ADDRESS: 502-04 S JUNIPER ST
Proposal: Demolish buildings
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Jay Ernst
Applicant: Vern Anastasio, Anastasio Law
History: 1830
Individual Designation: 12/31/1984
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:
This application proposes to demolish the historic three-story building at 504 S Juniper Street and the adjacent non-historic, one-story garage at 502 S Juniper Street. This application proposes a complete demolition and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments.

The Historical Commission and its advisory Architectural Committee reviewed an application for this property in late 2017 which proposed demolition of the rear wall and roof of the historic building, demolition of the non-historic garage, and construction of a four-story addition. At that time, the Historical Commission voted to deny the application pursuant to Standards 2, 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. The Architectural Committee, in its recommendation of denial at that time, suggested that the applicant produce a letter from a structural engineer that substantiates the reasoning for the proposal. This current application includes two engineering reports from 2021 which recommend demolition of the buildings owing to the condition.

The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) issued Unsafe violations for this property in 2018 but have not since ungraded the condition to Imminently Dangerous, nor has L&I informed the Historical Commission that demolition is the only means of abating the unsafe condition of the historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Demolish buildings

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
- Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
  - The proposed work will destroy the features, materials, and spaces of the property.
- 14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition. No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission’s opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be
reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

- This application proposes a complete demolition and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.
MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 24 MAY 2022
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

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

The meeting was held 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 II
    Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:
    Barbara Eberlein
    Liz Scott
    Mary Ann
    Mathew Huffman
    Monica Ortiz
    Vern Anastasio, Esq.
    Zachary Gant
    Lauren Thomsen
    Maurice Edwards
    Laura Hansplant, Studio Sustena
    Tyler Martin
    Andrea Haynes, Studio Sustena
    Susan Wetherill
    Matt Gindlesparger
    Nissa Eisenberg
    Ben Estepani
    Hal Schirmer
ITEM: 106 Bainbridge St
MOTION: Approval with condition
MOVED BY: Cluver
SECONDED BY: Lukachik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Recuse</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan McCoubrey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cluver</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy D’Alessandro</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Detwiler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Gutterman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Lukachik</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Stein</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDRESS: 502-04 S JUNIPER ST
Proposal: Demolish buildings
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: James Ernst
Applicant: Vern Anastasio, Esq.
History: 1830
Individual Designation: 12/31/1984
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:
This application proposes to demolish the historic three-story building at 504 S Juniper Street and the adjacent non-historic, one-story garage at 502 S Juniper Street. This application proposes a complete demolition and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments.

The Historical Commission and its advisory Architectural Committee reviewed an application for this property in late 2017 which proposed demolition of the rear wall and roof of the historic building, demolition of the non-historic garage, and construction of a four-story addition. At that time, the Historical Commission voted to deny the application pursuant to Standards 2, 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. The Architectural Committee, in its recommendation of denial at that time, suggested that the applicant produce a letter from a structural engineer that substantiates the reasoning for the proposal. This current application includes two engineering reports from 2021 which recommend demolition of the buildings owing to the condition.

The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) issued Unsafe violations for this property in 2018 but have not since ungraded the condition to Imminently Dangerous, nor has L&I informed the Historical Commission that demolition is the only means of abating the unsafe condition of the historic building.
Scope of Work:
- Demolish buildings

Standards for Review:
The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:
- Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
  - The proposed work will destroy the features, materials, and spaces of the property.
- 14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition. No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission’s opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.
  - This application proposes a complete demolition and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

Start Time of Discussion in Zoom Recording: 00:37:10

Presenters:
- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Vern Anastasio and demolition contractor Maurice Edwards represented the application.

Discussion:
- Ms. Stein asked if demolition of the non-historic garage was an issue, given that the structural reports in the application include a good amount of information about the structural integrity of the garage.
  - Ms. Chantry responded that the garage is non-historic and can be demolished without a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the Historical Commission reviewed and denied an application for the partial demolition of this building in 2017. He asked what was done since that time to stabilize the building and prevent further deterioration.
  - Mr. Anastasio responded that work was done since that time to the rear wall to prevent its condition from getting worse. He stated that the recent engineering reports show that the building is in serious disrepair to the point of being...
dangerous. He stated that he would be willing to schedule an inspection by the Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) should the Architectural Committee prefer to rely on a report from L&I. He stated that his client is willing to work with the Historical Commission on details for a replacement building.

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the structural engineering reports made any recommendations.
  - Mr. Anastasio responded that the reports state that the building is not structurally safe and should be demolished.
- Ms. Lukachik stated that she is struggling with this application because she has worked on buildings in worse shape that were preserved. She stated that the building probably does have parts that are unsafe, but it is a question of repair versus complete demolition.
  - Mr. Anastasio responded that it was not the owner’s intent to demolish the building, but it has become apparent that demolition is the safest path forward. He stated that anything can be saved with a million dollars, but it is not practicable in this case.
  - Mr. Edwards, the demolition contractor, described the structural condition of the building, including rotted joists and star bolts that are not holding the front wall as well as they should. He agreed that anything can be repaired with a million dollars, but that he has seen many buildings in poor condition owing to his job as a demolition contractor, and this building is in bad shape. He stated that a lot of the brick is damaged and deteriorated so it would not be able to be salvaged and reused in a new building.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned if the real problem is that the property owner has taken no steps over the last five years to stabilize and repair the building.
  - Mr. Anastasio responded that the owner shored up the rear wall.
  - Ms. Gutterman responded that the Architectural Committee is being told that brick is failing at the front and side walls.
  - Mr. Anastasio acknowledged that work has not been done to the front or side walls but that the owner is deployed overseas and that these conditions existed several years ago.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that this is a hardship application to demolish a building.
- Mr. D’Alessandro commented that roof replacement is not difficult on a building of this size and he does not understand why that was not done.
  - Mr. Anastasio responded that the owner’s intention is to build a new home but that the building was in poor condition when it was purchased. The owner’s intention was to rehabilitate it, but it was determined that the condition is too poor to save.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the 2017 application called for significant demolition of the rear and it was denied owing to the extent of demolition.
- Mr. Detwiler commented on the amount of time which has passed since the last application proposing demolition. He stated that this could be considered demolition by neglect.
  - Mr. Anastasio responded that the property had been neglected prior to the current ownership.
  - Mr. Detwiler stated that a building needs to be maintained and not allowed to deteriorate further.
  - Mr. Anastasio stated that the rear wall is in better condition today than it was previously.
Mr. Detwiler responded that the rear wall is not enough now that the entire building is proposed for demolition.

- Mr. McCoubrey noted that this property is individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and the façade is important.
  - Mr. Edwards responded that the façade is in very bad shape and would have to be taken down and rebuilt regardless, owing to the condition of the bricks. He stated that he could salvage as much brick as possible to use in the rebuild, and could find other old brick from the houses he demolishes.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that there has not been significant enough investment in this property to maintain it, which has resulted in this application for complete demolition. She stated that this is a hardship case that has not been proven.
  - Mr. Anastasio responded that anything can be saved with enough resources, but resources are not unlimited. He stated that he understands the Architectural Committee’s position and its mission, but that there are two reports from engineers, as well as Mr. Edwards’ testimony, that the building is beyond reasonable repair.
  - Ms. Gutterman stated that the structural engineer on the Architectural Committee has given a different opinion.
  - Mr. Anastasio responded that the Architectural Committee’s structural engineer has not personally inspected the property.
  - Ms. Lukachik, the Architectural Committee’s structural engineer, responded that she is not claiming that the reports from the structural engineers in the application are wrong that the building has areas where it is not safe. She stated that the reports support what the engineers were asked to recommend, which is demolition. The reports do not say that the building cannot be saved or that it is beyond repair. She stated that the Architectural Committee has seen nothing on this building that is insurmountable in terms of repair and restoration. She stated that the garage is a separate structure which can be demolished and that it is misleading to conflate what is happening between the two buildings. She noted that the floor areas to be replaced are rather small in terms of square footage.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission’s staff has recommended to this property owner many times over the years that a real hardship application is the way to solve this problem. He noted that statements were made during this review about it costing a million dollars to repair and that repair is impracticable. He stated that this is exactly what the hardship process is designed to determine. A complete financial hardship application would include construction cost estimates and estimates for the return on that investment, and the Historical Commission could determine whether or not it was reasonable to repair the building. He stated that L&I has confirmed that it does not consider this building to be Imminently Dangerous. He stated that the materials before the Architectural Committee are insufficient to make a hardship decision. He stated that it may very well be that it is not financially feasible to repair the building, but that the applicant is obligated under the law to provide the documentation to prove it.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the reason why this property was designated as historic.
  - Mr. Farnham responded that the designation predates the use of nomination forms, but that presumably it was seen as a good representation of a pre-Civil War building in the Washington Square West neighborhood.
  - Mr. Anastasio noted that the building is one of four or five on this block that are identical in appearance.
**PUBLIC COMMENT:**
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented that this is a clear example of demolition by neglect. He suggested that the owner sell the property to someone who respects the historic building and can restore it.
- Hal Schirmer commented on the history of sales of the property.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**
The Architectural Committee found that:
- The circa 1830 three-story house was individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1984.
- L&I has determined the building to be Unsafe, but not Imminently Dangerous.
- An application proposing demolition of the roof and rear wall of the building was denied by the Historical Commission in 2017, owing to the extent of demolition.
- The two engineering reports provided in the application recommend demolition, owing to the poor condition of the building.
- Claims were made about the cost to rehabilitate the building, but no documentation was provided to substantiate those claims.
- The one-story garage is non-historic.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:
- The proposed work will destroy the features, materials, and spaces of the property. It would not satisfy Standard 2.
- This application proposes a complete demolition and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments.
- The one-story garage may be demolished.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the demolition of the three-story building, pursuant to Standard 2 and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, but approval of demolition of the adjacent non-historic one-story garage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM: 502-04 S Juniper St</th>
<th>MOTION: Denial of demolition of main building; approval of demolition of non-historic garage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVED BY: Gutterman</td>
<td>SECONDED BY: Lukachik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MAY 2022**

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

**PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**
April 19, 2022

VIA EMAIL EXCLUSIVELY
Philadelphia Historical Commission
One Parkway, 13th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102
kim.chantry@phila.gov

RE: Project Review: 502-04 S. Juniper Street

Dear Members of the Historical Commission and Staff:

This office represents Jay Earnst, the owner of the above referenced address. The address has two structures, a three-story home at 502 S. Juniper ("Home") and a garage at 504 S. Juniper ("Garage") (collectively, "Structures").

This project was previously denied in October of 2017 for lack of an engineering report and was up for review again in January 2019 but the request was withdrawn prior to the hearing with the intention to resubmit at a later date.

Mr. Earnst is serving in the United States Armed Forces and stationed in Europe, and by and through undersigned counsel proposes the following plan for review. We intend to submit an application to demolish the structures as per the proposed plans attached hereto at Exhibit “A”.

The instant review request includes an engineering report and conclusions from the structural engineer, attached hereto at Exhibit “B”, which address the poor condition of the Structures and the overall lack of salvageability.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Vern Anastasio, Esq.
Anastasio Law, LLC
EXHIBIT A
A written document, which contains a comprehensive set of minimum safety requirements for demolition sites, is required to ensure the safety of the Demolition Contractor's personnel as well as the safety of the general public and the protection of adjoining property. The Demolition Contractor shall provide the requested information and/or documentation as detailed in this document. "Attach additional sheets as necessary."

CONTRACTOR WORK PLAN
Project Address: 502-504 S Juniper Street

A. DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE

1. Materials of Construction (check all that apply)
   - EXTERIOR WALLS
     - Masonry
     - Wood Frame
     - Reinforced Concrete
     - Steel Skeleton
     - Other_________________________
   - INTERIOR WALLS
     - Masonry
     - Gypsum
     - Wood Frame
     - Plaster
     - Other_________________________
   - FOUNDATIONS
     - Masonry
     - Reinforced Concrete
     - Rubble Stone
     - Other_________________________
   - INTERNAL COLUMNS
     - Reinforced Concrete
     - Steel Posts
     - Masonry
     - Wood
     - Not Applicable
   - FLOORS
     - Steel Framing
     - Wood Framing
     - Concrete
     - Other_________________________
   - ROOF STRUCTURE
     - Wood Framing
     - Steel Framing
     - Other_________________________

2. The building suffered damage resulting from fire, flood, explosion or other cause. Describe_________________________

3. Other (attach additional sheets as necessary) Describe_________________________

B. DEMOLITION MEANS & METHODS (check all that apply)

The Methods of Demolition for safe demolition of the structure shall be provided below. A detailed Sequence of Demolition shall be provided to clearly detail the Demolition Contractor's plans for safely demolishing the building.

1. EQUIPMENT:
   - Exterior Walls
     - Handheld Devices
     - Mechanical
   - Floors/Ceilings
     - Handheld Devices
     - Mechanical
   - Interior Walls
     - Handheld Devices
     - Mechanical
   - Foundation
     - Handheld Devices
     - Mechanical

   - Mechanical demolition equipment to be utilized. Describe_________________________

2. Lateral bracing of the upper story walls will be required as the demolition proceeds. Describe_________________________

3. Dust control measures to be utilized. Describe_________________________

4. METHOD OF DEMOLITION (check all that apply; include additional sheets as necessary)
   - Describe method of demolition, including any of the following items which apply:
     - Method to be used for demolishing walls and partitions to ensure work above each tier of floor beams will be completed before any of the supporting structural members are disturbed.
     - Measures to be taken to ensure that masonry walls, or other sections of masonry, will not be loosened or permitted to fall upon the floors of the building in such masses as to exceed the safe carrying capacities of the floors or the stability of structural supports.
     - Methods to be used to ensure that no wall section, which is more than one story or 15 feet in height, will be permitted to stand alone.
C. RESTORATION OF SITE (check all that apply)
☐ Where a building, or any portion, has been demolished to grade, the floor slab or foundation of such building, or portion, shall be removed and the site backfilled to grade. Will the floor slab remain and not be backfilled? Yes ☐ No ☑ If yes, a Department approved waiver is required along with justification for the floor slab, including a demonstration of positive cellar drainage prepared by a registered design professional. A copy of all relevant documents shall be attached to this Site Safety Plan. ☑
☐ Details shall be provided regarding the future maintenance of the premises free from all unsafe or hazardous conditions, which may include the erection of necessary retaining walls and fences. Describe ☑
☐ Details shall be provided for the means and methods for restoration of established grades, including description of backfill material to be used. Describe ☑

D. DISPOSAL OF DEBRIS
All demolition waste materials (debris) shall be removed from the site and disposed of at an approved facility / site. The Demolition Contractor shall provide L&I with the following information:
☒ Provide name and contact information of the landfill (or facility) where the debris will be disposed of: Modern Dumpster
☒ Provide an estimate of the volume of the debris (not including recycled materials) to be disposed of: 140 tons

E. MISCELLANEOUS
- Provide PA One Call Number: 2021510199
- Describe any additional hazards:

F. PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER’S CERTIFICATION
If required in accordance with Chapter 33 of the Philadelphia Building Code.

Signature of Design Professional: [Signature]
Date: 5/30/21

Demolition Supervisor’s Name: Maurice Edwards
Demolition Supervisor’s Signature: [Signature]
A written document, which contains a comprehensive set of minimum safety requirements for demolition sites, is required to ensure the safety of the Demolition Contractor’s personnel as well as the safety of the general public and the protection of adjoining property. The Demolition Contractor shall provide the requested information and/or documentation as detailed in this document. "Attach additional sheets as necessary."

PUBLIC INFORMATION
Project Address: 500-04 S Jenerper Street

A. DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE

Building Height
Maximum height above grade 36 feet
Number of stories above grade 3
Number of stories below grade 1

Building Dimensions
Length 34' feet by Width 16' feet

B. SAFETY PROVISIONS

1. Safety Exposures & Environmental Issues (check all that apply)
   All potential site hazards shall be identified, along with method for their remediation (encapsulation and/or removal). These materials shall be removed from the site prior to the commencement of the demolition work. All pipes, tanks, boilers or similar devices containing fuel shall be purged of such fuel.
   - Hazardous Substances (paints, fuels, flammables, PCB's, etc.)
     Present - yes/no [N/0]
     Removed - yes/no [N/0]
     Describe method of disposal
   - Asbestos (An asbestos inspection report, which is a prerequisite for a demolition permit, is required for all buildings, except for those constructed after January 1, 1980, or for buildings last legally used as 3-family or less) [N/0]

2. Other (attach additional sheets as necessary)
   Describe [N/0]

C. PROTECTION OF ADJACENT PROPERTIES, WALKWAYS AND PUBLIC WAY (check all that apply)

Means of protection to be utilized within the site shall be identified to ensure the safety of the general public and the protection of adjoining property, buildings, appurtenances, and related structures. Demolition operations shall not commence until the applicable protection is in place.

1. SITE SAFETY ZONE
   - A site Safety Zone has been established and is clearly shown on the drawings. Describe [N/0]

2. ADJACENT BUILDINGS IN SAFETY ZONE
   - Building to be demolished is higher than the roof of adjoining building. Indicate height differential and method(s) of protection, if applicable. Describe [N/0]
4. WALKWAYS IN SAFETY ZONE
   ☑ Walkways/Public ways within the Safety Zone. Provide description of protection to be used.
   Contractor to cover sidewalk w/3/4" plywood

5. RESTORATION OF SITE (check all that apply)
   ☑ Adjacent foundation walls shall be properly treated prior to backfilling of areas below grade. 
     Contractor to pressure prior to backfilling
   ☑ Exposed walls shall be covered in accordance with Chapter 14 of the Building Code.
     Contractor to skimcoat walls w/ cement
   ☑ Openings in exposed party walls will require closing. Describe: Contractor to fill gaps
     w/ cement prior to skimcoat

D. PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATION
   If required in accordance with Chapter 33 of the Philadelphia Building Code.

   Signature of Design Professional
   [Signature]
   Date: 5/30/21

   AP# FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

   Demolition Supervisor's Name: Maurice McWoods
   Demolition Supervisor's Signature: [Signature]
EXHIBIT B
STRUCTURAL REPORT
Project site: 504 S. Juniper Street
Philadelphia, PA 19147

Prepared for:

James J. Ernst
CMR 402 Box 1824
APO, AE 09180
e-mail: jayernst1@gmail.com

Prepared by:

Earl F. Buser, PE
43 Lawrence Drive
Manahawkin, NJ 08050

Professional Engineer: PA 12184-E
Philadelphia Business License Number: 477281

October 10th, 2021
Dear Mr. Ernst,

Earl F. Buser, PE inspected the property at 504 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia, PA 19147 on September 24, 2021. The building structure consists of brick masonry bearing walls and wood floor framing.

The scope of our work was limited to inspecting the readily visible and accessible areas of the building and determining the structural condition. The scope of work did not cover the inspection of any non-structural elements such as roofing, HVAC, electrical elements, etc.

During the time of inspection, we noted deteriorations in the following areas:

1) Cracks to the exterior of the building that has continued to increase over time
2) Deteriorating masonry conditions at the front wall of the main building, the party wall between the main building, garage, the interior brick chimney, and alley facing side wall
3) Deteriorating masonry conditions in the garage structure
4) Garage roof framing is partially unsupported
5) The deterioration around the windows / doors in the front of the house

Based on the field inspection and engineering judgment, it is my conclusion that the building exhibits deficiencies that has deteriorated further over time since the first report was completed in 2018 (ie: front wall bulging) as well as new deficiencies that need to be addressed (items listed above). Based on the building’s age and the current structural condition, it is my recommendation that the main building and the garage should be torn down.

The findings and conclusions of this report with respect to the inspection of the property at 504 South Juniper Street are based on normal visual observations of the site. No conclusions, expressed or implied, shall represent that I, Earl F. Buser, has made an evaluation of the material, fabrication, or erection deficiencies beyond that which would be detectable by a normal visual inspection. Please feel free to contact me or my partner Chris Hammel (609) 504-0224 if you have any questions. Thank you.

Regards,
Earl F. Buser, PE
Image No. 1- Above View of 504 S. Juniper Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19147

Image No. 2- Street View of 504 S. Juniper Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19147
Image No.3- Streetview of the attached garage structure

Image No. 4- View of brick masonry in the garage structure
Image No. 5- View of garage corner

Image No. 6- View of unsupported roof framing in the garage structure
Image No. 7- Loose masonry/ masonry voids at the exterior wall

Image No. 8- View of sidewall, masonry, and joints show deterioration w/ a vine the is making its way into the mortar joints
Image No. 9- Closer look of the deteriorating sidewall

Image No. 10- Front door of the main housing structure & the continuation of the deterioration around the door
Images 11, 12, and 13- View of windows located on the front of main structure & the continuation of the deterioration around the windows
DEAR Mr. Ernst,

You have asked for my opinion concerning the structural integrity of the subject property. You have asked that I inspect the house and attached garage and determine the structural integrity of the house.

I am presently the owner of Home Inspection Engineers, which I have operated since 1983. I have earned a Bachelor of Engineering degree, with a major in Mechanical/Structural Engineering, as well as a Masters of Science in Engineering. My company conducts a variety of services, including inspection of commercial and residential properties, construction inspections, structural design work, plan approval/specification, consulting on various aspects of building and acting as an expert witness in building construction, home inspections, code compliance and construction related accidents. I am a Registered Professional Engineer with active licenses in Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and New York. I am also a member of the National Society of Professional Engineers and National Academy of Building Inspection Engineers. A copy of my complete CV is attached.

This building is a three story (trinity) single family home with an attached two car garage. The building has brick exterior walls with a sloped roof surfacing. The house is approximately 100 plus years old.

In preparation for this report, I have reviewed a report from AR Engineers dated May 11, 2018 and prepared by Alex Rong P.E. I have received no other documentation or discovery on this property. This report is based solely on this visit to the property plus review of this report.

Site Inspection

In accordance with your request, I visited the subject property on October 22, 2021. The weather during the inspection was sunny and approximately 65 degrees F.

The purpose of this structural inspection was to view the building including the garage to determine the structural integrity of the building and its safety for use and occupancy. The exterior of the building and the accessible areas of the interior were viewed.
The basic structure of the building is masonry/brick foundation and bearing walls supporting side to side wood joists for the various floors. The attached garage has a wood frame roof and brick exterior perimeter walls. This is a standard method of construction for this age house.

I was able to inspect the exterior of the building, the garage and the first floor of the building. This inspection showed the following major structural issues:

- **Garage**
  - The roof of the garage is not sound. There is unsupported roof framing in the rear of the building.
  - There is rotted roof underlayment.
  - The perimeter brick walls have deteriorated brick and mortar joints

- **Interior**
  - The interior has had ceilings and walls and steps removed.
  - The interior brick walls have much missing mortar, loose bricks, deteriorating bricks.
  - The wood floor system has deteriorated wood ends in the brick pockets.
  - The front star washer supports on the brick walls are not properly fastened to floor systems. There is no blocking/solid bridging and fastening of the rear end.

- **Exterior**
  - The exterior bricks are deteriorating. There are loose bricks, missing bricks, missing and porous mortar.
  - The roof level of the left side around and below the chimney area has much missing and loose bricks and not supporting roof.
  - The left side bricks are cracking and deteriorating and many are broken and missing.
  - The front brick wall has a bulge in it. There are four star washers on it but the washers are not holding the bricks properly. There are new cracks and movement especially at window lintels.
  - The front roof edge is bowing out. The roof is collapsing.

Based on this inspection of the building, this building has many very significant structural issues in it and the building is not safe and not sound. As a minimum all of the roofs (house and garage) need to be totally removed and replaced with new framing, new roof sheathing, etc. The exterior brick walls of the building need to be replaced. The brick walls are not sound and require all bricks to be removed and replaced with new bricks and new mortar. The interior wood floor joist system needs replacement.

Basically the building needs to be demolished to be able to be rebuilt into a safe condition. Therefore, the building is not safe and not sound and needs to be taken down. At this time, the building should not be entered and should be closed off. The building is not safe.

I have also reviewed the report written by Alex Rong on May 11, 2018. This report basically has the same conclusion as my evaluation. The conditions shown on Mr. Rong's report have continued to deteriorate as shown on my inspection.
Following are pictures taken at the time of inspection:
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Conclusions and Recommendations

In conclusion, this building and its attached garage are not structurally sound and not safe. The perimeter bearing walls and the roof structures and many floor joists are deteriorating and pose a significant safety concern. This house could collapse at any time and should be demolished to prevent collapse.

These conclusions have been reached with a reasonable degree of professional certainty, based on a review of materials provided to me as well as my site inspection. I reserve the right to supplement this report upon the provision of any additional material or facts.

Should you need anything further from me, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Stuart F. Rosenbaum
PA PE # 030223
NJ PE # 28903
NJ home inspector license #24GI00041700

National Society of Professional Engineers®
Signatory, NSPE Licensed Member
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