

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

**TUESDAY, 26 APRIL 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		
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:

- Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
- Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
- Jordan Donaldson
- Doug Bomar
- Matthew Dunphy
- Jay Farrell
- Rachael Pritzker
- Susan Wetherill
- Michael Caine
- Julian Hinson
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
- Hal Schirmer
- Steve Black

Paul Pelullo
Aaron Rowlett, Community Ventures
Alex Rice, Archer & Buchanan Architecture
Liam Zheng
Troy Hannigan, Community Ventures
Kathy Lent
Ming Shao
Dennis Carlisle
Marlene Schleifer
Michael Farinella
David La Fontaine
Charles Long
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Randal Baron
David Traub
Jonathan Morse
Roxborough Development Corporation
Cassidy Martin, Old City District
Meagan Knapp
Rustin Ohler
Jessica Vitali, Coscia Moos Architecture
Dane Bombara
Jim McKenna
Diego Figueroa
Lorna Katz
Morris Zimmerman

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2204 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building and construct 10-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Flamingo Bay Investments

Applicant: Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos Architecture

History: 1871; John Ashhurst House; Furness & Hewitt; New front façade in 1938 for Anthracite Industries, Inc., George W. Neff, architect

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

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to demolish the building at 2204 Walnut Street, which is classified as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District, and construct a 10-story, mixed-use, commercial and residential building in its place. The overall height of the building would be 117 feet. The upper stories would be set back 10'-2" from the lower front façade at the fifth floor and an additional 5'-3" at the seventh floor. No cladding or other materials are identified in the application.

In 2019, the Historical Commission approved a two-story rooftop and rear addition for the existing four-story building. The addition would have been set back from the front façade. Renderings of the project are included below.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 APRIL 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing building; and,
- Construct 10-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.*
 - The existing building is classified as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The existing building is not considered historic fabric and therefore its demolition complies with Standard 9.
 - At 10 stories and 117 feet tall, the proposed building is not compatible with the streetscape or historic district. The historic buildings in the immediate area are between three and five stories in height. The application does not comply with Standard 9. The height of the proposed building should be reduced to a maximum of six stories, with the upper two stories set back from the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the demolition but denial of the new construction, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:40

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jessica Vitali represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Vitali showed a presentation with information about the site and proposed building. She pointed out several tall buildings in the area as well as the gas station directly across the street. She showed a site plan. She showed photographs of the existing building, which will be demolished. She stated that she reviewed the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District nomination to inform her design. She stated that she is proposing a 10-story, 177-foot-tall building, which matches the height of the Roosevelt at the corner of 23rd and Walnut Streets. She stated that the existing cornice line at the fourth story will be maintained. She showed images of the main façade materials. She displayed renderings of the front façade and pointed out that the floor levels match those of the neighboring buildings. She showed a section drawing that indicated the setbacks at the upper levels. She pointed out that the setback allows the adjacent mansard to remain independent. The first floor will include a retail and residential unit and the upper floors will include residential units. Ms. Vitali displayed renderings of the building in the streetscape and stated that its height is compatible with its surroundings. She stated that the design is of a high quality, in keeping with the historic district.
- Ms. Stein stated that taller buildings are usually found on corners, not mid-block like this site. She stated that the two stories that were approved for addition to the existing four-story building were compatible, but 10 stories in the midst of four and

- five-story buildings is not. She stated that the proposed structure is a building on a building. She concluded that it is too tall.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Ms. Stein and stated that the massing of the proposed building is inappropriate for the historic district. It is too tall and thin.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that he agreed with Ms. Stein. He also noted that the building looks like two buildings, one on top of the other. The upper and lower sections of the building are unrelated.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that the vocabulary of the first four floors of the building is unlike anything in the historic district.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that the windows at the first four floors are very large and set back from the façade in chamfered surrounds, unlike anything else in the area. The ratio of glass to masonry is not typical of the historic district. He added that the penthouse area is too tall, making the building look very tall.
 - Mr. McCoubey stated that the three-story building at the corner of 22nd and Walnut makes this site very visible from the street. The east party wall will look massive from the street. He suggested pushing the upper stores back farther from the front façade, making the upper part of the structure look like a different building in the distance. He suggested differentiating the upper and lower floors more. He stated that the proposed building is too tall. Six stories might be appropriate.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that the very light color stands out. He suggested a less bright color.
 - Mr. Detweiler advised against a dark grey, which is currently in style.
 - Mr. McCoubrey also objected to the bright white of the lower façade.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the balconies are not characteristic of the historic district.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that his organization does not oppose this project. He noted, however, that he finds that the design does not fit into the historic district. He objected to the color of the proposed building. He stated that the building is too tall and the setbacks are too small.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization does not oppose this project. He stated that the Historical Commission approved a very similar building at 2110 Walnut Street. He suggested more unity between the upper and lower sections of the building. He concluded that the proposed building “makes sense” on the street and within the historic district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing building at the site is classified as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.
- Owing to its non-contributing classification, the existing building may be demolished without a finding of necessity in the public interest or financial hardship.
- The buildings on the block are primarily four and five stories in height.
- Taller buildings in the area are usually found at the corners, not mid block.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- At 10 stories and 117 feet tall, the proposed building is not compatible with the streetscape or historic district. The application does not comply with Standard 9.

- With a reduction in height, additional setbacks, and other design modifications as discussed during the review, the application may be revised to comply with Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of the non-contributing building but denial of the proposed building, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2204 Walnut St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Detweiler					
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: 322-40 RACE ST

Proposal: Construct five-story mixed-use building
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Elders + Deacons, the Minister Trustees
 Applicant: Morris Zimmerman, O:Z Collaborative
 History: 1837; First German Reformed Church, includes houses at 151 and 153 N 4th St
 Individual Designation: 1/25/1966
 District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003
 Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story mixed-use building on the site of the Old First Reformed United Church of Christ at the southeast corner of 4th and Race Streets in the Old City Historic District. The building would include residential and service facilities for homeless men, commercial spaces, and offices for the church. The site of the new building, along 4th Street to the west of the church building, currently includes an eighteenth-century house classified as significant in the historic district, a pseudo-colonial house classified as non-contributing, a surface parking lot, and open space. In June 2019, the Historical Commission approved the massing and location of the proposed building in concept and granted final approval of the relocation eighteenth-century house to the south property line and the restoration of its commercial first-floor façade, and the demolition of the non-contributing house. This application requests final approval of the new building.

The new building would include a two-story section for church offices adjacent to the relocated house and a five-story section at the corner with commercial space on the ground floor and residential units with support spaces on the upper floors. The new building would be beveled to maintain views of the church from Race Street. The new building would be designed to meet

passive house standards and would be clad with brick, cast stone, and metal panels. The church-office section of the building would be clad in cast stone and have the appearance of a separate building. The mass of the new building would be broken down with shifts in height and changes in materials. The upper floors would stand on columns at the northeast side of the building. It is important to note that, although the land at the corner of 4th and Race is now open, it was historically built up with structures about the size of the proposed building. The clearing of that land post-dates the period of significance of the historic district by many decades.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct mixed-use building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.
 - The new construction will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- *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 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 will be unimpaired.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of June 2019.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:29:13

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Morris Zimmerman and developer Troy Hannigan represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Hannigan stated that Community Ventures is partnering with Old First Church and others to expand the church's services to homeless persons. The church has run a homeless shelter out of it building for more than 30 years and would now like to develop a homeless services building on an underutilized portion of the site as part of the church's charitable mission.
- Mr. Zimmerman introduced the Architectural Committee to the project. He explained that the Historical Commission granted in-concept and final approval to this project in

2019. The project has moved fairly slowly because of the extremely complex funding structure for the project. He also noted that the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency also has significant energy requirements for the projects it funds. He described the site and its context. He explained that the non-contributing house will be demolished and the historic house will be moved. He stated that that work has already been granted final approval. He displayed current and historic photographs of the site. He showed images of the design for the new building that was approved in concept in 2019. He showed floor plans of the proposed building. He discussed the exterior cladding materials including brick, cast stone, and metal panels. He stated that materials salvaged from the demolition of the non-contributing building will be reused. He stated that the new building will meet passive house requirements and will have triple-glazed windows.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the metal panels and the color choices.
 - Mr. Zimmerman stated that they chose neutral colors and wanted some contrast between the different sections of the building. They chose the lightest color for the courtyard to increase the natural light in the area.
 - Mr. Cluver objected to the metal panels facing the church in the courtyard.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the metal panels in the courtyard create an inappropriate scale for the eastern part of the building.
 - Mr. Zimmerman stated that the first-floor level of the courtyard is clad in brick.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested more brick.
 - Mr. McCoubrey questioned the cast-stone façade of the two-story office section of the building. He also questioned the scale of the two-story structure.
 - Mr. Zimmerman explained that the configuration of the two-story section, which was approved in concept, is predicated on the need to make the adjacent historic building accessible.
 - Mr. Detweiler objected to the window placement and spacing and the window-to-wall ratio in the new building. He objected to the horizontal windows on the chamfered section. He stated that the building needs more windows.
 - Mr. Zimmerman responded that the window size, shapes, and locations are driven by the interior program as well as the need for energy efficiency. The interior rooms are tiny studio apartments with few options for privacy. The windows are small to give the occupants some privacy. He stated that they considered the furniture layout, given that the rooms are so small. The horizontal windows are located in accessible rooms, which have different requirements such as sill heights.
 - Ms. Stein suggested reconsidering the use of metal panels at the beveled corner.
 - Mr. Hannigan stated that there is a precedent for metal panels on front side facades in the immediate area. The Historical Commission approved new construction with metal panels on front facades diagonally to the northwest at the corner of 4th and Race Streets and to the northeast across Race Street at 313-25 Race Street, where EFIS and grey metal panels were used. Both buildings were constructed in the last few years with the Historical Commission's approval.
 - Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Hannigan also noted that the block-long concrete US Mint building is directly west of the site, across 4th Street.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron commended the project to create housing for the homeless. The project is in the public interest. He suggested vertically oriented, not horizontally oriented windows in the beveled section of the façade. He also mentioned that the

staff should review the window details in the historic building, which is not part of this application.

- Job Itkowitz of the Old City District stated that his organization supports the project, which is a charitable project to provide housing and services to homeless people. He also noted that this building will face the rear of the US Mint, with its truck entrances. He stated that the Mint building is an enormous, concrete, Brutalist building without windows. The project site is not the typical red brick Old City environment. He also mentioned the metal panel building to the northwest, at 401 Race Street. He concluded that, in light of the fact that this is a charitable project in the public interest and in light of the fact that the immediate surroundings includes non-historic buildings faced with metal panels, EFIS, and concrete, this application should be approved.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that the Architectural Committee appreciates the project's mission, to house the homeless, but would like to see it done in a better building with better materials.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- In June 2019, the Historical Commission approved the massing and location of the proposed building in concept and granted final approval of the relocation eighteenth-century house to the south property line and the restoration of its commercial first-floor façade, and the demolition of the non-contributing house.
- The proposed building would include residential and service facilities for homeless men, commercial spaces, and offices for the church.
- The site is bounded on the west by the rear façade of the Brutalist, concrete US Mint building. Adjacent new construction at 313-25 and 401 Race Street include grey metal panels on street facades.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The metal panels proposed for the courtyard elevation are not appropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, primarily owing to the metal panels proposed for the courtyard elevation.

ITEM: 322-40 Race St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
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: 14 AND 20 PELHAM RD, SUBDIVIDED FROM 30 PELHAM RD

Proposal: Construct two houses on subdivided parcels

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: CDP Pelham LLC

Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates

History: 1902; Fairlawn; G.W. & W.D. Hewitt

Individual Designation: 7/14/2017

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to construct two, three-story, single-family, detached houses on parcels that have been subdivided from the rear of the historically designated property at 30 Pelham Road. The historic building, a grand Tudor Revival mansion, stands on a very large lot at the corners of Cresheim and Pelham Roads and faces Cresheim. The historic carriage house, which was designated at the same time as the mansion, was subdivided off many years ago and faces Westview Avenue. The proposed new buildings would be located at the rear of the site, away from the historic house. They are designed to be compatible with the surrounding context in terms of setback, massing, materials, and features. The proposed new construction will not block views of the historic resource from the public right-of-way and will not have an adverse impact on the designated resource.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct two three-story single-family detached residences on subdivided parcels.

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, satisfying Standard 9.

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

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Logan Dry represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Dry summarized the project scope and the varied architecture in the immediate area.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that this area is primarily masonry buildings. He asked if the masonry veneer bases could be extended up to include the first floors. He commented that metal siding is not appropriate, and suggested cementitious siding instead. He commented that the porch canopies are not appropriate as designed,

- and should be a pent or more traditional porch design. He commented that the east side stair addition could be changed so that the third level of the mass steps back and reads more like a shed dormer.
- Mr. Dry responded that he can look into extending the masonry up and revising the canopies, and that minimal masonry was proposed owing to budgetary considerations.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that the space between the chimney and closet is too close and will create leaks.
 - Mr. Cluver asked for clarification on the brick.
 - Mr. Dry confirmed that it is a four-inch thick veneer, which is a full brick thickness and a standard brick size.
 - Mr. Detwiler discussed the garage doors, which are shown as flat slab overhead doors. He suggested something with a more traditional style.
 - Mr. Dry responded that he can look into a design that is more of a carriage style or includes lites.
 - Mr. Detwiler discussed the front entry doors with sidelites. He suggested front entry doors with divided lites, and making the sidelites be more like smaller windows.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that there is too much wood frame, and that there should be more masonry or stucco.
 - Mr. Dry explained that stucco is not proposed here because of its inability to hold up well when applied to wood-frame buildings.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commended Mr. Dry on nicely sited and scaled buildings that are generally appropriate for this location. He agreed that some materiality and details could be reconsidered. He commented that he appreciates the grouping of windows but suggested that the black windows are changed to a lighter color because otherwise the muntins are very difficult to see.
 - Mr. Farnham clarified that this property is not located within a historic district. The house from which this is subdivided is individually designated.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This area is not a historic district; the building lots have been subdivided from the rear of an individually designated property.
- The proposed new construction will not block views of the historic resource from the public right-of-way and will not have an adverse impact on the designated resource.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

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

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

- The masonry veneer bases are extended up to include the first floors;
- The front porch coverings change to a pent or more conventional porch;
- The stair bay on the east sides change to a full bay that extends out, or does not interrupt the roof line and the third floor component reads as a shed dormer;
- The front doors change to a four-lite with bottom panel, or six-lite;

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 APRIL 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- The sidelites next to the doors change to windows;
- The garage doors change to carriage-style doors with or without lites;
- Metal siding is eliminated as a façade material;
- The four-inch brick refers to the depth of the brick; and
- The color of the black windows is reconsidered.

ITEM: 14 and 20 Pelham Rd					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 7037, 7039 AND 7041 RIDGE AVE

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

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gerardo A. & Jean T. Papiro, owner; Select Redevelopment, equitable owner

Applicant: Dane Bombara, Square Architects, LLC

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to restore a historic building on Ridge Avenue and construct a three-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 this parcel will be consolidated with two that are designated, 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 three-story multi-family building proposed for the property will not block views of the historic resource.

A similar application was reviewed by the Architectural Committee in February 2022 and was withdrawn by the applicant prior to review by the Historical Commission so that revisions could be considered. The new building proposed in the earlier application was four-stories in height and located significantly closer to the historic building. This application was revised to account

for the Architectural Committee's comments, which included recommendations for reducing the height of the new construction by removing the first-floor parking and siting the new construction further from the historic building. This application also includes several revised details for the restoration of the historic building façade.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-historic additions on existing building.
- Restore historic building façades.
- Construct three-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: 01:32:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Dane Bombara and James McKenna represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Bombara and Mr. McKenna summarized the project and the revisions made since the Architectural Committee's review in February.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the cladding material for the new building.
 - Mr. Bombara responded that it will likely be fiber cement siding.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the windows for the new and historic buildings. He noted that the windows on the historic building are called out as aluminum clad, but that wood windows would be more appropriate.
 - Mr. Bombara responded that the windows are specified as aluminum clad, and that he can work with the staff on the window details.
- Mr. Cluver stated that he is very pleased with the changes made for this application.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed. He commended the applicants for responding so well to the Committee's earlier comments.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the entrance porch at the new building should be more residential in appearance rather than commercial, with more of a porch-like design. He suggested that the space between the two masses of the new building should be a recessive color. He suggested some distinguishing feature in the paving where it meets the historic building.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed and suggested a small sliver of green space against the historic building.

- Mr. Detwiler commented that the shed dormer on the new building comes very close to the gable corner. He suggested pulling it back by one foot.
- Ms. Lukachik commented that this proposal is very sympathetic to the historic building and commended the applicants on their presentation materials.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the windows on the new building should have show sills.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that it could be a simple flat trim board.
- Mr. Cluver applauded the applicants for a nice blending of old and new in their proposal.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Pelullo, property owner of the nearest single-family residence, commented that he has been impressed with the applicants' willingness to communicate and work through some of his concerns. He noted that numerous apartment buildings are being constructed in the immediate area. He commented that he will continue to follow this project closely.
- Hal Schirmer commented in support of the project.
- Marlene Schleifer, president of the Ridge Park Civic Association, received confirmation that the commercial tenants would have to move if this project comes to fruition, as the historic building will be solely residential units.
- Lorna Katz asked the staff if a pergola, separate from the new building, would be an appropriate way to handle protection getting into the new building.

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.
- The new construction will not block views of the historic building from the public right-of-way.
- A similar application was reviewed by the Architectural Committee in February 2022, at which time comments were provided to the applicant for ways to improve the project.
- This application was revised to account for the Architectural Committee's comments, which included recommendations for reducing the height of the new construction by removing the first-floor parking and siting the new construction further from the historic building.

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

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

- The entry at the new building is reconsidered to be more traditional in design;
- A buffer between the paving and the historic building is considered;

- The area between the two masses of the new building is darkened in color to be more recessive;
- The edge of the front dormer on the new building is pulled back slightly so that it is not as close to the gable end of the building;
- Painted wood windows rather than aluminum clad windows are used for the historic building;
- Fiber-cement siding rather than vinyl siding is used on the new building; and
- The windows on the new building have a more traditional sill and frame.

ITEM: 7037, 7039 and 7041 Ridge Ave					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
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: 701 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Add roof deck; cut window openings; create basement access

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Julian Hinson & Justin Billhime

Applicant: Liam Zheng, AR Engineers

History: 1979; Gross Realty and Construction, developer

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 701 Lombard Street is a 3-story, 2-bay, brick, contemporary house constructed ca. 1970 and is classified as contributing in the Society Hill Historic District.

This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house, cut two new window openings at the third-story south façade, and create basement access from the parking space at the west side of the building.

The staff reviewed a previous version of this application that showed the deck lifted off the roof, causing the railing to be visible from the public right-of-way. Fig. 5 shows the difference between the originally proposed railing visibility (red square) versus the current application (yellow square). The staff believes that lowering the deck to sit closer to the roof has succeeded in making the railing minimally visible and therefore inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, as seen in the site-line studies on drawing A.3. The plans note that the proposed railing is white vinyl, and the staff recommends that a metal picket would be more appropriate. Based on the site-line studies, the pilot house appears visible looking west from 7th Street. The staff

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 APRIL 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

recommends that the roof of the pilot house be slanted to minimize the visibility from this view. The staff also asks the applicant to clarify the location of the stair to the pilot house. The roof plan shows it set back from the east façade behind a skylight; however, elsewhere on the plans, it appears that the stair extends all the way to the front façade of the building.

The application proposes to cut two new window openings at the third-story south or Lombard Street façade. The staff recommends that the proportions of the new window openings more closely match those of the existing windows.

The proposed new basement access is recessed from Lombard Street and will have minimal impact on the public's understanding of the building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct roof deck and pilot house;
- Cut two new window openings;
- Create basement access.

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 deck railing is proposed in white vinyl, which is not a material that is compatible with the building or the historic district. Instead, the staff recommends a simple metal picket railing in order to satisfy Standard 9.
 - The proportions of the proposed window openings are not compatible with the existing windows on the same façade. To satisfy Standard 9, the staff recommends that they be revised to be more harmonious in size and scale with the existing fenestration.
 - Because the new basement access is set back at the end of the parking space, the staff contends that this change will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and therefore will not impact the public's understanding of this building or the historic district. This scope satisfies 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 railing appears to be minimally visible from the public right-of-way; however, it should be a simple metal picket rather than white vinyl.
 - As proposed, the pilot house appears to be highly visible from 7th Street. The staff recommends slanting the roof of the pilot house to minimize its visibility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the deck railing is metal picket, the pilot house roof slants back, the stair to the pilot house is set back from the façade of the building, and the size and proportions of the new window openings are revised to be more harmonious with the existing windows, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:01:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Julian Hinson and architect Liam Zheng represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Hinson thanked the Architectural Committee members for the work they do. He stated that he and his family reside in the subject property and that they are proposing the roof deck to provide outdoor space for their two young children. Mr. Hinson explained that the two new window openings on the top floor of the south façade would provide much-needed light into that space. Mr. Hinson added that the proposed basement access from the parking space would allow the family to enter the house more safely than having to walk around the corner and enter from 7th Street.
- Mr. McCoubrey thanked Mr. Hinson for his comments and said that the revised plans reflected several of the recommendations made by the staff. He said that his biggest concerns had been the size and shape of the new punched window openings at the third floor and the visibility of the pilot house, both of which had been addressed in the revised plans. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the height of the pilot house could likely be further reduced.
 - Mr. Hinson responded that he thought his architect, Mr. Zheng, had reduced the height of the pilot house as much as possible. Mr. Zheng confirmed that he would try and reduce it further.
- Mr. Cluver suggested switching the direction of the pilot house roof slant and Mr. Zheng agreed that that would help decrease the visibility of it. Mr. Cluver remarked that he was fine with the new window openings at the third floor but suggested that the new openings be shifted to align with the windows at the ground floor.
 - Mr. Hinson asked if the new windows could be made wider if they were shifted to align with the windows below.
- Mr. Cluver responded that the width and location of the proposed new windows were important details for this façade. Ms. Stein commented that the plans showed that the proposed window openings only needed to be shifted a few inches in order to line up with the windows below.
- Mr. Cluver recommended that the color of the pilot house be a neutral gray rather than a sky blue as proposed. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Cluver and further recommended that the coping should be the same color as the pilot house siding.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the metal pickets be a darker color. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the scale of the railing posts needed to be revised.
 - Mr. Hinson agreed to make these changes.
- Mr. McCoubrey thanked Mr. Hinson for having revised his plans based on the staff even before the Architectural Committee meeting.
- Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Hinson what color the existing windows were and Mr. Hinson responded they are white.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lorna Katz on behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that her organization supported the recommended changes.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicant had already revised their plans to reflect several of the staff's recommendations.
- The pilot house roof can be further revised to decrease the visibility of it from the public right-of-way.
- The shape and location of the proposed new window openings need to be revised to ensure they are compatible with the existing windows.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Revising the deck railing to a dark metal picket makes it more compatible with the context of the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.
- Further decreasing the height of the pilot house roof and painting the pilot house a neutral gray color will make it even more inconspicuous from the public right of way, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.
- The basement access is set back from the street and will not impact the public's understanding of either the subject property or the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.
- Relocating the new window openings to align with the windows at the ground floor will help make this alteration more harmonious with this designated structure, thereby satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the pilot house roof is pitched in the direction of the stair the height of the pilot house is minimized; the pickets of the deck railing are black metal; the details of the new windows are compatible with the existing windows and align with the windows on the first floor; the cladding and coping at the pilot house is a neutral gray tone; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 701 Lombard St					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
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: 316 DELANCEY ST

Proposal: Construct one-story rear addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Elizabeth & Robert Legnini

Applicant: Alex Rice, Archer & Buchanan Architecture

History: 1969; R.M. Parsky, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 316 Delancey Street is a two-and-one-half-story Georgian Revival building constructed in 1969 to relate to the adjacent eighteenth-century structures. It fronts Delancey Street, and the side of the building extends along Saint Peter's Way. The building's character-defining features include a pent eave, gambrel roof, and front and rear dormers. The property is classified as contributing in the Society Hill Historic District.

This in-concept application proposes to construct an addition at the third story of the rear ell. The addition would not impact the existing chimney and would be set back from the Saint Peter's Way elevation, but it would require the demolition of the rear dormer and a significant portion of the lower slope of the gambrel roof. The addition would feature six-over-nine double-hung sash windows and Boral trim and clapboard siding.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear dormer and portion of rear gambrel roof;
- Construct rear addition;
- Alter Juliet balcony; and
- Replace deteriorated wood trim with Boral trim.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The application proposes to replicate deteriorated wood trim in Boral trim. Provided the new features replicate the historic in design, dimension, and profile, a substitute material may be appropriate and would comply with Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition would cause the loss of a large portion of the rear slope of the gambrel roof and the demolition of the rear dormer, both character-defining features of the property. The work does not comply with Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:22:53

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 APRIL 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Alex Rice represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Rice explained the reasons for the application, noting that the owner wants to create a small sunroom at the rear third-story of the house. He elaborated that he tried to incorporate the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in creating the addition and felt that he accomplished an appropriate design by including a setback from St. Peter's Way and minimizing the addition's conspicuousness. The windows, he continued, match the configuration of the property's existing windows, and trim details would match details throughout the building, though they would be simplified.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the property is in a prominent location and is highly visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Stein questioned whether an outdoor deck is proposed around the addition, noting that a railing is indicated in the elevations.
 - Mr. Rice responded that the owners are considering using the space for potted plants. Because French doors are proposed, he continued, a railing would be required, though it would be a minimal black metal railing. He added that the owners would be agreeable to no exterior roof access.
- Ms. Stein commented that the property was constructed in 1969, though it is classified as contributing in the district, and asked whether the property gets full review.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the property is part of the redevelopment era.
 - Mr. Farnham answered that the Society Hill Historic District was designated in such a way as to include buildings constructed during the redevelopment era. The district's period of significance, he continued, extends into the 1980s to account for the construction that took place from the 1950s forward. He confirmed that the Committee should review this building like any other contributing building in the district.
- Mr. Cluver asked where the existing air conditioning units would be located.
 - Mr. Rice responded that they are shown in the elevation and would be located on the upper corner of the roof. He noted that it would be reduced from two units to one and would be tucked behind the chimney.
- Mr. Cluver inquired whether the addition would wrap around the chimney.
 - Mr. Rice confirmed that it would.
- Ms. Stein stated that she is not opposed to a change at the building's third story, but she would respond better to a central enlarged dormer, adding that it would also allow more space on the roof for the condensers.
 - Mr. Rice replied that the addition's footprint abuts the party wall and is set back from the side and rear walls in a way that is typical of rear ells. He contended that it seemed to be an appropriate massing for the space.
 - Ms. Lukachik observed that the neighboring building does not have the same plan. She agreed with Ms. Stein that the roof access should be eliminated and that the massing should be centered.
- Mr. Detwiler argued that the addition would be so visible and contended that there is a purity to the building's massing. He added that it would be an attractive addition, but he is struggling with the loss of the rear gambrel and the flanking dormer. He

then commented on the enlargement of the Juliet balcony, stating that it is too deep as proposed and should be 1-foot or 18-inches.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee often reviews alterations to the rear slopes and dormers of properties and that it often prefers to see the dormers remain in their general form. In this case, he continued, it appears to be a third-story overbuild. He noted that the chimney is also a character-defining feature and argued that wrapping the chimney and losing a portion of the gambrel and rear dormer would not be consistent with the Standards.
- Mr. Rice stated he is not clear on a direction to improve the design, other than a few comments to consider an enlarged dormer. He questioned whether there cannot be any addition in the back or if the direction is for a smaller, centered addition.
 - Ms. Stein answered that a centered expanded dormer that provided extra space at the third story would be acceptable to her. She noted that the building sits on a large site and that a one- or two-story addition in the rear yard could be considered.
 - Ms. Gutterman remarked that she does not find any addition appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lorna Katz commented that the Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee of the Society Hill Civic Association voted to deny the proposal for the same reasons stated by the Architectural Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building was constructed in 1969 as part of the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority's effort to revitalize Society Hill. The building is classified as a contributing resource in the Society Hill Historic District.
- The property is highly visible from the public right-of-way, because it is adjacent to St. Peter's Way.
- The addition would cause the loss of a significant portion of the rear gambrel roof and the rear dormer, and it would wrap around the chimney. Each of those features is character defining.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- An enlarged dormer may be appropriate to allow for more space at the third story, or an addition in the rear yard could be considered.
- As proposed, the addition would cause the loss of several character-defining features and is not appropriate in massing, size, or scale. The work does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 316 Delancey St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 133 BECK ST

Proposal: Construct two-story rear addition with roof deck
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Jordan & Melanie Donaldson
 Applicant: Jared Melvin Blake, Level Nine Architects
 History: 1830
 Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 1/26/1965
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW:

This application seeks final approval for a two-story rear addition with a roof deck at 133 Beck Street. The main block was constructed circa 1830. The one-story addition was constructed with concrete block and a stucco finish around the middle of the twentieth century. The property is located at the northeast corner of Beck Street and S. Hancock Street. The new addition would be visible from the public right-of-way.

The scope of work includes the demolition of the one-story non-historic addition and the full rear wall of the main block. A new two-story addition with roof deck is proposed. It would be wood-frame construction with Hardie Board clapboard style siding. The proposed windows on the addition are double hung.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing one-story rear addition.
- Demolish rear wall of main block.
- Construct new two-story addition and roof deck with foundation.

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 demolition of the rear main wall permanently removes a large amount of historic material and does not meet Standard 9. If the applicant can retain the rear wall, reuse its existing openings, utilizing selective demolition, instead of full demolition, the work will meet Standard 9.
- The rear addition was constructed in the middle of the twentieth century more than one hundred years after the historic main block and is constructed of concrete block; therefore, the addition is not historically significant and its demolition meets Standard 9.
- The proposed two-story addition is compatible in terms of massing, scale, and materials and generally meets Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent 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 will be unimpaired.*
 - The full demolition of the rear wall would be a permanent alteration and therefore does not meet Standard 10. If the applicant can update reuse existing openings in the rear wall instead of full demolition, the proposal will meet Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the proposed addition if the applicant can eliminate the full demolition of the rear wall, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:42:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Jordan Donaldson represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Donaldson summarized the project and noted that work on front façade such as installation of shutters will be reviewed by the staff. He explained the revised plan for the rear addition is to use existing openings on the second and third stories for the doorways. Mr. Donaldson commented that the double-hung windows on the rear addition are intended to be a six-over-six configuration, although they are shown in the elevation drawings as one-over-one. He stated these changes have already been communicated to his architect.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out the windows on the addition are currently shown as double-hung windows but a one-over-one configuration. He also inquired about changes to the front door.
 - Mr. Donaldson replied that the architect will update the drawings to show the six-over-six configuration for all double-hung windows. He noted that there are no planned alterations to the front façade door or windows, and these elements will remain as they currently appear. Mr. Donaldson did point out they would like to install shutters on the front facade.
- Ms. Stein asked Mr. Donaldson about the cladding material proposed for the rear addition. She commented that the notes on the drawings are confusing.
 - Mr. Donaldson responded that it will be Hardie siding on wood frame and would be a beige color. He said that in the Queen Village neighborhood additions often use a beige color, whether it is stucco or another material, as this is a complement to the brick.

- Ms. Stein inquired how the proposed siding would meet the sidewalk. She explained that usually Hardie siding does not go all the way to the sidewalk.
- Mr. Donaldson said he will have to consider what material will transition to the sidewalk.
- Mr. Detwiler said that the Committee is challenged by not having a lot of the details in front of them. He continued that, as with other applications that had been presented prior to this one, the Committee likes to review drawings with a certain level of detail and respond to them accordingly. Mr. Detwiler said there are a lot of unknowns with this project without seeing updated drawings. He stated that it is challenging to review the application.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro added that he finds the application to be incomplete.
- Ms. Lukachik inquired if the new intent is to keep the existing rear wall and repoint it. She also asked if the windows would be altered into doorways.
 - Mr. Donaldson confirmed this is accurate. He noted this would be done to the windows on the second and third stories on the left side. Mr. Donaldson explained that these two windows would be modified into doorways.
 - Ms. Lukachik replied that while that makes sense in concept, it makes it difficult to approve the version of drawings in front of them.
- Ms. Stein said that even if the Committee, which is advisory only to the Commission, recommends denial, the applicant has the opportunity to revise the drawings prior to the Historical Commission meeting in May. She continued that, if the revised drawings are representative of the intent of Mr. Donaldson's statements, it is likely that the application could be approved by the Historical Commission. Ms. Stein reiterated Ms. Lukachik's comment that it is difficult for the Committee to approve the drawings in front of them because they do not currently reflect the intent as stated by Mr. Donaldson.
 - Mr. Donaldson said he understood and stated that his architect is currently working on the changes recommended by staff. He commented that he is looking to have changes recommended by staff and Architectural Committee completed in time for the Historical Commission meeting.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the application drawings show one elevation with windows and another without windows.
 - Mr. Donaldson replied that the intent is to have no windows on the side elevation, which faces the street.
 - Ms. Stein pointed out the elevations on drawing page A200, which shows the addition without windows.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the construction materials of the neighboring additions on the block.
 - Ms. Mehley showed an aerial photograph of neighboring buildings showing additions clad in stucco.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted the materials use on nearby buildings and suggested his preference for the addition would be brick or stucco rather than fiber-cement siding.
 - Mr. Donaldson replied that they can consider both brick and stucco for the addition.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the chimneys will remain.
 - Mr. Donaldson confirmed they will be remaining in place and removal is not in the scope of this project.
- Ms. Stein recommended windows on the addition. Ms. Stein and Mr. Detwiler suggested the different types of windows configurations that would be appropriate for

- the space on the side elevation. Ms. Stein suggested two paired windows on the first and second floors. Mr. Detwiler suggested two separate windows on each floor.
- Mr. Detwiler said he is struggling with the enclosed parapet surrounding the deck.
 - Mr. Cluver disagreed with the use of a parapet and stated that something like a metal picket railing would look good especially if the parapet covers the bottom area of the wood deck with a picket railing installed above it.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested a wood picket railing could also be compatible with the historic building and that there are precedents in the area that would support this type of railing.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randal Baron stated this building likely would have had shutters. He recommended that a simple vertical picket on the rear deck would be more compatible with the historic building than the parapet wall.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application drawings appear incomplete. Details and notes should be added to plans and elevation drawings that clearly show the scope of work. Areas of the building not in scope should clearly delineated.
- The applicant has revised the scope of work based on discussions with the staff but the drawings do not yet reflect these changes. If applicant can revise drawings based on staff and Committee feedback prior to the Historical Commission meeting, it is possible that application can be approved at upcoming Historical Commission meeting.
- The cladding material on rear additions in this area of Philadelphia was historically masonry construction. The applicant should consider stucco or brick cladding on the addition.
- The parapet should be lowered to just above the roof decking. A metal or wood picket railing should be used in place of the higher parapet wall. This metal or wood railing is most compatible with the historic building.
- Windows should be added to the addition walls facing the street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The demolition of the rear main wall permanently removes a large amount of historic material and does not meet Standard 9.
- The proposed two-story addition is not compatible in terms of proportions, details, and materials and does not meet Standard 9.
- The rear addition is not historically significant, and its demolition meets Standard 9.
- The full demolition of the rear wall does not meet Standard 10. If the rear wall is retained and altered, the proposal could meet Standard 10.

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

ITEM: 133 Beck St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 341 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Construct three-story addition on three-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Scorsone

Applicant: Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: 2002

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 341 N. Front Street is a 3-story, 2-bay, brick, vernacular house constructed ca. 2002 and is classified as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. The upper bays at the N. Front Street façade appear to be clad in vinyl siding. The ground-story of the rear (Water Street) façade is also brick and has a garage, with the upper floors clad in vinyl siding. A deck and railing are visible on the roof of the second story.

This application proposes to construct a three-story addition on top of the existing building. The third story of the N. Front façade is proposed to be reconstructed and clad in a red brick veneer to match existing. Aluminum composite panels are proposed to clad the upper floors. At the rear (Water Street) façade, the floors of the addition are proposed to be clad in the same aluminum composite panels. Covered balconies are proposed at the top floors of both the N. Front and Water Street facades. Glass guardrails are proposed throughout. Aluminum-clad wood windows are also proposed throughout both facades.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story addition on a three-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.

- Because this structure is not historic fabric on this structure, no historic material will be destroyed, satisfying Standard 9.
- Though the materials of the proposed addition are similar to the materials on other non-historic structures adjacent to the subject property, they are not compatible with the district as a whole. Moreover, the massing, size, and scale of the proposed addition are not compatible with the Old City Historic District. The proposed addition appears much taller than the surrounding buildings. For these reasons, the proposal does not satisfy 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.*
 - There is no historic fabric to protect, therefore the proposal satisfies Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:05:28

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked if the applicant wanted to respond to the staff's recommendation.
 - Mr. Ohler explained that some alterations to the front of the building had been previously approved by the staff. He commented that the work under review today is in the spirit of making the building more compatible with the block and the historic district.
- Ms. Stein commented that, because the party walls of the new addition extend above the adjacent properties, it makes the proposed addition look taller than the plans show. She suggested that, if the party walls were opened up, it could make a difference in terms of the perceived height of the addition.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that his client might be open to the suggestion.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein's comments about pulling back the party walls. He added that the Architectural Committee members typically prefer guard rails to be a simple metal picket design rather than glass as the applicant is proposing.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that he sees glass guardrails used frequently throughout the Old City Historic District.
- Ms. Stein stated that with the right architectural detailing, the proposed height could likely be appropriate on this block of the historic district.
 - Mr. Ohler replied that he would consult with his client about making some of the recommended revisions.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant why the brick does not extend all the way up at the Water Street façade. He remarked that the proposed overbuild is substantial for a relatively small footprint.
 - Mr. Ohler explained that structural reasons prevented the brick from extending up the entire façade.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the proposed design was compatible with the buildings to its right more so than the buildings to its left.

- Ms. Stein asked how the two party walls would be clad.
 - Mr. Ohler replied that the composite siding would extend around to both sides of the addition.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The design of the top floor of the addition makes the building appear taller than the plans propose.
- Pulling back the walls of the top floor of the addition may help improve the perceived height of the addition from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed design of the addition makes it appear taller than it is, which is not compatible with the context and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9.
- Materials such as glass guard rails and vinyl are not compatible with the historic district, and therefore do not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 341 N Front St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Stein					
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				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:21:18

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:22 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