

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

**TUESDAY, 22 OCTOBER 2024
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

Acting Chair Amy Stein called the meeting to order at 9:04 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
- Ted Maust, 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:

- Alex Canady
- Andrew Langsam
- Brett Madsen, Permit Philly
- Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- James Potts
- James Sirio, Renewal by Andersen
- Jay Farrell
- John Hunter
- Jonathan Wallace, AVLV Architecture & Development
- Kevin King
- Matt Elson, KORE
- Meaad Aldosari, Permit Philly
- Meredith Ferleger, Esq., Dilworth Paxson
- Nancy Pontone
- Ryan N. Boland, Esq., Offit Kurman

Sam DiGenova
Sam Turner
Zachary Winters

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 310 S 16TH ST

Proposal: Install Fibrex windows
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Aileen and Mark Andrews
Applicant: James Sirio, Renewal by Andersen
History: 1850
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing seven Andersen Fibrex windows on the front façade and three on the rear façade. The proposed six-over-six, simulated-divided-light windows do not match the original in materials. The section drawings provided are inaccurate; the existing brickmold is misrepresented and the existing frame is shown although the description calls the project a full-frame replacement. The existing door, door surround, brickmold, and windows at the front façade are not original in design or configuration. The existing brickmold can remain because it is grandfathered, but, if it is removed, it should be replaced with an appropriate clamshell brickmold. Screens on the Fibrex windows are typically set forward in the openings, which are inappropriate for historic windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install Fibrex windows.

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 windows, failing to satisfy Standard 6.
- The Fibrex material and design of the screens are incompatible with the historic district, failing to satisfy Standard 6.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:51

PRESENTERS:

- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- James Sirio of Renewal by Andersen, a window manufacturer, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Sirio acknowledged that the Historical Commission has not previously approved the installation of Fibrex windows because they are not wood, and the dimension of the jams does not match original historic windows.
- Mr. Sirio stated that the company will replicate the historic the window installation. The main matter for discussion is the composite material.
- Ms. Stein stated the committee is evaluating the specific proposal submitted, not having an abstract discussion of what may be able to be approved.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the condition of the existing windows and why their removal is necessary.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the staff if the existing windows are original to the building.
 - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff replied that windows are not original but are wood.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the owner considered interior storm windows as an alternative to replacing the exiting windows.
 - Mr. Sirio intoned that the owners are disinterested in installing interior storm windows.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the drawings of the proposed windows must be accurate and provide sufficient dimensions to be properly evaluated.
 - Mr. Sirio asked what information the application should provide to be properly evaluated.
- Ms. Gutterman declared that Fibrex windows are inappropriate for the front facades of historically designated structures because they lack the character-defining features of a wood window.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the Fibrex window may be indistinguishable from a wood window, but the dimensions of the Fibrex window components and the installation of the Fibrex windows differ from those of historic wood windows.
 - Mr. Sirio asked what the submitted drawing should show to be properly evaluated and if the Fibrex windows can gain approval on the front facades within historic districts.
 - Several Committee members listed the deficiencies in the drawings that were submitted and enumerated the details that should have been provided.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed windows are a composite material, not wood.
- The drawings submitted do not reflect existing window details.
- The drawings submitted do not reflect the installation details described in the application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6 because the composite material will not match the old material in design, color, texture, or composition.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6 because the proposed windows employ subframes that would reduce the size of the window openings.

- The application is incomplete and inaccurate because the drawings are not properly dimensioned, are inconsistent with the submitted project description, and do not accurately reflect the existing conditions.

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

ITEM: 310 S 16TH ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					X
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 11 SHURS LN

Proposal: Demolish structures; construct mixed-use building
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Boyding Smith
 Applicant: Ryan Boland, Offit Kurman
 History: C.O. Struse and Sons Coal Company
 Individual Designation: None
 District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, 12/14/1983
 Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the structures at 11 Shurs Lane and construct a four-story mixed-use building on the property. The existing structures, remnants of the former C.O. Struse and Sons Coal complex, lie on the northern edge of the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. This district was designated by City Council by ordinance in 1983, before the Historical Commission itself had the authority to create historic districts. The properties in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District are subject to the provisions set forth in Section PM-804 of the Property Maintenance Code, which provides a concise set of design review criteria for permit applications but does not directly address demolition. Supplementing the limited nature of the provisions in the Property Maintenance Code for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District, Section 18 of the Historical Commission’s Rules and Regulations authorizes the Historical Commission to apply the provisions of the historic preservation ordinance, Section 14-1000 of the Philadelphia Code, to properties in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District, provided those provisions do not conflict with the Property Maintenance Code. In this instance, the Historical Commission should apply the demolition provisions and the review criteria for new construction in the historic preservation ordinance.

The Main Street Manayunk Historic District was designated without a nomination and inventory. Properties in the Philadelphia Register Manayunk district do not have classifications such as non-contributing or contributing. The nomination and inventory for the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District have been traditionally used in place of the missing nomination and inventory but are not binding on local reviews. The National Register inventory classifies this site as contributing to the district, but the inventory listing (under the incorrect address of 111-113 Shurs Lane) describes buildings or parts of buildings which are largely gone from the site:

SHURS LANE - NORTH OF MAIN

- B. 111-113 Shurs Lane. Industrial building company. Struse & Sons. C. 1875; original structure 3 story rubble construction with gable roof; structure butts up against Pennsy Railroad line; 111 is a later addition, a handsome 2 story yellow brick structure with decorative quoining; segmentally arched window openings with splayed brick lintels and hipped roof.

A major fire at the site in 1959 resulted in a condemnation and subsequent demolition of parts of structures over the years. The Historical Commission's staff recommends that the Commission consider the property as non-contributing to the district, which will allow the staff to administratively approve the removal of the structures on the site.

The application includes architectural drawings, a structural engineering report, zoning plans, renderings, current photographs of the property, and the entire application that was reviewed earlier in 2024 and approved by the Historical Commission for the adjacent property at 4045-61 Main Street.

The proposed building would be four stories tall and include 42 residential units, 37 parking spaces on the ground floor, and first-floor commercial space with entrance on Shurs Lane. While the drawings call out retention of the existing stone wall fronting Shurs Lane and incorporation of it into the new facade, a structural engineer has recently said this is not feasible, and that the structure including front wall must be taken down. The applicant has offered to attempt to salvage and reuse the stone where possible on the new façade. This proposed building will be seen within the context of the recently approved seven-story new construction project proposed on the adjacent property at 4045-61 Main Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish structures on site.
- Construct four-story mixed-use building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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.*
 - The materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the proposed building will be compatible with the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission find that the property at 11 Shurs Lane is non-contributing to the Main Street Manayunk Historic District owing to the complete loss of historic character-defining features. The staff recommends

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 OCTOBER 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

approval, pursuant to Standard 9, because the proposed building is compatible in size, scale, materials, and massing with the historic district.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:22:17

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Ryan Boland, owner's representative Andrew Langsam, and structural engineer Sam DiGenova represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Boland emphasized the seven-story massing of the approved project on the adjacent parcel at 4045-61 Main Street and how that massing will overshadow this smaller building and block visibility of the entire side of this building. He stated that the floodplain does not extend onto his property, which sits at a higher elevation than the adjacent property.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the existing stone wall and about the plans to either retain it or take it down, salvage, and reuse the stones in the new facade.
 - Mr. Langsam explained that the initial intention was to retain and reuse the wall, but his structural engineer reported that it is not feasible to retain it. He stated that the new plan, based on the engineer's findings, is to take down the wall and reuse the stones to replicate the existing design, but with some changes to openings to allow for necessary doorways and additional windows.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that, if the wall needs to be taken down, it should be put back together to replicate the current appearance. He stated that it should not look like wallpaper on the new building, but rather should have a reveal where it hits the brick of the upper stories so that it reads on its own plane.
- Ms. Stein commented on the lintel and jamb details on the existing wall and recommended that these be replicated in the reconstructed wall design.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the thickness of the existing wall and questioned why it could not be further stabilized.
 - Mr. Langsam responded that the wall is approximately 12 inches thick. He referred to the structural engineering report for why the wall could not be further stabilized.
- Ms. Stein commented on the design of the proposed building, stating that the character of the building is appropriate in terms of scale, massing, and materials. She commended the applicants for designing something appropriate for the district.
- Mr. Detwiler commented on the driveway entrance and asked if there was a way to make it more pedestrian friendly, such as another pier between the driveway and the walkway.
 - Mr. Langsam explained that the proposed driveway is the same width as the current driveway.
 - Mr. Boland stated that the neighbors required that deliveries be made within the driveway area rather than having delivery trucks parked across the street, which has also driven the footprint of the driveway.
- Mr. Cluver noted a discrepancy between the plans and the rendering and recommended correcting it in advance of the Historical Commission's review.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that new windows will be added to an area of the reconstructed stone wall.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the plan for protecting the top of the stone wall.

- Mr. Langsam responded that they intend to install a stone lintel or similar features to keep water out.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested using something similar to the existing terracotta capping.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the Architectural Committee implicitly agrees with the staff’s recommendation to treat the property as though it is classified as non-contributing, as evidenced by the discussion about the proposed design.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that, in his opinion, the wall remnant is contributing, but the remainder of the structures on the site are non-contributing.
- Ms. Stein encouraged the applicants to make modest revisions to the drawings in advance of the Historical Commission’s meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- A major fire at the site in 1959 resulted in a condemnation and subsequent demolition of parts of structures over the years. The remaining structure is a remnant of the former C.O. Struse and Sons Coal complex.
- This proposed building will be seen within the context of the recently approved seven-story new construction project proposed on the adjacent property at 4045-61 Main Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The stone wall along Shurs Lane should be retained or reconstructed with the existing door and window openings.
- The proposed building is compatible in size, scale, materials, and massing with the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, owing to the design of the reconstructed front stone wall, but approval of the overall design of the new construction, provided the existing openings in the wall are maintained and any new construction sits behind the stone wall at least 12 inches or the thickness of the wall, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 11 Shurs Ln					
MOTION: Denial as submitted, but approval with changes to stone wall detailing					
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	6				1

ADDRESS: 301-03 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Demolish structure; construct multi-unit building

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Andrew Sacksteder

Applicant: Mark Wallace, Kore Design Architecture

History: 1997

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to demolish a 1½-story non-contributing building in the Old City Historic District and construct a four-story-plus-basement structure containing two single-family dwellings. The proposed structure would have three basement level parking spaces along with a roof deck and pilot house. The property at 301-03 N. Front Street is located along the north side of Vine Street between N. Front Street on the west, and N. Water Street on the east. Across N. Water Street from the property is a large vacant lot where a 26-story mixed-use building is being built. That project that was approved by the Historical Commission in October 2021. The properties directly adjacent to and north of 301-03 N. Front Street are contributing properties to the Old City Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing structure
- Construct four-story structure with basement and roof deck

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.*
 - Trex cladding and faux wood are not compatible new materials in the Old City Historic District.
 - The design of the N. Water Street façade with the variation in material textures and colors may not preserve the integrity of the historic environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval in concept of the demolition of the non-contributing structure and construction of a four-story building, provided the cladding materials and design details are revised to be more compatible with the surrounding historic district, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:52:34

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Matt Elson of KORE Design Architecture represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked the applicant to respond to the staff's recommendation regarding revising the cladding materials.

- Mr. Elson responded that they are proposing primarily brick for the N. Front Street facade and that they chose materials such as vertical board and batten and thinner materials that could accommodate the curve of the side of the building. He noted that they wished to keep brick for the lower level for added stability on the N. Water Street facade but wished to break up the tall N. Water Street facade, keeping affordability in mind. He explained that his team was open to hearing suggestions from the Architectural Committee.
- Ms. Stein noted that this is an unusual property which has no back side. She opined that the N. Water Street side, the N. Front Street side, and the corner curve itself would all be highly visible in the Old City Historic District and that siding was not typically appropriate in historic districts. She asked the applicant how he could address the material on the curved facade and on the N. Water Street facade to make them better fit within the context of the Old City Historic District.
 - Mr. Elson noted that they initially looked into using more brick on all facades but then reduced the amount of brick owing to cost constraints.
- Mr. Cluver commented that there should be more unity between the facade treatments and that the N. Water Street facade especially did not look like it belonged. He agreed that the idea of using different materials to break up the scale of a building was a longstanding tradition but stated that using too many materials could have the opposite effect and give the property a scattered look. He suggested that the applicant tone down the materiality and the size of the windows. Mr. Cluver added that the roof deck and pilot house overbuild seemed to have an outsized presence and the applicant should reduce the size of the pilot house and set it further back from the edge of N. Front Street. He also drew attention to the lack of mechanical equipment shown on the roof drawings.
- Ms. Stein added that the rhythm and proportion of the facade and the amount of steel and glass did not fit into the neighborhood. She pointed to the raised front door and metal staircase on the N. Front Street side, which appeared to her as an industrial feature. She opined that the balconies seem too prominent and additive, not part of the architecture. She noted that perhaps balconies on the building's curve could be interesting, but she suggested inset instead of protruding balconies. Ms. Stein opined that brick on most of the facade could be appropriate.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asserted that the projecting balconies do not add to the building and noted that, if the applicant was concerned with cost, the projecting balconies could impact the cost quite a bit. He also noted that using so many different materials could greatly impact the cost. He suggested that the applicant could easily get a curved brick fabricated for the curved building side.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested simplifying the N. Water Street facade, opining that the shape of the building could be the attention-grabber instead of the assortment of materials. He noted that the windows taper as they go up in height in masonry buildings. He suggested incorporating that into this design to better fit within the district.
 - Mr. Elson responded that they want to take advantage of the great views from the building. He noted that he understood the comments offered by the Architectural Committee about the materiality and facade composition and that they would look into revisions that could bring the design into alignment with the Architectural Committee's expectations. He also noted they would reconsider the dimensions and details of the pilot house.
- Ms. Stein commented on the fiber cement material proposed for the roof deck railing, noting that it would be a solid wall.

- Mr. Elson concurred that it was proposed as a solid parapet.
- Ms. Gutterman noted her concern about the shape of the windows, the size of the garage door, and the buff and tan choice of color for the brick instead of shades of red or brown.
 - Mr. Elson responded that they were trying to keep the mass of the building feeling lighter, but that they are open to exploring more traditional colors of brick.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant think of the proposed building in context of the surrounding neighborhood and streamline some design ideas.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The current building at 301-03 N. Front Street is non-contributing to the Old City Historic District and its demolition can be administratively approved.
- The overall massing of the proposed building is compatible with the Old City Historic District and the surrounding buildings on N. Front Street and N. Water Street.
- Across N. Water Street is a large vacant lot where a 26-story building is being built.
- The design as presented uses too many materials, which would detract from the property. Some of the proposed materials are not appropriate in the Old City Historic District.
- The pilot house size and location as well as the proposed roof fiber cement parapet should be reconsidered.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, owing to the incompatible materials and building design detailing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the demolition and four-story massing of the new building, but denial of the application as proposed, owing to the materials and details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 301-03 N FRONT ST					
MOTION: Approval in concept of demolition and new massing					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detweiler					
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	6				1

ADDRESS: 252 QUINCE ST

Proposal: Legalize as-built roof and dormers

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Danielle Harvey

Applicant: Jonathan Wallace, AVLV Architecture & Development

History: 1806, William Smith

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: Washington Square West Historic District, Contributing, 9/13/2024

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the as-built roof and dormers at 252 Quince Street, which deviate from the plans approved by the Historical Commission in December 2023. Deviations from the approved plans include the removal of original roof and framing, removal of front and rear cornices, construction of a roof above the location of the original roof, and installation of new dormers that differ in proportions from the approved dormers. This application for legalization was prompted by a staff site visit and subsequent issuance of a violation by the Department of Licenses and Inspections for construction that exceeded the approved plans.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize aspects of as-built new construction 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 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 gable roof, which was constructed above the location of the historic roof, and dormers, which were constructed taller than approved, are incompatible with the historic property and environment and fail 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 historic integrity of the original 1806 roof and cornices was permanently altered with full removal, failing to satisfy this 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.*
 - Front and rear dormers were constructed 10 inches taller than approved plans and the dormer cornices are oversized. As currently constructed, the dormers are highly visible from the public right-of-way and fail to satisfy the roof guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:15:43

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 OCTOBER 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Architect Jonathan Wallace represented the application. Contractor Zachary Winters attempted to join the meeting but experienced technical difficulties and was unable to join.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked the applicant to explain how the approved project scope changed during the construction process.
- Mr. Wallace said that he completed the original project drawings and was present to provide support for the project. He commented he was attending today's meeting in anticipation of revising the application drawings. Mr. Wallace pointed out that Mr. Winters, the contractor, would be the one to speak to the decision-making at the project site that led to the changes. Mr. Wallace said that when the Mr. Winters began working on the building and completed partial demolition, he reportedly found structural elements that were rotted and undersized.
- The staff attempted to unmute Mr. Wallace several times so that he could join the discussion, but he was unable to participate in the Zoom meeting, owing to technical difficulties with his connection.
- Ms. Lukachik said that, if the historic roof structure was deteriorated with rot and other issues, then replacement in kind would have been acceptable. However, the roof structure was not replaced in kind. The roof and other elements were raised up, significantly changing its appearance. She said she would like to know how why the changes were made without any review.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the Historical Commission was never informed of the issues after the discovery of the roof deterioration.
- Mr. D'Alessandro said that the Architectural Committee has not been presented with any information to support legalization of the as-built roof and dormers.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Mehley if there is anything else she could share about the roof.
 - Ms. Mehley stated that she visited the site and she and Mr. Winters measured different parts of the roof and dormers. She pointed out that the dormer setback from the front of the roof had been built accurately with a 24-inch setback but the face of the dormer from the roof to the soffit measured 10 inches taller than specified in the plans approved by the Historical Commission. Ms. Mehley pointed to the rear of the roof and the cornice removal and visible edge of new roof. She noted that the dormers also had pronounced soffits and cornices.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Mehley if the roof had been raised 10 inches.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that the 10-inch dimension was based on observations at the property and the on-site conversation with Mr. Winters.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Wallace if that 10-inch dimension was correct.
 - Mr. Wallace responded that this dimension was based on Ms. Mehley's site report.
- Ms. Stein speculated about what could be done to bring the project into compliance. She asked if smaller modifications, such as trimming the joists back, could accomplish this or if the roof joists need to be dropped down to their original location. She told Mr. Wallace that they are looking to the architect to propose solutions for bringing the project back into compliance.
- Mr. Wallace said that he is concerned that trimming the joists back could compromise the structure. He said if they want to lower the roof, it will likely have to be completely rebuilt which is effectively starting from zero.

- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the new roof and how it compared to the historic roof. She asked Mr. Wallace if the slope had changed or if the new one was just elevated.
 - Mr. Wallace replied that he was not sure but did not think that the slope had been altered.
 - Ms. Mehley said that input from the contractor, Mr. Winters, on this point was important because she understood from their discussion onsite that the roof slope had changed.
 - Ms. Lukachik commented that, based on the photographs provided, it appeared that the slope was changed but she could not be sure from the photographs alone.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Lukachik agreed that the amended plans do not accurately document the changes between the new roof and historic roof.
- Ms. Stein stated that the applicant, not the staff, should provide the new dimensions of the roof and dormers. She added that the architect should provide the historic and new dimensions as well as some solutions for bringing the roof into compliance.
 - Ms. Lukachik agreed that the Architectural Committee needs to understand what was built and how the applicant proposes to bring it into compliance.
 - Ms. Stein and Ms. Gutterman advised that the Architectural Committee should not recommend legalizing the new construction shown in the amended plan.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The contractor was unable to attend the meeting and was not able to provide key information about changes to the original plans.
- During the project, the contractor discovered that the historic roof framing was deteriorated and undersized.
- The Historical Commission was not notified of the structural issues or the changes to the approved plans.
- The amended drawings include approximate dimensions that were not verified by the architect and contractor in the field. The drawings should include documented dimensions and details, including new roof slope, for all new construction.
- It is not possible to determine from submission information provided and discussion whether specific roof elements could be reconstructed or if a full rebuild was required in order to bring the project into compliance.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, owing to the construction of a new roof and dormers that are incompatible with the historic property and environment.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 10 because the original 1806 roof and cornices were removed.
- The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline because the front and rear dormers were constructed 10 inches taller than approved plans and the dormer cornices are oversized. As currently constructed, the dormers are highly visible from the public right-of-way.

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

ITEM: 252 Quince St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Lukachik					
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	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:30:24

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:44 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.