

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

**TUESDAY, 28 JANUARY 2025
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		Arrived 9:09 a.m.
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
- Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown Civic Association
- Ann Peters
- Aubrie Lincks, Krieger and Associates Architects Inc.
- Chagai Bader, Nadlan Properties
- Daniel Reisman, Esq., Eckert Seamans
- Garth Herrick
- Georgette Bartell
- German Yakubov, Haverford Square Properties
- Gina Michaels
- Hal Schirmer, Esq.
- Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
- Jay Farrell
- Jeff Krieger, Krieger and Associates Architects Inc.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Jim Dragoni
Justino Navarro
Kevin L. Valentine
Lorabeth Lobst
Michael Jones
Nelle Mills, YP Manager
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Rasheed Ajamu
Ryan Farragut
Sam Katovitch, Toner Architects
S. Grayson
Shawn McAnally, Designblendz
Steven Glass
Suzanne Ponsen, West Central Germantown Neighbors
Tina Marie Hartnett
Tommy Tucker
Tuomi Forrest, Historic Germantown
Zachary Frankel

DRAFT

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 26-34 CHURCH LN

Proposal: Construct five-story building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Nadlan Properties

Applicant: Kevin O'Neill, KJO Architecture LLC

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Germantown Urban Village Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/9/2024

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a five-story mixed use building on a vacant lot at 26-34 Church Lane. The property is classified as non-contributing to the Germantown Urban Village Historic District and, therefore, is considered an “undeveloped site” in the eyes of the preservation ordinance; the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction is limited to review-and-comment only. The proposed building will include a commercial space on the ground floor, 33 dwelling units, and a roof deck. The façade fronting Church Lane will be clad in a light-colored brick and feature a large grid of regularly spaced, narrow, rectangular windows.

The Historical Commission considered versions of this application at its February and March 2024 meetings and ultimately denied the application. At the time of the denial, the property was classified as contributing to the historic district, owing to its archaeological potential. The property owner appealed the contributing classification, and, on 9 December 2024, the Court of Common Pleas granted the appeal, reclassifying the property from contributing to the historic district under Criterion I for archaeology to non-contributing. With the change in classification, the property is considered an “undeveloped site” and the Commission’s jurisdiction is limited to review-and-comment only. The current application seeks the comments of the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. The building that is currently proposed appears to be identical to the building that was considered by the Architectural Committee in January 2024.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a five-story mixed-use building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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.*
 - As the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission concluded during the earlier reviews, the massing, scale, and proportions of the proposed building do not satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF COMMENT: The massing, scale, and proportions of the proposed building do not satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Chagai Bader of Nadlan Properties represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein observed that the Architectural Committee reviewed and rejected this design one year ago. She stated that her opinion of the project has not changed. The massing and scale are not appropriate for the context. The design of the building does not fit into the community. She stated that the size and scale of the building should be reduced.
 - Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey objected to the use of the Hardie siding and suggested that masonry would be more appropriate.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro added that the developer will encounter installation and maintenance problems with that much siding.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the proposed building is unfortunate and inappropriate. He stated that the view from Germantown Avenue and Market Square needs to be taken into account. He asked the applicant why he returned to the original design rather than the revised design, which was slightly better.
 - Mr. Bader stated that he prefers the original design to the second design.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Suzanne Ponsen of West Central Germantown Neighbors objected to the application.
- Jim Dragoni, a neighbor, objected to the application.
- Tuomi Forrest of Historic Germantown objected to the application.
- Ann Peters, an archaeologist from Germantown, objected to the application.
- Allison Weiss of SoLo/Germantown Civic Association objected to the application.
- Gina Michaels, a neighbor, objected to the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 26-34 Church Lane is a vacant lot and is classified as non-contributing in the Germantown Urban Village Historic District. Therefore, the property is considered an “undeveloped site” in the eyes of the preservation ordinance. The Historical Commission’s jurisdiction over this application is limited to review-and-comment only.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the massing, scale, proportions, and details of the proposed building do not satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ITEM: 26-34 Church Ln					
MOTION: Comment that the application fails to satisfy the Standards					
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	6				1

ADDRESS: 100 SUMMIT ST

Proposal: Construct addition, garage, and one-story porch; modify windows and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kerri and Ryan Farragut

Applicant: Aubrie Lincks, Krieger and Associates Architects Inc.

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-historic garage building at an individually designated property and construct a two-story detached garage with carport in its place. It also proposes to demolish a one-story rear shed addition and construct a larger one-story addition with a roof deck. It proposes to convert a window into a door on the north facade. Finally, it proposes remove a small, non-historic airlock and add a small, one-story porch at the east or rear facade of the main block.

The house was constructed c. 1860 in an elaborate Italianate style. A major two-story addition was added to the house in 1909, and other major alterations took place in 1922 and 1946. The one-story shed addition and other areas proposed for alteration appear to date to the first half of the twentieth century. The garage appears to be a later twentieth-century building, but there has been an outbuilding in the same place on the property since at least 1895. The garage will be significantly larger than the existing and also feature a second-floor studio space. The addition will be approximately twice as large as the existing and feature a roof deck. The modifications to the rear window and door and addition of a porch will alter the current appearance of this rear wall, but it appears to be already altered. The proposed designs will reflect the materials and architectural details of the historic building. All proposed work is located at the rear of the lot but will be visible from the adjacent Prospect Avenue.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish existing garage and one-story rear addition
- Construct a two-story garage and one-story rear addition with roof deck.
- Modify an existing window and door and construct a one-story porch.
- Convert window to door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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 alterations and additions meet Standard 9. The areas of work involve altering later, non-character-defining features of the building. The proposed massing, size and scale are larger than the existing structures on the site, but are compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic building.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed addition and garage will be removable in the future without affecting the integrity of the historic building; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:26:27

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Jeff Krieger and Aubrie Lincks and property owner Ryan Farragut represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein commented on the application materials and explained that the drawings submitted had a lot of small details but were also separated into small sections, so it was difficult to get a sense of the entire site with its surrounding neighborhood context. She added that it is important to be able to consider the application with its surroundings, owing to the size of the proposed new garage.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed and added that it would be helpful for the Commissioners to have dimensions added to the application before the Historical Commission's review.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the application included any neighborhood context photographs.
 - Mr. Till clarified that there are a few photographs that show the current garage building at the edge of the property but that the property is also individually designated, so the application materials mainly focused on the site itself.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the positioning of the garage on the site and noted that it appears to be located in the setback from the property line with the neighboring property.
 - Mr. Krieger responded that it is located in the setback and they have just had their first meeting with the Chestnut Hill Community Association for the multiple zoning variances they require for the project. The new garage will not be as close to the property line as the extant garage but will still be in that setback. He added that the Department of Licenses and Inspections determined that the new garage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- qualifies as a primary building owing to its size, while an accessory structure would meet the setback requirements.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the property is located in a “neighborhood of carriage houses” and that the overall design presented aligns with that and is in keeping with an accessory building on the site. He further commented on the design, pointing out that the garage doors look a little short and asked if they could be extended upward.
 - Mr. Cluver added that the budling could also be made lower to improve those proportions.
 - Mr. Krieger responded that the current ceiling heights are to allow for the overhead garage door track. He offered to look into whether that spacing could be reduced by a few inches. He added that the current garage door size of eight feet tall by nine feet wide is a stock size, though they have not selected specific doors yet. He further commented that they did not want to bring the second-floor windowsills down since they would then be too close to the floor.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested that, based on the dimensions given, the second-floor height could come down by about six inches. He recommend that the spacing be reduced.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that the second-floor windows look rather large and that the framing elements appear too thin.
 - Mr. D’Alessandro agreed.
 - Mr. Krieger explained that the designs are schematic so do not have full details such as the window frames. They plan to add that after they obtain their zoning variances. He added that the arched tops are inspired by windows on the main house and that the trim on the house is not very elaborate, but the decorative details are focused on the cornices.
 - Mr. Detwiler replied that the design presented is very “period” and if the details match up, it should come out looking good.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented on the design of the one-story addition. He pointed out that, on the south elevation, the windowsill is positioned too high above the line of the stone watertable. He asked if the stone could come up a little or the window down.
 - Mr. Cluver added that the sill placement is based on a counter located inside, so his suggestion is to pull the water table down closer to floor level and give more space to the window.
 - Mr. D’Alessandro asked for more details about the stone. He asked if it was real or faux and if it would be pointed.
 - Mr. Krieger responded that they are amenable to lowering the water table and that it will be made of a thin Wissahickon Schist veneer that will be mortared.
 - Mr. D’Alessandro also asked about the materials of the existing building where it meets the stone. It can look awkward to have the new stone next to the old brick.
 - Mr. Krieger explained that the drawing in the application does not show the full extent of the historic building nearby. The brick immediately abutting the addition is painted white and there is stone on the wall on the other side of it.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented on the proposed doors for the east side of the one-story addition. He asked why they are proposing a single door with a large sidelight instead of a pair of doors.
 - Mr. Krieger responded that their intent was to bring in more light since the room inside will be for gardening and potting.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested they match the door to the design of the multilight window

- instead of having them be different. He added that the relationship now looks off and that the two panels should be designed together.
- Mr. Cluver commented on the door area as well. He pointed out that the pent roof above and the stone landing below also do not line up proportionally with the door or each other. He suggested everything be adjusted to be aligned so that all the elements are working together in this area. He also pointed out that the spacing of the guardrail on the deck above is not consistent and should also be adjusted to have a regular rhythm.
 - Mr. Krieger responded that these were all good points and will be considered moving forward. He reiterated that they could adjust the pent roof, the door, and the sidelight and ensure the railings have a regular rhythm.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that he appreciates the level of documentation included in the application. He addressed the positioning of the door and reiterated to the applicant that it should be accurate in the final submission. He asked about the stucco finish on the proposed new porch area and if it was pebbled.
 - Mr. Krieger clarified that the area where the new porch is proposed is part of the main block of the historic building. He stated that they are not changing the existing smooth finished stucco there.
 - Ms. Stein summarized that the Architectural Committee seems accepting of the overall size and scale of the addition, but she is hesitant to approve the proposed garage owing to its size. She added that the application does not include enough dimensions detailing its exact size and height compared to the main house. She recommended reducing the garage's height to ensure that it is not taller than the main house and added that the bracketing and other details do not seem to reflect those on the main house very well. She also would like to see more information about the neighboring buildings and how the garage will look in relation to them. Finally, the spacing of the garage compared to the main house is not well detailed and she worries about how tight the site will feel.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein. Along with reducing the height, he suggested they take inspiration from the tower roof on the main house to use as a good model for the garage. He also commented on the addition pointing out that currently, the stone watertable overlaps part of the thin pencil tower on the rear of the historic building, and it should be pushed back slightly to allow that facet to be fully expressed.
 - Mr. Krieger thanked the Architectural Committee for its input. He clarified that the main block of the house is three stories high and is definitely much taller than the proposed garage, though the mass is focused on the front facing Summit Street rather than the rear.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that it seems like the applicants need to adjust details for this project since the details of the historic house are so important. He added that if the applicants take maybe six inches out of the ceiling height on the garage, the relationship to the proportions on the main house would be better. He pointed to an arched window on the house as an example to follow.
 - Mr. Farragut stated that he intended to base the design of the addition and garage on one of the porches on the side of the house and that the height of the garage is intended to relate to the height of the two-story rear addition on the house.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that the garage feels taller than that.
 - Mr. Krieger again explained that the main house is much taller than the proposed garage.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro referred to the snow guards on the main house and

- o recommended that they could be added to the garage.
- o Mr. Detwiler suggested they take the roof line on the two-story ell that Mr. Farragut referenced and replicate its design on the garage while bringing down the overall height slightly. He added that he appreciated the level of detail on the submitted drawings and the proposed quality of the construction.
- Mr. Cluver suggested simplifying the corner and midplane board elements on the proposed addition. They have no direct inspiration on the main house and make the addition look busier than it should. In addition, horizontal members applied over stucco can cause water retention and drainage issues.
 - o Mr. Krieger agreed to take a closer look at the trim details and dimensions for the project.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes to demolish a one-story addition and garage and construct a one-story addition and garage as well as a side porch at 100 Summit Street.
- The property at 100 Summit Street is individually designated on the Philadelphia Historical Register
- The overall design of the garage and addition is well suited to the property, but the architectural details of the proposed alterations and additions should be revised.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application generally satisfies historic preservation standards, but the details of the proposed garage and alterations should be refined. The application fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed addition and garage will be removable in the future without affecting the integrity of the historic building; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

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

ITEM: 100 Summit St					
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				

ADDRESS: 613 S HANCOCK ST

Proposal: Demolish additions; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark and Sally Forester

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1765; John Fullerton House

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a highly altered rear ell and construct a rear addition that encloses a portion of the rear of the main block at 613 S. Hancock Street. No work is proposed to the front façade. The rear ell of the building at 613 S. Hancock Street faces S. Howard Street, a short, dead-end alley used primarily for parking.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept version of the application in May 2024 and recommended denial. That design featured a side-gable roof with skylights and facades clad in cementitious panels with one-over-one windows clad in aluminum. The addition would not be visible from Hancock Street. The Architectural Committee objected to the design of the roof, which would drain onto the historic building, as well as the cladding and windows. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a revised in-concept application in June 2024. The revised design featured a flat roof instead of a side gable roof and an alteration to the slope the rear gable of the historic building to shed water to the front downspout. An internal roof drain in the addition will manage all water runoff from the addition internally without impacting the historic building.

At its December 2024 meeting, the Architectural Committee recommended denial of a revised design that was based upon the Historical Commission's in-concept approval. The Architectural Committee's concerns were that a large amount of water would flow to the downspout of the front façade and that the roof of the addition should be lowered to equal the height of the rear gable. Most of the roof, however, could extend above the height of the back of the rear slope of the historically designated house. The applicant withdrew from consideration at the January 2025 meeting of the Historical Commission.

The applicant has submitted a revised application for the Architectural Committee's consideration. The new proposal includes correspondence from a mechanical engineer stating that the current 3" diameter downspout is sufficient to manage anticipated water flows, the addition's rear slope has been steepened and the downspout on the addition has been moved further from historic building to the middle of the south façade of the addition.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear ell; and,
- Construct three-story rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - No work is proposed to the historic front façade. The rear of 600 S. Hancock Street,

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

including the ell, is highly altered and lacks character-defining features. The applicant has supplied an engineer's statement that the front façade downspout can handle anticipated water runoff.

- *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 scale of the proposed addition is large, but it does not diminish the view of the designated property from S. Hancock Street; there is no historic fabric on S. Howard Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:03:26

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sam Katovitch and property owner Mark Forester represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Katovitch noted that an MEP engineer determined that the 3" downspout on the front facade was sufficient to manage anticipated stormwater flows, the addition's roof slope was adjusted to shed water more quickly and the downspout was moved from near the historic building to the center of the north facade.
- Mr. Cluver concurred with Mr. Katovitch's statement regarding the capacity of the 3" downspout to handle water flows to the front facade.
- Mr. D'Alessandro complimented the responsiveness of the applicant to the Architectural Committee's concerns.
 - Mr. Katovitch opined that the plan now calls for new EPDM roofing for the historic house.
- Mr. Cluver wondered about the fascia where the rear roof slope meets the addition.
 - Mr. Katovitch noted that a small knee wall and curb is needed to support the new rear roof slope. The rear knee wall will be clad with stucco-colored fiber cement panels.
- Mr. Cluver suggested making the additional trim proud of the fascia so no butt joint that requires waterproofing.
- Ms. Stein expressed concern regarding cladding of the new roof slope because the south side of the house is potentially visible from South Hancock Street.
- Mr. Detwiler concurred that the cladding material should blend with the stucco of the third story, south facade.
 - Mr. Katovitch stated that using metal framing would allow for stucco to clad the fascia adjoining the third story, south facade.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern regarding the stability of scuppers during freeze/thaw cycles.
 - Mr. Katovitch stated the need for redundancy as the basis proposing two scuppers and an emergency overflow.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the ceiling height of the rear room of the addition.
 - Mr. Katovitch said its lowest point was nine feet.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- No alterations are proposed to the front facade.
- The only alteration potentially visible from Hancock Street is the south end of the rear roof slope.
- The applicant submitted MEP engineer documentation that the 3” downspout on the front facade is sufficient to manage future water flows.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 2 because no work is proposed to the historic front façade. The rear of 600 S. Hancock Street, including the ell, is highly altered and lacks character-defining features.
- The application satisfies Standard 9 because it does not diminish the view of the designated property from S. Hancock Street and there is no historic fabric on S. Howard Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ITEM: 613 S Hancock St					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
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: 926 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Install automobile parking lift

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Steven J. Glass and Richard Price

Applicant: Steven Glass

History: 1831; Portico Row - Wirts House

Individual Designation: 5/27/1958

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to install a car lift for additional parking in the rear yard of 926 Spruce Street. The installation will not alter the appearance of the front of the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

house on Portico Row. The car lift will not be attached to the rear section of the building. The rear yard faces the 900 block of Cypress Street. The street functions as an alley. No front facades face the 900 block of Cypress Street. An 11' tall garage-style door extends across the rear of the property. The car lift will not be visible from Cypress Street when it is not supporting cars because the posts of the lift are 8'4" in height. If on the lift, they will likely be visible to some extent above the garage door.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a car lift with the capacity to support two cars.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The proposal will not alter the historic building at 926 Spruce Street.
- *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 work will not harm historic materials. The appearance of cars on the lift may be visually discordant but this impact is mitigated by the lack of character-defining features on the properties facing the 900 block of Cypress Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:23:10

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Steven Glass represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked about visibility from the public right-of-way of a car on the top level of the lift.
 - Dr. Glass responded that that the top 1'-6" of a vehicle would be visible above the roll-up door.
 - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff intoned that the Historical Commission has not seen an application for an outdoor car lift before. The staff seeks direction to clarify the circumstances where it might be permitted
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned if anyone had verified the purported 11' height of the garage door. He declared that, by counting bricks, the door did appear to be approximately 11' tall.
 - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff stated the staff did not field verify the applicant's measurement.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the top of a tall SUV would be approximately 13'-10" above grade.
- Mr. Detwiler intoned that a portion of the vehicle on the lift would be visible above the wall and that is less than ideal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Mr. D'Alessandro concurred with Mr. Detwiler.
- Mr. Detwiler recalled that the Department of Licenses and Inspections had determined that car lift could not be installed outdoors in compliance with the building code.
- Mr. D'Alessandro wondered if the grade behind the garage door was the same as the grade on Cypress Street.
- Mr. Gutterman suggested using wood framing to simulate the height of a car on the lift.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that future applications should include dimensioned section drawings showing a large car on the lift in relationship to neighboring fences/party walls, in cross section and long section.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned if a car lift is subject to deterioration in freeze/thaw cycles.
- Ms. Stein pondered that neighbors would see the lift from their windows
 - Dr. Glass expressed appreciation to the Architectural Committee for delineating additional tasks.
- Mr. D'Alessandro opined that pedestrians on Cypress Street would see cars above the garage door.
 - Others noted that they already see cars throughout the service alley, which is used for parking.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with the staff that garages line nearly all of the 900 block of Cypress Street, reducing concern regarding the proposal's visual impact.
- Mr. McCoubrey wondered if walls adjoined the rear yard of 926 Spruce Street.
 - Dr. Glass said the rear yard of 928 Spruce Street has a garage and a brick wall at the border with his property. The rear yard of 924 Spruce Street has a brick wall that borders his property.
- Mr. McCoubrey said future submissions should show the height of the adjoining garage and walls.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The car lift installation will not have any impact on the front facade of 926 Spruce Street.
- The rear yard of 926 Spruce Street faces the 900 block of Cypress Street, which is a service alley.
- The submittal did not demonstrably indicate the visibility of vehicles stored on the top level of the car lift.
- There is an open question as to the permitting of an outdoor car lift in a residential area.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application, despite being in-concept, does not provide enough information and is therefore incomplete.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial owing to incompleteness.

ITEM: 926 Spruce St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 327 N 34TH ST

Proposal: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Carmine Zheng

Applicant: Pink Zhao, D & R Company Electric LLC

History: 1907

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Powelton Village Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/2022

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize front windows that were replaced in October 2024 without the Historical Commission's approval, leading to a violation being issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. The replacement windows are incompatible with this historic building in style and material.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize front window 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 shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The wood windows removed included leaded glass windows on the first and second floors. The removal of these distinctive windows does not meet Standard 2.
- *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 original windows were replaced with vinyl windows that have interior muntins. The replacements windows do not replicate the historic windows in design, configuration, or material. The design and material of the original windows were a character-defining feature of this building and row; therefore, the new windows do

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

not meet Standard 6.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:43:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Kevin Valentine represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Valentine explained to the Architectural Committee that his client is new to the renovation of historic properties and recognizes that the work was done without consultation with the Historical Commission. He pointed out that properties in the same building row as 327 N. 34th Street have similar windows to those installed by the applicant. Mr. Valentine said he would like to consult with the Historical Commission to determine a cost-efficient solution that would meet the Commission's guidelines.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the owner still had the windows that were removed. She said there may be properties near this building that have non-historic windows but contended that those windows were likely replaced prior to the designation of the historic district.
 - Mr. Cluver pointed out that the submission cover letter states that the developer disposed of the historic windows.
- Mr. Valentine asked when the building was historically designated.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the historic district was designated in 2022. She noted the owner would have been told that the property was historically designated when the property was purchased.
 - Mr. Valentine stated that his client may not have understood the ramifications of the historic designation.
- Ms. Stein asked if there was a building permit for the window replacement.
 - Mr. Valentine said he does not believe that there was a building permit.
 - Ms. Mehley confirmed there was no building permit for window replacement.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that, in addition to the historic materials being lost, the overall configuration of the windows was not replicated with the new units. He explained that there are ways to work with existing windows, and if they are being replaced, they need to match what was there.
- Mr. Valentine acknowledged that his client did not follow the standard review and permit process and that he will advise them on these points going forward. He asked the Architectural Committee what steps the applicant could take to rectify this situation.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that, although the historic windows have been disposed of, ideally, they would be brought back. He noted the removal of the original, historic windows resulted in the loss of special features on this building.
- Mr. Detweiler asked if the frames and casings were still in place. He stated that it is important to determine how the windows sit within the masonry openings. He noted, for example, that historic windows often are set back from the masonry openings. Mr. Detwiler added that the Historical Commission often requires new installations to retain historic exterior frames and install the new window behind the frames as a way to preserve the historic appearance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Ms. Mehley said she believes the frames and casings have been removed but can verify this prior to the Historical Commission's meeting.
- Ms. Gutterman said that there is a lot they do not know about the situation but the Architectural Committee needs to make a decision on the application based on what they do know. She clarified that they need to know if materials such as frames or brickmolds remain in place. Ms. Gutterman added that it should be confirmed if any of the windows or transoms are still available for reinstallation. She advised the applicant to obtain estimates for replacement of the windows that more closely resemble what was there historically. Ms. Gutterman explained that, based on her experience, the Historical Commission does not have a precedent for approving vinyl windows on the front elevation of historic buildings.
 - Mr. Detwiler added that it should be documented how the new windows sit within the existing window openings.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that these windows were an important historic feature of this building. The windows should be replaced in kind.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Michael Jones, a neighbor at 311 N. 34th Street, agreed with the Architectural Committee's comments and advocated for the windows to be restored as closely as possible. He stated that as the work was taking place, the Historic Committee of the Powelton Village Civic Association reached out and communicated to the contractors that the work they were doing was unpermitted and not compatible with the historic district. Mr. Jones said that, although the contractors were made aware of these issues, they proceeded with the completion of the work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The new windows were installed without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval.
- The historic windows that were removed have been disposed of and cannot be reinstalled.
- During the installation of the new windows, the contractor was advised of the building's historic designation and the requirement of a building permit.
- Additional details must be documented and added to the application. The application should be supplemented with information about surviving window materials such as frames, brickmolds, and setbacks. This should be added prior to the presentation at the Historical Commission's meeting.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2, because the wood and lead-glass windows removed were distinctive, character-defining features of this building.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6, as the replacement windows do not replicate the historic windows in design, configuration, or material. The design and material of the original windows were character-defining features of this building and row.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ITEM: 327 N 34th St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 510 E WILDEY ST

Proposal: Legalize alterations to front façade owing to financial hardship
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: GLY Investments LLC
 Applicant: German Yakubov, Haverford Sq GC LLC
 History: 1840
 Individual Designation: 2/28/1967
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application requests that the Historical Commission relax its review standards owing to a finding of financial hardship and allow for the retention of front façade work which does not comply with plans for a rear addition and selective front façade work approved by the Historical Commission in 2020 and 2023, or an electrical permit approved in 2024. The approved plans called for wood six-over-six double-hung windows in existing openings, the existing (non-historic) front door to remain, and no exterior electrical work. The completed work includes vinyl windows with grilles between the glass in openings which are slightly larger than the former openings, a new front door that is not based on historic documentation, and the electric meter and associated conduit installed on the front façade. The residential building permit included the following “PHC Staff Review” conditions, none of which were met:

- This permit is subject to the following conditions.
- CONDITIONS**
- Homeowner assumes all liability for any work they perform. If a contractor is not named compliance with codes is the sole responsibility of the homeowner performing the work.
 - PHC Staff Review of railings required for final approval.
 - PHC Staff Review of siding required for final approval.
 - PHC Staff Review of door assembly 'shop' drawings required for final approval.
 - PHC Staff Review of window assembly 'shop' drawings required for final approval.

The approved plans called for Hardie Plank siding to bring the front façade closer to the original wood clapboard appearance, and it appears that this product was indeed used although a sample was not provided to the staff for review. The Department of Licenses and Inspections

issued a violation for the exterior work at the request of the Historical Commission's staff, which prompted an application for legalization from the property owner/developer. That application was reviewed by the Architectural Committee in December 2024 and the Historical Commission in January 2025, when the legalization request was denied. Commissioners noted that the perceived hardship appeared to be self-imposed and did not excuse the applicant from following the approved permit conditions. Several Commissioners encouraged the applicant to work with the staff on a solution, or submit a financial hardship application, given that the argument for legalization was based on financial concerns. The Historical Commission's staff offered to work with the applicant on a solution, but that offer was declined. Instead, the applicant chose to submit this financial hardship application.

Pursuant to Sections 14-1005(5)(b) and (6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the Commission may determine that a building, structure, site, object, or public interior portion of a building or structure cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted. Such a finding, commonly referred to as a finding of financial hardship, allows the Commission to consider the approval of an application to alter or demolish an historic property that may not otherwise satisfy the Commission's review standards. However, such a finding does not release the historic resource from the Commission's regulation; it allows the Commission to consider relaxing its review standards. To substantiate a claim of financial hardship to justify an alteration, as is the case with this application, the applicant must demonstrate that the property cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In this case, the applicant would need to prove that the additional cost to restore the front façade according to the approved plans in order to comply the violation, combined with the overall construction costs, could not provide a reasonable return on investment. This application will be reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship before being reviewed by the Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize alterations to front façade owing to financial hardship

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.*
- *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 vinyl windows and entrance door do not match the old in design or materials. The electrical meter was not installed in an inconspicuous location. This application fails to satisfy Standards 6 and 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends to the Architectural Committee that the alterations proposed for legalization do not satisfy Standard 6. The staff will provide a recommendation based on the financial analysis to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:03:43

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner and developer German Yakubov represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Yakubov explained that this application was submitted, owing to guidance from the Historical Commission at its December 2024 meeting, when his application for legalization was reviewed and denied. He stated that this application is similar to the application that the Architectural Committee reviewed one month prior but now contains financial information about the project. He explained that the project exceeded expected costs, owing to the condition of the building, which was only fully understood after work commenced. He explained that he took on this project for an employee who was losing the house to foreclosure, and that it is not a typical building that he otherwise would have chosen to renovate. He clarified that property is currently listed for sale, and that the former owner was not able to afford to purchase it once the work was complete, given the increased unanticipated costs owing to the condition of the building.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned the appearance and material of the siding on the front facade.
 - Mr. Yakubov stated that the approved product, James Hardie fiber cement siding, was indeed used on the front facade.
 - Ms. Chantry confirmed his assertion but noted that the seven-inch width chosen is possibly wider than what the staff would likely have approved, had a sample or specification been provided for the staff's review and approval.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the estimated cost of correcting the windows, door, and electrical was approximately \$16,000.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that the least expensive part to correct is the door.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The approved plans from 2020 and 2023 called for wood, six-over-six, double-hung windows in existing openings, the existing, non-historic front door to remain, and no exterior electrical work. The completed work includes vinyl windows with grilles between the glass in openings which appear slightly larger than the former openings, a new front door that is not based on historic documentation, and the electric meter and associated conduit installed on the front façade.
- This application will be reviewed by the Committee on Financial Hardship and the Historical Commission in February 2025.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The vinyl windows, window casing, entrance door, and siding exposure do not match the old in design or materials. The electrical meter and conduit were installed in a conspicuous location on the front facade. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ITEM: 510 E Wildey St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:15:54

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:18 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.