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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Arrived 9:18 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy D’Alessandro</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Detwiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Gutterman, FAIA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Lukachik</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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.
  o Most of the work proposed meets Standard 9.
  o 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.
  o Most of the work proposed meets Standard 10.
  o 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 its massing and articulation and is doing the opposite, and the result is an addition that is 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.

ITEM: 838 1/2 N 42ND ST
MOTION: Denial
MOVED BY: Cluver
SECONDED BY: Stein

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Recuse</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan McCoubrey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cluver</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy D’Alessandro</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Detwiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Gutterman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Lukachik</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Stein</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JANUARY 2022
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV
PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES
REVISED
PROPOSED RESIDENTES AT
838 1/2 N. 42ND ST., PHILADELPHIA PA

SITE

LOCATION PLAN
SCALE: 1/100

SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1/100

FRONT ELAVATION
SCALE: 1/100
ZONING CODE SUMMARY FOR 838 1/2 N. 42ND ST.

PROJECT: 838 1/2 NORTH 42ND STREET  ZONING DISTRICT: RM-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVISION</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USE REGULATIONS:</td>
<td>MULTI FAMILY</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN. LOT SIZE</td>
<td>1,440 SF</td>
<td>7,097 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN. LOT FRONTAGE (WIDTH)</td>
<td>16'–0&quot;</td>
<td>70'–0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN. OPEN AREA</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>BUILDING 6,182 – SANCTUARY 146 + ADDITION OPEN AREA 261 = 8,762 x 120% / LOT 7,897 = 74.92 % = 100.00 = 25.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN. FRONT YARD SETBACK</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN. SIDE YARD DEPTH</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN. REAR YARD DEPTH</td>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY: 9'–0&quot;</td>
<td>5'–2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN. REAR AREA</td>
<td>144 SF</td>
<td>725 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT REGULATIONS</td>
<td>38'–0&quot;</td>
<td>478'–0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED BICYCLE RACKS</td>
<td>CLASS 1A 1 RACK PER 3 RESIDENTIAL UNITS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: THE OWNER WISHES TO ELECT CMX3 ZONING AS THE ALLOWED EXCEPTION UNDER THE CITY COUNCIL ORDINANCE BILL NUMBER 190613–A
GENERAL NOTES

MASSORY:

1. Clean all stone with "Pro Sco" Heavy Duty Restoration Cleaner and water at a pressure less than 500 PSI. PHC to review and approve.
2. Clean all limestone bands, details, lintels and sills with "Pro Sco" Heavy Duty Restoration Cleaner and water at a pressure less than 500 PSI. PHC to review and approve.
3. Existing limestone and text over entry door to remain.
4. All existing steps to remain unless otherwise noted as step location in conflict with new ADA Ramp. All existing steps to be repaired as needed with techniques and materials approved by PHC.

ROOF, GUTTERS, DOWNSPOUTS:

5. Existing roof to be replaced - repaired and patched as needed. Existing gutters are to be checked and repaired as required to ensure water tightness.
6. Existing downsputs are to be removed and replaced with new aluminum downsputs with half round profile in bronze duranodic color. Provide cut sheets for review and approval by the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

HVAC:

7. Dryer vents and gas exhaust vents are to be ganged together to minimize the number of roof penetrations. They are to be located as far to the back of the building as possible.

ADA RAMP:

8. Install new concrete ADA ramp, railing, and landing where indicated on the drawings. Remove existing masonry steps and existing wooden ramp. Maximum slope of ramp not to exceed 1:12. Railings are to be black painted steel with traditional handrail profile. Profile to be submitted to PHC for approval prior to fabrication.

PROPOSED ADDITION:

9. Proposed two (2) story addition on existing one (1) story portion of Church.
10. Proposed Addition is to be finished in brick. Sample to be submitted to PHC for approval prior to installation.
11. Existing pitched roof profile to be removed in portion and remake flat for new floor levels where shown on Architectural Drawings.
12. Existing façade at Parish Street to remain, to be repaired and repainted as needed.
13. Existing one (1) story rear portion of building (also called the Apse/Chancel) to be demolished to make way for new addition as shown on Architectural Drawings.

DOORS:

14. Door and transom to remain, to be closed permanently and sealed off on the interior as noted on plans. Exteriors are to be scraped clean and re-painted using semi-gloss exterior paint. Fill any damaged or rotted areas with "Bondo" fiberglass filler or equal.
15. New door in existing opening. Transom opening to remain, to be repaired or replaced as needed.

WINDOWS:

16. Existing windows to be repaired or replaced as required – with careful attention to maintaining or duplicating existing frames where possible. Existing decorative window features to be maintained or replaced to match. Shop drawings for all windows to be submitted by window manufacturer to PHC for approval prior to manufacturing.
REVISED

TYPE A
NEW HOLLOW METAL DOOR IN EXIST. OPENING. AUTO CLOSER & PANIC HARDWARE ADDED. NEAR FIX GROUND IN EXIST. TRANSOM & SIDELIGHT OPENINGS.

TYPE B
EXISTING DOOR & TRANSOM TO BE CLOSED OFF PERMANENTLY AND SEALED OFF ON THE INTERIOR AS NOTED. REPAIR AND REPAINT EXTERIOR AS NEEDED.

TYPE C
NEW HOLLOW METAL DOOR IN EXIST. OPENING. AUTO CLOSER & PANIC HARDWARE ADDED. NEW TREAD SAWN IN EXIST. TRANSOM & SIDELIGHT OPENINGS.

TYPE D
NEW HOLLOW METAL DOOR IN EXIST. OPENING. AUTO CLOSER & PANIC HARDWARE ADDED. EXISTING EXTERIOR ADA DOOR OPENER, BUTTON & PANIC HARDWARE ADDED.

TYPE E
NEW HOLLOW METAL DOOR IN EXIST. OPENING. AUTO CLOSER & PANIC HARDWARE ADDED. EXISTING EXTERIOR ADA DOOR OPENER, BUTTON & PANIC HARDWARE ADDED.

DOOR DETAILS
SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"
REVISED

FRONT (42ND ST.)

PHOTOS TAKEN 7-19-21