, but want some level of detail, shadow, and articulation that some metal panel systems lose. He noted that there are many examples in Philadelphia of poor metal panel buildings that they would want to try to avoid. He explained that he does not want expanse of flat material, but wants an articulated façade.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, but opined that the proposed board and batten system looks too much like a wood-framed building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the material of the parapet of the main portion of the six-story building.
 - Mr. Yonce responded there is a red cast stone cornice and belt courses.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the vertical cement board siding would be seen from the public right of way.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that the siding seen in the section through the ramp view would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The general scale, massing, and fenestration of the proposed new construction is compatible with the Old City Historic District.
- Red brick and cast stone are compatible with the materials in the historic district, but board and batten siding is not compatible for the scale of the building. The applicant should explore other cladding materials for the party wall and American and Wood Street elevations of the six-story building.
- Buildings in the historic district typically have masonry bases or watertables, and a base should be added to the new construction at 207 Vine Street.
- The drawings and renderings do not accurately reflect the rooftop conditions shown on the plans and should be updated prior to the Historical Commission's meeting.
- The removal of the rear ell of 209 Vine Street is acceptable, owing to its heavily-altered nature and the absence of visibility to that area from the public right-of-way once the new buildings have been constructed.
- The new construction may increase the snow load on the roof of the historic building at 209 Vine Street and may require additional structural reinforcement.
- The number and size of garage doors on the American Street elevation may have a negative impact on the historic district.
- The applicants can work with the staff on the details for the rehabilitation of 209 Vine Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The project retains the historic character and does not remove historic materials that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 2.
- The proposed new construction does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and, with some minor modifications to the proposed design, the new work will be differentiated from the old but compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and the district, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the applicant explore the reduction of the number of garage doors along American Street; a base is added to the townhouses at 207 Vine Street; the drawings and renderings are updated to accurately reflect proposed rooftop conditions at 207 Vine Street; and a material other than board and batten that is compatible with the historic district is used for the party wall and elevations of the new construction along American and Wood Streets, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ITEM: 207-09 and 211 VINE 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 111 S INDEPENDENCE E MALL

Proposal: Cut-down openings and install doors; install canopy
 Review Requested: Review In Concept
 Owner: MRP Realty attn. Charles McGrath
 Applicant: Eleanor Krause, MV+A
 History: 1893; Philadelphia Bourse Building; Hewitt Brothers, architects
 Individual Designation: 1/26/1971
 District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003
 Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks in-concept approval for the installation of an ADA-accessible entrance for the eastern end of the Bourse Building. Presently, the only accessible entrances to the building are located on the west elevation facing Independence Mall, over 360 feet away.

The application proposes to cut the new entrances in the first two or three bays of windows in from 4th Street on the southern, Ranstead Street elevation. The new entrances would be the

width of the existing windows. A new glass canopy and signage would be installed over the entrance.

The application also proposes to close off the entrance to the lower level of the building from 4th Street. The existing glass enclosures are not historic, but the below-grade entrance has always been present.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Cut two or three ADA-accessible entrances on the eastern portion of the Ranstead Street elevation
- Install glass canopy
- Pave over stairs and install glass and metal wall

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Code-Required Work—Accessibility Guideline | Recommended: Identifying the historic building's character-defining exterior features... which may be affected by accessibility code-required work. | Recommended: Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features... are preserved or impacted as little as possible.*
 - This application proposes to remove historic material, but the proposed accessible entrances are located on a secondary elevation, and maintain the width and general appearance of the historic openings. The staff suggests, if possible, maintaining the first bay in from the corner and cutting down the two openings to the west.
- *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 paving over of the 4th Street steps and installation of a glass and metal wall destroys spatial relationships that characterize the property. This portion of the application fails to satisfy this Standard. The staff recommends the installation of a simple metal gate to block the entrance, if it is no longer in use.
 - The attachment of the proposed canopy into brownstone masonry has the potential to compromise and cause permanent damage beyond the holes required for the attachment. The staff recommends that any canopies be free-standing or attached into the window frames, and that the canopy be as minimal as possible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept of the addition of ADA accessible entrances and a canopy, provided they are as minimal as possible, but denial of the paving of the 4th Street steps and installation of a glass and metal wall to block the entrance, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline and Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:47:18

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Eleanor Krause and Neville Fernandes and owner Charlie McGraff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein noted her appreciation of the application as an in-concept request, since it is a big change for a significant building that everyone loves and admires.
- Ms. Stein explained that the Committee understand issues related to accessibility, and an accessible entrance on the side would be consistent with previous approvals, but expressed concern about the scale of the current proposal.
 - Ms. Krause responded that there are two issues they are trying to address. The first is accessibility, with the intent being to make all three entrances accessible. Owing to the grade change, she explained, this may mean that the third entrance may require the floor inside to be manipulated. Secondly, she explained, is the desire to market to prospective tenants. The owner is looking for new tenants, ideally a large retail tenant like a grocer that could fill the main hall and not subdivide the interior. For that kind of use, she continued, it is important to have one large or multiple smaller openings to move customers in and out of the store. She explained that they hope to utilize all three openings to speak to the architecture of the building and provide as much flexibility to the prospective tenants as possible. She noted that they want a sense of what might be possible before the owner starts talking to prospective tenants.
- Ms. Stein expressed concern over the size of the canopy, arguing that it is too large and takes away from primary entrance on 4th Street. She suggested that the canopy be re-scaled and that the applicants explore more modest alternatives. She noted that it would be possible to provide accessibility without making such a big statement.
 - Ms. Krause explained that they intend to install a single canopy across all three openings. She opined that a minimal glass canopy with a light frame would be most appropriate. She noted that they looked into the idea of a free-standing canopy with columns instead of attaching to building, but felt that the sidewalk was too narrow and that it would obscure existing architecture. She said their desire is for something as minimal as possible with steel structural supports that would pierce through the masonry wall.
 - Ms. Gutterman echoed Ms. Stein's concerns, noting that she is concerned not only about the size of the canopy, but the impact on the masonry.
 - Ms. Lukachik agreed, noting that steel is not light, and will have a long-term, permanent effect on the fabric of the building. She suggested that the material be lighter, with individual, cantilevered canopies over the doors, not piercing the building skin.
- Ms. Gutterman explained that she understands the need to install a pair of doors, and based upon the tenant, the potential need for more than one set, but expressed general concern about the long-term impact of this change to the building. She asked whether additional changes would also be requested along Ranstead Street and whether other access points were considered.
 - Ms. Krause responded that they have looked at the building all the way around, and selected this corner for the intervention because it has parking garage access. Since they are seeking a prospective grocer or large tenant, they anticipate more than walk-up use. The main pedestrian access would remain at 5th Street, but customers could also park in the garage, come down elevators that empty at the corner, and go directly across the street to this new entrance. She explained that they did not want to impact the primary, 4th Street elevation. On

the interior, the southeast corner has less significant architecture than the main hall, which they did not want to alter.

- Ms. Lukachik noted that the application proposes to cut the floor to create 0-0' level. She questioned which set of doors this was based upon, since the doors will change in size because of significant change in grade.
 - Ms. Krause responded that the intent is to find a level platform on the sidewalk so all the entrances can come in at the same point.
 - Ms. Lukachik opined that, rather than forcing the design to have three doors, it would be better to have two, so they are not fighting so much with the grade, which drastically changes as goes from the corner back.
- Mr. Cluver commented on the nature of the entrance. He noted that they are not creating a new accessible entrance, but a new public entrance that will take away from the 4th Street entrance, and that three bays of double doors could accommodate a huge volume of people. As a starting point, he suggested agreeing to single cut down at the center bay to respect the balance, and allow the corner to turn in the way it was always intended to turn. He suggested that the initial approval be for an accessible entrance with a canopy at the center bay only, with the potential for the addition of a second cut-down entrance depending on the nature of the fit-out and tenant needs.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, opining that it is important to keep corner intact.
 - Ms. Krause responded that in order for the owner to attract a large tenant to this building, that tenant is going to need more than one door, and this would be essentially one of the primary entrances. She argued that it is necessary to be able to roll grocery carts in and out. She agreed that they might be able to get by with two doors, but that that feels imbalanced. One entrance, she asserted, would not be acceptable to any prospective tenants. She opined that the three-bay entrance seemed like the least adverse effect on the architectural façade while still meeting potential requirements of a prospective tenant.
 - Ms. Stein questioned the scale of the potential grocery tenant, noting that deliveries may also become a challenge. She noted that the proposal is not just the entrance, it is trying to take a historic building and adapt it for something it was not designed for and redirects the public energy from 4th Street to the side.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that most grocery stores do not have three sets of entrance doors.
 - Ms. Krause responded that two is probably a requirement, and three was to be related to the existing architecture of the tripartite element. She stated that she is happy to look at alternatives for the canopy.
- Ms. Stein noted that there are also issues with the size and scale of the signage on the canopy.
- Ms. Stein commented on the proposal to seal access to the lower level of the 4th Street side with a new wall, and argued that there should not be any changes made other than to permanently seal the door.
 - Ms. Krause explained that there is an existing curved stone base.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicants integrate the structure for the canopy into the new door system.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed some confusion over a note shown on the fourth set of doors in from 4th Street, since the existing exterior stairs are not shown in plan.
- Mr. Fernandes explained that for a typical grocery tenant, they usually provide 16-foot wide doors, and that the portion that slides creates an 8 to 9-foot opening, but here the openings would only be approximately 7 feet 6 inches or less.

- Mr. McCoubrey noted that it would be helpful to see a complete floor plan of the space, including all entrances, since it is impossible to tell the size of the potential tenant space.
- Mr. Cluver explained that they should set a bare minimum, since it is not confirmed that it will be a grocery tenant.
- Ms. Krause responded that on 4th Street there is an existing curved stone base that curves down to the lower level basement doors, and on top of the stone wall are existing non-historic storefront panels. She agreed that they could put a railing across top of stairs, but were concerned that if they do that, it will become a trash pit since there would not be access to the doors. She opined that that is probably why the historic wells were covered over in the first place. She explained that they are proposing to continue the storefront across the opening. She noted that they never intended to damage original steps, but planned to cover over first few steps with precast stone planks. She explained that it is not necessary, though, and that they are open to suggestions. She noted that they thought it was best to leave the non-historic structure in place from a symmetrical perspective because it is there on the other side of the building.
 - Mr. Cluver recommended removing structure and restoring the area, even if it unbalances the two sides. He opined that what is proposed is stuck in the middle.
 - Ms. Krause agreed that they are open to exploring options.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that he supports the concept of closing the entrance to the public, but does not support the current way it is proposed.
 - Ms. Gutterman disagreed, noting that she is not supportive of the concept. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with her disagreement.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application is for more than ADA accessibility; it creates a new public entrance on Ranstead Street that detracts from the primary, historic entrances on 4th and 5th Streets.
- The installation of three sets of doors is too many, and should be limited to one at the center if strictly for ADA-access, or two for a tenant entrance, but that the first bay in from 4th Street should remain unaltered. The reduction from three to one or two entrances will also alleviate some concerns about grade changes.
- The scale of the proposed canopy and its signage is too large and the attachment into or through the masonry is inappropriate. A free-standing cantilevered attachment or attachment integrated into the individual door/window frame systems would be more appropriate.
- No changes should be made to the 4th Street stair or façade.
- The application should be supplemented with floor plans that show the full tenant space and how it relates to all existing and potential street entrances.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The current application proposes to remove historic material and create a new primary entrance that alters the spatial relationships that characterize the building, failing to satisfy Standards 2 and 9. However, the proposed entrances are located on a secondary elevation, and maintain the width and general appearance of the historic

openings, so if reduced in scale to one to two entrances, while maintaining the first bay in from the corner, the application may satisfy this Standard.

- The installation of the canopy through the masonry wall may destroy historic materials and cause long-term damage to the building, failing to satisfy Standard 2.
- The proposed alterations to the 4th Street lower-level entrance would alter features and spaces that characterize the property, failing to satisfy Standard 2.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, pursuant to Standard 2 and 9, with the comment that the proposal should be limited to a maximum of two entrances, based on the final tenant, with a limit of one if just for ADA purposes; that the canopy should be freestanding or attached to the new door system; and that future plans should include the full space and all doors to provide a comprehensive understanding of the building and the proposal.

ITEM: 111 S Independence E Mall					
MOTION: Denial as presented					
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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 4204 AND 4206 PARKSIDE AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck with pilot house; rehabilitate buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 4204 Parkside Development

Applicant: German Yakubov, Haverford Square Properties

History: 1895

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Significant, 12/11/2009

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate two vacant but significant buildings in the Parkside Historic District. The buildings have stood unoccupied for years and have suffered substantial damage at the rear, including the loss of windows, exterior stairs, projecting bays, and cornices. This application proposes to restore some of the missing features, including reconstructing the two rear bays, and to construct a rooftop addition, roof decks, and pilot houses. The small rooftop addition would connect the existing historic masonry fire escape to the roof decks. One pilot house would be located at the center of each building's roof. Both the addition and pilot houses would be clad in stucco. The roof decks would be set back 5-feet from the front façade and from the sides of the buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 APRIL 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The application proposes to install new black vinyl windows in the side and rear openings where many windows are currently missing. Two new egress wells would be constructed at the rear. The existing rear door openings, which are missing staircases, would be infilled with brick recessed one inch.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rear addition to connect fire escape to roof deck;
- Construct roof deck and pilot houses;
- Install vinyl windows at sides and rear;
- Reconstruct rear bays;
- Infill openings at rear; and
- Install egress wells at rear.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - Many windows on the side and rear have been lost. The new vinyl windows would replicate the old in configuration, though not material; however, the location of the windows provides minimal visibility from the public right-of-way, and a substitute material may be appropriate. Similarly, the rear bays should be constructed to match the historic bays in appearance, though a substitute material may also be appropriate. Photographic evidence shows that while the bay-window structure remains at 4206 Parkside Avenue, the metal cladding has been lost for about ten years. The entire bay at 4204 Parkside Avenue is currently missing. Owing to the extent of loss at the two buildings, the work to restore the visual appearance of these features using substitute materials complies with this standard.
- *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 rooftop addition is small, does not destroy historic materials, and could be removed without damage to the historic structures. It is compatible in massing, size, and scale; would provide access from the roofs of the buildings to the existing stair tower; and would allow for the retention and rehabilitation of the historic masonry fire escape. The work complies with this standard.
- *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 proposed roof decks and pilot houses would be inconspicuous from the public rights-of-way. Provided the pilot houses are constructed within and not atop the parapet walls of the historic buildings, the work complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the pilot houses are constructed within and not atop the parapet walls of the historic buildings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:24:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Developer German Yakubov represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Yakubov noted that the buildings have been standing vacant for some time and that the addition would not be visible from the street. He explained that he is not planning to replace the roof but would install the footings on top of the existing brick, adding that the deck would not be visible from the street. He elaborated that the addition of the roof deck would be considered a fourth story by code and that two means of egress would be required from the fourth story. Since the fire escape tower already exists, he continued, the logical solution was to create a catwalk to connect it to the roof.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the fire tower connects to all of the floor levels and whether Mr. Yakubov is proposing to rebuild the catwalks.
 - Mr. Yakubov answered that metal catwalks connected the tower at the second and third floors in the past but that they will not be reinstalled. The intention, he continued, is to retain the existing I-beam framing and to paint it black but not to return it to use. He elaborated that egress is not needed from the back units at the second and third floors.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired why egress is not needed from the second- and third-story rear units but is needed from the roof.
 - Mr. Yakubov replied that one means of egress is required at the second and third stories, while two are required for a fourth story. He reiterated that the roof deck is considered a fourth story by code. The tower, he continued, would provide the second means of egress from the roof.
- Ms. Lukachik asked whether the height of the tower would be extended, and whether a bridge at the roof level would then be created.
 - Mr. Yakubov affirmed that the tower would be extended to allow for a bridge to the roof.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the drawing states that the brick at the top of the tower is existing.
 - Mr. Yakubov clarified that there would be a brick extension on the existing fire tower with a stucco bridge to connect to the roof. He further explained that the extension on the fire tower would be brick, because it would be supported below; however, he noted that the bridge would need to be a lighter material, since there is no support underneath.
- Mr. Cluver inquired why the bridge could not be an open walkway with a guard.
 - Other Committee members agreed that it should be an open walkway rather than an enclosed addition.
 - Mr. Yakubov replied that he would need to confirm that it would be acceptable to create an open walkway under the current building code.

- Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern over the width of the walkway from the tower to the roof, stating that it intersects the tops of the bays and overlaps them by approximately one foot.
 - Mr. Yakubov explained that the width results from the requirement to have a three-foot wide door. He noted that the project should be treated as two separate applications, because they are two separately deeded properties. The codes, he continued, would apply to each building, so each building needs its own entrance to the stair tower.
- Ms. Lukachik questioned whether there would be two separate stairs within the existing stair tower.
 - Ms. Stein noted that the plans show a single stair and added that there is likely not enough space for two separate stairs.
 - Mr. Yakubov stated that the stairs would need to be separate and that the plans show the existing layout.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired whether the existing stairs would be removed.
 - Mr. Yakubov answered that they would need to be removed, owing to their poor condition, adding that they have been exposed to the elements.
 - Ms. Gutterman cautioned that removing the stair could cause structural issues to the tower.
- Ms. Stein commented that there are examples in the city where two properties share a fire stair. She suggested investigating whether shared access would be possible in this case.
 - Mr. Yakubov responded that he would look into a building variance. He reiterated that the stair would only function as the second means of egress from the roof deck.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether there would be two pilot houses.
 - Mr. Yakubov explained that there would be one pilot house for each building, since the buildings are separate.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned whether there is one combined roof deck over the two properties.
 - Mr. Yakubov clarified that the decks are separate.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the pilot houses could be reduced in size.
 - Mr. Yakubov stated that they are currently almost eight-feet wide but that he could look into reducing the size. He again noted that the pilot houses will not be visible from the street. He questioned why the dimensions of the pilot houses were concerned the Committee members if they were not visible to anyone on the street.
- Ms. Gutterman asked where the mechanical equipment would be located.
 - Mr. Yakubov answered that it would be on the front portion of the roof deck but would not be visible from the street. He suggested that the roof deck could be set back approximately 15 feet to allow for the placement of the mechanical equipment.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether there was consideration given to consolidating the two properties into a single property.
 - Mr. Yakubov explained that other issues arise when properties are consolidated.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked for a section drawing of the party wall, noting that a railing is proposed to be installed on top of it.
 - Mr. Yakubov stated that the railing will be placed on the parapet wall, and the total height would be 42 inches. The brick component of the wall, he commented, is 12 to 18 inches.

- Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether, regarding the proposed window replacement, the frames will be removed or if they will be salvaged.
 - Mr. Yakubov stated that it depends on the condition of the frame. In some locations, he continued, the frames are fully rotted and need to be removed. In other locations, he noted that the frames would be maintained. He added that he just renovated 4262 Parkside Avenue and approximately 95 percent of the window frames were retained.
 - Mr. McCoubrey urged Mr. Yakubov to save as many frames as possible and to consider sash replacements.
- Mr. D'Alessandro urged Mr. Yakubov to repair the existing windows with epoxy consolidants.
 - Mr. Yakubov responded that if he needs to install wood sash replacement windows on the sides and rears of the two properties, the project would not be feasible.
 - Mr. McCoubrey clarified that he was only referring to the frames, adding that he understands windows with minimal visibility can be vinyl.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether Mr. Yakubov would retain the arched heads of the frames.
 - Mr. Yakubov affirmed that the arched heads exist in just about all the windows and would be retained.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether the existing neighboring bays would be used as models for the reconstruction of the two rear bays.
 - Mr. Yakubov replied that the cladding is no longer extant but that the bays would be reconstructed in a substitute material to match the historic appearance. The bay at 4262 Parkside Avenue, he elaborated, was in its original condition and the two bays at 4204 and 4206 Parkside Avenue will be reconstructed to match that one.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Committee received public comment via email.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the proposed one-over-one windows are based on ease of installation or precedence.
 - Mr. Yakubov stated that the original windows on the building are one-over-one, though he noted that there are two-over-two double-hung sash windows in the stair tower and those will be replaced to match the historic appearance.
- Ms. Stein thanked Mr. Yakubov for his work to restore the buildings in the neighborhood.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The buildings have been vacant for years and many windows are missing. Similarly, the rear bay of 4204 Parkside Avenue has been lost. While the structure exists at 4206 Parkside Avenue, the cladding is no longer extant.
- The application proposes recreating the historic windows and bays using substitute materials.
- The historic masonry fire tower survives at the rear of the properties and historically connected to the buildings at the second and third floors. The application proposes to reuse the tower as a second means of egress from the roof deck only. The connection at the second and third floors would not be reinstated.

- In addition to the egress from the deck to the stair tower, one pilot house is proposed on the roof of each building. The pilot houses would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Vinyl one-over-one double-hung sash windows are appropriate at the sides and rear of the properties where visibility is limited. The decorative historic frames should be retained where they are extant and not compromised. The work complies with Standard 6.
- Owing to the loss of the original cladding at the rear bays, a substitute material is appropriate, provided the reconstructed bays match the historic in appearance. The work complies with Standard 6.
- The pilot houses are large and should be reduced in height, width, and massing. However, the location of the pilot houses is acceptable. The pilot houses should be reduced in size to comply with Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.
- The brick addition to the stair tower is appropriate. However, the stucco bridge connecting the tower to the roofs should be reconsidered to be an open catwalk and should avoid intersecting the bays. As proposed, the work does not comply with Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline, provided the following:

- the connection between the stair tower and roof deck is minimized, and a catwalk is considered in place of the proposed stucco addition;
- the deck is setback farther from the front façade to allow for the placement of mechanical equipment;
- a section drawing is included to show the deck and pilot houses; and
- the pilot houses are reduced in height, width, and massing.

ITEM: 4204 AND 4206 PARKSIDE AVE					
MOTION: Approval, with conditions					
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				1

ADDRESS: 7204 BOYER ST

Proposal: Demolish rear addition; construct two-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Edwin Whatley and Linda Polgar

Applicant: Mark Hansen, Cadence Ad, LLC

History: 1920; W.H. Megargee, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Lutheran Seminary Historic District, Contributing, 11/9/2018

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 7204 Boyer Street was designed in the Arts and Crafts style by architect W.H. Megargee in 1920 as a private residence and was acquired by the Lutheran Seminary six years after its construction. The building is classified as contributing in the district, though it differs significantly from the neighborhood's Victorian Eclectic and Queen Anne style buildings designed by Frank Furness.

This application proposes to demolish a small shed structure at the rear and to construct a two-story addition that would be clad in horizontal wood board with vertical lap siding. The addition would feature a standing-seam metal roof and aluminum-clad, wood, double-hung sash windows. Though large in size, the addition would be positioned just below the ridgeline of the main structure and would leave the rear wall of the existing building largely intact. It would, however, be visible from the northeast on Boyer Street, though the buildings in the district are set back significantly from the street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear shed addition.
- Construct two-story rear 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, while large, would require little demolition and would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The addition would be differentiated from the old and would have little impact on the historic district, owing to the significant setback from the street. The staff recommends using materials appropriate to the district to allow the proposed addition to comply with this standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed addition would require the demolition of a small portion of the rear roof and a shed addition, but would allow for the retention of the rear wall of the historic building. The future removal of the addition would have limited impact on the historic structure and its environment. The work complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the addition materials and pattern of the window openings are appropriate to the district and the west elevation is slightly recessed behind the historic building, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:48:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Mark Hansen and property owner Linda Polgar represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver questioned whether the addition's roof would intersect the existing dormer of the rear roof of the main house.
 - Mr. Hansen replied that the third-story dormer would be maintained without being interrupted by the addition. He noted that the second-story dormer would be removed.
- Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern over the volume of the addition. He commented that, while it is two stories, its height is equal to a three-story house. The sense of scale, he continued, is much larger than the original building. He added that there are opportunities to lower the roofline and eave lines, owing to the tall ceiling space. He suggested that the windows be integrated into a large dormer. Mr. McCoubrey then observed that the addition is taller than the front gable of the main building.
 - Mr. Hansen asked to clarify whether the request would be to lower the ridgeline to match the front dormer and then to create a large dormer to accommodate the windows.
 - Mr. McCoubrey affirmed, adding that the design needs more articulation to make the roof more consistent with the gables on the original house. He further noted that lowering the ridgeline would create more distance between the roof of the addition and the rear dormer of the historic house.
 - Mr. Hansen noted that the ceilings in the upper floor of the existing house have many valleys and the owner would like to avoid creating a similar situation in the addition.
- Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's comment that the massing of the addition did not seem appropriate. She expressed confusion over the choice of cladding material and pattern of the window openings. She contended that the choices do not support the Arts and Crafts style of the house.
 - Mr. Hansen responded that the design approach was to incorporate Japanese Kanazawa-style elements, such as repeated shapes, into the addition. He added that he did not want to maintain the stucco and wanted to differentiate the addition by introducing another neutral material. He suggested that, if the design has too many elements, it could be simplified and that lowering the roof and eave and constructing dormers may create an opportunity to change the siding.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested possibly incorporating the wood siding in the long shed dormer at the second story, but then changing the material below.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the merging of the two design traditions was an interesting concept, though he found the lack of columns under the pent roofs and the pattern of the siding in conflict with the Arts and Crafts building.
 - Mr. Hansen questioned whether adding columns in a repeating pattern would relate better to the historic structure.

- Mr. Cluver responded that any one element will not change the overall design and argued that concept is achieved when each element works in aggregate. He did then agree that adding columns would help tie the addition back to the original building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed two-story addition would require the demolition of a small shed structure and the removal of one shed dormer.
- The addition is designed with Kanazawa-style elements in which repeated motifs are introduced. Those repeated motifs are found through the numerous window openings and the siding pattern.
- The addition would be clad in wood siding and would feature aluminum-clad windows and a standing seam metal roof. The original building is clad in stucco.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The height of the addition is not appropriate. The ridgeline should be lowered to match the height of the front dormer of the historic building, and shed dormers should be introduced to accommodate window openings. As proposed, the work does not comply with Standard 9.
- Modifications to the detailing of the addition's façade, including changing the window patterns and introducing porch columns, should be considered to better relate the addition to the historic building. As proposed, the work does not comply with Standard 9.
- The addition would cause little demolition and would not compromise any character-defining features of the historic building. The work complies with Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 7204 BOYER ST 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

718 BRADFORD ALY

Proposal: Install solar panels

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael Kessler

Applicant: Evan Haberman, Pinnacle Exteriors

History: 1882, Starr's Row

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

The building at 718 Bradford Alley is part of a row of houses with mansards that was constructed by philanthropist Theodore Starr in 1882. Starr was an early housing reformer who sought to improve unsanitary slums and provide social services for the poor. This application proposes to install solar panels at the flat roof of 718 Bradford Alley. Although the staff believes the solar panels themselves will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, the disconnect box is proposed to be attached onto the front façade of the house and would be highly visible.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install solar panels and associated equipment.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof (such as heating and air conditioning units, elevator housing, or solar panels) when required for a new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*
 - The proposed location of the six panels is at the flat roof of the house. Owing to the extremely narrow width of Bradford Alley, as well as the building's mansard, the flat portion of the roof is not visible. The proposed location of the panels is appropriate.
- *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 disconnect box is proposed to attach directly on to the front façade and would be highly visible from the public right-of-way. The staff has worked with other applicants in the past to install these boxes at less conspicuous locations and recommends that this applicant find another location, including possibly at the interior or the rear of the house. Alternatively, the applicant could consider installing the disconnect box free-standing in front of the house if possible.
 - The staff asks the applicant to explain where any associated conduit would be located and how it would interact with the mansard. The staff recommends against running conduit across or over the mansard roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of location of panels as proposed, but denial of the disconnect box at the front façade, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline and Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:03:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Evan Haberman and James Henriques represented the application.
- Owner Michael Kessler was in attendance.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Haberman explained that the disconnect box must be placed at the front façade of the house in order to comply with PECO rules and regulations. He said that they would make sure that everything was installed to look as attractive as possible; however, the proposed location of the disconnect box could not be changed.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the disconnect box could be free-standing in front of the house rather than attached to the façade.
 - Mr. Haberman said that he would need to consult with PECO to see if a free-standing disconnect box was an option; however, it was not something that he had ever seen.
 - Mr. Henriques interjected that he believed a free-standing disconnect box would look worse than one attached to the front façade.
- Ms. Gutterman said that her concern was not simply an aesthetic one, but that they also needed to consider the possible adverse impact the installation of the box could have in historic fabric.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the location of the associated conduit.
 - The applicants responded that the conduit would be located in the same place as the existing conduit.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the disconnect box could be located at the rear facade.
 - The applicants explained that the disconnect box was for emergencies and therefore needed to be easily accessible.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the box needed to be located so high on the building and reiterated that a free-standing box might be a better option.
 - The applicants responded that the box could be placed on a post but it would still need to be three feet high off of the ground.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the yellow box on the mocked-up photograph in the application materials was showing the correct location of the box.
 - The applicants acknowledged that the box would actually be slightly closer to the existing conduit.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the image in the application was giving a false impression of both the size and the location of the disconnect box.
- Ms. Schmitt informed the members of the Architectural Committee that other solar panel installers have been able to work with the staff to locate the disconnect box in less conspicuous locations.
 - The applicants responded that the National Electric Code had changed in 2020; perhaps those approvals were possible under the old code.
- Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro recommended that the applicants confirm whether the disconnect box could be placed on a free-standing pole or located somewhere else.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how the panels would be attached to the roof.
 - The applicants responded that they would be using a ballast system that would lie on top of the roof without making any penetrations.

- Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicants about the load of the system on the roof and whether the warranty of the existing roof would be impacted by the installation of the solar panels.
 - The owner Mr. Kessler responded that he purchased the house last year and was not aware of any warranty on the roof.
- Ms. Lukachik asked if the proposed layout of the panels allowed for access around the roof for maintenance and upkeep purposes.
 - The applicants confirmed that people would be able to access the roof and get around the panels.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the height of the ballast system.
 - The applicants responded that the distance between the flat roof and the panel was approximately nine and a half inches.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the panels covered the entire roof.
 - The applicants responded that there were some areas of roof left uncovered at the sides, front and rear of the roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey recommended that the panels be pushed as far back towards the rear of the roof as possible to make them as inconspicuous as possible.
 - Ms. Stein and Ms. Lukachik added that this would also help with accessing the roof for maintenance issues.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to confirm the layout of the panels since there application materials were showing two different configurations.
 - The applicants confirmed that the proposed layout was the one seen in the color image included in the application, not the site plan. They remarked that they did not know why they had included the site plan image throughout their application.
 - The applicants confirmed that they could push the panels back away from the front façade as recommended.
- Mr. Cluver commented there was not sufficient information provided by the applicant to understand what the disconnect box and conduit would look like after installation and he recommended that the applicants provide some examples of completed installations so the Historical Commission could be given a better sense.
 - The applicants asked whether they should provide documentation from PECO about the new electrical code's requirements.
 - Ms. Stein responded that the applicants needed to look into whether a variance could be granted since the subject property was an individually designated historic property.
 - The applicants remarked that neither the staff nor the members of the Architectural Committee were qualified to make statements about the National Electric Code or building codes.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed location, dimensions and appearance of the disconnect box are not accurately reflected in the application materials.
- The proposed layout of the arrays are not accurately reflected in the application materials.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed location of the panels on the front roof would be sufficiently inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.
- The location of the disconnect box as proposed would be highly visible from the public right-of-way and does not satisfy Standard 9. A free-standing option or a more inconspicuous location should be considered. The applicant should work with the staff to discuss other options for the location of the disconnect that they have previously approved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the installation of the panels at the roof with the condition they are pushed back approximately one foot from the roof edge, and denial of the disconnect box at the front façade as proposed, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline and Standard 9.

ITEM: 718 BRADFORD ALY					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 222 CHURCH ST AKA 237 MARKET ST

Proposal: Install protective system over storefront door and windows at 237 Market Street

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Market 222 Church LLC

Applicant: Ivy Solomon, Ivy's Vine, LLC

History: 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to install the DefenseLite product on the exterior of the storefront known as 237 Market Street, owing to security concerns of the commercial tenant. The product would be installed on the exterior over the two storefront windows and entrance door to prevent the glass from breaking. The layer of polycarbonate shields is clear and includes Gore vents to prevent moisture build-up between the glass and shields. This specific product can be installed at the interior or exterior, and is proposed for the exterior in this application. Generic section drawings are included at the end of the application. A photograph from 1960 shows a different storefront, so it is likely that the current storefront dates to a 1986 tax credit project and therefore is not historic fabric.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 APRIL 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install metal filler strip around windows to make mounting surface flush with rest of wood.
- Install polycarbonate shields.
- Install white capping around perimeter.

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 installation as proposed involves capping of the storefront and therefore is not compatible with the historic features of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the DefenseLite system is integrated into the existing storefront system in a manner that results in minimal visual impact, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:31:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Commercial tenant Ivy Solomon and contractor Brian LaBrose represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver described the overall projection of the security covering as being approximately one-and-one-half inches from the plane of the storefront, and asked how that relates to the existing windows and door.
 - Mr. LaBrose explained that the product would sit inside the lip that goes all the way around the windows.
- Mr. Cluver asked if this proposal is to address a current security issue or an anticipated security concern.
 - Ms. Solomon responded that it is to address potential future security concerns.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the system would cover over the trim around the windows.
 - Mr. LaBrose confirmed that the system would cover edge to edge, but the existing trim would be seen through the system. The system will sit proud of the existing window trim.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked how the system would intersect with the existing door hardware.
 - Mr. LaBrose explained that the product gets cut so that it is behind the lock and handle.
- Ms. Gutterman asked that detail drawings are created to show how the system works with this specific storefront, including a jamb detail and door conditions.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern about the condition of the existing door. He suggested that before money is spent to protect the glass, the door itself should be

- inspected more closely. He noted a patch in the upper corner that is holding the stile and rail together. He stated that this is a good concept, but the owner and installer will want to understand the details first.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the required Gore vents, which are small circles around the perimeter of the glass, and observed that some of the example photographs do not show vents.
 - Ms. Solomon responded that the vents are available in black or white, but she was informed that the vents are more noticeable in black, which is why white is proposed.
 - Mr. LaBrose responded that the vents are not necessary in aluminum storefront systems, but are required in wood frame storefronts such as at the subject property. He explained that the black Gore vents are much smaller, so twice as many are required as compared to the white Gore vents. He stated that he can provide the exact number required prior to the review by the Historical Commission, which will likely be six per window, and zero on the door.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the product website showed that it can be installed in a minimal way with a simple bar, which makes the profile quite low, but this application does not specify which installation method will be used.
 - Mr. LaBrose responded that what will be seen around the glass itself is a trim piece that snaps over the frame so that the screws are hidden. This is the reason for the capping. He stated that he can ask DefenseLite about the more minimal installation method to learn if it can be used in this application.
 - Ms. Chantry noted that the Preservation Alliance holds a façade easement on this property, and this scope will also receive a review by its easement committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing storefront is non-historic fabric.
- Additional details are necessary to understand the installation method for this specific storefront.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed system does not destroy historic materials or features, and therefore the concept is approvable, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the concept, with the applicant to provide details for review by the Historical Commission to show impact on the existing fabric; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 222 CHURCH ST AKA 237 MARKET ST**MOTION: Approval of concept, with additional details to be provided for PHC review****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				1

ADDRESS: 331 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Demolish rear roof slope and dormer; construct sloped roof addition at third floor

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Libby J Goldstein

Applicant: Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect

History: 1820

Individual Designation: 3/25/1969

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish the rear roof slope and rear dormer of this c. 1820 rowhouse and replace it with a new low-slope roof with French doors leading to a small roof deck over the existing second-floor rear addition. No work is proposed for the front façade. The rear of the property is currently visible from Kauffman Street, although the applicant's cover letter indicates that visibility may be blocked in the future by new construction.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear roof slope and rear dormer.
- Construct low slope roof at rear with doors to deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - Removal of the historic rear dormer and rear roof alters features that characterize the historic property.
- *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 alteration would destroy historic materials and features that characterize the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:55:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Raymond Rola represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Rola stated that he knows there will be a building constructed in the lot at the rear because he has been retained to design it. The new building will block a direct view to the rear of the subject building, although it still may be visible at an angle from the rear.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that part of the concern is about visibility, but the other concern is about the loss of historic fabric for an individually designated building. She opined that the proposed scope is too much for this building.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the rear slope and dormer on the main block of a house are character-defining features. He stated that this is proposing an entire removal and replacement of the rear slope of the main block of the house.
- Mr. Rola asked about the other buildings on the block that already have this modification to the rear. He asked if the Historical Commission has approved these other examples.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the modifications may pre-date historic designation.
 - Ms. Chantry clarified that this is not a historic district, so any properties that are listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places were done so as individual designations. Because of this, it is not guaranteed that every example on the block with this rear modification is a property that is historically designated. She stated that she can look into what has been approved, if a list of addresses is provided.
- Mr. Cluver commented that there are other details concerning the deck that are not fully understood.
 - Mr. Rola responded that those details could be developed if the overall scope was approvable in concept.
- Mr. Rola asked about the adjacent property and whether or not it is individually designated, and how this property came to be individually designated.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that the staff can look into which properties on this block are historically designated.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that it is possible that the property owner at the time of designation wanted the property to be historically designated in order to protect the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 APRIL 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Rear dormers and rear roofs are character-defining features of historic buildings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Removal of the historic rear dormer and rear roof alters features that characterize the historic property and therefore the proposal fails to satisfy Standard 2.
- The proposed alteration would destroy historic materials and features that characterize the property and therefore the proposal fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 331 QUEEN ST 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				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 241-43 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Steven Gelbart

Applicant: Douglas Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architecture

History: Borie Brothers Bank

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes a roof deck and pilot house at 241 Chestnut Street.

A roof deck located on the adjacent building, 239 Chestnut Street (image shown on A0.0), was approved by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission in 2006. The building and deck were demolished due to a fire in 2018.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 APRIL 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *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 overall location and dimensions of the deck area are appropriate. The application's renderings show the proposed pilot house to be partially visible from specific locations. Reducing the overall size of the pilot house, which is larger than the minimum needed, would render the deck and pilot house inconspicuous and minimally visible from the public right-of-way and thereby in compliance with this guideline and the Standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the overall mass of the pilot house is reduced, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:03:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Doug Seiler and owner Steven Gelbart represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Seiler if he wished to respond to the staff recommendation to reduce the size of the pilot house.
 - Mr. Seiler explained they made an effort to bring the height of the pilot house down. He noted the pilot house has a stair which is in its logical location based on the floorplan below, but they also have a utility space up there that is for the air handler for the unit. He pointed out the location on the plan of the condenser on the lower roof. Mr. Seiler explained that the owner has a 2-year-old child and wished to have a landing that would give him sort of a landing pad at the top of the stairs, room for a gate, and then space between the gate and the door to get out to the pilot house. He requested the Committee's guidance on how they might suggest how they reduce the mass of the pilot house per the staff comment, or preferences to not reduce it. He also requested comments on the color of the pilot house and noted that the photographs show the window facade is a medium gray and the stucco on the sidewall is an earthy buff. He explained he was thinking the color of the stucco the pilothouse would match the windows but noted the Committee might have an opinion on that.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the width of the pilot house stairs.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that they are approximately 40 inches times two plus a couple inches between them would be the width of the stair itself. He explained to the east are pipes and to the west is the HVAC closet.
- Ms. Stein said that she wondered why they needed a utility closet at this level. She noted that typically they only see stairs coming up to a pilot house and a small landing but not utility rooms. Ms. Stein said that mechanical equipment is typically outside on the roof. Removing the utility closet would help reduce the scale of the pilot house.
 - Mr. Seiler responded that it may be possible to find an alternate space for the air handler. He said that the pilot house is the best location for it. Mr. Seiler explained that when they modeled the house for visibility, the pilot house itself

was not visible up close, but was visible from far away and the size did not change the visibility.

- Ms. Gutterman pointed out that pilot house is nine feet five inches tall. The height should be reduced. She said she understands there is an issue of doors and roof structure. Ms. Gutterman said she agrees with the issue of the width and noted that including the utility closet within the pilot house makes it very wide and very tall.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested placing the air handler behind the pilot house.
 - Mr. Seiler pointed out that the condenser is located in the area behind the pilot house. He noted that they might be able to find a space for the air handler in the floor below.
 - Mr. Seiler addressed the height of the pilot house. He pointed out that on the interior, there is a seven-foot four-inch ceiling which is pretty low. Mr. Seiler said that he thinks they can drop the nine-foot five-inch height with detailing but that it is difficult to get much below a seven-foot four-inch ceiling.
- Ms. Stein noted that pilot houses tend to stay once they are built. She said that decks tend to only last 20 years and may be removed or replaced by a future owner, but a pilot will never be removed. Therefore, she stated that she thinks it is worth reducing the size and reducing the scale of that pilot house in width and height. Ms. Stein said that it does not bother her that the deck does not align with the pilot house. She stated that she is sure Mr. Seiler can develop an architectural strategy to make it look good.
- Mr. Gelbart said that they are trying to be very respectful to the historical nature and trying to follow the historic guidelines. He stressed that it has been three years since the fire on the adjacent building, 239 Chestnut Street and has been living in temporary housing since then. Mr. Gelbart said he is eager to move back home and is willing to make compromises on the design to move this process along.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he thinks it is important to minimize the height, as other Committee members have pointed out. He said that the structural sandwich could be quite minimal.
 - Mr. Seiler pointed to the west elevation drawing and the slight horizontal of the roof slope. He noted that he wants the roof to have a quarter inch roof slope and drip edge and inquired if that is a visual issue.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that anything that keeps the western edge at low as low as possible would be good.
- Mr. Cluver raised the question of pilot house color. He recommended a mid-tone grey, so that it does not stand out against the sky.
- Ms. Gutterman said the other concern is the color of the glass and its degree of reflectivity. She added the glass is a detail that should be reviewed by staff.
- Mr. D'Alessandro pointed out that there may be wind issues related to a large pair of double doors on the roof. He explained that it is not comfortable to open a door and have the wind catch it, especially if it is a double door, and the door will snap back fast. He also recommended reducing the amount of glass on the pilot house's west elevation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Job Itzkowitz, Old City District, stated their Economic Development Committee submitted a letter of support for this application to the Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The size and glass area of the pilot house should be minimized and the color of the pilot house and the color and reflectivity of its glass should be revised to reduce the visibility of the pilot house from the street. The pilot house as presented does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.
- The double doors on the pilot house should be reconsidered, owing to wind issues on roof decks.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as presented, but approval provided the size and glass area of the pilot house is minimized, the color of the pilot house and the color and reflectivity of its glass are revised, and the double doors are reconsidered, pursuant to Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 241-43 CHESTNUT ST					
MOTION: Denial as proposed, but approval with revisions					
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				1

ADDRESS: 327-29 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Construct building

Review Requested: Review and comment

Owner: 327-29 N FRONT STREET LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: none

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a four-story building with a pilot house and roof deck on a currently vacant lot. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction is limited to review and comment because the lot has been vacant since the designation of the district and is considered an "undeveloped" site. The height of the main portion of the building would be approximately 52 feet above average grade, with the pilot house extending an additional 10 feet in height. The grade of Water Street is lower than that of N. Front Street. The building would be clad in brown/tan brick and feature metal panel-clad bay windows and recessed balconies. The N. Front Street elevation would feature a residential entrance and sidelite, while the rear along Water Street would feature a double-width garage door and single entry door. The staff notes

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 APRIL 2021

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

that both blocks of N. Front Street and N. Water Street are historically paved with granite block and are designated as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story building with roof deck and pilot house

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 construction is generally in keeping with the scale and massing of the Old City Historic District, which includes a range of building sizes. The use of brick is consistent with the district as well. The use of metal panels and bays and recessed balconies is not consistent with the district. The application partially complies with this Standard.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that, with modifications, the proposed design could be compatible with the Old City Historic District.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:18:16

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the proposed height is allowable in the district.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that the design received a zoning variance for height.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that the proposed structure looks considerably taller than the neighboring properties.
 - Mr. Ohler directed the Committee's attention to the context elevation showing the height relative to the properties on the block.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the context elevation includes the pilot house or solar panel structure, noting that they appear to be a full two stories taller.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that it does not because the pilot house and solar panel structure are exempt from the height limit in the zoning code.
 - Mr. Cluver appreciated the context elevation drawing but questioned its accuracy, noting that the adjacent buildings appear taller in the drawing than they do in the photographs.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that they are proposing essentially a four-story building, and the adjacent building to the south is two stories along Front Street. He explained that the drawing is taken from Water Street rather than Front Street.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the angled projecting bay feels inconsistent with the district.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that the purpose is to take advantage of the views.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the other elements that are inconsistent with the district are the balconies and recesses. He noted that the elevation is chopped into

pieces, giving it an interrupted rather than uniform appearance that would be typically found in a Philadelphia streetscape.

- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the starkness of the white metal bay, noting a preference for almond or a warmer white to be more in keeping with the character of the district.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that the white was the client's preference but that they are open to suggestions on color.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, opining that black and white are too cold.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested dark brown and beige to go with the brick.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the solar trellis location.
 - Mr. Ohler directed the Committee's attention to the side elevation drawing, noting that it is set back seven feet from each street front, and covers the full width of the roof and is directly over the roof deck.
- Mr. Cluver summarized that the pilot house and roof structure adds height to an already big building, the metal panels stand out, and the balconies and casement windows are out of character with the district. He opined that it is a modern building inserted into historic district, and that, aside from use of brick, he does not see any relationship to the historic district.
- Mr. McCoubrey explained that districts are so much about the plane of the street fronts. They may have some subtle ins and outs, with bay windows here and there, but the proposed façade is too cut up and loses the plane of the street façade.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the facades be simplified and commented that the design does not feel residentially compatible with the historic district.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed building would be taller than its neighbors.
- The proposed brick is consistent with other façade materials in the district, but the white metal panels, angled bays, dark recessed balconies, and casement windows are not consistent with the material palette and elements of the historic district.
- The proposed design does not hold the plane of the street frontage.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project is differentiated from but not compatible in scale, massing, features, or materials with the historic district, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee did not offer a motion, but allowed its comments to stand as its recommendation.

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:30:37

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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

DRAFT