

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

**TUESDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 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:

<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair	X		
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP	X		
Rudy D'Alessandro		X	
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Guterman, 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  
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Gabe Deck, Gnome Architects  
Colin Rupp, Gnome Architects  
David Orphanides, Esq., Orphanides + Toner  
Ehud Adar, Free Library  
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance  
Fred Santilli  
Maura Rossi  
Andrew Olen, Esq.  
Eric Horowitz, Campbell Thomas  
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas  
Randy Baron  
Matt Funk, DIGroup Architecture  
Ben Estepani  
Dennis Carlisle

Angie Dixon  
Otis Bullock  
Dane Bombara, Square Architects, LLC  
Meagan Knapp  
Tom Familetti  
Betsy Ackerman, DIGroup Architecture  
Travis Seal, Select Redevelopment  
Susan Wetherill  
Michael Farinella  
Zander Hagan, Zatos Investments  
Lynn Williamson, Free Library  
Ryan Laughlin, Zatos Investments  
Sally Nista  
Cassie O'Connell, Rebuild

## AGENDA

### **ADDRESS: 1513-17 PINE ST**

Proposal: Construct five townhouses  
Review Requested: Review and Comment  
Owner: ZI 1513 Pine LLC  
Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects  
History: Parking lot  
Individual Designation: None  
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995  
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct five, four-story townhouses with pilot houses and roof decks 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 applicant has submitted two design schemes. The first scheme represents the by-right massing of the new construction as allowed by zoning. The second scheme shows a slightly larger massing where the height of the new construction would align with the cornices of the Pine Street buildings. The new construction would be clad in a brownish-red brick with a cast stone base and detailing and would feature aluminum-clad windows. The townhouses would front onto S. Hicks Street, and the buildings would have garage access on Pine Street.

### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct five, four-story townhouses with roof decks and pilot houses on vacant lot.

### **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 new construction would be compatible with the district in size, scale, massing, and materials. The staff notes that the second design scheme in the application, showing the height of the new buildings aligning with the cornices of the buildings along Pine Street, would be more appropriate. The work complies with Standard 9.

**STAFF COMMENT:** The staff comments that the height of the townhouses should align with cornice line of the Pine Street buildings as proposed in Scheme 2, but that the proposed new construction is otherwise compatible with the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District in size, scale, massing, and materials.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:40**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney David Orphanides and architects Gabe Deck and Colin Rupp represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Orphanides stated that his client has developed plans for a by-right 38-foot-tall structure that was permitted for zoning by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. In developing the by-right project and observing how it related to the other properties on the 1500 block of Pine Street, he continued, the architects concluded that it seemed out of place. He explained that they are presenting the plans for the 38-foot-tall structure but are seeking the Committee's feedback on a taller structure that better maintains the cornice line and structure height of the 1500 block of Pine Street.
- Ms. Guterman stated that she understands the desire to align the cornice on Pine Street but argued that by making the building taller it overwhelms the Hicks Street properties. She asked that the height not be raised. She added that she finds the proposed garage door on Pine Street to be inappropriate and not complimentary to the building or surrounding properties.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that he prefers the height along Pine Street but wondered if the height could be lowered at the two or three townhouses adjacent to the Hicks Street properties. He agreed with Ms. Guterman that in the taller scheme, the townhouses loom over the Hicks Street properties. He then agreed with Ms. Guterman's comments about the garage opening and added that the floor levels do not align with the floor levels of the adjacent Pine Street buildings. He asked if the first story could be raised, as well as whether the upper floors could match the adjacent Pine Street buildings. He noted that the tallest ceiling appears to be the fourth floor, which is unconventional.
- Mr. Cluver agreed with the comments about the floor levels and garage door. He asked why casement windows were chosen instead of double-hung sash windows and inquired about the window proportions.
  - Mr. Rupp explained that the casement windows were selected to be in keeping with the modern construction, since double-hung windows are more traditional. He elaborated that the design is not meant to copy the adjacent historic buildings but to reference them. He added that, programmatically, the Pine Street units need more wall space inside and a larger, wider window did not work as well.

- Mr. Deck stated that the windows were also selected to meet code, egress, and venting requirements and that those requirements are more difficult to achieve with double-hung windows, particularly in the by-right design.
  - Mr. Detwiler argued that the code requirements would be achievable with double-hung windows and asked that they be reconsidered. He also suggested that the width of the openings be regularized.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that, to achieve the taller massing, the fourth floor was raised significantly, with some height added to the second floor.
  - Mr. Deck affirmed and explained where the adjustments to ceiling heights were made, noting that there were limitations resulting from the plans.
  - Mr. McCoubrey remarked that typically the second and third floors are similar in height with the fourth floor being shorter.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with the comments regarding the impact of the taller building on the Hicks Street properties and questioned whether there would be a compromise. He then suggested lowering the parapet height and modifying the cornice of the bay.
- Mr. Cluver asked what the height difference is between the lower and taller schemes.
  - Mr. Deck answered that it is approximately 7 or 8 feet.
- The Committee discussed the issue of wanting more height on Pine Street and less height on Hicks Street.
  - Mr. Orphanides responded that the by-right height does not complement the buildings on Pine Street, though he acknowledged that the taller building may negatively impact the Hicks Street buildings.
- Mr. Detwiler commended the applicants for investing in the details and quality of the proposed building and asked that the issues raised by the Committee be addressed. He then stated that Pine Street deserves two front facades and questioned whether two units could be turned sideways with the gate in the center of the Hicks Street elevation.
- Mr. Orphanides inquired whether the taller height would be appropriate on Pine Street and the two or three northern units along Hicks Street could be constructed to the by-right height of 38-feet without losing the upper story. He asked for clarification on the Committee's request to lower several of the Hicks Street units.
  - Mr. Detwiler responded that he found it acceptable to transition from the taller height to the by-right height without eliminating the upper story on Hicks Street.
  - Mr. Cluver argued against having the building step down to avoid interrupting the continuity of the complex. He suggested lowering the parapet and cornice of the by-right scheme so that the floor levels align better and so it appears just one story shorter than the Pine Street buildings, though he contended that the Committee would need to see the design to understand whether it would be successful.
- Ms. Stein stated that she supports the taller height, provided the issues described by other Committee members are resolved. She added that there would be no reason to go taller if the building does not align with the adjacent water tables. She argued that the whole design is based on the monumental buildings on Pine Street, and if the proportions are not matched, then the new construction will appear out of place in the district. She also asked that the garage door be downsized. She then commended the applicants on the general design.
  - Mr. Orphanides noted that the door is open at the top but solid at the base.
  - Mr. Detwiler suggested that it be more of a carriage door.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property is considered an undeveloped site and the Historical Commission's jurisdiction is review-and-comment jurisdiction only
- The applicant submitted two design schemes. Scheme 1 is four stories in height but lower than the adjacent Pine Street buildings, because it has been designed to the by-right height of 38-feet allowed by zoning. Scheme 2 was designed to align with the buildings on Pine Street and would require a zoning variance.
- The buildings on Hicks Street are smaller three-story buildings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The taller height of Scheme 2 may be appropriate and better relate to the Pine Street buildings, but it overwhelms the buildings on Hicks Street. The applicant should consider lowering the two or three units adjacent to the Hicks Street properties.
- In general, the massing, size, scale, and materials are appropriate for the Pine Street frontage and are appropriate for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.
- The parapet adds too much height to both design schemes and causes imbalance in the proportions. The parapet should be lowered in both design schemes.
- The garage door fronting Pine Street should be minimized and redesigned as a solid carriage door.
- The proportions of the proposed new construction should reflect the proportions of the adjacent Pine Street buildings, including the height of the water table and floor heights.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT:** The Architectural Committee did not offer a motion but allowed its discussion to stand as its comment.

**ADDRESS: 2100 MOUNT VERNON ST**

Proposal: Roof deck and access structure

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marc and Megan Vetri

Applicant: James C. Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.

History: 1855; Center entrance and storefront, late 19th century; storefront windows altered

Individual Designation: 2/7/1974

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to construct a roof deck and roof access structure with skylight at 2100 Mount Vernon Street. The building was constructed in 1855 with a storefront and center entrance alterations occurring in the late nineteenth century. The building, located at the corner of Mount Vernon Street and N. 21<sup>st</sup> Street, was individually designated in 1974 and is a contributing building to the Spring Garden Historic District.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct roof access structure with skylight.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2022**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

- Construct new roof deck with railing.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *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.*
  - The proposed alterations would not permanently alter the historic character of this building and could be fully reversed in the future; therefore, the application does meet Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
  - The deck and access structure will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way owing to the proposed setbacks for the deck and access structure; therefore the application meets the Roofs Guideline.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:31:12

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jim Campbell represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Mehley explained to the Committee that the applicant had submitted updated drawings the night before the meeting. She said that both the original and updated applications were in the presentation but that she would defer to Mr. Campbell to explain the changes.
- Mr. Campbell described the project for the roof deck and access structure. He noted that everything proposed sits back on the building out of the public view. Mr. Campbell pointed out that this property is located at the corner of N. 21<sup>st</sup> Street and Mount Vernon Street. He noted that it was important to design the roof deck so that it cannot be seen from any view along the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Campbell stated that the differences in the original application and the updated application are minor. He pointed to the updated roof plan and explained the set back from Mount Vernon Street has been increased slightly and is now nine feet and the set back from N. 21<sup>st</sup> St is now approximately 5'-11". He stressed that the important aspect of this application is the views from the public right-of-way along Mount Vernon Street and N. 21<sup>st</sup> Street.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the steel dunnage that the deck would sit on runs the full width of the building, as seems to be shown in the section drawing. He noted he does not see it on the roof plan.
  - Mr. Campbell replied that the steel runs to the bearing wall along N. 21<sup>st</sup> Street.
- Ms. Guterman asked why the deck was proposed for the main block and not the rear portion of the building. She inquired about the height of the deck railing and the

steel dunnage. Ms. Guttermann observed that the roof deck stood high on the roof and that there appeared to be a lot of space between the deck and roof.

- Mr. Campbell responded that there is not a lot of space between the deck and roof. He said the cornice comes up a bit higher and they need to adjust that in the elevation drawing. Mr. Campbell noted that the steel is really set down into cornice, so it is not as visible as it appears. He noted that their goal is to set the steel dunnage down behind the cornice in a way that none of it is visible from the surrounding streets. Answering Ms. Guttermann's other question, Mr. Campbell said that, because the rear ell of the building is lower and sloped, they determined that placing the roof deck at the rear was not a good idea. A roof deck on the rear ell would be highly visible from the street. He stated the deck railing height is three feet.
- Ms. Stein asked Ms. Mehley if the staff had requested a mockup of the deck and access structure.
  - Ms. Mehley replied that this has not been done yet, but the Committee can request that as part of their recommendation.
  - Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the doing a mockup is important to determining the degree of visibility from the surrounding streets.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he can accept the roof on the main block in this case as it would be highly visible on the rear ell. He noted that the sloping roof on the rear ell is a historic feature of the house, and this would be lost if the roof deck was placed there.
- Mr. Campbell said the deck railing they are proposing is a horizontal wire railing so this will be relatively transparent.
- Ms. Lukachik encouraged the applicant to provide additional detail of how the steel beam is tying into the cornice. She noted that it is strikingly visible in the elevation drawing.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the party wall or parapet extension that is shown extending over the skylight. He noted the funny shape of the extension.
  - Mr. Campbell replied they have to extend up the party wall between the two buildings for fire protection. He added that this extension will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Guttermann asked about any nearby chimneys or vents. She asserted that the chimney at the party wall of the neighboring property would need to be extended in height.
  - Mr. Campbell replied that nothing on the neighboring building will need to be altered. He added there is a newly constructed roof deck on the adjacent building.
  - Mr. Farnham noted that he reviewed a detailed aerial photograph of the adjacent roof and the element that Ms. Guttermann is calling a chimney is, in fact, an air conditioning condenser.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

#### **ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Accurate elevation drawings should be provided showing the steel dunnage in the design and how it ties into the cornice. The roof plan should also be revised to show the dunnage.

- Although the design is intended to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, an onsite mockup should be done to determine true visibility from the surrounding streets.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Placing the deck and access structure on the main block is preferable to locating it on the rear ell. If it was on the rear ell, it would be highly visible and alter the historic character of the rear roof area, thereby failing to satisfy the Standards.
- The proposed alterations would not permanently alter the historic character of this building and could be fully reversed in the future; therefore, the application does meet Standard 10.
- To confirm the deck and access structure meet the Roofs Guideline, staff should review an onsite mockup that includes steel dunnage that projects to the parapet and the height of the railing.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mockup demonstrates that the deck and access structure are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

<b>ITEM: 2100 MOUNT VERNON ST</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Stein</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Guterman		X			
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5	1			1

**ADDRESS: 7037, 7039, AND 7041 RIDGE AVE**

Proposal: Remove non-historic additions; renovate building; and construct four-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Select Redevelopment

Applicant: Dane Bombara, Square Architects, LLC

History: 7039 and 7041 Ridge Ave: 1830; First-floor commercial addition

Individual Designation: None

District Designation:

7037 Ridge Ave: None

7039 Ridge Ave: Ridge Ave Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018

7041 Ridge Ave: Ridge Ave Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:**

This application proposes to restore a historic building on Ridge Avenue and construct a four-story multi-family building behind the historic building. The vacant parcel at 7037 Ridge Avenue, upon which the majority of the new construct will sit, is not designated as part of the Ridge Avenue Thematic Historic District, but these three parcels will be consolidated, and the historic designation will then encompass the entire larger property. The one-story commercial addition at the front of the historic building, which dates from 1987, will be removed, the first-floor front façade will be restored, and a porch reconstructed. The one-story rear additions, which date from the 1990s, will be removed. The four-story multi-family building proposed for the property will not block views of the historic resource.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish non-historic additions on existing building.
- Restore historic building façades.
- Construct four-story multi-family building at rear.

**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. The proposed work will result in a restoration of a historic Ridge Avenue property.

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:50:05

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Dane Bombara represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Stein commented on the massing of the new building. She stated that it is too much building on the site, and it overwhelms the historic building. She suggested the addition of more room between the two buildings.
- Ms. Lukachik commented that the drive area is very close to the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the proximity of the new building and the existing building is his biggest concern. He stated that the front section of the new building needs to be eliminated to provide more space between the two buildings. He suggested that the long shed dormer be broken up into multiple dormers. He stated that the windows are too small and need to be larger to be more in scale with the windows of the historic building. He suggested that this resembles a barn behind the historic house. He stated that he is not opposed to a building at this location, but as proposed, it overwhelms the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler provided comments about the restoration of the historic building. He stated that once the stucco is stripped away on the first floor, it should be evident as to the appropriate size of the windows, and that the staff should review what is uncovered. He stated that the porch may be too tall and that there should be scars to show its original height once the non-historic addition is removed. He applauded the applicant for proposing to restore the historic building and remove its non-historic additions. He suggested that other porches on Ridge Avenue be used as a guide for the appropriate porch roof pitch and post detailing. He stated that the windows on the rear of the building were likely larger, and that the removal of the stucco will show their historic sizes.
  - Mr. Cluver agreed and added that the front doors likely had transoms above, which should also be revealed by removing the stucco and non-historic addition.
  - Mr. Bombara responded that the existing window openings appear to remain on the interior and will be investigated further to determine historic opening sizes, which will then be reviewed with the staff.
- Mr. McCoubrey returned to discussions about the new construction. He agreed that the two sections at the front of the new building are too close to the historic building and suggested omitting them and redesigning the gable end to reduce the sense of a four-story mass. He suggested using a hipped roof rather than a gable to any necessary massing at the front. He questioned if not covering the terrace would help to reduce the visual impact. He concluded that it would be best to eliminate the two projections from the main volume. He commented that the idea of a barn is not all that bad. He agreed that the windows on the new building should be larger.
- Ms. Stein commented on the issue of parking. She observed that it is creating a problem because it is lifting the new building by a full story, taking what should be a three-story building and making it a four-story building. She asked if site parking is possible if the new building is held back further from the historic building, as there would be space created then between the two buildings. She stated that removing the parking from inside the new building would allow its height to be reduced by one story.
  - Mr. Bombara responded that he could investigate parking options again but noted that a location in Roxborough means that most if not all tenants will have vehicles.
  - Mr. Detwiler commented that eliminating the parking level and removing the ends of the new building would reduce its overall massing. He commented that if the parking needs to remain as proposed, there could be some sort of pent or porch along that wall to break it up at the lower level. He commented that site parking is preferable to an elevated building.

- Mr. Bombara responded that the site is awkwardly shaped so it has made options such as site marking more difficult to make work, but that he will revisit this suggestion.
- Ms. Lukachik suggested locating the parking below-grade and dropping the height of the building by doing so. She acknowledged that it is not without additional cost, but it could fix some of the aesthetic issues.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the parking would not have to be entirely below-grade, and that construction of this new building would require excavation for foundations regardless.
- Mr. Bombara noted that part of the site overlaps with the Wissahickon watershed overlay, which could affect the potential for underground parking.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is great to see the historic building proposed for complete restoration.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The vacant parcel at 7037 Ridge Avenue, upon which the majority of the new construct will sit, is not designated as part of the Ridge Avenue Thematic Historic District, but the three parcels will be consolidated, and the historic designation will then encompass the entire larger property.
- The one-story front and rear additions on the historic building are non-historic.
- As proposed, the new construction will not block views of the historic building from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work will result in a restoration of a historic Ridge Avenue property, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed new construction at the rear is incompatible in terms of massing and scale, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9.

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

<b>ITEM: 7037, 7039, AND 7041 RIDGE AVE</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Guterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Guterman	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](mailto: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 Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier version of this project. After the January 2022 Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant withdrew an application. The applicant now presents revised plans and a report from a structural engineer assessing the deteriorated conditions of the building.

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 applicant now proposes a fenestration pattern at the N. Front Street façade that appears to replicate the locations of the original windows. Casement windows are proposed using a simulated divided lite pattern that attempts to approximate a six-over-six, double-hung window, the original window type. Sills and headers would be limestone.

At the N. Water Street elevation, the fenestration pattern is altered from the historic pattern. 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. A new garage door with a cast stone surround is proposed at the ground story.

A roof deck and pilot house are proposed with six-foot setbacks 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 and reconstruct brick facades at front and rear;
- 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:** 01:09:13

**PRESENTERS:**

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

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Estepani said that they revisited the interior program to try and reconfigure the design of the front façade to more closely replicate the original masonry openings. He briefly summarized the findings of the structural engineer that resulted in his recommendation that the front and rear facades must be rebuilt.
- Ms. Lukachik commented that the engineer's report stated that there was an issue with the building's foundation. She asked the applicants what they were doing to address this underlying issue.
  - Mr. Estepani responded that they were going to reinforce an existing vault that was located beneath the front façade.
- Ms. Lukachik stated that she had worked on similar projects and asked if the applicant had explored ways to reinforce the foundation without taking down the front and rear walls. She suggested that Mr. Estepani could repair and replace sections of the walls as needed rather than demolishing them entirely.
  - Mr. Estepani replied that they had discussed such approaches as repointing and replacing the star bolts. However, the engineer was concerned with the continuous settlement of the walls and was not confident that these interventions would adequately fix the problem in the long-term.
- Ms. Lukachik said that the applicant should address the foundation issues first which would stabilize the entire structure, and then revisit possible solutions to stabilize the front and rear walls.
  - Mr. Estepani responded that, if the issues with the walls were more localized, they would be willing to explore this approach but the problems with the structural integrity of the walls was too extensive. Mr. Estepani remarked that the engineer felt that there was just too much uncertainty with trying to repair the existing walls.
- Ms. Guterman said that the applicant was proposing to essentially demolish the front and rear walls and rebuild them to a design that was nothing like the existing conditions. She told the applicant that what they were proposing was simply too drastic.

- Mr. Detwiler commented that the proposed design for the front façade was not even matching the historic design because they were modifying the window heights in their proposal.
- Mr. McCoubrey remarked that this proposal was essentially a demolition.
  - Mr. Estepani responded that he understood the concerns about demolition, but noted that, in comparison to their first proposal, this revised design was much more in keeping with the original features of the building.
- Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Guterman disagreed with Mr. Estepani, noting that the proposed window heights and materials did not reflect the original design. Ms. Guterman pointed out that the large garage door and Juliette balconies were not appropriate.
  - Mr. Estepani responded that they were willing to change any of the proposed materials. He added that they did not make changes to the proposed balconies at the rear façade because he had thought that the Architectural Committee members were accepting of them since no one commented on them at the previous meeting.
- Mr. Detwiler said that, should the applicant be granted permission to remove these facades, a laser scan of the existing conditions would need to be undertaken in order to accurately reconstruct them. He added that the applicant might find the comments of the Architectural Committee members too strict, but the two facades are the only exterior portions to preserve at this building.
  - Mr. Estepani replied that he did not disagree with the characterization of the proposal as a demolition. He added that he could document the precise locations of the existing masonry openings to reconstruct the facades accurately.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that trying to make the proposed casement windows look like double-hung windows was not going to be easy to achieve. He suggested that Mr. Estepani use double-hung windows in the exact same size and location as the existing masonry openings. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the proposed garage door was too large, and, although he appreciated the applicant's attempt to bring the design closer to the historic conditions, there was still work to be done.
- Mr. Cluver said that there was a precedent in the archival images of the property to use a material other than brick at the ground floor of the N. Front Street façade. He suggested that Mr. Estepani's design should relate back to the 1919 photograph.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if anyone could tell whether the storefront seen in the 1919 photograph was made of granite.
  - Mr. Detwiler wondered if it was cast iron.
- Mr. Santilli explained some of the reasoning behind the proposed design. He told the members of the Architectural Committee that he intended to use the building for his home and so he was proposing to increase the size of the garage to accommodate three vehicles. Mr. Santilli stated that the balconies were intended to create some outdoor space at each floor. Mr. Santilli said that he wanted to use casement windows to help minimize the noise from Delaware Avenue and I-95.
- Mr. Santilli said that the proposed pilot house would be inconspicuous once the adjacent property was developed. He explained that some of the design choices for the window sizes were driven by the interior program, which he realized was not under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission. Mr. Santilli stated that he proposed the use of cast stone at the ground floors because he found it attractive, but he was flexible and open to the suggestions of the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. Cluver recommended that the applicants revise their plans to reflect the exact size and location of the existing windows. He also said that he was not aware of any

difference in noise cancellation performance between casement windows and double-hung windows.

- Mr. Santilli remarked that the condition of some of the brick was very poor, including fractured and broken pieces that were beyond repair. Mr. Detwiler responded that Mr. Santilli should save the bricks that can be salvaged and replace the ones that cannot.
- Mr. McCoubrey told the applicant that they could use the historic image as a blueprint for the design of the facades. He reiterated his opinion that the proposal was a demolition, and he urged the applicant to reconsider this approach and find a solution that retains more historic fabric.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Randal Baron spoke against the proposed demolition of the front and rear facades.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application did not adequately substantiate the need to remove the front and rear walls.
- The proposed designs for the reconstructed front and rear facades do not reflect the original conditions of the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The amount of demolition proposed does not meet Standard 9.

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

<b>ITEM: 305 N FRONT ST</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Detwiler</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Lukachik</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Guterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

**ADDRESS: 6942 WOODLAND AVE**

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; add ramp, stairs, egress stairs, and window wells

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia-Free Library

Applicant: Elizabeth Ackerman, DGroup Architecture

History: 1915; Paschalville Branch of the Free Library; Henry C. Richards, architect

Individual Designation: 6/14/2013

District Designation: Carnegie Libraries Historic District, Contributing, 7/9/2021

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, [jon.farnham@phila.gov](mailto:jon.farnham@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to rehabilitate a Carnegie branch library building, making several alterations, the most significant of which are the additions of a ramp at the front entrance for accessibility and an exterior stairwell for egress from the basement level, and some alterations to basement windows.

The library currently has a ramp that runs along the side and rear of the property and enters the building at a small rear extension. The ramp does not satisfy the safety, security, and programmatic needs of the library or its patrons and must be replaced. This application proposes to remove the ramp and construct a new ramp at the front façade. The current front entrance includes two sets of stairs, one on the exterior and one in the interior vestibule. The proposed ramp would bring visitors to a landing on the exterior at the same level as the main floor in the building. To accommodate the ramp, the main doorway would be altered, reducing the size of the transom and raising the doors up from the historic threshold level to the level of the main interior floor. The limestone and terra cotta door surround would be altered for raised entrance. The interior vestibule floor would be raised to the level of the main floor. The ramp would have granite paving, limestone cladding on the sides, and metal handrails.

For egress from the basement level, an open, exterior stairwell would be added to the side of the building. A basement window would be enlarged for a door. The stairwell's retaining walls would be clad in granite, the steps would be concrete, and the railing would be metal.

To accommodate the installation of the ramp and new mechanical systems, basement windows and window wells would be altered. Some would be infilled with panels, others with louvers.

The application proposes other work as well, all of which can be reviewed by the staff and need not occupy the Historical Commission's time. At the rear, for emergency egress, steps would be installed where the old ramp was removed and a retaining wall and steps from the basement would be rebuilt. During this work, the rear extension would be reconstructed. The extension's street-facing façade would be retained. All windows would be replaced with appropriate six-over-six, double-hung windows, which would be fixed, not operable. Masonry would be pointed and repaired. Light fixtures would be restored. A book drop would be added. Rear louvers would be replaced. Hardscaping and landscaping would be added at the sides. Planters would be added. A small storage shed would be added at the side. An electrical transformer would be relocated away from the front of the building. Exterior lighting would be installed. A World War I memorial would be rehabilitated.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Replace rear ramp with front ramp.
- Alter front doorway for ramp.
- Add basement egress stairway.

- Alter basement windows and window wells.
- Other work that the staff is reviewing including work to a rear extension, egress stairs, and retaining wall; window replacement; masonry repair; lighting; hardscaping; landscaping; etc.

**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.
- *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 ramp and egress stairwell could be removed in the future and the historic features restored.
- *Accessibility Guidelines: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.*
- *Accessibility Guidelines: Recommended: Designing new or additional means of access that are compatible with the historic building and its setting.*
  - The ramp will be compatible with the historic building and its setting and will provide dignified, barrier-free, code-compliant access to the main entrance of the public library while preserving significant historic features.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Accessibility Guidelines.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:56:15

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Betsy Ackerman and Matt Funk, Cassie O'Connell, Rebuild Project Manager for the Free Library, and Lynn Williamson, Chief of the Neighborhood Library Services Division of the Free Library, represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Ackerman presented an overview of the application and described the building and site. She explained that the building sits on the rear property line and the site is not very large.
- Ms. Ackerman explained that, in heavy rains, water collects at the corner of 70<sup>th</sup> Street and Woodland Avenue, at the base of the existing ramp, making it unusable. She explains that water and security are the biggest problems at the site. She stated that the existing ramp poses security problems because the location where it enters the building cannot be monitored by the staff. She observed that the site slopes down from Saybrook Street at the east to Woodland Avenue at the west. A ramp at the front door needs to rise four feet. A ramp at the west needs to rise six feet. She

stated that they considered many options for providing accessibility to the building and decided that constructing a full addition was not appropriate. They decided that they wanted to alter the existing building as little as possible. She explained that they chose to install the ramp at the proposed location because of the topography, which would result in the shortest ramp, and also to limit the impact of the ramp on the front façade of the building. She explained that the ramp would take visitors up to the level of the main floor in the library. There would no longer be steps within the vestibule. She stated that the goal was to create a “universal entrance that everybody can come into.”

- Ms. Ackerman then pointed out the proposed egress from the basement on the architectural plans. She also explained the need to close off the window wells at the east as well as behind the proposed ramp. She stated that water gets into the building through the east window wells, which must be addressed.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicants if they considered the possibility of the ramp running to a new door in the side of the projecting central bay rather than to the original front door.
  - Ms. Ackerman stated that they did carefully study that option and determined that locating the ramp against the front facade of the would create many problems and complexities, owing to the many projections and recessions in the façade. She stated that they would also have to significantly enlarge the window opening in the side of the bay to create an ADA door. She also noted that there is a built-in ladder to the roof in the area suggested by Mr. Cluver for the new door. The ladder and roof hatch would have to be relocated to use this space, now a janitor’s closet, for the ADA entrance. There is no other location in the library for the roof ladder. She stated that their design goal was to reduce the interface between the new and old to the minimum. The proposed ramp design touches the historic building very lightly. Pushing the ramp back up against the building would require many more alterations to the building, inside and out.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to explain the impact of the proposed ramp to the front doorway including the transom.
- Ms. Guttermann interrupted Mr. Cluver and reminded the applicants that they only had five minutes total to present their application. She objected to the ramp because it would “take over half of the public right-of-way in the sidewalk.”
  - Ms. Ackerman corrected Ms. Guttermann that the ramp would not be located in the right-of-way. It would be located entirely on the library property, leaving the sidewalk unencumbered.
  - Ms. Guttermann stated that the ramp should only extend to the height of the vestibule floor, not the main floor, and then an elevator could take people up from the vestibule to the main floor.
  - Ms. Ackerman responded that there is no room in the vestibule for an elevator. She also noted that the Free Library has a strong preference for allowing everyone to arrive in the same way to the main floor.
  - Mr. Funk added that the Free Library facilities and maintenance staffs need to be able to move equipment including high lifts in and out of the building easily. He noted that the ceilings in the library are very tall and a high lift must be brought in for all maintenance including changing light bulbs. If the ramp only extended to the vestibule, there would be no way to get heavy equipment into the library.
- Ms. Lukachik agreed that locating the ramp up against the building and entering the center bay from the side would have a greater impact on the building, she suggested that such a ramp would look better.

- Ms. Stein said that a ramp at the side of the center bay would alleviate the need to alter the front door.
  - Ms. Ackerman observed that such a ramp, which would enter into a very small space that is now a janitor's closet, would not accommodate the movement of equipment and materials in and out of the building.
  - Ms. Guterman disagreed and stated that they would be able to move equipment and materials in and out of the building with a ramp to the side of the central bay.
  - Ms. Ackerman responded that the space is too tight. They would not be able to move equipment and materials in and out of the building with a ramp to the side of the central bay. A lift, for example, could not make the right-hand turn in the small space that is now a janitor's closet.
  - Ms. Guterman suggested that the Free Library purchase a smaller lift.
- Ms. O'Connell observed that it may be productive to discuss the process that led to the decision to place the ramp in the proposed location, rather than in some of the other suggested locations. She stated that the potential designs for access have been vetted by committees of Rebuild, the Free Library, and the City. She stated that they have been through a very long conceptual and schematic design process to get to this point. They first studied the construction of an addition with an elevator. After many iterations of that design, they decided that an addition would have an adverse effect on the historic building. It also failed to bring all people into the same entrance. People with mobility issues would not have entered at the main entrance. Multiple entrances would also require more staff to manage them, and the Free Library is already facing staffing problems. She explained that they considered seven alternatives for access to the building in depth and determined that this option was the best. She stated that they determined that this option provided the most equitable access to the building and best retained the historic character of the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the front entrance is the most significant element of the building. He stated that he would prefer to see the front entrance left undisturbed, even if that means making more changes to the front façade wall adjacent to the entrance. He stated that he would prefer a ramp along the front facade of the building entering the central pavilion or bay at the side, even if that meant changes to the front façade and the cutting of a large door opening in the side of the bay.
- Mr. Cluver stated that pushing the ramp back against the building would prevent trash from collecting in that area behind the proposed ramp.
- Ms. O'Connell stated that Historical Commission approved a very similar ramp for the Logan branch library, which is also designated as historic. That ramp was recently constructed.
- Ms. O'Connell displayed a side elevation of the library showing the side of the projecting central bay and pointed out that, if the ramp was located as the Committee is proposing, a door would need to be cut where there is now a very narrow window between two projecting pilasters. She added that, even if the scheme was feasible, it would end up producing two separate entrances, one for the majority of people and another for those with mobility issues, which the library is seeking to avoid. Also having two entrances increases staffing needs and decreases the level of security.
  - Ms. Ackerman added that the roof is accessed from the janitor's closet. A built-in ladder in the closet runs up to a roof hatch right where the new door opening would be created. If the closet were converted to the ADA entrance, the ladder and roof hatch would need to be moved, but there is no other appropriate location for it.

- Ms. Lukachik and Mr. Cluver suggested that the alternate designs for ramps should be presented to the Architectural Committee so that the Committee can verify that all options have been considered and the appropriate decisions have been made.
- Ms. O'Connell stated that this decision cannot be made on historic preservation concerns only. The Historical Commission must also consider equity, security, staffing, and other factors playing into the decision.
  - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Historical Commission can take other factors into account. He remarked that the Architectural Committee has one charge, to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- Ms. Ackerman explained that the design met with Laura DiPasquale of the Historical Commission's staff and showed her options for placement of the ramp. Ms. Ackerman reported that Ms. DiPasquale indicated that the ramp currently proposed would have less of an impact on the historic building than the ramp that the Architectural Committee is now suggesting that would run alongside the front façade of the building and enter at the side of the projecting bay. She also stated that a ramp attaching to the side of the bay would need to be longer because it would require a landing outside the new doorway; such a ramp would extend beyond the end of the building into the side yard. The ramp that is proposed is designed to limit the connection between the historic building and the ramp to reduce the impact of the ramp on the building itself. She stated that connecting the ramp to the side of the projecting bay has cascading effects. The roof ladder and roof hatch would have to be relocated, among other things. The project is designed to maximize the funding available for restoration work. Relocating the ramp as suggested would have cascading effects like the roof ladder and hatch and would take money away from restoration.
  - Mr. Farnham noted that Ms. DiPasquale is on maternity leave.
- Mr. Funk stated that the Art Commission and its Design Excellence Committee, which reviews all Rebuild projects, favored the ramp as proposed over the other ramp options. The Art Commission opined that a ramp running along the building would require inappropriate alterations to the façade and would obscure views of the façade.
  - Mr. Farnham explained that the Art Commission's jurisdiction is like the Historical Commission's in this case. The Art Commission reviews all projects involving City property and resources. Its approval is required to obtain a building permit.
- Ms. Williamson, the head of branch libraries of the Free Library, stated that the Free Library must provide one entrance for its clientele regardless of mobility. She stated that the library must uphold best practices with regard to access.
  - Mr. Cluver stated that the Architectural Committee is suggesting two separate but equal entrances, one with steps and one with a ramp. It is not suggesting a rear entrance for disabled persons. The ramp entrance would terminate at what is now the janitor's closet.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested a switchback ramp to reduce the length.
  - Ms. O'Connell stated that the Free Library has a policy against switchback ramps because they do not accommodate the movement of equipment like high lifts. She added that they are difficult to integrate into most sites.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that, if the proposed ramp is accepted, it should be articulated with piers or pilasters to break up the mass. Articulations would help achieve a better scale for the ramp face. The limestone face of the ramp should be articulated, perhaps with seams or pilasters.

- Ms. Ackerman stated that she would be happy to add articulation to the limestone face of the ramp.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he could accept the ramp if the face of the ramp were given some level of rhythm and design.
- Ms. Ackerman agreed to refine the design of the face of the ramp.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that, even with the changes to the face of the ramp, the ramp is still shortening the doorway and changing the proportions of the front façade.
- Ms. Stein suggested moving the ramp to the side of the projecting bay and using the ramp for entrance only and using the historic entranceway for exit only.
  - Ms. O'Connell stated that the Free Library's policies and practices would not allow it to implement Ms. Stein's solution.
- Ms. O'Connell stated that her team would provide documentation on the ramp into the side of the projecting bay to the Historical Commission for its review. She stated that plans for such a ramp were developed but then rejected by the design team and other reviewers. They can be shown to the Historical Commission with an explanation of the flaws of that version of the design.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the Architectural Committee's task is to determine whether it finds that the proposal satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and then make a non-binding recommendation to the Historical Commission based on that finding. The Historical Commission has a much broader purview and may take into account safety, security, cost, programmatic needs, dignity of access, and other factors. He suggested that the applicants reserve some of their arguments for the Historical Commission.
- Ms. Guttermann asked if the proposed basement egress stair would fill with water.
  - Ms. Ackerman stated that the water problem occurs closer to the intersection, not where the stair will be located. The stairs will be appropriately drained.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the exterior is not needed for egress.
  - Mr. Funk stated that it is required for egress because the building is not sprinklered.
  - Mr. Cluver agreed.
- Mr. Cluver asked how much the entry vestibule floor is being raised.
  - Ms. Ackerman stated that it is being raised 2'-1½" above its current location.
  - Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to explain where that difference is being made up in the doorway.
  - Mr. Fink explained that one row of panes is being removed from the transom and the transom bar is becoming slightly narrower.
  - Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to check to see if the light fixtures will need to be raised for clearance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Randy Baron objected to the window replacement. He stated that the proposed windows do not have exterior muntins. He stated that they should have projecting muntins and should not simply be sandwiched muntins between the glass.
  - Mr. Fink responded that the claim is incorrect and stated that the proposed windows will have internal and external applied muntins and spacer bars between the glass. He stated that the new windows will match the exterior appearance of the historic windows. He reported that they evaluated the windows and found them to be in very poor condition and in need of replacement. He also noted that the storm windows will be removed. Security grates will be removed.

The new windows will be faithful reproductions of the historic windows but have much better thermal performance.

- Ms. Ackerman stated that the new windows will faithfully reproduce the appearance of the historic windows but will not be operable. The windows are difficult to access from the interior and leaving them open would adversely impact the HVAC system.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing ramp to the rear entrance is inadequate for several reasons.
- The existing windows are in poor condition and need replacement.
- The work involving the windows; rear steps, extension, and retaining wall; masonry pointing and repair; light fixtures; book drop; louvers; hardscaping and landscaping; storage shed; electrical transformer; and World War I memorial can be reviewed for approval by the staff.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- All aspects of the application except the ramp satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- More information about the ramp and alternative locations for the ramp is needed. Information showing that a ramp into the side of the projecting entrance pavilion is not feasible should be provided before the current ramp design can be approved.
- If the ramp to the front entrance is approved, its limestone face should be articulated with pilasters and/or other architectural devices.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the ramp as currently proposed.

<b>ITEM: 6942 WOODLAND AVE</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Guterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Guterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

**ADJOURNMENT**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:01:20**

**ACTION:** The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:02 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](http://www.phila.gov/historical).

DRAFT