MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 25 JANUARY 2022
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	Arrived 9:18 am
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

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

The following staff members were present:
Jon Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Robyn Oliver, Blackney Hayes Architects
Eugene Naydovich
Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
John Delutis, Midwood Development
Kevin Yoder, k YODER design
Austin Church
Christine Furman, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architects
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Michele Leff

Omar Zaater, k YODER design
Fred Santilli
Joseph Donohue, Studio 111 Architecture
Monica Wyatt, Studio 111 Architecture
Levi Dick, Aritzia
Jane Golden, Mural Arts
Ben Estepani, PACE Architecture + Design
John Hayes, Blackney Hayes Architects
Alex Balloon
Jay Farrell

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 329 S 17TH ST
Proposal: Restucco side wall; install mural
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Marlon Travis
Applicant: Jane Golden, Mural Arts Philadelphia
History: 1860
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The property at 329 S. 17th Street is a contributing structure within the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District. The southern elevation of the building is a stucco wall that faces on to a surface parking lot. A similar structure stood at 331 S. 17th Street, to the south of the building in question, until 1957, when it was demolished, exposing the south party wall of 329 S. 17th Street.

This application proposes to restucco the existing stucco wall in order to prepare the surface for a future mural in partnership with the Mural Arts Program. According to the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations Section 6.15:

> 6.15.a.2 Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.
> 6.15.a.3 Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.
> 6.15.a.4 The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees, and staff shall not consider a mural's content as a part of its review of any application for a building permit, but may consider size, scale, and relationship to the historic context.

For this mural, Mural Arts plans to work with Nationalities Service Center to create a mural that would be designed and produced by Philadelphia-based artist Michelle Ortiz. Though the artwork has not yet been designed, the theme of the mural will likely acknowledge the work of the Nationalities Service Center, currently in its 100th year.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Restucco side wall;
- Install mural.

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 mural is proposed for an unadorned existing stucco, former party wall, which was not historically exposed or finished, satisfying Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a.2 of the Rules and Regulations.
    - The proposed location of the mural would not alter or obscure any historic fabric, satisfying Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a.3 of the Rules and Regulations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.15 of the Rules and Regulations.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Jane Golden represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Golden gave a brief summary of the proposal.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant to describe the potential color and tonality of the mural.
    - Ms. Golden responded that the artist would account for the context and develop a mural compatible with the colors of the buildings around it.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that it was unusual for the Architectural Committee to review a mural application without seeing the proposed design. He asked if the applicant would return to the staff once the design had been confirmed in order to make sure it was compatible with the surroundings.
    - Ms. Golden responded that they would be happy to return to the staff with the final design. She explained that it is difficult to engage an artist without knowing for certain whether a location can be used for a mural, which is why they were seeking approval from the Historical Commission first.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether this proposal whether the existing stucco would be removed first before new stucco was added. He explained that his primary concern was with the area of the wall that extended above the gutter boxes because there is existing structure that supports the roof which may require reinforcement depending on the weight of the new stucco.
    - Ms. Golden replied that they would make the contractor aware of these concerns before starting the project.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro that the new stucco coat needs to integrate well into the barge boards at the top of the wall.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant why they were proposing to seal the stucco if it was going to be covered with the parachute cloth.
    - Ms. Golden responded that they had been advised to seal the stucco by the contractors with whom they had spoken. She added that they always mix primer with a sealant for the base coat of the murals they install.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that it was not a good idea to use coatings on masonry because it traps moisture.

    - Ms. Golden explained that the project manager was currently away, but she would confirm the specifics of the proposed use of coatings.
- Mr. Detwiler remarked that this wall was the perfect location for a mural and asked the applicant how the edges of the parachute cloth were treated.
    - Ms. Golden replied that the process is very meticulous and almost like the application of wallpaper.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he was concerned about how the edge of the parachute cloth would meet the edge of the building and suggested that the applicant work with the staff to resolve this.
    - Ms. Golden replied that she would be happy to provide the Historical Commission with the details of the installation process of the parachute cloth.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub stated that the proposed mural would not comply with the Historical Commission's mural regulations.
    - Mr. Farnham disagreed, stating that the regulations indicate that the selected wall is an appropriate location for a mural.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented about a different mural that Mural Arts installed without the Historical Commission's approval.
    - Mr. Farnham stated that the property owner, not the contractor, is responsible for illegal work, and that the Historical Commission cannot deny appropriate work at one property because of illegal work at another.
    - Ms. Golden stated that the illegal mural will be removed this spring, as soon as the weather changes. The money to pay for the removal has finally been raised.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The wall is an appropriate location for a mural as it does not possess any significant architectural features or historic fabric.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- No significant architectural features or historic fabric will be destroyed by the application of the mural, satisfying Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a.3 of the Rules and Regulations.
- The applicant will submit an image of the artwork prior to installation and details of the stucco and the parachute cloth perimeter to ensure that the mural complies with the regulations and Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the applicant submits an image of the artwork prior to installation; information of the stucco, attachment of the parachute cloth, and sealant; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a.3 of the Rules and Regulations.

DRAFT

ITEM: 329 S 17TH ST MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 305 N FRONT ST
Proposal: Renovate building; rebuild facades; add deck and pilot house
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 305 Front Street Land Trust
Applicant: Ben Estepani, PACE Architecture + Design
History: 1845; Glass block infill added
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The property at 305 N. Front Street is a four-story, three-bay, painted brick, vernacular building constructed ca. 1845, and is considered a contributing structure within the Old City Historic District. The rear (east) elevation faces N. Water Street and has five stories with a garage door at the first floor and three bays of glass-block-infilled windows at stories two through five.

The applicant proposes to remove and reconstruct the existing brick from the front and rear facades. At the N. Front Street façade, the applicant proposes to clad the first story in cast stone and clad stories two through four in a red brick veneer to match existing. The first story of the N. Water Street façade proposes a new garage door with cast-stone surround, with floors two through five clad in a red brick veneer to match existing.

The proposed fenestration pattern at the N. Front Street façade is altered from the original in order to accommodate the interior program. Casement windows with simulated divided lites and limestone headers and sills are proposed. At the N. Water Street elevation, the fenestration pattern is also altered: At stories two through five, balconies with double-doors are proposed at the middle bay, which are flanked by casement windows like the ones proposed for the front. As previously mentioned, a new garage door with a cast stone surround is proposed at the ground story.

A roof deck and pilot house are proposed. Six-foot setbacks are proposed from both the east and west facades. The pilot house is located at the south side of the building and would be clad in siding.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing brick facades at front and rear;
- Reconstruct facades;
- 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:

- *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 extent of the historic brick that is proposed for demolition does not satisfy Standard 9.
    - Any historic storefront material that exists beneath the altered N. Front Street façade should be preserved and restored.
    - The proposed reconstruction does not reflect existing physical and archival evidence of the building's historic conditions. Given the availability of such evidence, the proposed reconstruction should more closely reflect the historic facades in terms of fenestration, window type, and façade materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:35:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ben Estepani and property owner Fred Santilli represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked the applicant to respond to the staff comments and recommendations. She asked the applicant to please explain the reason why they were proposing such extensive demolition and rearranging of the existing masonry openings.
    - Mr. Estepani responded that they were trying to keep close to the historic conditions of the building by maintaining the three bays of the window openings and their overall sizes, as well as by proposing the use of a red brick similar in color and dimensions to the existing.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that they retain the existing front and rear façade rather than demolish such an extensive amount of historic fabric. He added that he did not see evidence in the application that justified the need for the demolition of the front and rear facades. Mr. Detwiler stated that the existing structure could be restored by removing the paint, retaining the brick, and recreating the historic window openings.
    - Mr. Estepani responded that the current conditions of the brick at the interior were extremely deteriorated and the conditions were very structurally precarious.
    - Mr. Detwiler told the applicant that they needed to demonstrate these conditions through a structural report and/or photographic evidence.
- Mr. McCoubrey remarked that there was very good archival evidence of the building's historic appearance that could be used to in the restoration process. He noted that this row was among the last remaining of this type of old, mercantile

buildings. Mr. McCoubrey recommended that the applicant consider restoring the existing historic fabric to its historic appearance.
    - Mr. Estepani responded that they could provide the Historical Commission with information about the structural conditions of the front and rear facades.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked why the applicant was proposing to retain the party walls but not the facades.
- Mr. Cluver remarked that the symmetry of the façade was a character defining feature of the building; the proposed change in the window pattern would destroy that symmetry. Mr. Cluver said that, while he was open to the use of stone cladding at the ground floors, the proposed changes to the rest of the facades is not in keeping with the original character. He expressed concern about the blind windows at the location of the proposed elevator.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant if there would be an overrun to accommodate the elevator.
    - The applicant responded that there would not be an overrun.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the pilot house will be extremely prominent from the public right-of-way.
    - The applicant responded that the adjacent property owner has plans to develop the one-story building at the corner, which, once completed, will likely obscure the view of the pilot house.
- Mr. Cluver said that the rear façade of the building is also highly visible from the public right-of-way and that the proposed design is not in keeping with the historic character of the structure. Mr. Cluver summarized the discussion by reiterating that the proposal includes a significant amount of demolition.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application did not demonstrate that the front and rear brick facades need to be demolished and rebuilt. They may be able to be repaired and reused.
- The proposed fenestration is not in keeping with the historic architecture of the building or its surroundings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The extent of the historic fabric proposed for demolition does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The design proposed for both the front and rear facades is not compatible with the the historic conditions and does not satisfy Standard 9.

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

DRAFT

ITEM: 305 N FRONT ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: D'Alessandro SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 312-14, 316, AND 318 RACE ST
Proposal: Demolish rear ells; construct six-story building; rehabilitate façade
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Race Street Apartments LLC
Applicant: Monica Wyatt, Studio 111 Architecture & Associates
History: 1831
Individual Designation: 6/5/1980
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

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

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

An in-concept application for this project was reviewed by the Historical Commission at its 9 April 2021 meeting. At that time, the Commission found that the rear ells of 312-14 Race Street were narrow, in poor condition, and were compromised. It further found that complete demolition may not be appropriate and may not satisfy Standard 9. It concluded that the overall massing of the new construction was satisfactory, including the potential visibility of the additions, though a five-story rear structure was considered at that time.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Demolish non-contributing buildings at 316 and 318 Race Street;
- Demolish rear ells of 312-14 Race Street;
- Rehabilitate main block of 312-14 Race Street; and
- Construct six-story building.

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
    - Demolition would be limited to the non-contributing buildings at 316 and 318 Race and the largely non-visible rear ells of 312-14 Race Street. Visibility of one of the existing ells is limited to the view through a narrow private alley off Orianna Street. The work complies with this standard.
    - The proposed new construction would be limited to four stories along Race Street to maintain the scale of the streetscape. An additional story would be set back from the front façade of all three structures and would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The addition at 312-14 Race Street would minimally intersect the rear of the existing building's main block. The massing, size, and scale of the new construction and addition comply with this standard.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:52:05

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Wyatt summarized the previous review, noting that more information on the rear ells of 312-14 Race Street was requested to better understand what could potentially be demolished and constructed. She explained that she conducted a further study of the properties to understand the evolution of the buildings. She elaborated that the property at 312-14 Race Street had been altered many times over the years and that no original material remained at the first story. She also noted that the entire façade had been replaced at some point in the past. She stated that the first story is designed to be in keeping with the historic commercial character of the district and the many Greek Revival storefronts in the immediate area. At 316-18 Race Street, she continued, a similar though not exact storefront system would be introduced. She added that while the building is an additional story taller than originally proposed, the sightlines have been maintained. Regarding whether the ells could be retained, she stated that she conducted several studies to determine whether any part of the ells could be incorporated and found that, owing to the width of the lot, she would not be able to retain any portion of the ells while also meeting codes of egress, daylighting, or room sizes.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the plan for the rear wall of the main block of 312-14 Race Street.
    - Ms. Wyatt responded that not much of the historic wall exists. She clarified that there is structure, but there are many penetrations and openings through the wall. At the second, third, and fourth floors of 314 Race Street, she continued, there is no structure, owing to a staircase. At 312 Race Street, she commented that masonry is present at the second, third, and fourth floors, but openings were

cut into the wall when the stair was connected to the building. She elaborated that the line of the rear wall would be maintained in the new design, but not necessarily the material.

- Ms. Stein stated that the application is complicated, noting that it entails three major issues: the demolition of the rear ells, new construction, and rehabilitation of the existing contributing building. She commented that the removal of the ells and design of the new construction are sensitive and responsive to the district. She added that she agrees with the massing, size, scale, and materials. She remarked that the application is lacking detail on the proposed rehabilitation, adding that there is no information on the plans. She questioned what is new, what is existing, and what restoration methods would be used. She asked that more detail be included.
    - Ms. Wyatt responded that she is requesting a determination on the ells and whether they are non-contributing and can be demolished. She added that she would expect to present design drawings and construction drawings in the future.
    - Mr. Donohue agreed that his team could return to present the rehabilitation, clarifying that the masonry above the first story would remain.
    - The Committee and applicants discussed whether the application should be in-concept or continue for final approval.
- Mr. D'Alessandro requested that demolition plans be included.
    - Mr. McCoubrey agreed but stated that he does not take issue with the removal of the ells. He asked that the applicant submit plans to show what masonry would be removed from the main block and asked that as much masonry be retained as possible.
    - Mr. D'Alessandro requested that the rear ells be thoroughly documented if they are to be demolished.
    - Ms. Wyatt clarified that the previous in-concept application presented full documentation of the existing structures, including the ells, and noted the extent of demolition. She added that she could submit those plans again.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether there are older photos of the storefront that show the building prior to its current first-story configuration. He then asked whether the proposed design is based on other examples in the neighborhood, or if it is based on something specific to the property.
    - Ms. Wyatt replied that there is no evidence of the first-story configuration prior to the existing brick, adding that the oldest photograph shows larger openings than what currently exists. She reiterated that the brick at the first story is different from the brick above and that there is a steel beam carrying the load above. She suggested that the beam indicates that there was not supporting brick below. She then clarified that she turned to other buildings in the neighborhood that had similar style and proportion and drew reference from a typical nineteenth-century Old City storefront. She clarified that there are slight differences, such as the width of the entry door, owing to code requirements, but that the proposed windows and doors in general follow the insurance surveys as much as possible, though not all details are included in the surveys. At 316-18 Race Street, she continued, a similar storefront is proposed with different proportions and details to be sympathetic while acknowledging that it is a new building.
    - Mr. Cluver stated that the Old City storefronts have a rigor to the design. While not always identical, he continued, there are patterns and purpose with where the doors are located. He asked that the patterns and details of the new storefront follow those of the neighboring storefronts, which may impact the proportion of the door to maintain the rhythm.

- Mr. Detwiler commented that it would be acceptable to have one large storefront over the two buildings at 312-14 Race Street, since for so much of its history it was a single mass. He agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's earlier comment to retain as much of the rear wall of the main block as possible. He asked that it be incorporated into the new design and shown in plan. He then argued that the application lacks the detail needed to provide final approval.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the incorporation of the roof decks at the front of the building at 316-18 Race Street. He acknowledged that they would be limited to the new construction but contended that they are out of character for the district. He noted that roof decks are typically at the rears of buildings in districts.
    - Ms. Wyatt responded that the decks cannot be located at the rear but that they can be eliminated from the front.
    - Mr. Detwiler argued that the lower deck is disguised behind the parapet and faux gable and may be acceptable, owing to the amount of setback and lack of visibility. He then asked that a section through the lower roof deck be included.
- Mr. Donohue asked what information would be needed to supplement the application. He noted the Committee had asked for demolition plans, a plan for the rear masonry wall of the main block, details of the storefront and rehabilitation, and a section of the lower roof deck.
    - Ms. Stein answered that the current plans lack any notation, so all the details of the rehabilitation would need to be included. She then asked for more information on the storefront patterning, especially on the historic buildings.
    - Mr. McCoubrey asked that the storefront of the new building be refined and that a column be inserted where there would have been a party wall.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Alex Balloon, a near neighbor, commented in support of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application at its 9 April 2021 meeting proposing the complete demolition of the rear ells of 312-14 Race Street and the five-story massing of the new construction proposed at 316-18 Race Street, with an addition at the rear of the historic buildings. The Historical Commission concluded that the rear ells of 312-14 Race Street were narrow, in poor condition, and were compromised. It further found that complete demolition may not be appropriate and may not satisfy Standard 9. It further determined that the overall massing of the new construction was satisfactory, including the potential visibility of the additions.
- The current application proposes to construct a four-story building at 316-18 Race Street that includes an additional two stories at the rear. The six-story rear structure would span the rear of the four properties.
- The application does not include enough detail on the extent of demolition proposed at the rear wall of the main block of 312-14 Race Street.
- The application lacks any notation on the façade rehabilitation at 312-14 Race Street.
- The proposed storefront across all the properties lacks sufficient detail and should be studied further to refine the proportions of the windows and doors.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As presented, the application provides insufficient documentation but may satisfy the Standards if supplemented.
  - The application should include demolition plans, including clear documentation on the retention of the rear wall of the main block at 312-14 Race Street.
  - The application should include full annotations and details of the façade rehabilitation at 312-14 Race Street.
  - The application should provide more detail on the historic storefront. The proportions of all storefronts should be revised.
- The massing, size, scale, and materials of the new construction are appropriate and satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as presented, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

ADDRESS: 2111 LOCUST ST
Proposal: Demolish roof; construct roof deck and pilot house
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Frank Defazio
Applicant: Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
History: 1870
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The property at 2111 Locust Street is a three-story brick Italianate building located mid-block with no visibility of the rear from a public right-of-way. In its current form, the building has a gently gabled roof over the main block and a flat roof over the rear ell. The roof of the rear ell had been raised at some point in the past, evident by the additional height of the masonry wall at the rear relative to the adjacent building to the east. The gable over the main block remains in its original form.

This application proposes to demolish the rear roof behind the ridge line to allow for more ceiling height at the interior and to allow for the installation of a roof deck. A pilot house would be constructed at the center of the roof behind the ridgeline and would slope toward Locust Street.

A trellis is also proposed over a portion of the deck. Other work includes installing new windows and recladding the rear ell in HardiePlank siding.

The staff suggests that if the rear roof were retained, a roof deck and pilot house could be appropriate, provided they are inconspicuous from Locust Street. The staff also suggests locating the deck and pilot house as far off the main block and onto the rear ell as possible.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear roof;
- Construct pilot house and roof deck;
- Install new windows; and
- Reclad rear ell.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
    - The application proposes to demolish the rear portion of the roof to construct a roof deck and pilot house. Only the front slope would remain. While the flat roof of the rear ell has been raised at some point in the past, the subtle gable of the main block should be considered a character-defining feature and should be retained. As proposed, the application does not satisfy Standard 9.
    - The alterations to the rear, including the recladding with HardiePlank siding, creation of a new opening, and infilling of a window, would not be visible from a public right-of-way and comply with Standard 9.
- *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 deck and pilot house would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, but the demolition of the rear roof would result in the loss of the character-defining gable. As proposed, the work does not comply with the Roofs Guideline; however, if the rear gable is retained and the deck and pilot house are moved further onto the rear ell, the work may remain inconspicuous and satisfy the guideline.

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

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Lauren Thomsen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Thomsen contended that the roof deck would not be visible from the right-of-way and noted that the rear ell is a small space and currently houses mechanical units.

She stated that there is not enough space to relocate them to ground level. She elaborated that the application includes recladding the rear ell, altering some rear window openings, and rehabilitating the front façade.

- Mr. Cluver questioned whether any visibility studies have been conducted, particularly to learn whether the proposed trellis would be visible.
  - Ms. Thomsen answered that a sight-line study was included in the zoning application that indicates visibility from the right-of-way. She added that she does not believe that study included the trellis, which can be removed if necessary. She noted that photographs were included in the application and that the gable roof is not visible from Locust Street. She stated that she could do a mock-up to confirm the lack of visibility.
- Mr. McCoubrey argued that the gable roof is a character-defining feature. The section included in the application, he continued, shows that the reading of the gable is lost, as is the hierarchy created between the main block and rear ell, owing to the changes to the ell and the removal of the rear slope of the main roof. He contended that the gable form should remain, despite the lack of visibility. He then suggested that a penetration could potentially be made through the rear gable for access to a roof deck located on the rear ell.
- Ms. Stein agreed, adding that the project would be achievable if the penthouse is located on the main block with the roof deck on the rear ell. She contended that the condensing units could be placed on the ground floor or on the roof of the first-story ell addition. She argued that the removal of the gable seems unnecessary to achieve the program.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether the plans show a portion of the rear wall of the main block being removed.
  - Ms. Thomsen responded that the rear wall has been largely demolished and that a portion of the wall is only being demolished at the first story but would be maintained at the second and third stories.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the proposed chimney removal.
  - Ms. Thomsen replied that the chimney will be removed and is not currently functional.
  - The Committee noted that there are two chimneys that extend up the party wall and asked that the chimneys be retained above the roofline.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the extent of window replacement on the front façade and whether it is necessary.
  - Ms. Thomsen answered that the existing windows would be removed down to the masonry opening and new windows in the correct configuration would be inserted.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the frames are being removed.
  - Ms. Keller explained that the current windows are vinyl with capping around the frame, so the condition is unknown. She added that the staff routinely approves the replacement of windows, provided the new windows replicate the appearance of the historic windows.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes to demolish the rear slope of the gable roof to accommodate a roof deck, pilot house, and trellis.
- Two chimneys exist above the west party wall and are proposed to be demolished.
- The application proposes to replace the existing vinyl windows at the front façade with windows in a historically appropriate material and configuration.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The entire gable roof, including the front and rear slopes, are character-defining features of the building. The rear slope, though not visible from Locust Street, should not be demolished. The work does not comply with Standard 9 or the Roofs Guideline.
- A roof deck and pilot house can be achieved without the complete demolition of the rear slope of the gable roof by penetrating the rear slope for a pilot house and limiting the roof deck to the rear ell.
- The chimneys should remain above the roofline and should not be demolished. As proposed, the work does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 2111 LOCUST ST **MOTION: Denial** **MOVED BY: Detwiler** **SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro**					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 317 LAWRENCE CT
Proposal: Alter window openings; construct rear addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Joao Soares and Bernita Spagnoli
Applicant: Kevin Yoder, k Yoder Design
History: 1970; Lawrence Court Townhouses; Bower & Fradley, architect
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes to construct a rear addition, insert a new window opening at the recessed front entrance, and install new windows at the third-floor front and rear mansards of this courtyard residence constructed c. 1970. An in-concept application proposing the same scope was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its December 2021

meeting. At that time, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, with the recommendations that the new fenestration at the mansard should be eight-unit ribbon windows, a vertical division should be added to the second-floor rear doors, the balcony parapet and railing should be redesigned to be less solid, and that rooftop mechanical equipment should not be visible from the public right-of way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. This application for final approval addresses those recommendations. The rear of the property is partially visible from Cypress Street to the north.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove first-floor rear masonry wall.
- Cut down second-floor rear windows into doors.
- Construct rear addition.
- Construct new window opening at recessed front entry.
- Install new windows at third-floor front and rear mansard to better replicate original fenestration.

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 work is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:48:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Kevin Yoder represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Yoder described the revisions made for this final review.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the change to light-colored brick at the rear addition. Mr. McCoubrey asked if cast stone was considered instead of light brick.
    - Mr. Yoder referenced the photographs included in the application showing precedent. He questioned if using cast stone would make the addition appear too monumental or historic.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he is not opposed to brick, but that it should not be too light in color. He suggested a darker brown brick.
    - Mr. Yoder showed a potential brick sample.
    - The Committee members agreed that it is difficult to review brick color over Zoom.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested a black metal screen or panel rather than a wall for the side of the deck to diminish the visual impact, with brick below deck level.
    - Mr. Yoder responded that he initially considered using a railing throughout but decided against it.

    - Mr. Detwiler disagreed with that suggestion and stated that he thought the brick walls extending up at the sides of the deck were appropriate.
- Ms. Stein supported the application. She stated that it is respectful to the historic building. She suggested that the side walls should be a buff or darker color, not off-white.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern about seeing light coming from the skylights at night.
    - The other Committee members disagreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- It recommended approval in-concept at its December 2021 meeting with several recommendations, all of which were addressed in the current application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including brick color, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 317 LAWRENCE CT **MOTION: Approval** **MOVED BY: Cluver** **SECONDED BY: Detwiler**					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 251 S VAN PELT ST
Proposal: Construct rooftop addition; alter façade
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: David Fetkewicz and Michele Leff
Applicant: John Hayes, Blackney Hayes Architects
History: 1880; Alice Kraft School of Rhythm; 1954, new façade
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes façade alterations and a third-story addition to a former carriage house which has been significantly altered since its original construction about 1880. The carriage house was originally part of the property at 244-46 S. 21st Street but was subdivided off in the 1940s. The existing façade dates to 1954, when the building was converted to single-family use. Before that, the building was converted for use as storage and dance studio. The adjacent third-story additions to the carriage houses at 247 and 249 S. Van Pelt Street were approved by the Historical Commission in 2012.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Install doors and windows in new openings on the first floor and existing openings on the second floor.
- Remove non-historic pent roof and construct brick cornice.
- Construct third-story addition set back 6.5 feet from front façade.

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 work is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:07:25

PRESENTERS:
- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects John Hayes and Robyn Oliver represented the application.

DISCUSSION:
- Ms. Gutterman asked the staff about the history of the building and its multiple façade iterations.
    - Ms. Chantry responded that the historic district inventory listing is incorrect, as it listed the building as c. 1960, when it is a much earlier building with a façade

from 1954. She directed the Committee's attention to the 1938 photograph showing the building with its second façade iteration.

- Mr. Cluver asked about the new windows for the front façade and what was driving the size and design.
  - Mr. Hayes responded that the interior uses of the first-floor space is driving the narrowness of the windows flanking the central entrance, and the muntin design is contextual with the surrounding streetscape.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the depth of the balcony.
  - Mr. Hayes responded that the depth can be adjusted, but it is currently proposed to be approximately the same depth as the existing balcony.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if this iteration of the façade will also be painted brick.
  - Mr. Hayes responded that he prefers to have it be unpainted red brick, but that it may need to be painted owing to patches.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the tone of the metal on the third-story addition.
  - Mr. Hayes responded that they intend to use zinc shingles, so the color will be a lead tone.
- Mr. Cluver observed the new steel beam over the first-floor openings.
  - Mr. Detwiler suggested that it match the width of the balcony above.
- Mr. McCoubrey concluded that the façade has been so fundamentally changed over the years that the proposed changes are acceptable.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing façade dates to 1954, when the building was converted to single-family use.
- The adjacent third-story additions to the carriage houses at 247 and 249 S. Van Pelt Street were approved by the Historical Commission in 2012.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the recommendation that the metal panel or shingle system at the addition not be darker than a lead tone, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DRAFT

ITEM: 251 S VAN PELT ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 838 1/2 N 42ND ST
Proposal: Convert church for multi-family residential use; construct addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: German Yakubov
Applicant: Stephen Bachich, Raymond F. Rola Architects
History: 1872; St. Petri Evangelical German Lutheran Church; Emil H.C. Hartmann; Duhring, Okie & Ziegler, architects
Individual Designation: 6/14/2013
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert a historic church building located at 838 1/2 N. 42nd Street to a multi-family residential building. Originally known as St. Petri Evangelical German Lutheran Church, the church was constructed in phases. A chapel building was constructed in 1872. The second phase of construction in 1895 added a one-story masonry church building that covered the remainder of the lot. The final phase of church construction in 1906 added an upper section and steeple above the 1895 section. Today, the church complex maintains a high level of architectural integrity.

This application proposes limited exterior interventions as part of the scope for the rehabilitation and conversion work. The most significant change is the addition of a two-story structure on top of the 1872 chapel. The proposed overbuild is a wood frame structure with clapboard type siding and a combination of casement and awning windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Convert existing three-story masonry church into a multifamily building with 20 residential units.
- Construct two-story addition over the existing rear one-story area of the building.
- Install new ADA ramp along Parrish Street elevation.
- Restore existing windows and doors. Selective replacement only where necessary.
- Exterior masonry will be cleaned and repaired as needed.

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.*
    - Most of the work proposed meets Standard 9.
    - The proposed two-story addition above the 1872 chapel is not compatible with the historic materials, features, scale, and proportion of the chapel and church and does not meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
    - Most of the work proposed meets Standard 10.
    - The removal of the full chapel roof and a large section of the chapel's north wall does not meet Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:22:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Raymond Rola and property owner Eugene Naydovich represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Rola explained that the rear addition is very important to the project as it includes four residential units, which represents 20% of total residential units. He pointed out that the original 1872 chapel has been altered since its construction and that the original chapel included a cupola on the roof and a vestibule on the front of the chapel. Mr. Rola noted that a photograph showing these elements was included in the building's nomination. He explained that one of the complications is that zoning required the addition be setback nine feet from the west side of the property line. Mr. Rola stated that, owing to this, he was not able to push the addition farther back from the chapel's front façade but that he set it back a little, enough to leave the articulation of the historic front and rear façade in place.
- Ms. Stein said she agrees with the staff that the addition does not complement the historic property, adding that the building is individually designated. She continued that any changes must be sympathetic and compatible and that this proposed change obscures views of the wonderful architecture on the top roofline of the chapel. Ms. Stein contended that perhaps with a redesign there is a solution with setbacks and other changes that may be more in keeping and allow those views to occur of the chapel.
- Mr. Rola said there several approaches that could be taken with the new addition. He explained that the design could emulate the detailing of the historic building, which he feels would not be appropriate. Mr. Rola continued that the other approach is to make it modern, let it be what it is, and not call attention to itself.

- Ms. McCoubrey said that the issues are fundamentally its mass and its articulation. He said an additional setback could be added and perhaps this would result in only one unit per floor rather than two. Mr. McCoubrey contended that they should pursue a zoning variance. He pointed out that the floor plans show the addition coming out to the front of the chapel, so that detail is not clear. Mr. McCoubrey added that the chapel is such a unique and special feature of this building. He said that, if the addition was set all the way back to the apse shape, which would allow the visibility of the side of the apse, they may be able to get in one unit per floor.
- Mr. Naydovich said they have really strived to make this redevelopment project work. He said they are not asking for much of an overbuild and pointed out that these four units make the project feasible. Mr. Naydovich said they are replacing windows and the full roof and are asking for this concession for the addition. He added that their team is open to suggestions on what materials to use, window configuration, and whatever else to make it work. Mr. Naydovich stressed again that the four rear units of the addition make the project feasible.
- Mr. Detwiler said he appreciates that they are breathing life into a building form that many people find challenging. He stated that saving this building is important. Mr. Detwiler said that the chapel at the rear is an important component in its own right. He noted that he is not opposed to an overbuild of some sort. He agreed with Mr. McCoubrey about the setback on the overbuild. Mr. Detwiler said that, while applying for a zoning variance is always fraught with issues, he would rather see the overbuild the full width of the building but set back further from the front elevation of the chapel. He also suggested reducing its height and massing in any way that is possible. He added that he recommends not matching the brick below but would make it distinguishably different. Mr. Detwiler continued that having the overbuild set back would allow the architecture of the sanctuary behind it to be more clearly read. He contended that, while he understands the applicant's intent by choosing a more contemporary solution, the current overbuild proposal is stark in it its massing and articulation and is doing the opposite, and the result is an addition that it too bold and visible. Mr. Detwiler said that it needs more articulation on its façade without being historicist.
- Ms. Lukachik said she agrees with Mr. Detwiler on many points and that the current addition proposal is too visually jarring. She said she also objects to the amount of historic fabric removal from the chapel's north wall and she hopes there could be more retained.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the side yard setback. He noted that the addition could be placed over the apse area and leave more room at the front of the chapel building. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed this would be another viable option. Mr. Detwiler noted that it could be done but is not ideal. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he is not saying the apse should be demolished but that it could be built over.
    - Mr. Rola noted that the apse is not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman said the roof deck should be removed to help reduce the overall massing of the building. She noted the parapet is three and half feet tall and the mechanical equipment could potentially be relocated somewhere else such as on grade. Mr. Detwiler agreed that if the parapet is not required for utility access, it should be removed. Mr. Cluver said the architectural plans indicate a roof deck.
    - Mr. Naydovich said the roof deck is for utility access only.
- Ms. Stein asked about the trusses of the chapel and pointed out that the removal of the roof is demolition of a character-defining feature of the historic building.

    - Mr. Rola replied that the trusses are being removed and it is being flattened out to accommodate the new floor above. He said if they moved the addition back, they could potentially preserve part of the historic truss system. Mr. Rola added that this would involve a zoning variance and that there is no guarantee it would be approved.
- Mr. Farnham stated that he wrote the nomination for the church. He has observed since designation in 2013, the building is showing signs of increased deterioration. Mr. Farnham encouraged the applicants to find ways to adaptively reuse it and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation because the church and chapel are extremely significant and worthy of preservation. He commended the applicants for taking on this type of project.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, stated while he is pleased to see the adaptive reuse plan, he agrees with the staff that the proposed addition is not compatible with the historic building.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, says the adaptive reuse plan is good for the building and neighborhood but noted that the current proposal for the addition is not compatible in material and form. Mr. Steinke encouraged the applicant to consider the comments of the Committee and public for a revised proposal in order to move the project forward.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The 1872 chapel building is important and is not a secondary feature of the church building.
- The addition at the rear of the church and above the chapel is incompatible with the overall historic complex of the church and chapel.
- Although the Committee recognizes the design intent of the contemporary addition, the massing and articulation as presented compromises the overall historic character.
- The massing of the addition should be set back from the chapel's front elevation as much as possible. The applicant should seek a zoning variance to allow for a more sympathetic overbuild of the chapel.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed two-story addition above the 1872 chapel is not compatible with the historic materials, features, scale, and proportion of the chapel and church and does not meet Standard 9.
- The removal of the full chapel roof and a large section of the chapel's north wall does not meet Standard 10.

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

DRAFT

ITEM: 838 1/2 N 42ND ST MOTION: Denial 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	7				

ADDRESS: 1723-29 WALNUT ST
Proposal: Alter facade
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: John DeLuits, Honey Nuts LLC, c/o Midwood Investment & Development
Applicant: Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
History: 1956; Nan Duskin Store; Thalheimer & Weitz, architects
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the front façade of the building at 1723-29 Walnut Street. The building at 1723-29 Walnut Street was created when the existing buildings were rehabilitated for the Nan Duskin Store by architects Thalheimer & Weitz in 1956. The building is classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. In light of its classification as non-contributing, the building itself should not be treated as a historic resource and any alterations to it should be judged based on their impact on the historic district, not on the building. Although there is a diversity of age and styles of buildings within the immediate vicinity, buff or light-colored masonry—brick, stone, and cast concrete—is a character defining feature of this area of the historic district. The proposed material for the updated storefront includes black steel and aluminum, black stone, aluminum, spandrel glass, and clear glass.

SCOPE OF WORK
- Extend section of façade that fronts directly on sidewalk.
- Reclad exterior and install new steel storefront.
- Demolish section of façade and install aluminum curtain wall.
- Replace windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

- While the size, scale, proportion, and fenestration of the proposed façade renovation is compatible with the neighboring buildings of the historic district, the proposed exterior cladding and color of that cladding is not and does not meet Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:47:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Michael Schade and Christine Furman, representative of the retail tenant Levi Dick, and developer John DeLuits represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Schade explained that the main issue is that his client Aritzia has a distinct physical presence that they work to promote throughout its stores. He said their dark gray metal panel system is part of that presence and that appears to be the main issue in the staff recommendation.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the metal panels proposed for the façade appear dark and heavy.
  - Mr. Dick said they may be able to incorporate more of limestone color, perhaps in at the spandrel glazing. He commented that it would be preferable if they could distinguish this storefront from the neighboring one at 1729 Walnut Street. Mr. Dick said they could expand the darker marble areas, which would maintain the brand color but in a natural stone. He stressed that it is important for Aritzia to keep their brand presence on the storefront.
- Mr. Schade pointed out that the building originally had one single tenant but is now broken up into multiple businesses, which is a challenge from a design perspective.
- Mr. McCoubrey said one of the issues is the insertion of the fitness center entrance in the recessed area of the original building. He suggested that it would be preferable if the dark panel system could fit neatly into the existing recessed area and leave the limestone bays in place. He noted that he understands the architect's challenge.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested selectively placing the dark panels within the limestone façade, with the limestone material as the overall frame of the building. Mr. Detwiler said he understands why Aritzia wants to distinguish itself from the adjacent businesses.
- Mr. Cluver said the proposed design would alter the current façade's visual rhythm. He suggested that they absorb the "Fitness" bay into the dark facade and eliminate the sliver that currently feels out of place. Mr. Cluver noted that a characteristic of the retail portion of Walnut Street is its many variations. He said his focus is on the "Fitness" bay because this catches his eye.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that she is bothered by the heavy dark perimeter on the stone more than the light-colored interior.
- Mr. Schade said they must balance several requirements and pointed out that the building is non-contributing to the historic district. The Historical Commission's task is to preserve the historic district, not this building.
- Ms. Gutterman responded that while it is non-contributing, it is still reflective of the district. She pointed out that there is no front façade in the district that has this type of extensive dark material.

- Mr. Detwiler said that the proposed design divides up the building in a way that makes the overall design appear unresolved. He restated his suggestion that the limestone remain on the Aritzia's store border with the dark panels on the interior area.
- Mr. D'Alessandro made suggestions to reduce the dark panels on the façade.
- Mr. Dick noted that there are several ways to reduce the dark panels and he will need to review the different options with his team.
- Ms. Stein noted that, if the dark panels and signage were just been applied to the existing recessed area, it could be potentially approved.
  - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein.
- The Committee members suggested relocating entrances for a revised design including relocating one entrance to the right side and making the dark panel area more visually central. Mr. Dick said they needed to look at the mechanicals and other design features to see if this would work for Aritzia.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The dark gray metal panel system is a key element of the Aritzia storefront branding.
- The streetscape is characterized by light-colored masonry facades.
- The building and streetscape have a visual rhythm.
- The property in question is not individually designated and is classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- While the size, scale, proportion, and fenestration of the proposed façade renovation is compatible with the neighboring buildings of the historic district, the proposed exterior cladding and color of that cladding is not and does not meet Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1723-29 WALNUT ST **MOTION: Denial** **MOVED BY: Gutterman** **SECONDED BY: Detwiler**					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:18:35

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:20 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