

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

**TUESDAY, 26 AUGUST 2025
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner III
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
Josh Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner I
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNObdesign
Chwen-Ping, Ping Architects LLC
Claudia Martin
Daniel Trubman
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Jake Blumgart, Inquirer
Jay Farrell
Kevin King, Voith and Mactavish Architects
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Lauren Jacobsen
Raymond Conlon, Armagh Carpentry LLC
Lauren Conlon, Armagh Carpentry LLC
Rich Leimbach
Stephanie M. Pennypacker

Thomas Keller, CANNObdesign
Vivek Tomer

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1632 POPLAR ST

Proposal: Remove gable roof and stone veneer; construct rooftop addition; replace windows

Review: Final Review

Owner: Poplar Lofts LLC

Applicant: Chwen-ping Wang, Ping Architects LLC

History: 1860; Green Hill Market

Individual Designation: 5/11/2018

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes constructing a fourth-floor addition, roof deck, and pilot house to the building at 1632 Poplar Street. The building was constructed in 1859 and was historically known as the Green Hill Market House. The developer intends to convert the former market and church building to residential use. The proposed rehabilitation scope includes adding a fourth floor and roof deck with pilot house, restoring the brick façade and cornice, and installing new windows and exterior doors. The Historical Commission approved an in-concept application for this project at its June 2025 meeting.

At its June 2025 meeting, the Historical Commission asked the applicant to include more information about the neighborhood context in the final review submission. Other considerations included completing removal of the stone veneer, incorporating a cladding material and a color scheme that minimizes the public visibility of addition, determining the original configuration of the third-floor windows, and determining a historically appropriate window replacement configuration.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Add a fourth floor and roof deck with pilot house.
- Rehabilitate the exterior.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - Photographs provided of the third-floor interior indicate that the existing window openings have not been altered. The exterior brick recessed panels below the third-story windows are character-defining features and should remain in place. A similar element is extant on the second-story elevation along N. 17th Street, and this too should be retained. Removal of these historic brick details does not meet Standard 2.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The design of the proposed fourth-floor addition successfully differentiates itself from the historic building through its massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The proposed gray cladding is a neutral color and will minimize public visibility, meeting

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 AUGUST 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Standard 9.

- To increase compatibility and better meet Standard 9, a detail should be added.
- The applicant will work with the staff on the future removal of the stone veneer and the condition of the masonry material underneath it in order to meet Standard 9. Once the removal is complete, the applicant can work with the staff to determine an approvable preservation approach to rehabilitating the masonry façade.
- The identified historic window configuration should be incorporated into the two first-floor windows and central entrance along Poplar Street to meet Standard 9. For the majority of the windows, the installation of two-over-two double-hung windows would be appropriate to the original construction period and satisfy Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - The low-slope gable roof proposed for removal is hidden by the building's cornice and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The historic form and integrity of the designated building will not be visibly altered by the removal of the roof. If a future owner wishes to return it to its original appearance, the roof could be reconstructed; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the exterior brick panels are retained and the window configurations are revised, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chwen-Ping Wang and developer Vivek Tomer represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Wang summarized the revisions that were undertaken based on feedback from the in-concept review. He stated that the pilot houses and elevator overrun were reduced in size. Mr. Wang added that the roof deck railing was updated to a more transparent design, and the fourth-floor addition cladding was revised to a lighter, gray panel. He also noted the incorporation of an additional five-foot roof deck setback.
- Mr. Cluver said the additional setback made a huge difference and if it could be increased in size that would even be better. He commented that he recognized the limits of the size of the setback with regard to maintaining a viable floor plate. Mr. Cluver agreed with the staff's recommendation to add a cornice-type treatment on the fourth-floor addition.
- Mr. Cluver said he wished that the Architectural Committee could convince the applicant to increase the setback of the addition from the east side of the building, noting that he believed it would make a big difference in the perception of the addition on the building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the elevator serviced the roof deck.
 - Mr. Cluver observed that, if it does, the elevator overrun shown in the application was not drawn tall enough.
 - The Architectural Committee members expressed concern about the accuracy of the drawings of the two pilot houses and elevator overrun, pointing out that a pilot

- house was drawn without a door. They suggested different configurations to simplify the roof structures and the stairs leading to the roof.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that showing accurate locations of the pilot houses and elevator overrun and minimizing their sizes was important.
 - Mr. McCoubrey pointed out the blocky cornices shown on the pilot houses and elevator tower. He said this area should be minimally detailed.
 - Mr. Wang and Mr. Tomer explained to the Architectural Committee that the current pilot house and elevator overrun design was the result of code requirements.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the status of the removal of paint and stone veneer from the outside of the building. She expressed concern about the condition of the brick under the materials. She opined that the limited material removal that was completed may not provide them with an accurate picture of the conditions. Ms. Gutterman requested that the applicant consult the staff when the exterior materials are fully removed, in the event that a change needs to be made to the scope of work.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that he was disappointed with accuracy of the drawings and renderings.
 - Mr. Detwiler said he agreed with the staff that the exterior decorative brick panels, located below the windows on the third floor should remain in place. Mr. Cluver added that similar detailed panels at the corner of the second floor should also remain.
 - The Architectural Committee members discussed the historical market precedents provided to justify the window replacements. They pointed to buildings from this era that could be used as a reference for window replacement, noting that the Academy of Music was built during the same period and had similar windows to many of the market buildings of that era. The Architectural Committee members said that the window drawings in the submission did not include enough detail, noting that elements such as the frames and muntins must be accurately shown in the final drawings.
 - Mr. Tomer said that they would work with the staff on the window details and shop drawings. He commented that windows with a high level of details and requirements may exceed the project's budget.
 - Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Stein asked if the five-foot addition setback was from the third-floor historic cornice to the façade of the fourth-floor addition.
 - Mr. Wang confirmed that that was accurate.
 - Ms. Stein stated that she was uncomfortable with the set of drawings presented to the Architectural Committee, which included the demolition of brick panels and windows that were not correctly sized. She contended that the drawings were not accurate enough for the Architectural Committee to recommend approval of them. Ms. Stein added that the current drawings also show more removal than is appropriate.
 - Mr. McCoubrey said his biggest concern was the windows. He stated that the window configurations and accurate representations of the extant masonry elements should be included in the final drawings.
 - Ms. Gutterman recommended that the applicant wait until the paint and veneer are removed before making final color selections for the addition's cladding, windows, doors, and other details. She said the color of historic brick and masonry should be considered for final material color selection.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The two pilot houses and elevator tower must be accurately drawn on the plans and elevations, showing their exact locations and as-built dimensions. The height and sizes of the structures must be minimized as much as possible. The cornice detail currently shown on the pilot houses and elevator tower should be minimized.
- The window and door drawings must be revised with a greater level of detail. The proposed window configurations must be shown with accurately proportioned frames and muntins. The applicant should review the architectural precedents provided by the Historical Commission's staff and determine how to incorporate historical elements into the final window and door designs.
- The drawings submitted for review including floor plans, elevations, and renderings were not accurate enough for the Architectural Committee to recommend final approval. Inaccuracies include the demolition of historic materials, location of rooftop structures, incorrect sizing of windows, and other important details.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2, owing to the proposed removal of original decorative brick panels located on the second and third-floor exterior elevations.
- The application satisfies Standard 9 in the overall design of the proposed fourth-floor addition; it successfully differentiates itself from the historic building through its massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The proposed gray cladding is a neutral color and will minimize public visibility, meeting Standard 9. If a cornice detail is added to the addition and the rooftop structures are minimized, this portion of the application could satisfy Standard 9.
- The application will satisfy Standard 9 with regard to the masonry restoration, provided the applicant continues to work with the staff on the removal of the stone veneer and the condition of the masonry material underneath. Once the removal is complete, the applicant can work with the staff to determine an appropriate preservation approach to rehabilitating the masonry façade.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 because of the lack of detail included for the proposed windows and exterior doors.
- The application satisfies Standard 10 as the low-slope gable roof proposed for removal is hidden by the building's cornice and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The historic form and integrity of the designated building will not be visibly altered by the removal of the roof. If a future owner wishes to return it to its original appearance, the roof could be reconstructed.

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

ITEM: 1632 Poplar St MOTION: Denial, owing to incompleteness MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1600-06 E BERKS ST

Proposal: Install commemorative marker and plaque

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Memphis Street Partners LLC

Applicant: Carrie Jackson Yonce, CANNODESIGN

History: 1885; St. Laurentius Church; Edwin Forrest Durang, architect; demolished in 2022

Individual Designation: 7/10/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a marker and plaque to commemorate St. Laurentius Church, which stood nearby until 2022, when it was demolished to abate an unsafe condition. On 9 May 2025, the Historical Commission approved an application to construct eight three-story townhouses at the vacant church site, provided a public display commemorating the St. Laurentius church building is installed as part of the project. This application proposes that commemorative display, a marker and plaque.

The marker would consist of a bronze cast of the front section of St. Laurentius church building set on a masonry base. The cast would be fabricated with the scan taken of the front façade of the church before demolition. A plaque and cornerstone salvaged from the church would be incorporated into the masonry base. The marker would be located in front of the St. Laurentius Catholic School at 1608 E. Berks Street, adjacent to the site where the church building stood at 1600-06 E. Berks Street. The plaque would resemble the blue metal plaques on posts installed by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. It would be located at the northwest corner of the school lot at 1608 E. Berks Street. The text on the plaque, which is not yet written, would be developed with stakeholders.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install marker and plaque.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines are not applicable because no historic resources survive at the site, and the surrounding neighborhood is not designated as historic.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 AUGUST 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the application.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:03:37

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Carey Jackson Yonce and Thomas Keller represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Yonce reported that Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance has been working with one of the members of the former congregation to finalize the text for the new commemorative plaque. He also noted that they have confirmed that they will be able to incorporate the original bronze plaque and cornerstone, which were salvaged from the church, into the base of the marker. He explained that they are proposing to place the plaque and marker in front of the St. Laurentius School, which is adjacent to the site of the former church.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the size of the marker.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that the dimensions are in the application. He then provided the dimensions while two renderings of the marker were displayed.
- Mr. Detwiler asked why the marker includes a cast of the front part of the church and not the entire church.
 - Mr. Yonce answered that only the front part of the church was scanned before it was demolished. He added that the front facade with the towers was the most important part of the building. He stated that they decided to focus on and highlight the front section.
 - Mr. Detwiler opined that the marker should be larger.
 - Mr. Yonce stated that it was sized for children. It will be placed in front of a school, and children will be the primary audience.
 - Mr. Detwiler asserted that the marker is too small.
 - Ms. Lukachik agreed with Mr. Detwiler.
 - Ms. Stein suggested that the base of the marker should be larger, so that people look up at the church model, not down on it.
- Ms. Stein suggested that the marker should be located closer to the church site, not in front of the former rectory.
 - Mr. Yonce explained that the rectory building is set back from the property line, providing room for the marker out of the right-of-way, near the entrance to the school.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the base of the marker should be made with the same stone that was used for the church.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the bronze cast of the church facade should be designed to withstand wear and tear.
 - Mr. Yonce stated that it would be sturdy.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked who owns the property where the marker and plaque will be placed.
 - Mr. Yonce replied that it is owned by the church.
- Mr. Detwiler, Mr. D'Alessandro, and Ms. Gutterman suggested that the entire church should be modeled in bronze, not just the front facade.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed marker and plaque would be located in front of the school building, adjacent to the site of the former church.
- The proposed marker would incorporate the cornerstone and a bronze plaque salvaged from the church.
- The proposed marker and plaque would be funded by and owned by the church.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The marker and plaque proposed in the application do not adequately commemorate the church, which was demolished because its towers were structurally unsound and posed a public safety hazard.

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

ITEM: 1600-06 E Berks St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, 125, AND 127 N MOLE ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions; restore front facades

Review Requested: Final Review

Owner: Hassan Edge Jr., WJH Construction

Applicant: Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO design

History: 108: 1840, expanded into alley, new windows 1998. 109: 1835, new windows and doors 1972, rear one-story addition removed 1972. 110: 1840, historic door removed without permits 2019. 112: 1840. 114: 1840, door and frame replaced without permits 2018; 115: 1835, third story added by 1916. 125: 1850, rear frame addition replaced with brick addition 1938. 127: 1850, rear alterations 1960.

Individual Designation: 9/26/1967

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application for final review proposes to construct rear additions and restore the front facades of eight rowhouses on the 100 block of N. Mole Street, a block of brick rowhouses constructed between 1835 and 1850. The Historical Commission approved the proposed scope in concept in July 2025, provided the rear additions respond to the character of each building and do not extend above the parapet lines, the windows in the additions respond to the scales of the respective buildings, any rear roof decks do not extend above existing parapets, and any front facade elements proposed for replacement are called out as such in application materials submitted for final approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Front façade restoration work includes window, door, shutter, and stoop restoration or replacement and brick repointing. The Historical Commission's staff met on site with the applicants after the in-concept approval and developed a recommended repair and replacement list for each façade, which has been included with this application for final review. Replacement is called out where no original or historic feature remains. The Historical Commission's staff can typically review and approve this type of work administratively.

Public visibility of the rears of the even-number addresses is across a parking lot from N. 16th Street. There may be an oblique view of the rear of 109 N. Mole Street where a driveway cuts through from Cherry Street. There is no public visibility of the rears of the properties at 115, 125 and 127 N. Mole Street. Several rear addition fenestration options are included in the application for consideration.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rear additions
- Restore front facades

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The proposed front façade work will result in restoration or replacement with historically accurate windows, doors, shutters, stoops, and window sills.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 AUGUST 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

- The construction of the proposed rear additions will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, and the additions will be compatible with the historic materials and features.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the July 2025 in-concept approval.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:23:58

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Schroeder presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Carey Jackson Yonce and Thomas Keller represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Yonce explained that his team conducted a house-by-house survey with the Historical Commission's staff to create a list of recommendations for restoration work to individual features of the Mole Street front facades, in response to the Architectural Committee's comments during the in-concept review. Mr. Yonce pointed out examples of prospective work to windows. Mr. Yonce described the intent to replace or install window shutters where historic shutter hardware exists.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if all of the current windows are vinyl replacement windows.
 - Mr. Yonce stated that most are vinyl replacement windows, with a few wood windows remaining which are old but likely not original.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed concerns that the window sizes in the drawings did not match the photographs. He stated the proposed window proportions and orientations in the drawings, particularly the third-floor windows, do not appear to be historically accurate and that the windowpanes should be vertical rather than horizontal.
 - Mr. Yonce responded that he believed the drawings were based on an existing historic window but would coordinate with the Historical Commission's staff before making final determinations.
- Mr. D'Alessandro discussed replacing original frames at 109 Mole Street, expressing concern about unnecessarily replacing historic features. He pointed out that partial replacement when needed is also an option.
 - Mr. Yonce stated that he will determine whether to replace with a historically appropriate new frame or repair the existing frame once any metal capping is removed.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned the accuracy of drawings of the dormers, which he said looked like stock dormers and did not match the photographs. He asked if work is being proposed for the dormers.
 - Mr. Yonce responded there are no plans to alter the dormers but he would look into improving the drawings.
- Several Architectural Committee members debated whether it would be appropriate for each window to have shutters or only where historic shutter hardware existed, as the applicant proposed. They advised Mr. Yonce to pay attention to historic details of shutters themselves including panel design.
 - Mr. Yonce affirmed that his team would ensure that the shutter details are historically accurate and would generally install shutters where evidence

- indicates the presence of shutters historically.
- Mr. Cluver turned the discussion to the design of the rear additions. He expressed concern that the slope away from the existing roof, and the gap between the existing building and proposed rear addition would trap water, would be susceptible to clogging, and be difficult to maintain.
 - Mr. Yonce explained that the slope was included to ensure there was adequate ceiling height for the top floor of the additions and that a gap was included to protect the existing cornice line of the original structures, as had been requested by the Architectural Committee during the in-concept review. He also said that the gap is purposefully wide to make maintenance easier. Mr. Yonce stated that, if the Architectural Committee was open to overbuilding and that the cornice line did not need to be open and visible, he could adjust his approach to how the additions meet the original structures.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that the cornice line would not be visible with the additions anyway and protecting the structure was more important than visibility.
 - Ms. Gutterman expressed discomfort with the height of the three-story additions being taller than the eaves despite the Architectural Committee's previous favorable stance toward them.
 - Other Architectural Committee members generally agreed, commenting that the new additions appear taller than the original houses. They recommended that Mr. Yonce look into reducing the height either by reducing the slope or including a step-down on the first floor of the additions, as done with similar projects. The Architectural Committee members stated that the drawings were not detailed enough.
 - Mr. Yonce explained he had already taken steps to reduce the massing, including removing roof decks from the original proposal. Mr. Yonce explained that the sloped roofs were in response to the Architectural Committee's comments from their in-concept approval. He doubted that a step-down or simply reducing the slope would leave enough ceiling height for a viable third-floor living space but would investigate it. He stated that, if the Architectural Committee was now more concerned with mitigating water damage than keeping the cornice visible, he might be able to change his approach.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that the rear elevations depict windows directly against door frames. He stated they do not look "constructable" and look ahistorical. He acknowledged that this would not be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Yonce replied that it is a design he has used before but can confirm the constructability.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated the need for better documentation rather than just graphics.
 - Mr. Yonce asked for clarification on what that would include.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro said he would rather have "constructability documents" and detailed documents.
 - Mr. Yonce replied that it is difficult to produce full construction documents before knowing what can be approved.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that, as this is a final review, there should be more detailed documents than shown here.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if the rear additions will be clad in red brick.
 - Mr. Yonce affirmed that red brick will be used for the rear additions.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that although the additions are marginally visible from public rights-of-way and preserving the rear cornices is ideal, a compromise that addresses

the water drainage issues and the height concerns is more important. He stated that the Historical Commission has approved additions that were taller than the historic buildings because of physical constraints.

- Mr. Yonce replied that he appreciates the Architectural Committee's feedback, and he will work on an appropriate solution.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicant needs to submit more accurate, complete, and detailed documentation.
- Historic features on the front façade should be repaired or restored if their condition allows it.
- The roof slope of the rear additions and resulting notch could result in water damage.
- The proposed heights of the rear additions, though technically no taller than the original buildings' heights, appear larger as they are taller than the eaves.
- The applicant should explore alternative designs that address both water mitigation concerns and height concerns for the rear additions.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application lacks the level of detail required for the Architectural Committee to recommend final approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, as the rear additions are not compatible in terms of size, scale, and proportions. The potential risk of water damage created by the design of the rear additions also fails to protect the historic buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ITEM: 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, 125, AND 127 N MOLE ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 602 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Construct shed dormer and replace front windows

Review Requested: Final Review

Owner: Claudia and Eric Martin

Applicant: Armagh Carpentry, LLC

History: ca. 1795; James Henderson House

Individual Designation: 6/28/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a shed dormer on the front gable roof and replacing existing front windows at 602 S. Front Street. The current roof is a standing seam roof with 19 skylights and a glass clad dormer. The skylight and dormer alterations were completed in 1988 when the Department of Licenses and Inspections approved a building permit without the Historical Commission's review. Court proceedings resulted in a consent decree whereby the Historical Commission approved the skylights. Despite these past alterations, the front roof and dormer maintain their historic eighteenth-century slope and form. The full proposal for the front roof includes removal of existing skylights and dormer and construction of a wide shed dormer with Andersen Fibrex casement windows. The standing seam metal roof would be maintained. The application also proposes removing the existing double-hung, wood windows and installing Andersen Fibrex casement windows in the existing openings.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove 19 skylights and dormer.
- Construct shed dormer with casement windows.
- Replace four front facade windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - Removal of the skylights is appropriate and meets Standard 2.
 - Maintaining the existing standing seam roof or installing a new standing seam roof meets Standard 2.
 - Although the existing front dormer is clad in glass, it maintains its historic form and proportions. Removal of the front dormer does not meet Standard 2.
 - Removal of the double-hung windows from the front façade and replacing them with casement windows does not meet Standard 2.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed shed dormer would be highly visible, and the proposed design and materials are incompatible with the late eighteenth-century house. Therefore, it does not meet Standard 9.
 - The four front windows on the second and third floor are not original and can be replaced in kind with new double-hung wood windows. An in-kind replacement would meet Standard 9. The current proposal to replace the historically accurate

windows with casement windows does not meet Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 2:08:15

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Contractors Raymond and Lauren Conlon presented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman opined that the proposed alterations are not in character with the building.
 - Ms. Conlon noted that the applicant did not realize the building was historically designated and has already purchased the materials for the project.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the fact that materials are already purchased does not change her objection to the proposed alterations.
 - Ms. Conlon replied that previous alterations to the building have resulted in a contemporary appearance, making the proposed alterations appropriate.
 - Ms. Gutterman intoned that the roof slope and dormer proportions reflect the historic design.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the house dates to 1795. The Historical Commission designated the property in 1958, soon after the Commission was established. He expressed support for removal of the skylights but not for the construction of the larger dormer.
- Mr. McCoubrey wondered if the rear slope was already altered to provide more space at the fourth floor.
 - Mr. Conlon indicated that the rear slope of the roof has been altered.
- Mr. Conlon asked how much the dormer could be widened.
 - Mr. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey responded that they did not support widening the dormer.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff typically approves Fibrex windows.
 - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff responded that the staff does not approve Fibrex windows for facades visible from the street.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed opposition to the installation of casement windows on the front facade.
- Mr. Conlon asked if the Architectural Committee was only willing to support the removal of the skylights and installation of a copper roof.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that the historic roof would not have been copper.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that the roof may have historically been a lead-coated metal.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed support for the restoration of the side walls of the existing dormer.
 - Mr. Conlon emphasized that the existing dormer is too narrow for the current owners.
 - Mr. Detwiler observed that the top floor of the building, the attic space, was not designed to be fully occupied.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that the dormer's function was for ventilation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The current roof is a standing-seam metal roof with 19 skylights, and the dormer has its historic shape and proportions but is clad with glass. The front roof and dormer maintain their historic eighteenth-century slope and dimensions.
- The Historical Commission approved the skylights and dormer alterations in 1988 after some litigation.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposal to replace the historic dormer with a shed dormer fails to satisfy Standards 2 and 9.
- The proposal to install Fibrex casement windows on the front facade and roof dormer fails to satisfy Standards 9.

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

ITEM: 602 S Front St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:19:32

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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