

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

**TUESDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 2023  
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM  
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 00:00:00

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

<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair	X		
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP	X		
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

The meeting was held remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

- Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Scott Shiffert, Canno Design
- Harrison Finberg
- Catherine Gao
- Randi Skibinsky Abramson
- Kevin Angstadt
- George Poulin
- Alex Balloon
- Robert Gurmankin
- Gary Clarke
- Alina Herzberg
- Lea Litvin, LO Design
- Jenn Patrino
- Stephen Mileto, Qb3, LLC

Jonathan Wallace, AVLV Architecture & Development  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance  
Sasha Coviello  
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance  
Lili Razi  
Harrison Haas  
Evan Litvin, LO Design  
Scott Shiffert  
Bill Strehse  
Philip Rakita  
Tim Lux, Tierview Development

## **AGENDA**

### **ADDRESS: 502 WOOD ST**

Proposal: Construct six-story multi-unit building  
Review Requested: Review and Comment  
Owner: TierView Development  
Applicant: Scott Shiffert, Canno Design  
History: Vacant lot  
Individual Designation: None  
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003  
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

### **BACKGROUND:**

This Review-and-Comment application proposes to construct a six-story multi-family apartment building on several vacant, undeveloped parcels within the Old City Historic District. The lots at 313, 315 and 317 N. Randolph Street; 504-08 Wood Street; and 312, 314, 316 and 318 N. 5th Street will be consolidated as 502 Wood Street.

### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct six-story building.

### **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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 overall design of the building relates to the Old City Historic District through its materials, massing, and proportions.
  - Although the use of brick on the street facing sides of the building is compatible with the historic district, the extent of cement board siding south elevation and fencing should be revisited.
  - The north elevation with the tan brick appears flat and lacks articulation. Adding detail to the cornice, windows, and doorways would increase compatibility with the Old City Historic District.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - As the lots are currently vacant, there would be no adverse impact on the surrounding buildings or on the historic district if this property were to be removed in the future.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the cement board siding on the south elevation and detailing of the north elevation are reconsidered, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

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

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Scott Shiffert represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Stein asked Mr. Shiffert to respond to the staff comment about the detailing of the north elevation and cement board on the south elevation.
  - Mr. Shiffert agreed with the comments about the detailing of the north elevation and stated that it is a difficult façade to articulate. He stated that their team made a real effort to clad the façade in brick as much as possible but that budgetary constraints have made detailing the north façade challenging. Mr. Shiffert pointed to the light-colored brick and noted that they have recessed the brick jambs a half brick on each side of the window to create some shadow lines even though it is north facing. He added that there is a flush header course above the window and a brick sill. Mr. Shiffert noted they are working to create other ways to add shadow lines to the north façade.
  - Mr. Shiffert addressed the south façade, noting that this area is primarily inward facing and stands close to the Vine Street Loft building. He explained that the use of cement board is limited to this area that is less visible than the other elevations.
- Ms. Stein pointed out that with the rear being a driveway and a high traffic area, the south elevation siding can get damaged. She commented that having one level of brick on this façade would protect the siding.
  - Mr. Shiffert stated there is a brick wall existing in that area that will be retained and that their team can look at adding a brick water table or one level of brick to the south façade.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out that horizontal lap siding is a material associated with residential single-family homes and it is being proposed on a massive wall plane. He noted that the scale of these boards is not in proportion to the area where they are being used. Mr. Detwiler recommended cementitious panels and other options that may be more cost-effective. He said the expanse of dark black siding is a lot and that he understands and appreciates the amount of brick elsewhere on the proposed building. Mr. Detwiler pointed to the elevator and stair overruns and recommended these be clad in brick to reduce the large expanse of dark cementitious siding on the south elevation. He said he would like to see some brick introduced into the south façade.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the siding may present a challenge for construction. He recommended stucco or another masonry solution for the south façade.

- Mr. Detwiler said he has observed on other recent construction projects in Philadelphia that cementitious lap siding used in similar situations appears to be failing soon after buildings are completed. He added that this product was not intended to be used on very large wall planes. Mr. Detwiler encouraged the applicant to explore other materials for the south façade.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed and strongly suggested the applicant look at the Hardie panelized system instead of a material that looks like clapboard, which is usually associated with wood-frame construction buildings. He agreed with Mr. Detwiler that the elevator shaft and other vertical protrusions on the roof should be clad with a different material. Mr. McCoubrey added that he appreciates the use of brick on this building but noted that they should pay careful attention to the transitions and detailing between the masonry joints.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the roof shafts appear to be very tall.
  - Mr. Shiffert explained the reasons for the height of each overrun.
  - Mr. Cluver and Mr. Detwiler expressed concern about the height of the roof overruns. They asked the applicant to explore reducing the height of these areas. Mr. McCoubrey stated that they should only be the code-required height.
  - Mr. Shiffert agreed to look at the overruns again.
- Mr. Cluver redirected the discussion back to the long expanse of the north elevation. He said that detailing of the brick was discussed but inquired if the applicant had looked at window patterning. Mr. Cluver said there is a relentlessness to the expanse of the brick on the north elevation and a rigidness to the window grid pattern. He said that alternating window pattern is another way to break up the façade.
  - Mr. Shiffert responded that this was explored but did not work with the interior layout.
  - Multiple committee members further encouraged the applicant to explore different ways to break up the north elevation.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Randi Skibinsky Abramson, president of the Vine Street Condominium Association, inquired about the access gates shown in the rendering. She expressed concern that the project is proposing access gates that would inhibit access to their property. She noted the easements in place for their property and wanted to confirm that access would not be blocked as a result of this project.
- Robert Gurmankin, president of the Franklin Bridge North Neighbors, stated that he applauds the applicant for the use of brick in the building design. He agreed with Architectural Committee's comments regarding the tan brick portion of the north elevation. He asked the applicant to consider a lighter color for the south elevation.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT:**

The Architectural Committee commented that:

- The brick material proposed for the facades is compatible with the historic district.
- The design of the north elevation should be further explored as the wall plane currently appears flat and monotonous with minimal detailing. The applicant should consider additional masonry detailing, color variation, and window patterning to add more distinction to the north façade.
- The use of clapboard style cementitious siding on the south elevation should be reconsidered as this type of material is not appropriate for a building of this scale. Other materials should be explored such as a cementitious panelized system that is more compatible with larger scale buildings. The siding color should also be revisited

as the dark color currently shown draws attention to this area of the building. Using a mix of materials on this elevation would break up the visual scale of the large south elevation wall.

- Elevator and stair overruns should be reduced to code-required height.

**ADDRESS: 252 QUINCE ST**

Proposal: Construct dormer additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Danielle Harvey

Applicant: Jonathan Wallace, AVLV Architecture & Development

History: 1806, William Smith

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to alter the gable roof of this circa 1806-1810 rowhouse to create a livable fourth floor. A wide dormer would be installed on the front slope of the gable roof. At the rear, the roof would be removed from the ridge line and a fourth story would be added. The architectural drawings are schematic and inconsistent between plan, section, elevation, and axonometric views.

The application wrongly suggests that the design of the rear addition matches that of the neighboring property at 254 Quince Street, which was approved by the Historical Commission in 1995. The rear dormer at 254 Quince Street, however, is set in from the side and rear facades, allowing the rear roof slope and cornice to remain visible. The rear of the subject property at 252 Quince is also more visible from Manning Street than its neighbor at 254.

The application would satisfy preservation standards if the front dormer was sufficiently set back from the plane of the front façade to ensure that it was inconspicuous from the street and the rear addition was designed as a dormer like the adjacent dormer at 254 Quince Street, with some gable roof retained at the front and sides of the dormer.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Remove rear slope of roof
- Construct fourth-floor rear addition
- Construct front dormer

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The application proposes to remove the majority of the existing gable roof, a character-defining feature of the property, failing to 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.*

- The application proposes to remove the rear slope of the roof for the installation of a new addition. If removed in the future, the essential form of the property would be altered, failing to satisfy this standard. Some portions of the rear gable should be preserved.
- *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.*
  - If the front dormer is set back from the front façade and the rear addition is reconceived as a dormer, the dormers could be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the front dormer is set back from the plane of the front façade and the rear addition is redesigned as a dormer that is set in from all sides to allow the original roof rafters and slope to remain visible, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:29:50

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jonathan Wallace represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Wallace explained that he is trying to understand what can be approved. He noted that he is open to duplicating the rear dormer at the neighbor's property if that is approvable and questioned whether a front dormer was also acceptable, and if so, how far it should be set back.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that there are several issues with the front dormer design beyond the alignment with the front wall. He explained that the thickness and overhang of the cornice makes the dormer proportions bigger and boxier than necessary.
  - Mr. Wallace responded that they are open to suggestions and can minimize the roof and push the dormer back.
- Several Architectural Committee members asked if the dormer at 253 Quince Street was approved by the Historical Commission.
  - Ms. DiPasquale responded that a front dormer was approved, but that work has been done to the property that is not in compliance with the Historical Commission's approval and suggested that it not serve as a precedent.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the front dormer should be set back so that it is minimally visible or invisible from the street. He suggested installing a simple mock-up on the roof to demonstrate visibility.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested reducing the dormers in scale so that the ridge of the main roof is retained.
- The Architectural Committee members discussed a single versus double-width dormer.
  - Mr. Detwiler noted his opposition to a double window in the front dormer.
  - Mr. Wallace responded that the dormer is proposed to be 7 feet 4 inches wide and asked whether a 5-foot dormer with one window would be acceptable.

- Mr. D'Alessandro argued that the Architectural Committee needed to see true dimensional drawings in order to make that assessment.
- Ms. Stein disagreed with Mr. Detwiler, opining that a double window would be acceptable, as long as the dormer is pulled back at least 24 inches from the front façade so that the cornice is the dominant feature, and the dormer recedes from view.
- Ms. Stein noted that flat trim boards around the window frame on the front of the dormer rather than siding would be more successful and appropriate for the historic building.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that in drawing 6, the space between the head of the dormer window to roof is overly boxy and should be more delicate and light feeling. He noted that drawing 4 demonstrates that the dormer could be pulled back without serious implications to the room.
- Mr. Wallace asked for comments on the rear dormer and whether they should replicate the neighboring house in terms of reducing width and depth.
  - Mr. McCoubrey responded that he would have the same comments for the rear dormer and the front, that it should be set in from the façade and reduced in scale and boxiness.
  - Mr. Wallace asked what material the rear dormer should be clad in, noting that they had originally proposed it to be stucco to carry up the same material of the rear façade, but if it is inset, could match siding material of the front dormer.
  - Mr. Detwiler responded that they should replicate the front dormer at the rear.
- Ms. Stein noted that there appears to be a chimney in the aerial view of the property that is not shown in the drawings. She argued that where it sits is critical to the size and scale of the dormer and that it needs to be added to the plans.
  - Mr. Wallace responded that they are not proposing to touch it.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested bringing the high point of the dormer down a minimum of 12 inches from the ridge to maintain the historic gable roof ridge.
  - Mr. Wallace responded that it is difficult to do that and maintain the code-required 6-foot 8-inch head height.
  - Ms. Gutterman replied that the proposed additions are modifying character-defining features that need to be maintained and that the applicant must balance the preservation of character-defining features of the historic property with the desire to put additions at the front and rear. She noted that Mr. Wallace had described the addition as a child's bedroom, so maybe it is possible to adjust the height slightly so that the ridge is not lost.
  - Mr. Detwiler commented that the application currently proposes to demolish most of the roof and suggested retaining the existing ridge and using thinner framing for the dormer. He suggested pulling in the sides of the dormers to preserve more of the roof structure and rafters.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The gable roof is a character-defining feature of this circa 1810 property.
- The application proposes to remove the entire rear slope and most of the front slope of the roof.

- The rear addition should be reconceived as a dormer, with details to match the revised front dormer.
- Dormers at the front and rear roof may be acceptable provided the following:
  - They are pulled in a minimum of 24 inches from the front and rear facades;
  - They tie into the existing roof ridge and are set between rafters and retain roof rafters on either side to preserve the original roof slope and historic materials;
  - The boxiness of the proposed front dormer is reduced;
  - Flat trim boards are used around the dormer windows rather than siding on the front of the dormer.
- The existing chimney(s) should be shown in the drawings and should not be altered.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application proposes to remove the majority of the existing gable roof, a character-defining feature of the property, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- The application proposes to remove the rear slope of the roof for the installation of a new addition. If removed in the future, the essential form of the property would be altered, failing to satisfy Standard 10.
- If the front dormer is set back from the front façade and its boxiness reduced, and the rear addition is reconceived as a dormer, the dormers could be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.

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

<b>ITEM: 252 Quince St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				



**ADDRESS: 625 S DELHI ST**

Proposal: Install mural on stucco wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Del Rossi

Applicant: Phil Asbury, Mural Arts Philadelphia

History: 1847; William & Letitia Still House

Individual Designation: 3/9/2018

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to install a mural on the south-facing stucco façade of 625 S. Delhi Street, the historic home of William and Letitia Still and an important surviving station of the Chesapeake-Pennsylvania-New York-Canada network of the eastern Underground Railroad. The proposed mural would be intended to honor William and Letitia Still, famed African American abolitionists and civil rights activists. The application states that the mural could be painted directly onto the stucco south wall of the property, or it could be professionally printed onto 3M banner vinyl that would then be installed using a flexible PVC frame. Currently the stucco façade faces a surface parking lot of an adjacent property and can be seen from Bainbridge Street and much of Palumbo Park. The building at 625 S. Delhi Street was historically designated under Criteria A and J and not for any architectural merit. At some point before designation, the front façade was rebuilt and is not the historic front façade.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Install a mural on the southern stucco façade of 625 S Delhi Street, either by directly painting it onto the stucco or installing a banner.

**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 will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
  - The alteration of the stucco wall with a mural would not destroy the historic character of the property, which is designated under Criteria A and J.
- *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 work 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.*
  - 625 S. Delhi Street is historically designated for being associated with William and Letitia Still and not necessarily for its architectural merit. The addition of a mural which elevates the story of the Stills would add to the property's significance.
- *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 would be unimpaired.*
  - *If the proposed mural were removed in the future, the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
- *Section 6.15.a. of PHC Rules & Regulations:*

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with the suggestion that the mural is painted directly onto the wall with permeable paint, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Section 6.15.a. of the Commission's Rules & Regulations.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:50:33

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Gutterman stated she was not opposed to a mural at this location but would like the applicant to clarify the pros and cons of each method of attachment proposed.
  - Ms. Lukachik added that she would like the applicant to specify the type of anchorage that would be used.
- Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the application was missing many details.
- Ms. Gutterman noted the need for additional documentation and details of painting systems, methods of banner hanging, and the condition of the stucco. She also expressed the desire to know the outline of where the mural would go as well as its approximate size.
- Mr. McCoubrey wished for more information about the bargeboard, noting there seem to be only two pieces left, and more details about the front rake of the roof.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed his gratitude that the proposed mural relates to the property, especially because the front façade no longer looks as it did historically.
- Ms. Gutterman noted the star bolts already present on the side of the property, and wondered how that would affect the proposed mural. She also noted the texture of the stucco and the possibility of some cracking, which she wanted more information and details about.
- Mr. Cluver clarified that there were two questions about the mural, its location and its material or method of attachment. He noted that the Architectural Committee has enough information to answer the first question but not the second.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application was incomplete and missing details about possible methods of installation.
- A mural at this location that relates to the history of the building can be approved.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application as presented is incomplete, owing to a lack of information on installation methods.

- The application as presented fails to satisfy Section 6.15.a. of the Commission's Rules and Regulations for murals owing to a lack of information on size and scale.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Section 6.15.a. of the Commission’s Rules and Regulations regarding murals, but approval of the concept of a mural at this location.

<b>ITEM: 625 S Delhi St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: D’Alessandro</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

**ADDRESS: 1706 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Legalize marble veneer and doorway replacement  
 Review Requested: Final Approval  
 Owner: Sasha Coviello  
 Applicant: Stephen Mileto, Qb3, LLC  
 History: 1850  
 Individual Designation: None  
 District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995  
 Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize façade alterations made to the building at 1706 Delancey Place, which exceeded approved building permits. These alterations included installation of marble veneer over brick at the first floor, and removal and replacement of the historic door frame and transom. The six-panel door itself was likely not original but was an appropriate panel configuration for the building. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the unpermitted alterations at the Historical Commission’s request in September 2023, after Commission staff received a complaint from a neighbor.

Work approved through the review of building permit applications between 2020 and 2022 included window replacement and a rear addition and rooftop pilot house. That scope is not part of this legalization application. The work included in this application is solely the marble veneer and front doorway alterations. The marble veneer was installed over an altered area of the front facade, which was cut down for a below-grade entrance prior to historic designation. The historic doorway that was removed matched the adjacent one at 1708 Delancey Place. The historic transom bar and associated trim at the top of the opening was removed from the historic door frame and a new, taller door was installed.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Legalize marble veneer installation and doorway replacement.

**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 will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
  - The removal of the historic doorway and replacement with a new door and frame which does not replicate the historic appearance fails to satisfy Standard 2.
  - The installation of marble veneer to the height of the first-floor windowsill creates an unusual spatial relationship not typically found on a historic building. However, the brick area being covered is a later alteration to the building.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
  - The new door and specifically doorway including frame and transom do not match the old in appearance.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the legalization of the marble veneer and door replacement, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:03:55

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Stephen Mileto represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Mileto briefly explained the history of the project and apologized for moving ahead with this scope without official approvals in place. He stated that the project started at the beginning of the pandemic, and he had been careful to work with Historical Commission's staff on approvals for windows and mechanical equipment on the addition. He admitted that the appropriate, amended plans for the marble base and door were not submitted as an amendment to the Department of Licenses and Inspections, owing in part to a misinterpretation with conceptual approvals from the Historical Commission's staff through email. Mr. Mileto stated that two factors informed the approach to this scope; first, the brick water table was discovered to be out of square and plumb with brick that did not match, and, second, because the first-floor window opening was previously altered to be one large opening, they wanted a corresponding larger front door.
- Ms. Stein asked about the installation of the marble, noting that it stands proud of the brick. She asked if it could be removed at this point and the brick restored.
  - Mr. Mileto explained that installation was stopped when a violation was received, which is why the work is not complete. He stated that it is on clips, not mortared onto the brick, and the intention was to miter it back into the building and install

marble coping. He stated that it could be removed, but the intention was to respond to the qualities of the block with the marble wainscot. He noted that the brick in this location is not original to the building.

- Mr. Detwiler remarked that the alterations now make the building stand out as different rather than respond to the historic context of the block. He opined that the brick water table stood out visually owing to its bright mortar, which could be repointed to better blend with the rest of the façade. He stated that the building should not be changed just to suit the altered window.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the original door and transom survive, or if they were scrapped.
  - Mr. Mileto responded that he would have to confirm its status with his business partner and the property owner.
- Ms. Stein noted that the white marble stairway to the basement was not called out specifically as a topic for discussion, but it was also not part of any prior approval. She noted that the marble was installed over the side walls and steps leading to the basement door and opined that it is inappropriate. She asked what the material was previously.
  - Mr. Mileto stated that this was previously red brick, which was deteriorating.
- Mr. Cluver provided a counterargument. He stated that there are lower marble water tables along the block, but at threshold height, not windowsill height. He stated that there could be an argument for a marble water table, but it would need to be detailed to be compatible with historic precedent. He stated that the current marble looks like tile, not at all like the marble used historically for a water table.
  - Mr. Detwiler noted that the projecting brick water table with the marble over it projects inches from the front wall.
  - Mr. Cluver agreed, and stated that to do this properly, some of the brick would need to be removed so that the marble sits nearly flush with the brick wall above. He suggested that the adjacent building at 1704 Delancey Place be used as an example for how to detail the marble, which would only rise to threshold level.
  - Mr. Mileto responded that the applique brickwork is covering up a structural steel beam and there would be structural implications to removal of the brick, and so it is unlikely to be removed in order to install marble in plane with the façade.
  - Mr. Cluver and Ms. Lukachik suggested doing probes if there are structural concerns.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the marble slides behind the railing at 1704 Delancey Place, which appears to have been cut to make space for the marble.
  - Mr. Mileto confirmed that the neighbor's railing was cut but noted that the neighbor provided a letter of support for their application.
  - Ms. Gutterman noted that the neighbor's railing is now not secured to anything, and therefore has no structural integrity.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Work which was done that was not part of the approved building permit includes installation of a marble veneer at the first floor and below grade along the walls and steps leading to a basement entry, replacement of the front door and transom, replacement of the basement door, and cutting of the handrail at 1704 Delancey Place.

- The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for unpermitted alterations at the Historical Commission’s request in September 2023, at which time work was stopped, and remains in an unfinished state.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The removal of the historic doorway and replacement with a new door and frame which does not replicate the historic appearance fails to satisfy Standard 2.
- The installation of marble veneer to the height of the first-floor windowsill creates an unusual spatial relationship not typically found on a historic building. However, the brick area being covered is a later alteration to the building, and there is precedent for marble water tables which rise to threshold height.
- The new door and specifically doorway including frame and transom do not match the old in appearance, failing to satisfy Standard 6.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

<b>ITEM: 1706 Delancey PI</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

**ADDRESS: 3627 SPRING GARDEN ST**

Proposal: Legalize alterations

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Catherine Gao

Applicant: Catherine Gao

History: 1894; H. E. Flower

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Gardiner Poth Historic District, Contributing, 8/13/2021

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize façade alterations made to the building at 3627 Spring Garden Street between April 2020 and December 2021 without permits or the Historical Commission’s approval. These alterations include significant changes to the mansard roof and front shed dormer, replacement of windows and the front door, and removal of decorative details. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the unpermitted and unapproved alterations at the Historical Commission’s request in September 2023.

Photographs from April 2020 show the property with its distinctive front roof elements intact, as well as the windows and doors that were present at time of the notice of proposed designation. Photographs from November of that year, however, show the front roof elements rebuilt in a different shape and the top floor windows along with molding running beneath them removed. Later images, from December 2021, show the windows and front door replaced. Although other work on the property was properly permitted and reviewed by the Historical Commission's staff in February and March of 2020, none of these alterations to the front façade was permitted.

The property owner has indicated the willingness to correct the work to the roof but requests leniency to use more inexpensive materials. Ms. Gao has also agreed to replace the front door with something more like the previously existing door and has submitted a photo of the neighboring door at 3625 Spring Garden Street as a model.

#### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Legalize exterior façade alterations completed without (or exceeding) permits including the rebuilding and resurfacing of front roof segments and replacement of doors and windows.
- Rebuild roof to emulate previous shape as possible while using more affordable materials such as shingles rather than tiles.
- Replace the front door with a more appropriate door.

#### **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 will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
  - The rebuilding of the front roof with a different shape and different materials neither preserves the material nor the style of the historic structure.
  - The removal of molding below the replaced windows removes a distinctive feature of the façade.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
  - The new windows and door do not match the old in appearance or materials.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:23:30

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Catherine Gao represented the application.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Detwiler commented that the previous door was an original feature, and its removal is a loss for the building. He asked for clarification as to which windows were replaced without permits.

- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern about the rebuilt roof and noted that it should retain the shape of the original, including the brackets. She noted that asphalt shingles were an acceptable cost-saving measure, but that the shape of the roof should be replicated.
- Ms. Lukachik and Mr. Detwiler suggested that the restored features should replicate the roof of 3617 Spring Garden Street and the decorative bracket that survives on 3625 Spring Garden Street. Mr. Detwiler opined that the shingle color should match the neighboring roof's terra cotta.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the front door, with one large window above and one large panel below, would not be complicated to reproduce. He clarified that the door at 3625 Spring Garden Street, which was proposed by the applicant for replication, does not replicate the door that was there.
  - Ms. Gao asked about the material of the door, and expressed concern that the previous door was having difficulty with the hinges.
  - Ms. Gutterman responded that the new door should be wood, and that adequate hinges would solve that issue.
- Ms. Stein noted that the cantilevered roof, brackets, and decorative molding would require some detail and that the average contractor would likely not be able to do it correctly. She suggested that the applicant work closely with the staff on these details.
- Ms. Gao expressed concern about the cost of a custom door.
  - The Architectural Committee members responded that the staff could likely help her to find a solution which could be more affordable.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed that measured plans would be necessary to replicate the character-defining details of the façade.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- George Poulin, a neighbor in Powelton Village, supported the comments of the Architectural Committee. He stated that the applicant is seeking to use the building as an income-producing property.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The front roof segment, with its distinctive overhang and cornice, is a distinguishing feature that should be rebuilt based on the surviving example at 3617 Spring Garden Street. Using asphalt shingles for the roof is acceptable, but they should emulate the color of adjacent terra cotta roofs.
- The decorative bracket under the third-floor windows should be rebuilt to match the bracket next door at 3625 Spring Garden Street.
- The front door should replicate the proportions of the original door, with a large window in the top half and a single large panel below.
- Measured drawings documenting the details are necessary to replicate the character-defining details of the façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application as submitted does not provide details of a proposed reconstruction of the façade, and therefore fails to satisfy Standards 2 and 6.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.



<b>ITEM: 3627 Spring Garden St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

**ADDRESS: 415-17 AND 419 S 15TH ST**

Proposal: Construct rooftop and rear additions

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Turning Points for Children/Pennsylvania Society to Protect Children from Cruelty

Applicant: Evan Litvin, Lo Design

History: 1860 to 1870

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This in-concept review proposes constructing multiple rooftop additions and a four-story rear connector building at 415-17 and 419 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street. Both properties are contributing historic resources in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The building at 415-17 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street was constructed circa 1860 as a three-story building with two-story wings on each side and stables at the rear. The mansard roof was added between 1880 and 1900. The building at 419 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street was constructed circa 1870 as a four-story rowhouse.

By 1922, the building at 415-17 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street was converted from a private home to a group home by the Pennsylvania Society to Protect Children from Cruelty. In recent years, the properties were connected on the interior, and until recently provided support services for children. During the twentieth century, multiple changes and additions have occurred at the rears of the buildings and properties.

The rears of both properties are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. There are two small non-accessible alleyways and rear yards along Lombard Street, but these areas offer limited visibility to the back of both properties.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct rooftop additions and four-story rear connector 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 proposed size and massing of the four-story connector at the rear of the properties meets Standard 9. The majority of the connector building will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
  - The proposed size and massing of the fourth-floor addition at the rear of 419 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street meets Standard 9. This addition will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
  - The proposed size and massing of the fourth-floor addition on 415-17 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street at the corner of S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street and Waverly Street does not meet Standard 9. The addition will be visible from the public right-of-way and remove a portion of the mansard roof. A fourth-story addition could be added to this level and meet Standard 9. To do so, it would need to be set back from the mansard and edge of the building along Waverly Street.
  - The proposed two-story connector between the two properties along S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street does not meet Standard 9. This wing of the building at 415-417 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street maintains its original form that dates to the circa 1860 construction. The proposed two-story connector would alter the historic integrity of this wing and remove a section of the mansard on the main block of the building.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - The four-story connector at the rear of the properties meets Standard 10.
  - If the fourth story additions do not connect with the front and side elevations of the mansard, they could meet Standard 10.
  - If the fourth-story additions are set back from the corner of S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street and Waverly St, they could meet Standard 10.
  - The proposed two-story connector along S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street does not meet Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
  - The proposed fourth-floor addition on 415-17 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Street at the corner of S 15<sup>th</sup> Street and Waverly Street could meet the Roofs Guidelines with proper setbacks.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the rooftop additions are set back from the front of the building and alterations to the mansard are limited, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:45:30

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Evan Litvin and Lea Litvin represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Litvin summarized the project for the Architectural Committee members and noted their intent to follow preservation standards to the best of their ability while meeting the goals of the project.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that it is difficult to understand what the applicant is trying to achieve without floor plans showing how the different additions are integrated with the buildings. He noted that the staff also recommended setbacks along Waverly Street.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the Architectural Committee will need to know the location of any mechanical equipment and the location of a roof deck or stair/elevator overruns if those elements are in the scope of work. She noted her concerns about what would be visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Gutterman reminded Mr. Litvin that their jurisdiction is on the exterior only and that they have no purview over interior spaces.
  - Mr. Litvin said there would be no elevator overrun and their intent is to place all mechanical equipment out of view of the public right-of-way. He added that any roof deck would be placed in an inconspicuous location.
- Mr. Detwiler said he appreciates that this overbuild is not excessive. He noted that, while the Committee is concerned about the overbuild, he does not think the visibility along Waverly Street will be excessive. Mr. Detwiler said that, if the overbuild is modest, the project can be approved, provided how it is detailed, how it is drawn, and how it blends with the existing building. He noted that in future in-concept applications, blocked out elevations and floorplans included in the submission would be helpful to understanding the intent. Mr. Detwiler asked about the height of the proposed roof additions.
  - Mr. Litvin confirmed that they are proposing one-story additions only on the historic buildings.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that a one-story addition may be acceptable.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the difference in height between the main block and the rear area along Waverly Street. He asked how this would work on the interior.
  - Mr. Litwin said there would be steps on the interior in this space.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated he agreed with the staff's concerns about the visibility of the additions and potential changes to the mansard. He agreed with Mr. Detwiler that the general project is reasonable but perhaps with some reduction in the masses.
- Mr. Cluver added that details really matter in a project like this.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed the connector between the buildings does not seem like useful space and that providing information on circulation is important in future applications.
- The Architectural Committee members and the applicant discussed the rear area along Waverly Street. There were some questions about the building chronology and the degree of interventions that could occur in the future. The Architectural Committee members encouraged the applicant to study the building and its history more prior to determining the design of the overbuild on this area of the building.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Adding one-story additions to select areas of the top level on both buildings may be acceptable with the appropriate setbacks, materials, and detailing.
- The visibility of the additions from S. 19<sup>th</sup> Street and Waverly Street will be critical in the consideration in future applications for this project.
- The rear and courtyard areas are not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Roof decks and mechanical equipment are not part of the current application but must be shown in future submissions.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application failed to satisfy Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guidelines owing to the incompleteness of the application. Additional information such as floorplans, elevations, sections, and other details are needed to evaluate this in concept application.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the incompleteness, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and Roofs Guidelines.

<b>ITEM: 415-17 and 419 S 15<sup>TH</sup> ST</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial of in-concept application</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: D’Alessandro</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

**ADJOURNMENT**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:07:35**

**ACTION:** The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:09 a.m.

**PLEASE NOTE:**

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its advisory Committees are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission’s website, [www.phila.gov/historical](http://www.phila.gov/historical).