

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

**TUESDAY, 27 JUNE 2023  
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM  
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

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

| <b>Committee Member</b>                  | <b>Present</b> | <b>Absent</b> | <b>Comment</b>      |
|------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair | X              |               |                     |
| John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP                | X              |               |                     |
| Rudy D'Alessandro                        |                | X*            | *Arrived<br>10:10am |
| Justin Detwiler                          | X              |               |                     |
| Nan Gutterman, FAIA                      | X              |               |                     |
| Allison Lukachik                         | X              |               |                     |
| Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP                  | X              |               |                     |

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

German Yakubov  
Nathan Farris, Esq., Ballard Spahr  
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Dilworth Paxson  
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District  
Marissa Howard, JKRP Architects  
Jakob Noon  
Ilona Prodan  
Stephanie Boggs Magagna, Esq., Klehr Harrison  
Greg Mastalerz  
Eva Lew  
Cassidy Martin

Kim Lageman  
Christopher Schrack  
Phoebe Bachman  
Jack Burns  
Stephen Kieran  
Roberto E. Villasante  
Dennis Carlisle  
Ke Feng  
Amanda Gold  
Will Kunkle  
Nancy Pontone  
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison  
Michael Ramos  
Kelly Vresilovic  
Gabe Canuso  
Joe Pyle, Scattergood Foundation  
Jay Farrell  
Nate Torok  
Jack McElwee, SEPTA  
Seth Cohen, VSBA  
Patrick Keenan  
Ellen Feringa  
Daniel Mangano  
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society  
Heather Coyne  
Ricky Yanas, Mural Arts  
Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown  
Jake Blumgart  
Adam Loughry  
Emily Khalid  
Alex Reiner  
Danele Alampay  
Dominique Hawkins  
Lucy Davis  
Dr. Cheryl Bettigole, Department of Public Health  
Kevin Rockey  
Sara Enes, Department of Public Health  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance

## **AGENDA**

### **ADDRESS: 4641 E ROOSEVELT BLVD**

Proposal: Demolish building, construct health center building  
Review Requested: Final for demolition, In-concept for new construction  
Owner: Thomas Scattergood Foundation  
Applicant: Nathan Farris, Ballard Spahr LP  
History: 1813; Lawnside, Superintendent's Residence, 1859  
Individual Designation: unknown  
District Designation: None  
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

### **OVERVIEW:**

This application seeks final approval to demolish a historic building and in-concept approval to construct a new municipal health center on the grounds of the historic Friends Hospital in the Frankford section of Philadelphia. Established by the Quakers in 1813 as the first private psychiatric hospital in the United States, the Friends Hospital complex is composed of numerous historic and modern buildings set on 99 acres. The date that the Historical Commission designated Friends Hospital is unknown. No documentation of the designation exists and the buildings and other features on the site were not classified as contributing or non-contributing. It appears that the hospital was designated in the early 1970s in response to the proposed Pulaski Expressway, a highway that would have cut across the hospital grounds and connected the Betsy Ross Bridge to Route 309. In addition to its local designation, Friends Hospital is a National Historic Landmark District. The building proposed for demolition, known as Lawnside, was constructed in 1859 as the superintendent's house and is classified as contributing to the district in the National Historic Landmark nomination. Any state or federal involvement in the health center project like funding may trigger a Section 106 review, a federal preservation review, which may preclude demolition.

The Department of Licenses and Inspections is prohibited by Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance from issuing a demolition permit for a building on the Philadelphia Register except in two cases. The section stipulates that "No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted." The application contends that the demolition of Lawnside is necessary in the public interest and asserts that:

- The New Health Center Will Address a Public Health Crisis in the Lower Northeast.
- The Friends Campus Is the Only Site in the Lower Northeast That Can Accommodate a Large Enough Health Center to Meet the Need for Primary Care Services.
- Demolishing Lawnside Is Necessary to Build the New Health Center in a Safe and Accessible Location.
- Demolishing Lawnside Is Consistent with the Campus's History of Changing to Meet the Needs of Modern Medical Practice.

The application includes letter from attorney Nathan Farris introducing the application and the following exhibits:

1. Letter from Health Commissioner, Cheryl Bettigole, MD, MPH, explaining: (a) the need for the Health Center in the Lower Northeast; (b) why the Campus is the only viable location in the lower Northeast; and (c) why the chosen site is the only location on

campus that allows for development of a safe, accessible Health Center that meets PDPH's high standards for patient care;

2. Letter of support from Councilmember Lozada;
3. Letter of support from Councilmember O'Neil;
4. Letter of support from Councilmember Driscoll;
5. Letter of support from Representative Hohenstein;
6. Letter of support from Representative Dawkins;
7. Presentation from VSBA Architects and Planners demonstrating why other locations on campus and other building footprints and configurations are not feasible;
8. Report prepared by Heritage Consulting Group setting forth the development history of the property; and
9. Letter from Gabe Canuso at D3 Development, LLC concluding that adaptive reuse or moving of Lawnside is not financially feasible.

The application highlights the significant need for additional public health center facilities in the Lower Northeast. The application documents the analyses the City's Department of Public Health has undertaken to select a site for Northeast Philadelphia Health Center. The City considered 44 sites and selected the Friends Hospital site. The application also includes analyses that the City, Scattergood Foundation, VSBA, and other consultants have undertaken to identify a site on the grounds of Friends Hospital that can accommodate the new health center. The project has very strict requirements for the new building and parking that involve security, safety, ease of access by foot, mass transit, and car, drop off and pick up, parking, and flow through the building. The impact of the building on the historic site, especially potential impacts on trees and view sheds, were also considered.

The Historical Commission considered a similar application at its September 2020 meeting and continued the matter to allow time for additional analyses and supplemental submissions. The application was eventually abandoned. In the intervening two plus years, the Health Department and Scattergood Foundation conducted additional analyses and again concluded that the demolition of Lawnside is necessary to construct the health center.

The application includes a letter from the City of Philadelphia's Health Commissioner explaining why demolishing Lawnside and constructing a health center at this location is necessary in the public interest. The letter is supported by letters from numerous elected officials representing the area supporting the assertion that the new health center is necessary in the public interest. The application presents four options for siting the new building, the preferred plan as well as Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. The application summarizes why the optimal plan is the only feasible plan and why the Alternatives are infeasible for security, safety, accessibility, transit, parking, topography, utility, view shed, and other reasons. The application documents the Lawnside building with photographs and scaled drawings. The application includes a letter from a development expert stating that the rehabilitation and the relocation of the Lawnside building are infeasible. The in-concept new construction part of the application provides site, plan, and massing drawings for the new building, but not finalized architectural drawings, which would be submitted later for review. The application includes a preservation consultant's report that documents the history of the development and redevelopment of the site.

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

- Demolish 1859 building known as "Lawnside"
- Construct health center

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

- *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.*
  - o The demolition of the historic building proposed in this application does not satisfy Standard 9.
  - o Excepting the demolition, the massing, size, scale, and location of the new construction proposed in the application satisfies Standard 9.
- *Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance: No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.*
  - o This application demonstrates that the demolition of Lawnside for the construction of the health center is necessary in the public interest.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends final approval of the demolition as necessary in the public interest and in-concept approval of the new construction, provided the demolition permit is not issued until final approval of the new building is obtained and the project is ready to proceed, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance and Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:03:20

**RECUSAL:**

- Mr. McCoubrey recused, owing to his employment at the architectural firm involved in the application. Ms. Gutterman assumed the position of Chair.

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Nathan Farris, Health Commissioner Cheryl Bettigole, and architect Seth Cohen represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Farris stated that he represents the Thomas Scattergood Foundation, the owner of the Friends Hospital property. He stated that the Foundation is partnering with the Department of Public Health to build a new City health center on the Friends campus. He reported that the health center is really at the core of Scattergood mission and resonates deeply with the history of the campus. The Scattergood Foundation is excited by this historic opportunity to partner with the City to write the next chapter of the Friends campus story. He stated that they are requesting final approval to demolish the Lawnside building in the public interest and conceptual approval to construct the new health center building. He observed that the demolition is a gating issue for this project. The project cannot move forward, including detailed architectural design of the building, without an approval to demolish. He assured the Architectural Committee that it will be a part of the conversation as this project progresses. Mr. Farris stated that, assuming that he obtains permission to demolish Lawnside, he will submit a final building permit application for the new health center building. He assured the Architectural Committee that his client has no plans for the demolition of Lawnside until the project schedule demands it.

- Mr. Farris stated that there is no doubt that there is a deep need for primary medical care services in the Lower Northeast. He reported that Public Health Commissioner Dr. Cheryl Bettigole will describe this need and the City's years-long attempt to meet that need. He asserted that the bottom line is that, after years of study, the Department of Public Health has concluded that it needs to develop a new, very large health center on the Friends Hospital campus. He noted that, in some of the public comments on the application, it was suggested that the Historical Commission and this Committee should revisit the Department of Public Health's determination. He pointed out that, while the results of the City's analysis of possible alternatives is relevant to deciding whether demolition is necessary in the public interest, the Department of Public Health, and not the Historical Commission, is the body with the expertise to decide what is and is not a suitable location for a new health center. It has its own standards for safety, for access and patient services, and those standards and the application of those standards are not within the Architectural Committee's jurisdiction. He contended that the determination that this is the only viable site in the Lower Northeast is not something can be relitigated today. As Commissioner Bettigole will explain, that determination was made after careful study, including significant public involvement, and just as it would be inappropriate for the Department of Public Health to question the Commission's judgments that the campus should be designated as historic, it would be inappropriate for the Historical Commission or this Architectural Committee to question the propriety of the Department's determination. The reality of the situation is that the only safe and accessible site on the Friends campus to locate this health center requires the demolition of the former superintendent's residence, which is known as Lawnside. Scattergood and the City have thoroughly considered all possible alternatives to demolition, but, even after years of study, no viable alternative could be found. Mr. Farris noted that architect Seth Cohen will discuss the details of that study and the alternatives that were considered and explain why none of them is viable.
- Mr. Farris stated that it is important to note that when considering the public interest, the opinions of public and elected officials carry extra weight because they are the people elected and appointed to care for the common good. He stated that several elected officials have submitted letters of support in this project, including the District Councilperson who has toured the property and is fully supportive of this project. The District Councilperson is the person whose constituents will be most directly impacted by the construction of a new health center. He asked the Committee to pay special attention to her determination that demolition will serve the public interest of her constituents.
- Commissioner Bettigole stated that she was the clinical director at Health Center 10, which is the Northeast site at Cotman and Bustleton, for five years. She reported that she is a family physician. She related several stories from her time at Health Center 10. She told the story of a gentleman from Jamaica who had struggled with hypertension. He ran a small business. He did not have health insurance, which is true of many health center patients. And he did not have the time or money to address his high blood pressure without insurance. Ultimately, he had a large stroke that affected the whole left side of his body. She recounted that he could no longer work, and his wife and his daughter, who, as a nurse at the local hospital, had to stay home because he was not safe and kept falling. He was admitted to the hospital when he had a stroke, but because he was uninsured, he did not get rehabilitation services. He did not have physical therapy. He did not have the devices to support himself. The family went from thriving to both economic and emotional disaster, and

it was completely unnecessary. Commissioner Bettigole explained that the health centers can treat hypertension with cheap medications, but only if people have access to care.

- Commissioner Bettigole reported that the waiting time for new patients at Health Center 10, the one site in the Northeast, for adults varies from about seven months to one year, far too long for somebody with a problem. For children, the wait is over five months for an initial appointment, which is an unacceptable waiting time. She explained that many people just wait. She noted that the City has other centers with shorter waiting times, but Philadelphians go in their neighborhood, and even though they could cross the city and go somewhere else, they wait, and they wait too long.
- Commissioner Bettigole told the story of a seven-year-old boy who developed a cough and fever. He started to develop pain when he took a deep breath, so his parents, who did not know what else to do for him and knew that they could not afford the bills if they took him to an emergency room, wrapped him in a giant ace bandage so that he would not take the deep breaths that hurt. She relayed that, by the time she saw him, what had been a very treatable pneumonia had developed a lung abscess because his pneumonia had gone untreated for so long. He ended up spending one month in the hospital with the chest tube. Again, this case was preventable with accessible care. People need access to primary care. She stated that this section of the city suffers from the effects of a lack of care. The city needs a health center at this location on the Friends campus.
- Commissioner Bettigole stated that they considered dozens of other locations for the health center. They prioritized safe public transit access. They considered properties to rent and to purchase. She stated that they did identify another site and will be building a health center at the site near the Frankford Transportation Center. That site will serve just over 5,000 people annually. The current Health Center 10 in the Northeast serves between 14 and 20,000 people annually. The new site will serve more than 30,000 annually. She stated that, if they could have found another site in the years while studying this site, they would have selected that site. She stated that they are coming back before the Historical Commission because they are unable to find another site that works. This specific location on the campus provides for safe access. She recounted that, while she was working at Health Center 10, an elderly couple parked across the street to get flu shots at the health center. When they were crossing back to their car after getting the shots, they were hit by a distracted driver. One was killed. One had a severe injury. The proposed site at Friends will provide safe access to transit and a parking lot. She explained that the City's health centers require a very specific layout that provides a linear progression. Patients enter at registration, proceed to their appointments, then to the lab, pharmacy, and X-ray services. The health centers employ many interpreters. For example, the Northeast site has 18 common languages. The centers must be designed so that people cannot get lost. They should be on one floor, two at the most. Commissioner Bettigole concluded that they have studied many sites, and this is the only site that accommodates all of their needs.
- Agreeing with Commissioner Bettigole, Mr. Cohen, the architect, explained that the health centers require a very specific, systematic architectural layout to accommodate the flow of patients through the facility. He stated that he would discuss the siting of the building first. He reported that the intent is to minimize the impact on the historic landscape as much as possible. He noted that they would be widening the entrance gate for a safer entrance and exit to the Friends Hospital campus for both pedestrians and vehicles. The new health center building will be set

back from an allee of trees, which will be restored. He observed that they will be saving a significant cluster of trees on the west end of the site, which serves to both shield the building from the adjacent historic buildings across the drive and continue the tree buffer from the allee. He said that they are preserving as much of the viewshed of the main hospital from the entry drive by locating the building away from the bend in the road and that they are providing a safe drop off far enough away from the site entrance, but also before the road starts to bend. He indicated that they will be improving the central parking lot and using available spaces to minimize the impact of the landscape and also planting additional trees and using current storm water management practices in the parking lot. He noted that the facility will be close to SEPTA stops and will provide safe, close parking for visitors. Mr. Cohen displayed conceptual drawings of the proposed building to show the beginnings of the design intent. He stated that the building is really intended to be a background building shielded by a restored allee of trees. The materials are to be light-colored brick with a stone base, and the color palette takes cues from the historic hospital building. He stated that they intend to use pattern and texture to give the facade modulation. He noted that the appearance of the building is intended to be serene. The building should fit nicely within the landscape. The scale of the windows references the hospital building with a rhythmic pattern of punched openings with exceptions in the middle and at the end of the building. The west elevation shows the entry to the building. The porch references Quaker meeting houses. The porch creates a welcoming, inclusive experience for patients and visitors. It wraps around both sides of the building to engage patients and visitors walking from the transit stops or the parking lot. The building will serve as a subtle backdrop to the landscape. The service entrance as well as the wall that surrounds it is shielded by existing and new landscape. Mr. Cohen concluded that, in general, the design seeks to minimize the impact on the landscape.

- Mr. Cohen explained that they looked at a variety of sites and tried to explore other avenues and other possibilities on the Friends Hospital campus. He stated that Alternative 1, the site located on the north end of the campus, does not allow for safe access because the secondary entry drive near the site is located on a blind curve on Roosevelt Boulevard. There is no left turn access and there are no traffic lights at this entrance point. The health center would be a very long distance from SEPTA stops. It would be a very long travel distance across the campus for people with mobility issues. He concluded that it is really just not a good site. Alternative 2, which is located along Roosevelt Boulevard at the center of the lawn, has the same issues as Alternative 1, but even worse. The new building would block the view shed of the main hospital from Roosevelt Boulevard. It would require additional removal of historic landscape that serves as the buffer along Roosevelt Boulevard. Alternative 3 is a site with very steep grade changes. Building on it would cause the most disturbance to the landscape. It would require new roads, a new surface parking lot, major regrading, and demolition in that area of campus. A stream that runs through that section of the campus as well. The steep slope and grade changes are significant impediments for people with mobility issues, people with strollers. The Alternative 3 site is not feasible. Mr. Cohen stated that, once they determined that the chosen site was the only feasible site, they considered various locations for the building, trying to preserve the superintendent's house and as much of the landscape as possible. Mr. Cohen showed four options they considered as they attempted to fit the new building onto the site. A south, central entry did not work because they require a patient flow from one end of the building to the other. Also, it would be too far from the parking lot. A north entry did not work for flow reasons as well, and it



- also created conflicts between pedestrians and cars. They decided that the entrance needed to be on the west. Mr. Cohen explained that they then attempted to shift the building to the west by 50 feet to avoid the footprint of Lawnside, the historic building, but that created conflicts between pedestrians, drop-off and pick-up, and traffic because it places the intersections right at the bend in the existing driveway. Shifting the building west would also result in a loss of the landscape buffer, which is very important to the site. He stated that they want to maintain that allee of trees as much as possible to provide a buffer for the other historic buildings on campus.
- Mr. Farris pointed out the report by Heritage Consulting, which provides a development history of the campus, and includes a map that shows a number of demolitions that have happened since this property was listed in the Philadelphia Register. He stated that this campus has always evolved to meet the needs of modern medicine and patients, and there is a history of demolishing for the public interest here. The demolitions occurred to make room for parking lots and roads, and to provide lifesaving health care, which is a compelling public interest.
  - Mr. Cluver asked about the preferred site with the building shifted to the west to avoid Lawnside. He asked if the driveway to the health center could leave the main driveway at an angle to accommodate the shifted building.
    - o Mr. Cohen pointed out several safety, accessibility, and engineering problems with Mr. Cluver's proposal and concluded that it was not feasible. He stated that it would result in the loss of many more trees. He stated that it would also obstruct views of the main hospital building.
    - o Mr. Cluver then questioned the need for the small number of new parking spaces in the selected scheme.
  - Mr. Detwiler stated that he is very troubled that the presentation did not include images or any mention of the historic buildings on the site. He claimed that there has been no real consideration or conversation about the Lawnside house itself, or even the main building. He contended that the experience of this National Historic Landmark district is its approach starting with the gatehouse, driving down the allee of trees, where one catches views of the main building across the landscape. This application proposes to put a billboard of a structure on that land, completely shutting off the historic viewshed. He added that the new building will be very visible when the leaves are off the trees. Mr. Detwiler asserted that he is not convinced that the other alternatives are not viable. He stated that Lawnside as well as the viewshed must be preserved.
    - o Mr. Cohen disagreed with the claim that the historic buildings are not included in their application. He observed that the application includes photographs of the historic landscape and buildings as well as photographs and drawings of Lawnside. The application also includes a lengthy report of the history and development of all of the historic buildings on the campus.
    - o Mr. Cohen disagreed with Mr. Detwiler about the viewsheds on the campus, contending that the important viewsheds are the views from Roosevelt Boulevard to the main building and from curved section of the driveway to the main building. He stated that their intent is to design a background building that protects the important views.
    - o Regarding the alternative sites, Mr. Cohen stated that they have studied them extensively and have determined that the selected site is the only feasible site for numerous reasons including safety, landscape, accessibility, and viewsheds.

- o Mr. Farris added that the selected site has the advantage of being near the crosswalks and SEPTA stops. Neither can be relocated to the other end of the campus because of the dangerous curve in Roosevelt Boulevard.
- o Mr. Cohen added that Mr. Detwiler is not taking the size of the campus into account. He stated that it is very large and people using walkers and wheelchairs and people pushing strollers cannot traverse the entire campus easily. He concluded that a team of people has been studying the possible locations for years and has concluded that the selected site is the best site for many reasons.
- Ms. Stein commented that the selected site is very tight, very constricted, and very crowded. She suggested an alternate site and a taller building with a smaller footprint. She suggested demolishing a different building and reconfiguring the driveway.
  - o Commissioner Bettigole stated that three-story health centers do not work for many reasons. Many of the patients are not literate and many do not speak English. They get lost in complicated, taller buildings. Interpreters must be able to find them and keep track of them to assist them. Also, patients have a relatively high level of acuity and medical emergencies are common. The building needs to be able to be easily monitored and easily accessible in case of an emergency. Buildings taller than two stories do not work as health centers.
  - o Mr. Cohen explained the interior layout of the building and the flow of patients through the facility. He discussed security needs. The building's layout is very strictly dictated by the flow of patients from one station to the next.
  - o Mr. Cohen responded that the site suggested by Ms. Stein does not work for many reasons, primarily because it is too small and also because the grade is very steep down to a stream.
  - o Ms. Stein replied that this building should be constructed on an abandoned parking lot.
  - o Mr. Cohen responded that they are locating this building adjacent to an existing surface parking lot that has capacity.
- Mr. Detwiler objected to any project that requires the demolition of a building at a National Historic Landmark.
- Mr. Farris stated that the question before the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission is whether the demolition is necessary in the public interest. A balancing must occur because demolishing a historic structure is a significant request. The health center is going to provide lifesaving care. There is a pressing need for it, and after years of searching for alternative sites that work, the Department of Public Health has determined that this is the only site that works. The Historical Commission must decide which is the greater public interest, the preservation of Lawnside or the delivery of lifesaving health care. The question is whether the public good associated with critical health care outweighs the public cost of demolishing this building. Mr. Farris stated that the team has studied this in great detail, looked at every feasible alternative to demolition over multiple years, and determined that there is no other scheme that works.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that he sent a letter to the Historical Commission. He stated that the Friends Hospital site is a very important one. It is not only listed on the Philadelphia Register, but is also a National Historic Landmark district, which includes the landscape. Mr. Steinke asked why nothing has been done to stabilize Lawnside in the three years since the earlier application was reviewed.

He contended that putting this building on the great lawn will forever compromise the historic integrity of this National Historic Landmark district. He noted the efforts to protect the main lawn at the Naval Home. He questioned the safety of this site and asked how people will cross Roosevelt Boulevard to get to the site. He objected to the Heritage Consulting report, which he claimed tried to normalize demolition. He observed that all the new buildings that have been built at the site have been deferential to the main building. He stated that the public should get to see the evaluation of the 44 sites that were considered for this use. He added that the public should be able to understand the criteria that were employed to make the decision. He concluded that the public needs to know how this decision was made.

- Allison Weiss of the Southwestern Central Lower Germantown Civic Association opposed the application.

**ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Cluver and Ms. Stein offered and then withdrew a motion to recommend that the application had not shown that the demolition was necessary in the public interest.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the landscape within the main driveway is significant, and he objected to any new construction in that zone.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission designated Lawnside prior to the adoption of the revised historic preservation ordinance in 1984, but that designation is not documented and the buildings and features on the campus were not inventoried or classified according to significance.
- The building known as Lawnside is classified as contributing to the National Historic Landmark Friends Hospital district.
- The application claims that the demolition of the building known as Lawnside and the construction of the health center are necessary in the public interest.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application failed to demonstrate that the demolition of the building known as Lawnside and the construction of the health center are necessary in the public interest.

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

| <b>ITEM: 4641 E. Roosevelt Blvd.</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Detwiler</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Lukachik</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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                                                                                                                      | 4   | 1  |         | 1      | 1      |

Mr. D'Alessandro joined the Architectural Committee.

**ADDRESS: 220-60 S 33RD ST**

Proposal: Repair, renovate, and construct rear addition to the Morgan Building (Weitzman Hall)

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Ke Feng, Office of the University Architect

History: 1892; Foulke & Long Institute for Orphan Girls of Soldiers and Firemen; Morgan and Music Buildings, University of Pennsylvania; Cope & Stewardson, architects

Individual Designation: 10/11/1989

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:**

This application proposes to construct a four-story addition at the rear of Weitzman Hall at 220-60 S 33rd St, a three-story brick academic building with a hipped roof located on the University of Pennsylvania's campus. The building, historically called the Morgan Building, is individually designated on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The building was designed by architects Cope & Stewardson and constructed in 1892. It has been owned by the University since 1900 and is currently used as an academic building for the Fine Arts Department. The proposed addition will be four stories tall, and it will be aligned with the peak of the historic building's roof. The addition will be connected to the historic block by a mostly glass connector portion that will partially enclose the building's east façade, which will be restored and become an interior element to the overall building. Existing widow openings on the east façade will be modified to serve as doorways into the addition and a portion of the roof on the same elevation will be removed inside the connector space. The addition will be clad in grey brick and terra cotta. The addition will provide needed accessibility to the building, which it currently lacks. The application also proposes exterior restoration work to the historic building, which can be reviewed by the staff.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct a four-story addition on the east façade of the building.
- Alter the east façade window openings and roof to accommodate connection to the addition.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2023**

**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.*
  - o The proposed addition is differentiated from and compatible with the historic building in massing, size, scale, and most architectural features. While the proposed cladding materials of brick and terra cotta are appropriate, the colors of the materials of the addition may be too dark for the historic building and its red brick surroundings. The proposed addition would meet Standard 9 with an adjustment to the color.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - o The proposed new addition meets Standard 10. It can be easily removed if needed in the future without impairing the historic integrity of the property.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends approval, provided that the colors of the cladding materials are adjusted, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:08:45

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects and consultants Eva Lew, Ke Feng, Stephen Kieran, Adam Loughry, and Dominique Hawkins represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Lew introduced the project and explained how the new addition will provide the School of Design with critical new space.
- Mr. Kieran presented a summary of the design and intent behind the project. He described the site and surrounding buildings and highlighted an addition made to the adjacent, very similar Lerner Building in 2010, which was approved by the Historical Commission. He provided an overview of the materials and architectural details present on the Morgan Building and those proposed for the new addition and described their thematic connections. He mentioned the scope of preservation work and highlighted part of the plan to restore the original slate roof. He summarized how the new addition will reflect the proportions of the Morgan Building in the width of the bays and height of spandrels as well as the overhang of the roof. He addressed the connection point between the new addition and the historic block and described the entrances and walkways that will be used to access the space. He emphasized the use of brick and terracotta on the new addition and added that the color choices for the new materials were made to complement the historic building as well as other buildings in the same section of the campus, but not match it. He highlighted the project's objective to leave the four corners of the Morgan Building exposed and how the proposed glass connecting gallery allows many of the architectural details of the east façade of the building to be preserved. He added that the intent was to leave the south face of the building more exposed.

- Mr Cluver asked if the application included floor plans. Mr. McCoubrey answered that it does not. Both Commissioners added that plans would be useful to have to fully understand the project. Mr. Cluver also commented that there were no demolition plans included. The Committee expressed the opinion that these drawings were needed for a final review of an application and recommended that the applicants add them before their review by the Historical Commission.
  - o Mr. Kieran responded that they could add more drawings for the Historical Commission's review.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the lack of plans makes it difficult to ascertain the proposed changes to the northeast corner of the building and specifically how the project proposes to cut off the roof eave in that area.
  - o Mr. Culver added that the projecting stair on the north end is a bit antithetical to a preservation approach even if a small portion of the Morgan Building's corner is left exposed. He added that usually you want elements like this set back and not projecting outward.
  - o Mr. Kieran responded that the area on the north end of the building is not a proper walkway, but it is a small garden area that historically was not exposed, hence the reasoning behind having the stair projecting outward on the north end while leaving the south side of the connector set back to expose more of the historic building there.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the size of the stair enclosure looks to be overwhelming the historic character of the original building. She asked if there were thoughts to potentially reduce its size.
  - o Mr. Kieran responded that, since the space to build is so limited, they thought it was most important to add separation to the south end of the building facing Smith Walk, which is a major pedestrian passage on the campus. The area to the north is not used much.
  - o Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Detwiler both clarified that they are asking if it was possible to cut down the height of the stair, not necessarily pull it inward. Mr. Detwiler added that the major feature of the wraparound overhanging roof eave on the Morgan Building will be cut off by the stairway, which is awkward.
  - o Ms. Lukachik commented that she would like to see the connector space continued through the whole width of the building so that the eave is not chopped off, to allow the historic building to stand apart.
  - o Mr. Kiernan responded that the stair landings will not allow them to cut the stairway back to allow for the overhang of the roof eave and still be able to access all the floors of the building. He did admit that it does not need to be quite as tall as it is currently proposed, though. He added that the space is very tight and there is not a lot of room for adjustments.
  - o Mr. Detwiler asked if it was possible to move the entire mass of the stairs three or four feet over.
  - o Mr. Kiernan explained that they are already very close to the adjoining walkway and there is not much room to move things without eliminating the buffer between the building and sidewalk.
  - o Mr. Detwiler asked if it could be moved inward instead of laterally as it is in the Lerner Center building.
  - o Mr. Kiernan responded that doing this would reduce floor area too much and the buildings are already smaller than would be ideal for their intended uses as they are currently proposed. Doing so would likely make the project too small to be justifiably done. He added that their aim is not to align the addition exactly with

- the Morgan Building. They are emphasizing a significant setback on the south side and are prioritizing that side of the building partially because the space at north end was never meant to be experienced by viewers.
- o Mr. McCoubrey commented that the space on the north end of the building is intended to be used for relaxing or sitting and asked if the stairs cannot be altered at the upper level and set back to allow the cornice and eave to remain intact.
  - o Mr. Kiernan responded that they certainly have looked at this, but that they are trying to meet all the floor elevations of the Morgan Building to make it accessible to the new addition.
  - o Mr. McCoubrey clarified that he is only talking about the top run of the stairs, and he sees space in the design to potentially move this to accommodate the eave. Mr. Kiernan agreed to take a second look at it, but he is unsure that doing this would create enough space.
  - o Mr. Cluver added that the stairway will also draw attention to itself based on its proposed position, especially when illuminated at night.
  - o Mr. Kiernan commented that the extra space around the stairway also allows for interesting views along the Morgan Building from within the new addition.
  - Ms. Stein commented that she is in support of the overall form and massing of the addition as well as the architectural qualities of it. She stated that she does not object to the stairway position either and even thinks that when illuminated at night it might be a nice way to highlight the adjacent courtyard. She added that the offsets are more fluid than the addition on the Lerner Center. She asked about the presence of mechanical equipment on the roof and whether that would be visible at all.
    - o Mr. Kiernan agreed that they do not want the mechanicals visible on the roof either.
    - o Mr. Loughry stepped in to explain that the main mechanical equipment for the building is located in the basement and there will only be smaller equipment situated on the roof. They believe they can fit all that roof equipment within a three-to-four-foot-tall mechanical screen.
    - o Ms. Stein asked for confirmation that nothing is visible from the surrounding public walkways. Mr. Loughry assured her that she was correct, and they have repeatedly studied sightlines as the mechanical equipment has been selected for the project. He did add that the screen itself may be visible from some vantage points, but the equipment will not be.
  - Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants could speak again about the color choices of the materials on the new addition.
    - o Mr. Kiernan replied that there is a lot of variation of colors in the building across Smith Walk from the project buildings. They are looking to use a long format contemporary style brick with similar color variations and tonality to the early twentieth-century brick around it. The terracotta on the addition will be selected in a color that sits within that same range. The metals used will be a warm brown-gray color that will not reflect sunlight. It is like the grey color under the eaves and on the soffit of the Morgan Building.
    - o Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the size of the face of the new brick should be close to the original and not thinner than the old brick. The length may be fine, but he does not think skinny bricks would be appropriate.
    - o Mr. Kieran responded that they do not want to match the Morgan Building and do want to set the new materials apart from the old in some ways. The exact bricks and other materials are still being decided upon.

- o Mr. D'Alessandro clarified that his first comment was his preference and not a requirement.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to briefly discuss the scope of restoration work.
  - o Ms. Hawkins responded by summarizing the list of restoration work. They will replace the existing roof with a new slate roof, maintain the chimneys, restore the cornice, repair all the masonry, brick, and terracotta. She explained that they are speaking with a terracotta manufacturer to try to duplicate the original designs. They will restore the foundations and the windows will be replaced with double-glazed units. She added that they are working to duplicate the profiles of the frames and especially the brickmolds.
  - o Ms. Stein asked what material they will be using for the new windows.
  - o Ms. Hawkins replied that the intent is to install aluminum clad double-glazed windows.
- Mr. Cluver commented on the overall size of the addition and how it is larger in almost all dimensions than the original building. Typically, the Committee would not recommend approval of an addition of this size and scale. He particularly highlighted the overbuild on the roof granting access between the new addition and the attic of the Morgan Building.
  - o Mr. Kieran responded that since so much space in the addition is necessarily taken up by needed accessible features like elevators and mechanicals, that at some point, shrinking the addition does not leave enough space for the people who use the building. The School of Design would like even more space than this and the current design only minimally achieves their goals. If a floor was removed, the addition likely would not remain a viable project. He added that the distinction of its design, in that it does not look exactly like the Morgan Building, enhances the relationship between the two rather than takes away from it.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that this is such a great site at the heart of the campus, and he understands the need to maximize its use. There have been other cases where the Committee has recommended approval of rear wing additions that are taller than the fronts. He thinks the care shown in the interface between the old and new buildings on the south side makes this project work. His concerns lie in the north side. In looking at the renderings, he thinks the building looks a bit gray and dull. He added that this part of campus is really heavy on red brick buildings. He specifically pointed out that the “dusk” rendering at the beginning of the application makes some of the panels on the addition look like they have a reddish tone. He appreciates the design trying to set the addition apart, but also thinks that the material can be made more analogous in color and urged the applicant to think more about that.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the cover sheet really does display a warmth that is not present in the other renderings. He is not opposed to the grey color, but when too much of it is present it makes the addition look too severe. He added that color and mockups are important and that the staff should be involved in that review process.
- Ms. Lukachik returned to the issue of the roof eave being cut off by the addition at the northeast corner of the Morgan Building. The abruptness with which it is cut off reads as a bad juxtaposition between the old building and new addition. It would be preferable if they were able to introduce a more deferential gasket that would allow that roof to continue. She posited that if the addition was modified or even extended in height it may not feel like they were trying to force the two spaces to work so closely together.
  - o Mr. Kieran responded that compromises had to be made while designing and they decided to make them in the least visible corner of the building. They will



look again at the stair, but also added that it is part of the fire egress requirements for the building and there are many constraints.

- o Mr. Detwiler interjected that there is indeed a lot of space above the top run of the stairs that could be reduced.
- o Mr. Kieran responded that they did look at an echeloned option where the stair stepped up to make room for the Morgan Building's cornice but that the design was very fussy and drew more attention to the area and not less. He added that they do think the current proposal is the best resolution in this circumstance, but that they will look at the design again for ways in which they could modify the top of the stairs.
- The Committee urged the applicant to make changes based on their comments and add supplementary plans to the application before their presentation at the Historical Commission meeting in July.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The overall form and massing of the proposed addition is generally compatible with the historic building and other surrounding campus buildings.
- The proposed new addition will necessitate cutting off a portion of the overhanging roof eave on the historic building at its northeast corner.
- The proposed colors of the new materials on the addition appear to be too dark and monochromatic and do not fit in well with the historic building.
- The application fails to include plans and demolition drawings. Additional plans and demolition drawings should be included for a final review.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9 in that the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the addition are compatible with the historic building.
- The application fails to satisfy Standards 2 and 9 in that cutting off a portion of the distinctive overhanging roof eave on the historic building's northeast corner will negatively affect a character defining feature of the building.
- The application satisfies Standard 10 in that the new addition could be easily removed in the future without impairing the overall form and integrity of the historic building.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

| <b>ITEM: 220-60 S. 33<sup>rd</sup> St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Lukachik</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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: 229 ARCH ST**

Proposal: Add mural on west-facing stucco wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Berger Development LP

Applicant: Ricky Yanas, Mural Arts Philadelphia

History: 1913; Berger Brothers Company; Valentine B. Lee, architect; expanded, 1918

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003

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

**OVERVIEW:**

This application proposes to install a mural on the west facing stucco wall of the building at 229 Arch Street, a five-story masonry commercial building that is listed as a contributing resource to the Old City Historic District. The west facing wall of the building was originally a covered party wall that was exposed, owing to the demolition of the adjacent building sometime after 1962. It is now finished in white stucco and faces the historic Betsy Ross house. The project proposed to repair some limited areas of damaged stucco on the wall and then install a mural designed by artist Russell Craig, which will address the theme of the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the US Constitution. The mural will be pre-painted on parachute cloth or a similar material and then installed on the wall.

According to Section 6.15 of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations:

6.15.a.2 Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.

6.15.a.3 Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.

6.15.a.4 The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees, and staff shall not consider a mural's content as a part of its review of any application for a building permit, but may consider size, scale, and relationship to the historic context.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Repair stucco on side wall;
- Install mural.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2023**

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

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

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.*
  - o The mural is proposed for an unadorned stucco, former party wall, which was not historically exposed or finished and will be painted onto cloth that will be adhered to the wall, satisfying Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a.2 of the Rules and Regulations.
  - o The proposed location of the mural would not alter or obscure any historic fabric, satisfying Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a.3 of the Rules and Regulations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.15 of the Rules and Regulations.

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

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Phoebe Bachman and Ricky Yanas of Mural Arts represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Cluver asked if the application included imagery of what the mural will look like.
  - o Mr. Till responded that it was his understanding that the Committee was not permitted to comment on the content of the mural.
  - o Mr. Cluver emphasized that the Committee is allowed to comment on the size, scale, and context of the mural.
- Ms. Bachman presented a summary of the project to the Committee. She emphasized the theme of the mural centered on the 13<sup>th</sup> amendment to the Constitution. She added that they do not currently have a rendering to share and are still working with the artist on the design. They are happy to talk through the process of installing the mural and the importance of the site.
  - o Mr. Cluver further emphasized that the Committee is concerned with the size, scale, and relationship of the mural to its surroundings and not its content. He commented that in the past, the Committee has been shown the proposed appearance of murals.
  - o Mr. Farnham responded that the mural review process is the same as it has been for the recent past. He clarified that there is no requirement for the applicant to submit a representation of the mural itself and noted that the last two mural reviews, which were approved by the Historical Commission and recommended for approval by the Architectural Committee did not include representations of the mural. He added that the Historical Commission's ad hoc Mural Committee of approximately 15 years ago emphasized that mural reviews are to focus on the location on the building and the mural's impact on historic fabric. It was the staff's position in this case that the mural will be located on a former party wall and not affect the historic fabric of the building. He stated that he advised the applicants that they did not need to submit a representation of the mural.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if they would be able to see exactly where the mural would be located and how far it will be from the top and side edges of the building. He is

concerned that if it is too close to the top of the wall, it could negatively affect the building.

- o Ms. Bachman clarified that there is a highlighted area on a photograph included in the application that outlines the proposed position of the mural. It will extend to the top and side edges.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro expressed his opinion that the proposed area was too large. He specifically pointed out that the thickness of the brick will be smaller at the top of the party wall and there could be structural issues with affixing the mural at the top. He recommended setting it back from the top edge and corner by at least two feet and also to give space at the edges of the windows.
- o Ms. Bachman answered that they usually install murals that extend to the edges of the walls.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro further emphasized that the topmost portion of the wall is a structurally weak area. Since it was a party wall, it was not originally built to be as solid as a front façade.
- o Ms. Gutterman disagreed with Mr. D'Alessandro and commented that the cloth would have little weight and will be glued to the masonry. She wondered how it would respond to moisture.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro emphasized that the mural should be placed at least a few feet down from the top coping.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the offset area in the wall with a light fixture installed over it and how the applicants plan to install around this.
  - o Ms. Bachman responded that they will cutout areas of the mural around the light fixture. There is also a little damage to the stucco at this offset and they will have that repaired. The offset itself does not impact their installation. The cloth will go over it without anticipated issues.
  - o Ms. Gutterman added that it is difficult to know how they would be able to adjust their image if they needed to stay above the line of the offset. Are they able to shrink their design if needed.
  - o Mr. Yanas responded that the artist is currently planning a mural for the proposed area and the design is still being developed.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the scale of the mural and its relationship to the neighborhood. He stated that the proposed size of the mural is larger than the Betsy Ross house located immediately adjacent to it. He is concerned that the mural will overshadow the neighborhood. The design of it may impact how the scale appears depending on its aesthetic choices. The proposed size appears too large to him in the context of the area around it.
  - o Ms. Stein agreed. She added that the color choices for the design could easily overwhelm the viewshed of the area around it if they are too bold. It is difficult to comment on its appropriateness without knowing about its appearance.
  - o Mr. Detwiler added that there are large murals around 23<sup>rd</sup> or 24<sup>th</sup> streets and Walnut or Locust streets near the Schuylkill River. Some of them even look like they are part of the buildings they are installed on. These are easier to blend in with the size of the buildings around them. He emphasized that the proposed size is too large for its context.
  - o Mr. D'Alessandro added that he does not think it should extend above the façade's overhang. As is, it is actually taller than the front façade.
  - o Mr. Detwiler noted the ghost signage on buildings in Old City in similar locations as this proposed mural. He suggested that the bottom of the mural could be

- located just above the bump-out and then the edges could be brought in based on Mr. D'Alessandro's comments.
- o Ms. Stein commented that it could also be altered to be only one story tall at the courtyard level, since there is a small courtyard adjacent to this building and the mural could enrich that space.
  - o Mr. Detwiler commented that traffic on Arch Street runs west, so this mural will be more visible for pedestrians. He questioned why it needs to be so large since it will not be seen from automobiles. The courtyard could really be enlivened by a mural in the lower area.
  - Ms. Bachman expressed appreciation for all the suggestions made by the Architectural Committee. She explained that the large scale is part of the aesthetic. There seem to be worries about how the final appearance will impact the neighborhood. She added that they are paying attention to the surroundings and working with the property owner, who has final approval of the design. She agreed that it is hard to judge fully without seeing imagery of the design and is not sure what the best way forward is to change the scale or how that might affect future recommendations.
  - Ms. Stein asked if they already have approval from the Art Commission.
    - o Ms. Bachman answered that they are seeking the Historical Commission's approval first.
  - Mr. McCoubrey asked who owns the wall and does this ownership change in the area where it steps out.
    - o Mr. Farnham clarified that the wall is entirely owned by the building owner and the property line extends all the way over to the Betsy Ross House across the courtyard entryway.
  - Mr. Cluver expressed nervousness about offering a recommendation final approval for a design that they have not seen. He thought the Committee could potentially turn this into an in-concept review and thought that they should be able to weigh in not on the content of the design, but on the overall aesthetic impact it has on the historic resources around it.
    - o It was again noted that the last two murals reviewed by the Historical Commission were approved without any image or representation of the artwork.
  - Ms. Lukachik asked if the Art Commission would look at the content and context and does the Historical Commission need to look at those aspects.
    - o Ms. Bachman answered that the Art Commission would consider context and content.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro explained that the mural should not be as large as proposed and should be pulled back from the edges. The fastening method is unknown, and they need to leave more of a return at the face of the original building and space around the top and windows.
    - o Ms. Lukachik corrected Mr. D'Alessandro and stated that the attachment method is documented in the application. The mural will be painted on parachute cloth, which will be adhered to the party wall.
    - o Ms. Bachman clarified that their process for installation involves priming the wall, and then using parachute cloth with a glue called Novagel to adhere it to the wall and then they do a final sealing. They have not had issues with moisture on any previous large murals installed this way.
    - o Ms. Lukachick asked how long the mural usually lasts.
    - o Ms. Bachman replied that most previous examples have lasted 15 to 20 years. They also have used newer technology since then with better UV protection.

- Mr. Detwiler asked if, in future submissions, they could include information on the treatment of the edges.
  - o Ms. Lukachuik added that she would also want to see some deference made to the façade of the building and pull the mural back from the edges.
- Mr. Detwiler added that he does not object to this location, but the size, especially relative to the Betsy Ross House, is too large and would be out of character with the neighborhood.
  - o Ms. Stein agreed.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the Betsy Ross housed has weighed in on this yet.
  - o Ms. Bachman responded that they have not reached out to them yet but will be happy to do so.
- The Committee members further emphasized that the scale is too large particularly in relation to the Betsy Ross house.
  - o Mr. McCoubrey added that he thinks that some kind of mural may work at the proposed size, but it would depend on the design, which they have not seen.
  - o Ms. Bachman described the artist's general design approach as based on black and white photographs. The graphics will not be too large.
  - o Mr. Detwiler added that they would not comment on the substance of the design but knowing what it will look like in even a sketched format would give them a better idea of if it needs to be scaled back and how.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society, commented that given the location, it is important for the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission to weigh in on scale and size and perhaps even style. It is located in a nationally significant part of the city that people travel to from all over the world. It is critical that that be taken into consideration. This location is even more focused on historic properties than other areas of the city and the mural should account for that.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application does not include any representation of the design or artwork of the mural, but one is needed to accurately judge the scale, size, and context of it in Old City.
- The edges of the mural should be pulled back from the top and corner of the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies section 6.15.a of the Rules and Regulations. It will not be placed directly on historic fabric or in a manner that obscures historic fabric.

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

| <b>ITEM: 229 Arch St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Stein</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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: 76 E LOGAN ST**

Proposal: Remove rear addition and construct new rear addition and residential building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Haverford Square by Metropolitan 5, LLC

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Dilworth Paxson LP

History: c. 1860, enlarged c. 1880

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: E. Logan Street Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2010

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

**OVERVIEW:**

This application proposes to demolish a rear addition, construct a new rear addition, and construct a multifamily residential building in the rear yard as this property is redeveloped. The house was constructed between 1851 and 1871 and then significantly remodeled and enlarged between 1871 and 1889. This application proposes to remove the rear addition and replace it with a new rear addition. The front portion of the historic building would be restored. The building is currently vacant and in poor condition and the rear sections of the building are in especially poor condition. The application also proposes to construct a multifamily residential building in the rear yard. A new parking lot for the development would be located at the rear and accessed from Stenton Avenue. The East Logan Street Historic District includes significance under Criterion I for archaeology, but the new rear addition proposed replaces an older addition, and the proposed building is slab on grade. The staff supports this application with some revisions because the historic building is in very poor condition and may be lost without a significant investment in the property, which will be supported by the income from the new building. The economics of properties in this location differ significantly from the economics of designated properties in other parts of the city. Some compromises may need to be made to save this deteriorated historic building.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Remove rear addition and construct new rear addition;
- Construct multifamily residential building.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2023**

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

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

- *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.*
  - o The extant rear addition is in very poor condition and is not conspicuously visible from the public right-of-way. It does not characterize the property. Its removal satisfies Standard 9.
  - o The proposed rear addition is compatible with the historic building and district, with the exception of the large pilot house, which should be reduced in size. The addition will satisfy Standard 9 if the pilot house is reduced in size.
  - o The proposed multifamily building does not satisfy Standard 9. It should be reduced in size and scale and the cladding material should be simplified and adjusted to be more compatible with the historic district to satisfy Standard 9.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends approval, provided the pilot house on the proposed rear addition is reduced in size, and proposed residential building is reduced in size and scale and the cladding material is simplified and adjusted to be more compatible with the historic district, with the staff to review details including the restoration details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:25:50**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Neil Sklaroff and developer German Yakubov represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Yakubov explained the poor condition of the existing building, due in part to a fire and a prior owner who did not maintain the building.
- Ms. Stein stated that the proposed building would overwhelm the historic building. She noted that the application is lacking context photographs. She asked if the developer had completed similar projects.
  - o Mr. Yakubov responded that he completed a very similar project for a historic property at 862 N. 41<sup>st</sup> Street project.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the proposed building is over-massed for the site. She agreed that context photographs are needed.
  - o Mr. Yakubov noted that there are woods at the rear of the property which would limit views of the proposed building from Stenton Avenue.
  - o Mr. Cluver noted that the overall context of the historic district is two-and-a-half and three-story residential buildings.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that no other properties in this historic district have this type of development at the rear.
  - o Mr. Sklaroff noted that there was a garage at the rear. He stated that this community needs capital improvement.
  - o Mr. Yakubov noted that this property is twice as large as those near it, which lends itself to this type of sensitive development.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the proposed building does not respect the historic context and is too “blocky.”
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the proposed building is a giant rectangle with bays stuck on it. He stated that this is a street of grand homes, and even though the



neighborhood is changing, this scale does not fit. He stated that the proposed building will be very visible from the street.

- o Mr. Yakubov responded that much of the proposed building will not be seen from either the front or rear street. He stated that the proposed building would sit approximately 100 feet off E. Logan Street and approximately 100 feet off Stenton Avenue. He noted that the renderings do not show the existing woods at the rear or trees at the front which block views of the rear area.
- Ms. Stein asked if the historic rear ell has already been removed.
  - o Mr. Yakubov responded that the prior owner may have removed some of the historic rear addition owing to fire damage.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the proposed pilot house on the historic building would cut into the mansard roof. He stated that the top floor of the proposed building would be too tall. He suggested removing one story from the proposed building.
  - o Mr. Detwiler agreed and suggested that a railing be used instead of a parapet if needed for a roof deck. He asked if both pilot houses are necessary on the proposed building.
  - o Mr. Sklaroff responded that the top floor of the proposed building appears tall owing to the parapet.
  - o Ms. Stein stated that two pilot houses on the proposed building are not required because no roof deck is proposed.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the details of the historic building restoration and proposed materials.
  - o Mr. Yakubov responded that he would work with the staff to review details for the restoration scope, as this is able to be reviewed by the Historical Commission's staff.
  - o Mr. Sklaroff agreed that typically the staff reviews restoration details. He stated that the elevations will be redrawn to make clear the materials and details.
  - o Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee must be informed of the entire scope, and that the applicant should not circumvent the Committee by planning to work with the staff on the restoration scope.
  - o Mr. Yakubov responded that he is not meaning to circumvent the Architectural Committee's review, but rather he intended to work with the staff to review the scope which falls under its review authority.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the application reads like an in-concept application based on the material provided.
- Mr. Cluver asked about accessibility for the historic building, noting that the drawings show the leasing office in the historic building.
  - o Mr. Yakubov responded that there will be accessible units in the proposed building, and that the leasing office will be located in the proposed building despite what the drawings show.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, commented in support of the application. He thanked the developer for taking on this near ruin of a building which a prior owner allowed to fall into disrepair. He commented that it is good that the rear building is oriented to Stenton Avenue, not E. Logan Street.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented generally in support of the application, but suggested that the applicant return to the Architectural Committee with a more complete application. He commented in support of increased density in general and that this project will result in a restored historic building.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building is currently vacant and in poor condition and the rear sections of the building are in especially poor condition. Some parts of the rear addition were removed by a prior owner owing to fire damage.
- The proposed building at the rear will be associated with Stenton Avenue rather than E. Logan Street.
- The application lacks context photographs and information about the restoration scope.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed rear addition on the historic building would be compatible with the historic building and district, with the exception of the large pilot house and its intersection with the mansard. The addition will satisfy Standard 9 if the pilot house is reduced in size and the intersection with the mansard is reconsidered.
- The proposed multifamily building at the rear does not satisfy Standard 9. It should be reduced in size and scale and the cladding material should be simplified and adjusted to be more compatible with the historic district to satisfy Standard 9.

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

| <b>ITEM: 76 E. Logan St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Gutterman</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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: 4432, 4436-42, 4400R, AND 4436R MAIN ST**

Proposal: Construct mixed-use residential and commercial buildings and bridge

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rock Venice, LLC

Applicant: Jerry Roller, JKRP Architects

History: Vacant lots and non-historic building

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/14/1983

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes demolishing non-contributing buildings on four parcels and constructing a new large-scale development with frontage on Main Street as well as Venice Island. The new construction on Main Street would be two-stories in height and clad in white brick with large-scale storefront windows. A dark metal and glass bridge would span the drive aisle to the island. On Venice Island, a five-story 189-unit residential development with ground-level parking is proposed. The buildings would be clad in vertical and horizontal corrugated metal with terra cotta colored metal accents above an elevated ground-floor set on pedestals. A pedestrian bridge would connect the buildings on Venice Island and Main Street at the second level. Historically, a large mill complex known as Ripka Mills occupied this stretch of Venice Island.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct two-story building on Main Street
- Construct five-story buildings on Venice Island

**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.*
  - o The proposed construction would not destroy historic materials and the proposed buildings are differentiated from the old. Along Main Street, the height, massing, scale, and features are compatible with the district, as is the use of brick. The district is characterized by terra-cotta-colored brick, natural stone, and light-colored stucco facades. The proposed white brick is not common to the district. The scale, massing, features, and materials of the proposed construction on Venice Island construction are not compatible with the historic district. The application partially meets Standard 9.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the new construction along Main Street, provided the color of brick is compatible with the historic district, but denial of the construction on Venice Island, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 02:58:22

**PRESENTERS:**

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2023**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, [PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV](mailto:PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV)**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

- Attorney Stephanie Boggs Magagna and architect Jerry Roller represented the application.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Roller explained that they have been working on the project for about one and one-half years. He noted that they reached out to the Historical Commission's staff in September 2022, and were under the impression that the scale and scope on Venice Island was generally acceptable, but that there were questions on massing and details. He directed attention to the historic Sanborn maps showing the mill complex that was on Venice Island historically, which included dense development of four to five stories in height. He commented that they are trying to do something that is similar in scale to what was on the site historically and are also using punched windows like there were historically. He noted that they are not trying to replicate masonry industrial buildings, but feel the design is appropriate. He also noted that the design is similar to buildings immediately to the south that were built about five years ago, which are all elevated owing to the location in the floodplain. He opined that the proposed building on Main Street is an appropriate scale and noted that staff had raised concerns about the color previously, expressing a desire for something more traditional and compatible with the district. He noted that the buildings it is replacing were white stucco, and that they have incorporated corbels and piers for a somewhat more traditional approach. He reiterated that he believes white is a better color to differentiate it from the context and make it look more contemporary but commented that color is not a deal-breaker for them. He noted that they propose to use clay brick, not concrete brick. He explained that the application has been through Civic Design Review at length and gone through multiple iterations and been refined. He opined that it would be a good addition to Main Street and Venice Island, taking a vacant parking lot and unattractive buildings on Main Street and making them good citizens.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the staff recommendation.
  - o Ms. DiPasquale responded that the materials and features were the biggest issues for the staff.
- Mr. Cluver noted that he has qualms about building on Venice Island that are not related to historic preservation, but that otherwise he is not too concerned with the massing of proposed buildings, which are set away from Main Street.
- Ms. Stein commented that her biggest issue with the proposed Venice Island design is that it crowds the bridge. In looking at the historic aerial photographs, she noted that the mill buildings stepped down and had 50 feet or so between the building and the bridge. She opined that the proximity affects the viewshed of the Manayunk bridge in a non-compatible way and suggested pulling back from bridge.
  - o Mr. Detwiler agreed, noting that the stair tower also pops up right next to the bridge. He noted that he is not opposed to development on the site but opined that the relationship to the bridge is problematic and suggested pulling it back.
  - o Mr. Roller responded that the building itself is shorter than the bridge, but that they could move the stair tower.
  - o Mr. Detwiler asked how close the building is to the bridge.
  - o Mr. Roller responded that it is less than 10 feet to the right-of-way of the bridge, but that the bridge sits within the right-of-way. He reiterated that they could pull the stair tower away from the bridge.
  - o Mr. Detwiler responded that the setbacks overall, not just the stair tower, would have to increase significantly, potentially eliminating a few residential units.

- o Mr. Roller presented the historic 1907 birds' eye view and commented that the buildings looked close to bridge.
- o Mr. Detwiler responded that the Manayunk bridge is iconic.
- o Mr. Roller commented that the rendering on Slide 28 shows that the building is slightly shorter than bridge, but agreed that they can look at stepping down in some way. He noted that at one point they thought they might want to make a connection to the bridge but have determined that is not a good idea.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the use inside of the second-floor bridge over the driveway on the Main Street building.
  - o Mr. Roller responded that the second floor is used as an amenity and services space for the residents in the units on Venice Island.
  - o Mr. Detwiler opined that the exterior of the bridge needs more detail, and that it currently looks like solid slabs. He expressed concern over all of the light that would come from the second floor onto Main Street, which is very much a street of punched openings.
- Mr. Detwiler took issue with the lack of division of the second-floor window on the stair tower portion of the Main Street building, as well as the use of a colored metal surround around the window.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the applicants did not choose red brick.
  - o Mr. Roller responded that they believe the design looks better in a more modern brick.
  - o Mr. Detwiler opined that it would be better in red brick, as much of Main Street is red brick, although some have been painted.
  - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that the design can still be modern and red brick.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the bridge is such a large feature, and questioned whether the use of masonry extending across the drive would be more appropriate and offer more continuity.
  - o Mr. Detwiler commented that he had been wrestling with that question as well. He noted that there are bridges around Manayunk and thinks the bridge could work if it had more character and was detailed in a contemporary way with shadow lines that is more refined and does not look like a mall walkway.
  - o Mr. Roller responded that his team looked at numerous iterations of the Main Street elevation, including spanning the drive in brick, but that because the opening is 30 feet wide, the span looks incongruous in masonry and they felt more comfortable detailing it in a bridge-like fashion. He agreed that they could look into enhancing the design with greater detail. He noted that the bridge span also helps separate the retail and residential entrances.
- Mr. Cluver objected to the width of the driveway, noting that at 31 feet wide, it is likely wider than most streets that intersect Main Street, and that the scale feels off. He asked whether there was any way to bring down the scale to be more consistent with other streets that open onto Main Street.
  - o Mr. Roller responded that the existing bridge is 13 feet wide, but is only one-way, and given the scale of the development proposed on Venice Island, they feel it needs to be two-way traffic, which would require a 24-foot-wide drive, plus a sidewalk for pedestrians.
  - o Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver that it is an expansive opening and questioned whether the portion of the building on the left could be extended to include a walkway and pass-through.

- o Mr. Roller responded that he thinks that looks less inviting, noting that the walkway is intended to provide public access to the riverwalk, and if the walkway was incorporated into the building, it might look like the public is not invited.
- o Ms. Lukachik asked whether the way they intend to keep pedestrians safe on the sidewalk without bollards.
- o Mr. Roller responded that they have not fully explored the walkway design yet.
- o Ms. Lukachik agreed with Mr. Cluver and Mr. Detwiler and suggested that they could make an archway for the pedestrians through the building and make a safer walkway separated from the traffic.
- o Mr. Roller argued that if the sidewalk is separate from the road, it will not look inviting to the public.
- o Ms. Lukachik disagreed. She opined that it could be inviting, depending on how it is treated, and that by separating the two, it would not feel like pedestrians are walking into a parking garage.
- o Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Detwiler agreed that separation would make pedestrians feel more comfortable than walking in traffic.
- o Mr. Roller responded that they could look into that question, as they want the walkway to be inviting and pedestrian friendly.
- o Ms. Stein asked whether it would be a publicly accessible bridge, so anyone could drive on it, and then whether they would turn around in the parking garage under the buildings.
- o Mr. Roller responded affirmatively, noting that the bridge would provide public access by foot and bike to the riverwalk, and that the parking would be limited to residents, but that gating off the drive would be untenable.
- o Ms. Stein noted that visibility will be challenging between the bridge and Main Street, and that while it is a nice idea from an urbanist standpoint, there may be issues with pedestrian and bike flow.
- o Mr. Roller agreed and noted that there may be a need to control vehicular traffic further back.
- o Mr. Roller noted that they are beholden to the Commonwealth and Army Corps in terms of what they will accept for a bridge.
- o Mr. Detwiler referred to the rendering on Page 26 showing a view of the bridge with concrete barriers and bollards, noting that it is a very auto-centric design. He suggested that it needs a creative redesign that might not be terribly complex but could make it more attractive and safer.
- o Ms. Stein suggested that the bridge have open railings and different paving for the roadway.
- o Mr. Roller responded that the design is a placeholder. He referenced the Cotton Street Bridge, which has lower concrete walls with railings on top, and agreed to look at how to improve the pedestrian separation.
- o Mr. McCoubrey noted that there is an effort to maintain navigability in the canal and commented that there may be clearance height requirements.
- o Mr. Roller responded that they are quite aware of that and are looking at the Cotton Street Bridge which is a culvert bridge. He explained that since they have the trail on the northwest side and railroad on other side and those points need to be connected, they do not have much of an option for raising the bridge.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the scale of the windows along Main Street feels just a bit out of proportion, 10% to 20% too large, compared to the context along Main Street.
  - o Mr. Roller argued that the ground-floor windows need to be as large as proposed to attract retail customers. He explained that the height of the upper floor is

predicated on the connector bridge and firetruck height but agreed to look at the height of the second-floor windows.

- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the comments on the design of the Venice Island portion of the project have been fairly limited to the proximity to the Manayunk bridge, and that the cladding has not been discussed. He noted that he does not object to the cladding, as it is removed from Main Street.
- Mr. Roller asked whether the suggestions made at the meeting should be addressed in advance of the Historical Commission meeting or if the design should be reviewed a second time by the Architectural Committee.
  - o The Architectural Committee members opined that they should review the proposal again.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society agreed with the staff recommendation. He opined that, while perhaps not contextual, the Main Street building adds a good blend of old and new, but the new buildings on Venice Island are alien to anything in the district, and not related to the historic buildings on the site other than in scale. He commented that the other large new buildings on Venice Island are aesthetic intrusions, overwhelming and ugly, and not a good precedent. He argued that if massive boxes are going to be built, they should be of quality materials and design.

#### **ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The overall design of both the Main Street and Venice Island new construction is appropriate for the district, but details of both need additional consideration.
- The proposed Venice Island building is too close to the railroad bridge and blocks iconic views. The building should be stepped down or pulled away from the bridge.
- The bridge spanning the drive aisle on the Main Street building needs to be enhanced with greater detail.
- The drive aisle is too wide and vehicle-centric. The applicants should consider how to reduce the width of the drive and to enhance the pedestrian experience and safety. Additional consideration should also be given to the paving and guardrails of the bridge, for example through the use of open railings and different paving.
- The scale of the windows on the Main Street façade are overly large and should be scaled down 10% to 20%.
- The second-floor window on the residential entrance portion of the Main Street building is overly large and blank, and the colored enamel surround is inconsistent with the scale and features of the historic district.
- Red brick would be more compatible with the historic district than white brick.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed construction would not destroy historic materials but would block iconic views of the historic railroad bridge, failing to protect the historic integrity of the property's environment, and failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- The scale and features of the Main Street bridge, windows, and drive aisle, as well as the brick color, are overly differentiated from the historic district, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2023**

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

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

| <b>ITEM: 4432, 4436-42, 4400R, and 4436R Main St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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   |    |         |        |        |

Ms. Lukachik and Ms. Gutterman left the meeting.

**ADDRESS: 2025 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Patrick Keenan and Mary Schaheen

Applicant: Brett Hand, Brett Hand Architect

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

**OVERVIEW:**

This application proposes to complete a roof deck and pilot house at the rear of the main block of this four-story rowhouse. The Historical Commission approved a substantially different roof deck and pilot house plan for the property in 2009 that would not have been visible from either the front or rear facades. In May 2019 and August 2020, the Historical Commission staff reviewed and approved work to the property that included alterations to the second-floor rear. No roof deck or pilot house were included on either of those permits. The work shown in the current submission below the roof level was part of that previous application.

In December 2020, the applicants submitted an amendment to the permit requesting construction of a roof deck and pilot house. The Department of Licenses and Inspections asked for additional information and revisions to that application. The revisions were not forwarded to the Historical Commission for review and the permit amendment was never issued. Nevertheless, a pilot house was partially constructed on the rear roof by December 2021.

This application proposes to complete the unfinished pilot house and construct an adjoining deck. The existing partially completed pilot house, which is clad in beige stucco, is shown on the plans as set back approximately 3 feet 9 inches from the rear façade. The new railing would align with the rear edge of the pilot house. The pilot house and deck would not be visible from



Delancey Place but are and would be visible from Cypress Street.

The roof plan on A1.1 also shows steel beams for an AC platform to straddle the rear chimney, but no units are shown in elevation.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Complete partially constructed pilot house
- Construct roof deck

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *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.*
  - o The constructed pilot house and proposed roof deck are and will be visible from Cypress Street, a public right-of-way. If the elevator extension was eliminated and the pilot house limited to the stair tower portion, visibility would be reduced and the deck and pilot house could be inconspicuous. Elimination of the roof overhang and use of a darker color cladding material may also help to reduce the conspicuousness of the pilot house and deck.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the conspicuousness of the pilot house is reduced through the elimination of the elevator overrun and/or overhanging roof; the deck railing is pulled back so that it is immediately adjacent to the pilot house door; the cladding of the pilot house is a darker, neutral color; and no visible mechanical equipment is installed on the chimney or roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 03:45:19

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Brett Hand and owners Patrick Keenan and Mary Schaheen represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Hand explained that he was not the original architect for the project and was not involved in the permitting process for the most recent work, but that it appears to have been the result of a series of crossed wires following the COVID shutdown and the death of the contractor. Mr. Hand stated that the existing pilot house and the plans shown in his drawings work for owners. He clarified that the elevator has a stop on the roof, the extension is not just an overrun.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether it was necessary to take the elevator to the roof.
  - o Mr. Hand responded that part of the reason the owners bought this house is so they could have an elevator to the roof.
- Mr. D'Alessandro clarified that this is an application for legalization.
  - o Mr. Hand responded affirmatively, noting that the pilot house and roof deck were shown on the amended plans but not the original permit set.

- o Mr. Keenan explained that when the project began in early 2020, the plan was to start the project without the roof deck, but with the expectation that the pilot house and deck would be added later. He noted that shortly after they received the initial permit, COVID hit, and the contractor lost track of the permitting, went ahead and built the pilot house, not realizing that amended permit was never approved. He acknowledged that they are aware that things need to be permitted and that this fell through the cracks.
  - o Mr. D'Alessandro argued that work needs to be done according to the permit drawings.
- Mr. Hand noted that they have no issue changing the color of the pilot house but take issue with removing the elevator and changing the roof.
- Mr. Cluver explained that, when reviewing an application for legalization, the Architectural Committee considers whether they would have approved the work in the course of a normal review. He opined that he cannot think of another project where an elevator access to a roof deck is visible. He noted that they usually recommend minimizing head height and sloping pilothouse stairs to reduce visibility.
  - o Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the actual setback dimensions of the elevator.
  - o Mr. Hand responded that he thinks what he has drawn is close to the as-built dimensions.
- Mr. Cluver questioned what the visibility would be if the elevator was cut back.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked where the photos in the overview were taken from.
  - o Ms. DiPasquale responded that they are views from Cypress Street.
- Ms. Stein commented that, if the elevator and overhanging roof were removed, visibility would be reduced so that it is nearly invisible.
  - o Mr. Hand responded that the elevator takes people to the roof.
  - o Ms. Stein asked if it is currently operational and whether the applicants have asked the manufacturer if it can be reduced by one floor. She questioned the functionality of the elevator.
  - o Mr. Keenan explained that it is a side-mount elevator, with the motor in the basement. Both the shaft and carriage have been installed.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he does not see how he can recommend approval of the application. He suggested adopting the staff recommendation.
  - o Mr. Keenan noted that the staff recommendation removing of the overhang but keeping the cab. He opined that other properties have visible pilot houses and noted that he is amenable to removing the roof overhang and painting the structure a darker color.
  - o Ms. Schaheen said she knows it seems like asking for forgiveness instead of permission, but, noting that they had so many challenges to completing this project and getting into the house, that they would do anything at this point to not have to deconstruct something constructed to allow to access the roof. She noted that they are senior citizens. She expressed willingness to move the railing and make the structure a darker, more discrete color.
- Ms. Stein asked if the height of the penthouse can be reduced, noting that it appears taller than necessary.
  - o Mr. Hand responded that they could look into deconstructing the roof, which probably does not need to be as high as constructed and might be able to be reduced 18 to 20 inches. He asked whether it would be acceptable to keep the footprint of the deck as proposed.
  - o Ms. Stein replied that everyone might have a different opinion.

- o Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee is advisory to the Historical Commission, and that its charge is to advise the Commission on whether the application meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He opined that lowering height would be helpful in reducing the conspicuousness of the pilot house and that eliminating the elevator stop would make visibility go away almost entirely.
- o Mr. Hand asked whether he should request the general contractor meet with the elevator manufacturer to discuss lowering the ceiling as much as possible but noted that they would like to keep the shape of the structure's roof and the footprint of the deck.
- o Mr. McCoubrey responded that that would be helpful, and that it would be possible to keep the shape and footprint.
- o Ms. Schaheen noted that they would like to keep as much as possible. She noted that she appreciates the suggestion about the Commission and offered to have the painting done to reduce the appearance.
- Ms. Stein advocated for pushing the deck railing back from the rear roof and suggested that a mockup showing the placement of the railing be undertaken. She said her guess is that it would be visible.
  - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed but noted that the footprint could stay as proposed but extend forward in the other direction.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the pilothouse is not drawn as-built in the plans and suggested that the architect double check the dimensions on drawings relative to the as-built structure. He noted that the roofline on Drawing B1.2 shows a thinner roof structure than is shown in the photographs of the built structure. He noted that amended drawings should be submitted before the Historical Commission meeting.
- The Committee suggested taking photographs of the proposed railing location, as well as the potential location with the same footprint but shifted forward if visible. They noted that the final elevations should be revised, as they appear different than the as-built photographs.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing penthouse was built without permits.
- The proposed/as-built penthouse incorporates both a staircase and an elevator stop.
- The drawings do not appear to correspond to the as-built penthouse structure. The drawings should be updated so they accurately reflect the existing/proposed conditions.
- The as-built structure is visible from the public right-of-way.
- Visibility and conspicuousness of the penthouse could be reduced by eliminating the elevator stop, reducing the height of the roof, eliminating the overhang, and painting the structure a darker, neutral tone.
- A mock-up should be done showing the visibility of the proposed railing, which should be inconspicuous or invisible from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The as-built structure is conspicuous from the public right-of-way, failing to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

| <b>ITEM: 2025 Delancey Pl.</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Stein</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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                                                                                                             | 5   |    |         |        | 2      |

**ADDRESS: 1900 MARKET ST**

Proposal: Modify trolley entrances at 19th and Market Streets

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: SEPTA

Applicant: Greg Mastalerz, Sowinski Sullivan Architects

History: 1955

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Cast Iron Subway Entrances Historic District, Contributing, 3/8/2019

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

**OVERVIEW:**

In 2019, the Historical Commission designated the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic Historic District, which includes historic entrances, ranging in date from 1928 to 1955, located along several subway and trolley lines throughout the city. As part of that designation, the Historical Commission maintains jurisdiction over the cast iron railings, granite curbs, and any historic auxiliary components, such as lamp standards, signage, and integral and free-standing light fixtures. The Historical Commission does not exercise jurisdiction over the steps, handrails, walls below the curbs, or any underground features.

This application proposes to reconfigure the trolley entrances on the northeast and northwest corners of the 19<sup>th</sup> and Market Street Station. Although the station dates to 1906, the above ground entrance was constructed in 1955. The northeast and northwest station entrances retain historic railings, while the southeast and southwest entrances have been reconstructed and are not contributing to the thematic district. This application proposes to install new headhouse structures at the northwest (contributing) and southwest (non-contributing) entrances, as well as separate elevators to allow for ADA accessibility to the west that will not be attached to the subway entrances.

The proposal is to retain all the cast iron guardrails at the contributing trolley entrance at the northwest corner of Market and 19<sup>th</sup> streets. The revised headhouse design includes an understated raised seam metal roof. Supports for the roof are located outside of the guardrails and are spaced in between the guardrail openings. Aircraft cables fill the voids between the roof and guardrails. Security gates are located at the top of the trolley stairs. The design of the contributing northeast subway entrance will remain unchanged.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Reconfigure subway entrances.

**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.*
  - o The application proposes to retain and reuse the cast iron railing and concrete curb on the northwest (contributing) trolley entrance at 19<sup>th</sup> Street and Market Street. The redesigned roof is contemporary but less conspicuous than the previous submission.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - o If the new headhouse is removed in the future, the original appearance can be restored.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 04:14:34

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Greg Mastalerz, Alex Reiner, and Jack McElwee of SEPTA represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Cluver inquired if the electronic message board is included in the revised design.
  - o Mr. Mastalerz responded that it would likely be on the headwall, below the guardrail.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed the desire to retain the capping of the existing curb with the bottom of the guardrails.
  - o Mr. Mastalerz agreed that the new headhouse design should preserve that design element.
- Mr. Cluver suggested placing the posts supporting the headhouse roof directly into the sidewalk, without a curb.
  - o Mr. Mastalerz clarified that the posts need to be on a curb to keep salt from harming the metal, but the design will allow for the curb detail of the existing, contributing railing to remain.
- Mr. D'Alesandro was curious about the operation of the security door.

- o Mr. Mastalerz said the door will swing in and be secured to the inside of the headhouse when the station is open.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the roof required stepping down at the fascia.
  - o Mr. Mastalerz agreed.
- Mr. Detwiler wondered if the design would be used by SEPTA in other locations.
  - o Mr. McElwee replied that the design would be used on the Broad Street and Market-Frankford routes.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The northwest trolley entrance at 19<sup>th</sup> and Market Streets is contributing to the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic Historic District.
- The revised design minimizes the impact of the headhouse structure on the railings and curbs of the existing trolley entrance, the character-defining features.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Retention and reuse of cast iron railings and concrete curb on the northwest, contributing trolley entrance at 19<sup>th</sup> Street and Market Street satisfies Standard 9.
- The headhouse is designed so its removal in the future would allow for restoration of the original appearance of the northwest, contributing trolley entrance at 19<sup>th</sup> Street and Market Street, satisfying Standard 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

| <b>ITEM: 1900 Market St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Approval</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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                                                                                                              | 5   |    |         |        | 2      |

**ADDRESS: 2322 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kim Lageman and Keith Lipman

Applicant: Jack Burns Architecture, LLC

History: ca. 1865

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:**

This application proposes to construct a roof deck with an upper section towards the building's front and a lower portion towards the rear. The contributing building in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District is three stories with a flat-roof, and is located at Delancey, South 24<sup>th</sup> and Panama streets. Fidler Square Park is located across Panama Street from the rear of the parcel. The front portion of the deck will be 14'6" x 19'9" and the rear portion will be 14'3" x 19'4". The front roof deck is set back 10' from the building's front façade and will not be visible from the street. The rear deck will be set back 5' from the rear façade. It will be minimally visible from Panama Street. The glass deck's glass walls will enhance its transparency at the rear. The roof deck is set back 5' from the parapet that extends along the west façade of the building.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Build a bi-level roof deck extending nearly the length of the building.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New addition, 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.*
- *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.*
  - o The roof deck will not be visible from Delancey Street or S. 24<sup>th</sup> Street and will be minimally visible from Panama Street.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 04:33:22

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jack Burns and owner Kim Lageman represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2023**

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

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

- Mr. Cluver argued that the transparency of the rail will expose outdoor furniture to public view and cause glare owing to sunlight.
  - o Mr. Burns noted that his client is open to considering other options for the railing but might like a decorative design.
- Mr. McCoubrey identified a simple railing design as preferred.
- Ms. Stein added that it would be desirable to locate the railing further from the rear façade.
  - o Mr. Burns noted that his client would consider relocation of the railing.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested a mock-up of the railing to ensure it is not visible from Delancey Place and minimally visible from Panama Street.
  - o Mr. Burns added that the rear railing could be moved to the north side of the chimney.
  - o Ms. Lagemin expressed her openness to the changes suggested by the Architectural Committee. She wondered if it is useful to put plantings in front of the railings.
- Mr. McCoubrey expressed skepticism of plantings in front of railings.
- Mr. Detwiler also expressed a desire for a mock-up of the front railing and along 24<sup>th</sup> Street as well.
  - o Mr. Burns agreed to undertake a mock-up.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 2322 Delancey Place is a contributing resource to the Rittenhouse–Fitler Historic District
- The rear railing should be a simplified metal design and should be minimally visible.
- Railings along Delancey Place and S. 24<sup>th</sup> Street should not be visible to the public.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application will satisfy Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline if the the front and side railings are not conspicuous and the rear railing is a simplified metal railing relocated further from the roof's edge.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval provided that the rear railing is a simplified metal design and is located on the north side of the rear chimney; and that mock-ups demonstrate that the other railings are not visible from adjoining public streets; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline.



|                                                                                                                      |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>ITEM: 2322 Delancey Pl.</b><br><b>MOTION: Approval</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>VOTE</b>                                                                                                          |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                     | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Dan McCoubrey                                                                                                        | X   |    |         |        |        |
| John Cluver                                                                                                          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Rudy D'Alessandro                                                                                                    | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Justin Detwiler                                                                                                      | X   |    |         |        | X      |
| Nan Gutterman                                                                                                        |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Allison Lukachik                                                                                                     | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Amy Stein                                                                                                            | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                | 5   |    |         |        | 2      |

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:49:27**

**ACTION:** The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

### **PLEASE NOTE:**

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