

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

**TUESDAY, 27 AUGUST 2024
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 9:01 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

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

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
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association
- Alayna Hutchinson
- Andres Duarte-Llanio
- Jake Blumgart
- Christian Origlio
- Daniel Trubman
- Eileen Heisman
- Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects LLC
- Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
- Jack Azran
- Jay Farrell
- Jeff Wyant, Wyant Architecture
- Joseph Jancuska, j2a Architects
- Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
- Maria Wyant, Wyant Architecture
- Mary Perry

Matt Gindlesparger, Lauren Thomsen Design
Menachem & Barry
Oscar Beisert
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Trevor Cordivari

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 415-17 S 3RD ST

Proposal: Alter and infill openings
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Christian Origlio
Applicant: Jeffrey Wyant, Wyant Architecture
History: 1970; Hans G. Egli, architect
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to alter and infill openings at 415-17 S. 3rd Street. The building was constructed in 1970 as part of the redevelopment of Society Hill and is classified as contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. The scope of work includes enclosing an arched exterior alcove on the front façade to create additional interior living space. Other changes include enlarging an original rear entry for a larger door system and removing the glazing from a rooftop element.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Enclose double height alcove on front façade with a window system.
- Remove original half arch opening on rear façade and replace with glazed folding wall.
- Remove glazing from roof element.

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 alterations of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The double height alcove facing S. 3rd Street is an integral and character defining feature of the original 1970 building. Demolition of the alcove's balcony and windows and enclosing the front arch with a new window system would be highly visible alterations that do not meet Standard 2.
 - The rear entry within a half arch opening is character-defining feature of the building. While the full removal of the door, moldings, and brick do not meet Standard 2, the alteration of this feature is not visible from the public right-of-way.
 - The upper window glazing of the rooftop element has limited visibility from the public right-of-way. The change is limited to the removal of the glazing only and the window frame will remain in place, therefore this alteration primarily meets Standard 2.
- *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 changes to exterior alcove alter historic materials, features, and spatial relationships on the primary facade. In addition, the proposed alterations are not compatible with the features, scale, and proportions of the historic building and do not meet Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the alterations to the rear entry and upper window, but denial of the infill of the front alcove, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Jeff Wyant and Maria Wyant represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Wyant provided an overview of the proposed alterations. He explained that one of the main reasons for the proposal was to expand the limited space as you enter the front foyer of the house. He stated that there is no space for items like coats and strollers and that the intent of enclosing the front vestibule was to create more usable interior space. Mr. Wyant pointed out that the recessed alcove lacks functionality and is not a hospitable space. He said that access to the alcove from the interior is limited to a small door from the living room and through a bedroom balcony on the second floor. He commented that it is a damp space, and their aim is to make better use of this as an enclosed living area. Mr. Wyant said that the design of the infill window system is based on design elements at the building such as the wood trellis, floor spandrel, and window pattern on existing glazing at the top of the facade.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the compass orientation of the building and alcove.
 - Mr. Wyant responded that the alcove faces northwest and explained that there is no southern light coming into the space.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the front roof structure above the alcove and the proposed changes to it.
 - Mr. Wyant confirmed that the front roof structure above the alcove, which is composed of metal and glass, is an original element. He described the structure as an aluminum storefront frame system with vertical panes of glass and angled panes of glass and perhaps fiberglass. Mr. Wyant stated that the front roof structure above the alcove has not held up well. It is in poor repair.
 - Ms. Wyant added that the front roof structure as well as the built-in planters leak, owing to deferred maintenance.
- Mr. Cluver said he viewed this application as equivalent to an application to enclose or fill in a front porch. He commented that infilled porches can be successful or not. Mr. Cluver said he is not quite sure where this design proposal falls. He noted that he agrees that the space within the alcove does not seem useful or pleasant. Mr. Cluver stated that he understands the reasons for altering the space from this perspective. However, the proposed infill would result in the loss of architectural intent. Mr. Cluver continued that, while the proposed infill would pick up on the elements that can be found elsewhere on the house, it would also weaken the solid/void relationship present in the original design. He concluded that he is not sure he objects to the

- concept of the infill and wondered if a revised design would be more successful.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she agrees with Mr. Cluver and said that the proposed front window system with numerous divided lights takes away from the architectural element of the arch. She asked the applicants if they had considered alternate options for the infill.
 - Mr. Wyant stated that they proposed the divided lights because they would be operable and allow for ventilation. He asked if larger single panes of glass in each of the existing quadrants in the alcove would be more compatible with the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with his colleagues' comments regarding the proposed window muntin patterns. He commented that the openness of the alcove is a character-defining feature of the historic building and opined that installing a larger single pane of glass would retain the openness. Mr. Detwiler objected to infilling the alcove because it is an important character-defining feature. Mr. Detwiler stated that he recognized the owners' needs and the limits on the use of the existing space but asserted that the alcove feature is unique and architecturally interesting.
 - Ms. Wyant asked if a simplified version of their proposal set back farther in the arched opening would be acceptable.
 - Mr. Detwiler said that it might be, but he would need to see a drawing of the proposal to be able to fully evaluate it.
- Mr. Detwiler said he is mourning the potential removal of the two-tone glass in the roof structure. He suggested recreating the feature in more durable materials. Mr. Detwiler contended that it is a key part of the original design.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that architect Hans Egli was a unique architect in this period and was responsible for some interesting and idiosyncratic projects. He pointed out that the front arch and alcove is the type of idiosyncratic work for which Egli was recognized. Mr. McCoubrey said there is no doubt that the arched, open alcove is a character-defining feature but agreed with Mr. Cluver that the space is not very practical. He wondered if recessing the infill wall would make the design successful. He said it is important to maintain the visible thinness of the arch and to see the sky through the arch. He stated he would like to see new drawings before agreeing that such a design was acceptable. Mr. McCoubrey concluded that he agrees with the staff that the changes to the rear can be administratively approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed infill of the front façade arch and alcove would significantly alter a character-defining feature of the historic building.
- Although there may be an alternate design that could infill the alcove and maintain the building's historic character, the infill window system proposed is not compatible.
- The upper two-tone glass windows should be maintained.
- The alteration of the rear entry and insertion of a glass folding wall will not be visible from the public right-of-way and is therefore acceptable.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2 because the double height alcove facing S. 3rd Street and upper window glazing are character-defining features. The proposed

- alterations would alter the public’s perception of the historic building.
- Although the removal of the rear entry does not satisfy Standard 2, the alteration of this feature is not visible from the public right-of-way and is therefore acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the alterations to the rear entry, but denial of the infill of the front alcove and alterations to upper window, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ITEM: 415-17 S 3rd St					
MOTION: Approval of rear alterations; denial of front alcove infill and upper window alterations					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1805 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck on rear ell
 Review Requested: Review In Concept
 Owner: Michael Sullivan
 Applicant: Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
 History: 1850
 Individual Designation: None
 District Designation: Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
 Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a roof deck on the rear ell of a Greek Revival rowhouse at a contributing property in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The building was constructed c. 1850 and is four stories tall with a prominent cornice, brick façade, and three-story rear ell that faces Panama Street. The proposed roof deck will be located behind the main block of the building on top of the rear and will occupy the full width, with the edge being held back several feet from Panama Street. The deck will be accessed from the fourth floor of the main block and is set rather high above the roof of the ell. It features a three-part stepped design with wood pergola, among other elements. The deck will be visible from Panama Street, a service alley at the rear with no frontage of houses. The application also references a zoning massing approval for demolition and new construction at the rear of the adjacent building at 1807 Pine Street, but that has yet to be submitted as a building permit application for Historical Commission review, and the actual rear additions at 1807 Pine Street are smaller and allow for greater visibility of the proposed deck at 1805 Pine Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct roof deck on rear ell.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed roof deck does not satisfy Standard 9. It stands too tall above the roof and is too bulky. It is not compatible with the massing and scale of the building.
- *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 roof deck does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline. It is conspicuous and very visible, owing to its overall height and design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as presented, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, but approval of the concept of a deck on the rear ell provided the height and overall massing is reduced to a typical height.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:24:46

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Lauren Thomsen and Matt Gindlesparger represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff discussed the proposed modification to the rear wall to allow access to the deck.
 - Mr. Till responded that the staff did not discuss that detail and were instead focused on the overall massing and size of the deck.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that there will be no modifications to the rear wall. The sliding door already exists.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant why the proposed deck would stand so high above the roof.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that the new deck is replacing an older deck that has already been removed. The property owner would like a taller deck to ensure that his views are not impaired by an addition on the rear neighboring ell, for which a zoning permit has been issued. She stated that her client is seeking privacy and wants to make sure the new deck will be a lasting addition to the house. She acknowledged that the work approved in the zoning permit for the neighbor has not been submitted or reviewed by the Historical Commission. The stepped design of the deck is intended to limit the visibility of the deck from Panama Street. She also clarified that the access to the deck will be through an existing sliding glass door in the rear wall of the fourth story of the main block of the building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the size of the previous deck.

- Ms. Stein asked about the previous deck's height. She also commented that the proposed deck would need a large amount of cladding material to cover the structure and would comprise an area almost the size of an entire additional floor of the building. She asked how the roof would be serviced after the deck was installed.
- Ms. Thomsen responded that the structure below would be vented and accessible.
- Mr. Cluver referenced Google Earth and pointed out that the previous deck was much smaller and lower, only extending to the chimney partway along the rear ell.
- Ms. Gindlesparger added that mechanical equipment would be installed below the proposed deck.
- Mr. Cluver commented that, by raising this deck up and adding the pergola and other elements, this proposal is essentially blocking the views of the neighbor, potentially creating the same problem for the neighbor that this application is intended to overcome with the very tall deck.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that the owner's desire is for privacy and shade to make the deck more usable year-round.
 - Mr. Cluver argued that privacy and shade are also possible with a lower deck.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with the previous comments that the deck is too tall, and that privacy is attainable with a lower design. He also questioned why there was so much space left below that could be used for something. He added that zoning plans often do not come to fruition, so he is wary of designing in response to a proposal for the neighboring building that may never be implemented.
- Ms. D'Alessandro asked how the roof is accessed from the deck.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that there will be a hatch to access it from the deck.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the feasibility of a contractor working in that confined space and the overall stability and constructability of a deck located so high above the roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicants' plan for a deck next to the existing conditions at the neighboring property instead of the potential conditions in the zoning application. He also agreed with prior comments about the height and design.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that the suggested changes can be made.
 - Mr. Detwiler added that it would likely make the project a lot simpler to construct.
 - Mr. McCoubrey added that a lower design also likely would not need so many different stepped areas.
- Ms. Stein observed that the applicants will be responsible for working around the neighbor's chimney as well and their treatment of that chimney should be documented in the plans.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the aerial photograph provided does not show the existing deck.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that the aerial photograph provided is newer and the deck is now gone.
 - Mr. Till confirmed that the date of the aerial photograph is April 2024.
- Ms. Stein pointed out that, based on the aerial photographs, the deck should step down from the fourth-floor egress and not up.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that she received similar feedback from a discussion with the staff and she will take the feedback provided today to her client and develop a new design based on it.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that there is no way to know what the intention is behind the

- neighbor’s zoning application and whether it will ever be implemented.
- Mr. Cluver added that, based on a general sense of the size of the proposed work depicted in the zoning application, it is unlikely that the Historical Commission would approve that project. A zoning approval does not guarantee an approval by the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. Gindlesparger responded that part of the reason they came forward today for an in-concept review was to get some more guidance regarding their project and the neighbor’s potential project. He thanked the Architectural Committee for its feedback.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The roof deck as proposed is too high above the roof of the rear ell and too visible from the public right-of-way.
- The Historical Commission has not reviewed or approved the addition to the neighbor’s property shown in the zoning permit.
- A smaller, less tall, less visible deck may be appropriate on the rear ell of the house.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9. It would stand too tall above the roof and would be too bulky. It would not be compatible with the massing and scale of the building.
- The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline. The deck would be conspicuous and very visible from the street, owing to its overall height and design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, but approval of the concept of a deck on the rear ell, provided its height and massing are reduced.

ITEM: 1805 Pine St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1930 PINE ST

Proposal: Legalize as-built townhouse at rear on Waverly Street

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jack Azran

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects LLC

History: 1888; J.R. Kates Row; Frank Miles Day, architect; Rear townhouse, 2024

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize aspects of a new construction townhouse at the rear of 1930 Pine Street which deviate from the plans approved by the Historical Commission in July 2019. Deviations from the approved plans include the use of vinyl siding instead of fiber cement siding, a front cornice that does not align with the adjacent building, a lack of a brick return on the side elevation, differing proportions and materials on the first-floor front, and a relocated pilot house.

This application for legalization was prompted by the submission to the Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) for a building permit amendment to include a pilot house. A pilot house was included on plans approved by the Historical Commission in 2019 but was omitted from the drawings submitted to L&I for the building permit at that time. A pilot house was constructed without a permit, and L&I issued a violation for construction that exceeded the approved plans. The submission of the building permit amendment to legalize the pilot house prompted the Historical Commission's staff to visit the site, at which time the other deviations from the approved plans were noted and relayed to the applicant and property owner. The staff explained that the pending building permit amendment to legalize the as-built pilot house could be approved in eCLIPSE at this time because the drawings of the overall building do not reflect the as-built conditions, or the 2019 application approved by the Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize aspects of as-built new construction townhouse that deviate from approved plans.

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.*
 - Aspects of the as-built building including proportions, massing, and materials are not compatible with the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:42:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Gabriel Deck and developer Jack Azran represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Deck stated that the vinyl siding used throughout can be replaced with fiber cement siding. He explained that the cornice height does not match with the adjacent building because the adjacent building was not as tall as initially believed. He also explained that the as-built spring point of the mansard sits higher than shown on the plans. He noted that the top-floor window heads more or less align with the adjacent building.
- Ms. Stein asked if the bricks at the cornice could be removed, and the cornice dropped down.
 - Mr. Deck responded that doing so would result in a vertical portion of the roofing cladding, which may look strange.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested keeping the cornice line but making a more substantial three-part cornice, with a larger projection at the top, then a band over the brick and a trim piece along the bottom.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver's recommendation to reduce the amount of brick visible in the cornice area.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the roofing incorporates too many different colors. He stated that the dormers are too dark and there is no definition or shadow lines. He stated that the staff needs to do better reviewing these types of details.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the omission of a brick return on the side elevation.
 - Mr. Deck explained that there ended up being too much of an encroachment from the adjacent garage to allow for the brick return. He stated there would also be an issue with toothing in brick to the front wall.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested a thin brick going back to the start of the mansard.
- Mr. Azran commented that the adjacent building's cornice is not level.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the visible piece of the party wall at the roof level. He suggested that something should be done with it.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the work is very messy.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested the use of a darker vertical standing seam for the roof including on the side elevations.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the visible PVC vent piping at the roof.
 - Mr. Deck responded that the vents are a plumbing code requirement.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that the vents could be ganged or otherwise grouped together. He stated that the Historical Commission's staff should do a better job of reviewing these kinds of details.
 - It was noted that the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the review of plumbing permit applications and did not review or approve the vents in question.
- Ms. Lukachik commented on the recessed front entry and adjacent wide brick pier, which did not appear as a brick pier on the approved plans. She questioned if there was one lintel or two separate lintels at the first floor above the front entry and garage door.
- Mr. Cluver commented on the capping over the front entry.
 - Mr. Azran responded that the contractor had recently done this work but will fix it.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned if the garage door reflects the design of the door in the approved plans.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicant can resubmit with a revised scope to correct aspects of the design discussed during the review.
- The staff can approve an application that sufficiently corrects the details that deviate from the approved plans.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Aspects of the as-built building including proportions, massing, and materials are not compatible with the historic district, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1930 Pine St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 248 N LAWRENCE ST

Proposal: Construct 5-story condo building on vacant lot

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Gianni Pignetti

Applicant: Joseph Jancuska, j2a Architects

History: Vacant Lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story condominium building with pilot house and roof deck on a vacant lot at 248 N. Lawrence Street in the Old City Historic District. This lot was vacant when the Old City Historic District was designated in 2003 and was classified as non-contributing. It is an undeveloped site. In cases such as this, the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission have “review and comment” jurisdiction only.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct five-story condo building on vacant lot

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed building would be more compatible with the Old City Historic District if the primary façade color is changed from white to red to reflect the brick red in the area, the height of the front of the building is more in keeping with the neighboring historic building and another material instead of vinyl siding was chosen for the side elevations such as cement fiber board, brick veneer, or a dark stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff comments that the proposed construction at 248 N. Lawrence Street should be revised as suggested to be compatible with the Old City Historic District, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:11:24

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Joseph Jancuska represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein noted that the proposed new construction would be highly visible, owing to its location, and asked the applicant to comment on the adjustability of the design to better conform to the historic district.
 - Mr. Jancuska responded that the design meets the zoning requirements. He noted that it was proposed to be a condominium building and they wanted the design to reflect a modern building with a unique signature using materials that stood the test of time without being a red brick building with punched openings.
- Ms. Stein commented that she was having difficulty understanding how the proposed new construction would relate to the surrounding buildings as there were no context drawings in the application packet. She asked if the proposed new construction would be flush with the adjacent building.
 - Mr. Jancuska responded that it would be flush. He noted that his team did not want to replicate the adjacent building. They wanted to introduce some visual variety to the street. He opined that he did not think it necessary to replicate the surrounding brick in a city as architecturally rich as Philadelphia.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the rendering did not appear to accurately depict the existing adjacent building and that one could not truly understand the real relationship between the proposed building's scale and massing in relation to the neighboring buildings.
 - Mr. Jancuska replied that he attempted to depict it with the side elevation with the existing building's volume indicated with hatch marks.
 - Mr. Detwiler explained that, although the side elevation is noted, this did not

- depict the locations of the window lines.
- Ms. Gutterman added that the Architectural Committee needs to see a front elevation of the proposed building next to the existing adjacent building. She added that, although limestone is an appropriate building material in many contexts, it is not an appropriate building material in the context of this historic district.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that, although there are many different building types on this street, they are all brick buildings.
 - Mr. Jancuska responded that his client is not opposed to brick, but wanted a material that would give this building its own signature. He also commented that he could align the windows.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the function of the large picture window on the first-floor front facade.
 - Mr. Jancuska explained that the first floor of this proposed condominium building would be raised and that the picture window would serve as a window for the basement and central lobby, that it would span the two floors.
- Ms. Gutterman, Ms. Stein, and Mr. Detwiler noted inconsistencies between the floorplan drawings, elevation drawing, and rendering such as the shape of the front bay window, the picture window sizing on the basement and first floor, and whether there would be masonry between the ground and the picture window as shown in the rendering.
- Ms. Stein opined that the size and scale of the building on this site put a lot of emphasis on the south facade, which was depicted as a five-story blank wall with “temporary vinyl siding” as the proposed material, which she noted is typically not a material used in this district.
 - Mr. Jancuska explained that they would like to install windows on that facade but cannot, owing to zoning regulations. He noted that there would most likely be another building built on that side in the future. He said that they may be able to address the material to make it more pleasing in the meantime, perhaps wrapping cement fiber board around from the rear in a pattern to create more interest and a sense of permanence.
 - Mr. D’Alessandro opined that the side was too large to have siding; it should be clad in masonry.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested using the same panelized system for the side that was proposed for the rear.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the green space behind the building.
 - Mr. Jancuska replied that it did not belong to his client, and they could not use it.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the roof deck, if two pilot houses were needed, and if the barrier would be the top floor wall or a railing.
 - Mr. Jancuska responded that it would be the top floor wall, and that two pilot houses were needed as two means of egress since the building is more than four stories tall.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed new construction is incompatible with the Old City Historic District.
- When the Old City Historic District was designated, this parcel of land was vacant and classified as “non-contributing.” Therefore, the Architectural Committee and

Historical Commission have “review and comment” jurisdiction only over this application.

- The rendering and the floorplans included in the application are inconsistent.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee commented that they would recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 248 Lawrence St					
MOTION: Comment of Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D’Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1615 GREEN ST UNIT 2

Proposal: Install two Fibrex windows at second floor

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Corbin Mills

Applicant: Nunzio Terra, Renewal by Andersen

History: 1859; Interior and exterior, 1985

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install Andersen Fibrex windows in two second-floor front façade window openings. The proposed two-over-two simulated-divided-light windows do not match the original in terms of materials, and the Andersen insert window will build down the openings. One of the provided section drawings depicts a sash replacement kit in a plank frame, not a full-frame system with ogee brickmould, and is therefore inaccurate. The Historical Commission’s staff informed the applicant of this and asked for accurate drawings, but nothing additional or revised has been submitted. The existing brickmold should remain exposed as part of any window replacement and should not be capped.

The building at 1615 Green Street is one of 12 semi-detached houses on the north side of the 1600 block of Green Street. It was built c. 1859 and rehabilitated using Historic Tax Credits in 1985. Although the applicant states that the current windows are vinyl, they appear to date from a 2007 wood sash replacement application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install Fibrex windows on second floor front facade of building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The application provides insufficient and conflicting details on the installation of the composite material window, failing to satisfy Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing to incompleteness.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 1:33:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned why the existing windows required replacement.
 - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff responded that window deterioration was visible at a site inspection. The existing windows are not original, having been replaced with an approved application in 2007.
 - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff further observed that Historical Commission's regulations allow for the replacement of existing windows in most circumstances, so long as the new windows are appropriate in design, material, and installation.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about efforts to work with Renewal by Andersen, to ensure that its applications for Fibrex windows comply with the Historical Commission's submission requirements.
 - Ms. Chantry intoned that Renewal by Andersen Fibrex windows have been approved when not visible from the street. However, some applicants have chosen to seek the Historical Commission's approval for Andersen Fibrex windows even though the windows are not generally considered appropriate for historic buildings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Renewal by Anderson Fibrex windows were proposed for two street-facing second story windows.
- The installation of the Fibrex windows would reduce the sizes of the original daylight openings.
- The section drawing in the application inaccurately depicts the window installation.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application provided insufficient and conflicting details on the installation of the composite material windows, failing to satisfy Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing to incompleteness.

ITEM: 1615 Green St, Unit 2					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:40:55

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:43 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.