

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

**TUESDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER 2022
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
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Julie Scott, Reku Design
Xinru Tan
James Saile
Jay Farrell
Anabel Pena, Parallel Architecture
Bernard Savage, Beech Community Services
Dennis Carlisle
Yuanyuan Lin
Evan Hall
Hal Schirmer, Esq.
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Robert Donatucci
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Herb Schultz, Studio HS4
Renita Dubuque
Kerrian France

John Toates, John Toates Architecture and Design LLC
Carolina Pena, Parallel Architecture
David Fecteau, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Thomas Holloman, TMH Associates Inc.
Nancy Pontone
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Khan Shibly

AGENDA

ADDRESSES: 705, 711, 713, AND 717 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions, replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 705 717 Pine Street Associates

Applicant: Carolina Pena, Parallel Architecture Studio

History: 1835

Individual Designations: 4/30/1957

District Designations: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to construct rear additions, replace windows, and install new roofing at 705, 711, 713, and 717 Pine Street. The roofing scope can be approved by the staff. The staff can also approve window replacement, provided shop drawings accurately depict the new windows within the existing masonry openings. The front façade windows and any windows at the rears or sides that are visible from the public right-of-way should match the appearance of the historic windows.

The rear ell of 705 Pine Street is not visible from Delancey Street, which runs along the rears of these properties, but it is visible from S. 7th Street at the side. The scope of work proposed for 705 Pine Street includes removal of the existing rear ell roof and the construction of a one-story addition on the ell and a three-story addition at the rear of the ell, with vinyl or fiberglass windows. Work to the main block includes wood window replacement and roofing.

The properties at 711, 713, and 717 Pine Street run through to Delancey Street at the rear. A similar scope is proposed for all three properties. Three-story additions would be constructed at the rears of the Pine Street buildings. The existing garage and roll-up doors fronting Delancey Street would be retained. The existing rear garages are all later construction. Windows and roofing would be replaced at these three properties as well.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rear additions on four properties.
- Replace windows on four properties.
- Install new roofing on four properties.

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.*
 - o Replacement of front façade features dating to a 1973 renovation, such as window sash to match the historic appearance, satisfies Standard 6.
- *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 rear additions are incompatible with the streetscape in massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The proposed rear additions do not satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the applications to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carolina Pena represented the applications.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Pena explained that the scope as proposed is a by-right zoning project. She suggested that revisions such as slightly reducing the square footage or changing the materials may help to move the project towards something the Historical Commission can approve.
- Ms. Stein noted that it is rare to review four properties on the same block at the same time. She stated that it will be a very significant alteration when undertaken at one time and will change the perception of the buildings from Delancey Street. She stated that the proposed design is insufficient because it will alter the view from Delancey Street. She suggested that new two or three-story finished houses on Delancey Street instead of large additions that look like rears of properties would be a more successful approach.
 - o Ms. Pena responded that that approach was considered, but it presents many issues in terms of zoning.
- Ms. Stein commented that the overbuild on the rear of 705 Pine Street is particularly visible from S. 7th Street and is not in character with the historic ell. She stated that the scale of the large additions along Delancey Street is not compatible with the character of the historic properties and neighborhood.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein, noting that a scope of this scale is an opportunity. He suggested rear entrances to the apartment buildings on Delancey Street so that there are both front and rear entrances. In this way, the rears could look more like fronts of houses, with inviting facades that have frontage on Delancey Street.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the staff can review the window replacement and roofing proposals. He suggested that windows for the new additions should be more in keeping with the neighborhood rather than vinyl as proposed. He suggested brick on

the new construction, especially if the design is revised to look more like individual houses.

- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that a preservation report concerning the existing windows should be compiled for the record.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey explained that replacement windows are typically reviewed by the staff unless the property owner insists on non-historic windows.
 - o Ms. Chantry noted that the existing front-façade windows date to a 1973 renovation of the four properties.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the rear ell of 705 Pine Street is remarkably intact, while the others may have been altered to varying degrees. He recommended that the rear at 705 Pine Street not have an overbuild.
 - o Ms. Chantry confirmed that the rear ell of 705 Pine Street appears to have a high degree of integrity, but that the other rear ells were altered in various ways over time.
- Mr. Detwiler asked that the applicant provide one drawing showing all four properties in context, both existing and proposed.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed, and suggested the applicant also provide a rendering showing what all four properties will look like from Delancey Street.
- Ms. Stein noted that the plans do not commit to a material. She stated that it is up to the design team to propose a material that is appropriate for the area, and then design the buildings with that material in mind.
 - o Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Stein suggested brick for frontage on Delancey Street but noted that there are material options for construction meant to look like an addition.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that a project as large as this one is potentially transformative to the immediate neighborhood and could really activate Delancey Street.
- Ms. Stein stated that she hopes a revised application is submitted that reduces the scale and massing of the additions or creates new buildings along Delancey Street which can contribute to the streetscape.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The roofing proposal can be approved by the staff. The staff can also approve window replacement, provided shop drawings accurately depict the new windows within the existing masonry openings. The front façade windows and any windows at the rears or sides that are visible from the public right-of-way should match the appearance of the historic windows.
- The rear ell of 705 Pine Street is not visible from Delancey Street, which runs along the rears of these properties, but it is visible from S. 7th Street at the side. The rear ell is remarkably intact.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Replacement of front façade features dating to a 1973 renovation, such as window sash to match the historic appearance, satisfies Standard 6.

- The proposed rear additions are incompatible with the streetscape in massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The proposed rear additions do not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 705, 711, 713, and 717 PINE ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 2340 CECIL B MOORE AVE

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Beech Community Services

Applicant: Thomas Holloman, TMH Associates Inc.

History: 1895; Dox Thrash House; Harold Godwin

Individual Designation: 6/14/2013

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for a three-story addition with roof deck and pilot house at 2340 Cecil B. Moore Avenue. Originally constructed in 1895, the building was owned and occupied by distinguished Black artist Dox Thrash from 1944 to 1959. In recent decades the building has been neglected, and in 2016 the Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) issued a violation for a collapsed roof, party walls, and rear wall. It is currently deemed unsafe by L&I.

The applicant is proposing to restore the front façade and rehabilitate the building for future use with commercial space on the first floor and apartments on the second and third floors. In addition to the structural work required, the side walls will be extended, and a new rear wall constructed. A new roof will be added and will include a roof deck and pilot house to house mechanical units and trash receptacles. The side wall and rear wall will be clad in stucco to match the existing party wall. The rear bay window will be clad in cement board.

SCOPE OF WORK:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 SEPTEMBER 2022

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Restore front façade.
- Rehabilitate interior for commercial and residential space.
- Construct three-story addition with roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.*
 - o The applicant plans to preserve and restore the existing features of the historic front façade, satisfying Standard 5.
- *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 Most of the roof, large sections of the side walls, and all of the rear walls are no longer extant. The new walls and roof are compatible in terms of massing, size, scale, and architectural features. Therefore, the proposed new construction meets Standard 9.
- *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 If the applicant reduces the height of the pilot house to the minimum allowed by code, the roof additions will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way and will meet the Roof Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the height of the pilot house is reduced, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and Roof Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:59:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Thomas Holloman and owner's representative Bernard Savage represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey said the application material submitted for the project is quite clear. He thanked the applicant for the preservation report submitted in addition to the drawings and elevations.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro commended the applicant for the quality of the preservation report.
- Mr. Detwiler thanked the applicant for taking on the project. He stated it is a significant project and an important legacy for the artist Dox Thrash. Mr. Detwiler inquired about the location of the rear property line in relation to the rear wall of the building.
 - o Mr. Holloman pointed to the application's site plan and noted that it is shown on the plan.

- Mr. Detwiler said he disagreed with the staff recommendation that the pilot house height should be reduced. He said that, given the importance of this project, the height of the overbuild as it is currently shown is acceptable.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the visibility of the new rear wall. He asked Ms. Mehley to explain the visibility of the wall from the public right of way.
 - o Ms. Mehley said she believed it would be visible, even once they construct the new building planned for the adjacent lot. She said the owner plans to construct a six-foot privacy fence but, even with the fencing in place, portions of the rear wall would be visible.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed to the windows on the rear wall and commented they are currently planned as vinyl windows. He advised that the windows on the rear should be wood-like in their appearance, wood or aluminum clad wood windows, in order to appear more historically compatible in their appearance. Mr. Detwiler stated this is his only suggested change for the proposed scope of work. He noted again this is a wonderful project.
- Mr. McCoubrey said he had a similar response to the proposed windows on the rear wall. He suggested that the windows should be revised to include sills and sense of framing around them, which would go a long way to making the rear look compatible with the other buildings in the neighborhood.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance supported the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicant has submitted a thorough and complete application.
- This is an important project and will honor the legacy of the artist Dox Thrash.
- The pilot house is acceptable at its current height and does not require any changes.
- The rear wall should have wood or aluminum-clad wood windows with sills and framing to be compatible with the historic building and overall neighborhood.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The applicant plans to preserve and restore the existing features of the historic front façade, satisfying Standard 5.
- Most of the roof, large sections of the side walls, and all of the rear walls are no longer extant. The new walls and roof are compatible in terms of massing, size, scale, and architectural features. Therefore, the proposed new construction meets Standard 9.
- The roof additions will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. Therefore, the proposed roof deck and railing meet the Roof Guidelines.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the rear windows have a traditional appearance, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9, and Roof Guidelines.

ITEM: 2340 Cecil B Moore Ave MOTION: Approval with condition MOVED BY: Detwiler 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	5				2

ADDRESS: 3600-30 LANCASTER AVE

Proposal: Install sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: CA Residential Drexel LLC

Applicant: Natalya Atroshyna, EZ Signs Inc.

History: 1878; William Fennell Row

Individual Designation: 10/9/2015

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to install a 9'-5" x 6'-5" vinyl wall film on the 36th Street side elevation of the building at 3600-30 Lancaster Avenue. The sign would be adhered to the historic masonry.

The staff has already approved additional signage for this commercial unit and encourages the applicants to pursue signage that is limited to the storefront portion of the property, such as a smaller wall sign located on the pier to the right of the storefront window on the 36th Street elevation.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install sign

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.*

- o The proposed sign is extremely large and out of scale with the historic property. Furthermore, the vinyl material may trap moisture against the masonry, causing long-term damage. The application fails to satisfy this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:19:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Mehley asked if the applicant or representative of the application was at the meeting.
 - o Mr. Farnham replied that no one identified himself as the applicant. He confirmed that the applicant had been notified of the meeting agenda and the scheduled meeting time.
- Ms. Stein asked Ms. Mehley if the large banner above the proposed sign had been approved by the Historical Commission's staff.
 - o Ms. Mehley responded that there is no record of an approval. She noted that it is a hanging banner and is not adhered to the masonry wall.
 - o Ms. Stein said she wanted it to go on the record that the hanging banner is not approved by the Historical Commission and that it is not compatible or in compliance with the historic property.
- Ms. Stein stated that she agrees that the proposed new sign is too large and agrees with staff that additional signage could be mounted on the pier to the right of the storefront window.
- Mr. Detwiler said there are plenty of other opportunities for signage in this situation. He pointed out that additional signage could be painted on the storefront window or hung from a bracket in front of the business. He added the proposed sign is not in an appropriate location and is not appropriately attached to the building.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the purpose of the wall sign is to be used as wayfinding for the entrance to the left in the addition.
 - o Ms. Mehley responded that signage is not for the business right on that corner but is in fact for a business much further down the block. She pointed to the elevation drawing of the front of the business and noted the signage approved and indicated there are other options for additional signage on the front of the business. Ms. Mehley said the distance from the actual business location plus the adherence of the vinyl signage to the brick masonry was the reason the staff concluded that this application was not in compliance with the Standards.
- Mr. Detwiler and Mr. McCoubrey asked about the metal brackets in front of all the businesses in this row. He observed that these appear to be for signage.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale stated that the brackets are light fixtures and not for signage.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed signage is located a significant distance from the storefront associated with the business.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed sign is extremely large and out of scale with the historic property. Furthermore, the vinyl material may trap moisture against the masonry, causing long-term damage. The application fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 3600-30 Lancaster Ave					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
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	5				2

ADDRESS: 339 AND 341 S 25TH ST

Proposal: Combine properties; construct 3rd floor addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Brooks Tanner

Applicant: Julie Scott, Reku Design

History: c. 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to make modifications and additions to two contributing two-story rowhouses in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District to create a double-wide three-story house. The proposal calls for the demolition of the entire party wall between the two buildings and the demolition of both roofs and chimneys. A third floor, set back five feet from the front façade, would span the rear ells of the buildings and a small deck would be located on the rear roof of the 341 portion of the property. The new construction would be clad in Hardie shingle siding.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an application in August 2022 that also called for the demolition of most of the rear and side walls of the ells of the properties. Since that time, the

application has been revised to retain the rear ell walls and to relocate a deck from the front to the rear. In March 2021, the Historical Commission approved a rooftop addition at 341 S. 25th Street that was set back five feet from the front façade.

Following the initial resubmission, the applicant has provided a secondary option showing a mansard treatment for the third-floor addition, but which does not change in plan at the rear, still spanning the space between the rear ells.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rooftop addition spanning two buildings

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.*
 - o The proposed project is differentiated from but not compatible with the historic properties and alters the spatial relationships that characterize the properties, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- *New Exterior Additions Guideline:*
 - o *Recommended: Ensuring the addition is stylistically appropriate for the historic building type; considering the design for a new addition in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district, neighborhood, and setting.*
 - The staff suggests that rather than an addition with a minimal setback that has no relationship to the historic buildings, a simple mansard addition limited to the main blocks of the buildings would be more appropriate for these properties and in keeping with the character of the district, provided the massing, fenestration, and details were appropriately scaled.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:40:07

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Julie Scott represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Scott explained that they have included two options for the addition, one with a five-foot setback, and one with a mansard, which is their preferred option.
- Ms. Stein noted that the proposed alterations change a pair of two-story residences to three stories and impact the scale and character of the neighborhood. She opined that the critical question is how to minimize the impact of the proposed addition and still make the building appear as two two-story properties from the front and rear.
- Ms. Stein explained that she is generally okay with either solution for the front of the proposed addition but does not support spanning the space between the rear ells at

- the third floor. She opined that the spanning overwhelms the buildings and that any proposed addition should step back and respect the eaves.
- Ms. Stein noted that no side elevations are provided. She questioned whether there would be any windows and what cladding material is proposed, since the sides will be highly visible as a full story.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that the side elevations are party walls, so there will not be any windows, and the shingle siding proposed for the front elevation will also clad the side elevations.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that this three-unit, two-story row is too small to support having an addition on top of two. He opined that the overbuild on top of two ruins the whole row and is out of balance.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that nothing is more character-defining of this part of the district than the existing view of the three, two-story rowhouses. He opined that any overbuild is a challenge and noted that he is not in favor of any addition. However, he continued, if he were to buy into an addition, the scale is the most critical aspect. He noted that the existing buildings are so petite, and the proposed addition feels out of scale from the front in large part because of the large size of the windows, which are bigger than any other windows on the house.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that the window size is governed by egress and the double-hung windows cannot be made smaller.
 - o Mr. Detwiler replied that it is possible to make casements that look like double-hungs to reduce the scale, so they better fit the scale of the house.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that she is not opposed to changing to casements.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted his preference for a mansard addition, provided it does not span the space between the rear eaves. He noted that, while a mansard addition would be highly visible, there is a long tradition of adding mansard additions to smaller rowhouses, and that the mansard option would make the front rooms bigger, so the addition could be pulled back from the rear to avoid spanning the space between the eaves. He noted that he could live with the setback option as well, since the Historical Commission previously approved an addition with a five-foot setback, but that either option needs more petiteness of scale in massing and features and should not span the space between the eaves.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that the existing second-floor windows of the 341 portion are not original, and the sill height is higher than that of the original window openings on 339. He commented that the sill of the second-floor windows could be lowered on the 341 portion, which would allow more light on the interior and make the scale of the windows on the addition seem more proportional.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that a central division like that shown in the mansard option would also be preferable in the setback option.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the Committee was just going to ignore that this is a set of three two-story buildings.
 - o Ms. Stein responded that the Committee cannot control which properties the owners own. She noted that the Historical Commission has approved additions on two-story buildings in the past.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that Photo G in the application materials shows the potential advantages of a petite setback addition.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that she and her clients prefer the mansard but are happy for either option.

- o Mr. Detwiler replied that a mansard is more in keeping with period of the houses, and he could see that as a potential option for the third on the row in the future.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicant study precedent in neighborhood for the proportion of the dormer windows and their relationship to the cornice line, noting that the proposed dormers appear set too high.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey clarified that sill heights in dormers of mansards are typically lower than those of the floors below.
- Ms. Lukachik noted that the drawings show a note about whitewashing the façade.
 - o Ms. Scott responded that that was a mistake, and they are not pursuing that option.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that Architectural Committee has offered good comments and suggestions, looking at proposal carefully because it could set a precedent. He noted that this block is also part of a National Register historic district that recognizes the neighborhood's history as a community of workers houses oriented towards the Schuylkill River waterfront and its support facilities. He explained that, originally, when the neighborhood was being built, larger homes were constructed on bigger streets such as Pine and Spruce for affluent families, while smaller houses were built on the narrower side streets for working-class families. Now that it is a highly desirable neighborhood, homeowners are trying to shoehorn larger living spaces into smaller homes originally designed for working-class families. He opined that it is important to let the district evolve while also being careful to protect the integrity of the district. He agreed that a mansard-roof-fronted third floor is a well-established way to expand two-story houses and opined that the overall scale and materials of the proposed addition are in keeping with the character of the properties and district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The two existing two-story buildings are both listed as contributing to the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District.
- The rears of the properties are minimally visible from Panama Street.
- Historically, two-story workers houses such as these were found on side streets such as 25th Street while larger houses were constructed for wealthier people on primary streets such as Pine and Spruce Streets. The change in scale between the blocks is a character-defining feature of the district. As proposed, the addition is out of scale and massing with the existing two-story buildings.
- If a third-floor addition is permitted, it should not span the space between the rear ells.
- A mansard treatment of the addition is preferable and, although it would be highly visible, it would continue a long-standing tradition in Philadelphia.
- Either option should treat the scale and features of the addition in a more petite way to be in keeping with the existing buildings and should feature a center division to break up the massing and keep the concept of the original two houses.
- The windows of the proposed addition should be scaled down so they are equal to or smaller than the sizes of the windows on the existing house.
- The applicant should study the sill heights of dormers on historic mansards, which are typically lower than those of the floors below.

- The sill height of the second-floor windows on the 341 portion is not original and could be lowered to the height of the original windows on the 339 portion.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As proposed, the third-floor addition is out of scale in terms of features and massing with the historic buildings and alters spatial relationships that characterize the properties by spanning the space between the rear ells, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 339 and 341 S 25th St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 2023 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct addition, roof deck and pilot house; replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Nguyet Chau and Eric Brown

Applicant: John Toates, John Toates Architecture and Design, LLC

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, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to make modifications and additions to 2023 Delancey Place. On the front façade, the application proposes to install 2-over-2 windows at the upper floors, restoring the windows to their original appearance. At the first floor, the application proposes to install 1-over-1 windows. The applicants have provided supplemental materials showing the window configuration of all the houses on the block, however the staff notes that this particular building was constructed as part of a row of eight within the larger block, from 2013 through 2027 Delancey Place. With the exception of 2023 Delancey and 2019 Delancey, which was refaced in 1918, the rest of the matching houses retain their original 2-over-2 window configuration.

At the rear, the application proposes to remove a circa 1989 addition and remnant of an original bay window and to construct a two-story addition with decks and a raised parapet over the

existing garage. The addition would be clad in brick and feature divided-lite windows and detailed metalwork.

On the roof, the application proposes to construct a deck with a glass railing set back five feet from the front façade, but only 3 feet 2 inches from the front of the mansard. It would be accessed by a central headhouse and two existing chimneys would be raised. The sightline studies and supplemental photos of a deck mockup show that the front glass railing and one raised chimney will be visible from Delancey Place.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace windows
- Construct rear addition
- Construct rooftop penthouse and deck
- Raise chimneys

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary or pictorial evidence.*
 - o The existing front windows are not original to the property. This application proposes to restore most of the windows to their original appearance. Based on neighboring properties that retain their original windows, the appropriate first-floor window configuration also appears to have been two-over-two; however, there are some similar, but not identical, neighboring properties that feature one-over-one first-floor windows as proposed. The application partially complies with this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed addition calls for limited removal of historic fabric and is deferential to the historic building and compatible in scale, massing, materials and features, satisfying Standard 9.
- **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 proposed roof deck is visible from the public right-of-way. If the was pulled back from the front façade so that it is not visible from Delancey Place, it could satisfy this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the first floor windows are two-over-two and the roof deck is pulled back from the front façade to the point that it is not visible from the public

right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:12:52

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect John Toates represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Toates explained his clients' desire for one-over-one windows at the first floor, noting that there is inconsistency along the block and one-over-one windows are used on other buildings on the block.
- Mr. Toates noted that the roof deck mockup shows that only the glass railing, which will have no cap rail and will return on the sides, will be visible from Delancey Place. He explained that there is a 30-inch-deep planter so that walking surface of the deck is held back from the street. The position of the glass railing allows for maintenance of the planting beds without risk. He explained that he understands the expectation that a deck should not be visible from the public right-of-way, particularly from the front, but argued that it is just the top portion of the glass railing that would be visible. He also argued that the trees, although not permanent, help screen the visible deck.
- Ms. Stein noted that the Committee has looked through proposal and can be broken down into three parts: work to the front, roof, and rear.
- Ms. Stein noted that the work to the front mostly constitutes a restoration, but that, since there is an understanding that the first-floor windows were two-over-two originally, the new windows should replicate the historic design.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether they are proposing sash replacements only or full replacement of the windows.
 - o Mr. Toates clarified that they are proposing wood sash windows in the existing historic frames, noting that the existing sash are not original. He acknowledged that, if they find they need to replace the frames, they will match the original and will show that in the shop drawing process with the staff.
 - o Ms. Lukachik opined that it would be more out of place to install one-over-one windows at the first floor and agreed that the windows should be two-over-two.
- Ms. Stein also noted that a new railing is proposed along the front steps on the brownstone knee wall. She noted that historically the property more likely had a brownstone balustrade and questioned the need for a second railing when there is no precedent for such a railing on the block.
 - o Mr. Toates responded that his clients want more definition and separation between their house and the neighboring house. He noted that the proposed railing matches the railing on either side of the existing stairs and that he did not think it was appropriate to introduce a third railing design.
 - o Ms. Stein responded that these properties were designed as pairs of buildings with paired entries not divided by railings and noted that she was not sure if the proposed railing was required by code.
 - o Mr. Toates replied that the railing is not required by code, but that the beauty of these neighborhoods and houses is that they adapt over time. He argued that there is no natural progression if they stay static. He stated that he and the Committee can agree to disagree.

- o Ms. Lukachik asked the material of the dividing stone between the steps, noting that a railing anchored into the dividing stone can cause damage.
- o Mr. Toates responded that the existing dividing stone is a cementitious stuccoed material to emulate brownstone, perhaps with brownstone underneath, and is approximately eight inches wide. He noted that there is scarring on the brick façade between the door surrounds where presumably there was a railing before, and then it will be anchored into the dividing stone at the base.
- Mr. Detwiler addressed the roof deck, noting that it appears they are proposing to build a structure over the roof, which makes it even taller and more visible.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Architectural Committee does not usually recommend approval of roof decks on the main blocks, especially when visible from the front.
 - o Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the deck needs to sit as high as it does, noting that it is very large and tall, and that from the rear a sizeable amount of copper paneling will be visible extending upward directly from the mansard.
 - o Mr. Toates responded that they have tried to lower roof deck surface, but the roof pitches towards rear so it gains height at the rear. He explained that the landscape architects had certain criteria for the proposed planters, and they want the deck to bear on the party walls, so it is spanning on dunnage. With the understanding that it will be visible, he continued, they designed it so the copper would patina and become part of the roof appurtenance rather than latticework.
 - o Ms. Stein replied that this is a prominent rear elevation and suggested that a setback may also apply to rear. She argued that from the front, no part of the deck or railing should be visible. At the rear, she opined, the copper panel flush with the coping of the historic mansard is in conflict with the character of the mansard and suggested that it be set back to allow the mansard to express itself as an architectural form.
 - o Mr. Toates argued that the front façade along Delancey is much more important than the rear. He opined that other roof appurtenances have been approved or constructed, many without good materials. He opined that the building should be able to adapt to a contemporary lifestyle rather than arbitrarily pulling it back from the edge of the roof.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that the suggestion to pull the deck back is not arbitrary; it is to reduce visibility. He explained that both streets are public rights-of-way, and the proposed deck is highly visible from both streets and should be reduced significantly.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that, in addition to the roof deck, there are additional decks proposed at the rear.
 - o Mr. Toates responded affirmatively, noting that there is a three-foot overhang for one balcony and the bay has a four-foot overhang. He explained that the planter boxes that run around the decks add additional visual space that is not usable space.
 - o Mr. Detwiler replied that the decks are very visible and on display. He noted that the Architectural Committee generally advocates for limited depths of balconies and other introduced elements. He explained that he has no doubt that it will be detailed beautifully, but cumulatively the proposed elements are large and visible and anything that can be done to reduce them would be helpful. He noted that there are ways to lighten the planting weight to make the proposed construction less substantial. He noted that he does not support the large copper spandrel

across the roofline and suggested that looking at additional ways to reduce the mass would go a long way.

- o Ms. Stein agreed.
- o Mr. Toates explained the construction of the deck, including how the steel dunnage will support the planter boxes and other deck elements, and the outboard ends of the framing will be clad in a copper skirt to hide the dunnage and create a consistent appearance.
- o Mr. Detwiler questioned whether most of the weight is the result of the large built-in planters.
- o Mr. Toates responded affirmatively, explaining that they are trying to avoid point loads of movable planters.
- Ms. Stein noted that this is the first property in the row to ask to remove the rear bay window, which is a character-defining feature of the properties.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the second-floor overbuild over the garage door creates a tall parapet. He opined that the proposed detailing is nice, but it still is a significant blank brick wall, and suggested a cut out with a hedge or planter would help reduce the apparent mass.
 - o Ms. Stein agreed.
- Mr. Toates commented that his clients would be willing to change front windows to two-over-two but would agree to disagree on the Architectural Committee's other suggestions, reiterating that the glass railing is the only element that would be visible from the front.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission do not generally allow glass railings at all, and while they may be less visible at some points, they can also reflect light, and the Commission usually asks for metal picket railings.
 - o Mr. Toates opined that once the railing is out of the line of sight, the point is moot and the Committee should not comment on it.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the penthouse is overly large and, if it were reduced in scale, the deck could also be reduced.
- Ms. Lukachik reiterated that much of the project seems driven by the depth of deck driven by planters, making numerous elements oversized.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The first-floor front windows were originally two-over-two and the replacement windows should match the historic appearance.
- The introduction of a railing that attaches into historic masonry and divides the paired entries is inappropriate.
- The proposed roof deck is visible from both the front and rear public rights-of-way. From the front the deck should be set back so that it is invisible, and from the rear it should be set back so it is inconspicuous.
- The scale and massing of the proposed roof and rear additions are overly large for the historic property. Numerous elements of the design are driven by the landscape plans and planters, making all of the proposed elements oversized and inappropriately scaled for the building.

- The tall spandrel extending directly from the rear mansard roofline is inappropriate and should be reduced and the deck set back from the rear façade.
- The parapet around the deck over the garage should be visually broken up to reduce its scale.
- The penthouse is overly large and should be reduced in scale along with the roof deck.
- While partially obscured by an existing addition, the original three-sided bay window remains at the second-floor rear, and this would be the first property on the block to remove that bay entirely.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- While the application proposes to restore most of the front windows to their historic two-over-two configuration, it also proposes to install one-over-one windows at the first floor, which is not the historic configuration. The first-floor windows should also be two-over-two. The application partially complies with Standard 6.
- The proposed addition calls for the removal of the original bay window at the rear, and elements of the addition are inappropriate in scale and massing, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed roof deck is conspicuous from both front and rear public rights-of-way, failing to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 2023 Delancey PI MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
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: 700-02 AND 704 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish building, construct addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: 700 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Herb Schultz, Studio HS4

History: 1922; Washington Square Building; Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Chestnut Street East Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2021

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street and the construction of an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street. The historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street would be reconstructed based on photographs as part of the addition. Currently, only the lower three stories of the original five-story façade at 704 Chestnut Street survives.

Both buildings, 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street, are classified as contributing to the Chestnut Street East Historic District. The applicant had requested that the Historical Commission reclassify the building at 704 Chestnut Street as non-contributing, but the Commission denied that request at its August 2022 meeting. At the same meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for an earlier version of the demolition and addition and commented that the proposed demolition did not comply with the preservation ordinance and the proposed addition was too tall for its context.

The addition would be constructed at 704 Chestnut Street and would extend onto the six-story historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street. The addition would include a recreation of the original façade at 704 Chestnut. The addition would be 13 stories tall, with seven new stories on the six-story historic building. The historic building is 76'-5" tall to the cornice. The enlarged building would be 157'-3" to the roof and 171'-7" to the top of the mechanical penthouse. The original façade at 704 Chestnut would be reconstructed as part of the addition.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish the three-story building at 704 Chestnut Street;
- Construct an addition on and adjacent to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street with a reconstruction of the historic facade at 704 Chestnut Street.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street will destroy historic materials and features, even if the façade is reconstructed, and therefore will not satisfy Standard 9.
 - o The addition will not be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street or

the historic district as a whole and therefore will not protect the integrity of the property and its environment, and will not satisfy Standard 9.

- *Section 14-1005(6)(d): Restrictions on Demolition No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... or of a building ... located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, 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 The demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street cannot be approved in satisfaction of Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance 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. No such claim of financial hardship or public necessity has been made.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibitions against demolition.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:57:39

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Herb Schultz and attorney Michael Phillips represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Phillips stated that they have adjusted their plans and are now proposing to reconstruct the front façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street to its historic appearance, as had been suggested during the first round of reviews. He noted that this is an in-concept application and asked the Committee members to comment on the reconstruction of the façade at 704 Chestnut Street as well as the construction of the overbuild.
- Mr. Schultz stated that he is now proposing to demolish the building at 704 Chestnut Street and then reconstruct the façade as part of the addition to 700-02 Chestnut Street. He stated that he also increased the setback of the overbuilding at the corner of 7th and Chestnut and also included a five-foot setback of the overbuild along 7th Street. He also reported that they simplified the design of the façade of the overbuild at the two floors above the historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street to create a void between the solids above and below.
- Mr. Schultz stated that they are looking for additional documentation of the historic building at 704 Chestnut Street.
- Ms. Stein asked Mr. Schultz to clarify their intentions with regard to the building at 704 Chestnut Street.
 - o Mr. Schultz responded that they intend to demolish the building down to the ground and then rebuild the historic façade with a new building behind it. He stated that they would align new floors in 704 with those in 700-02 Chestnut Street.
- Ms. Stein observed that they do not have an approval to demolish the building at 704 Chestnut Street.

- o Mr. Phillips explained that they would seek the Historical Commission's approval to demolish the building and reconstruct the front façade as part of the new building. He stated that they would precisely reconstruct the front façade.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that pieces of the front façade should be salvaged and either reused or recreated if the building is demolished and the front façade is reconstructed. He also confirmed that the historic storefront is entirely lost, as is shown in a Google Streetview photograph from July 2007. He objected to the way that the reconstructed 704 Chestnut Street façade looks like it is pasted onto the new building. He suggested setting the addition back behind the reconstructed façade of 704 to allow the gable and finials to stand free in space.
 - o Mr. Schultz agreed.
- Ms. Lukachik stated that they should preserve the building at 704 Chestnut Street if possible.
- Ms. Stein stated that the proposed reconstructed façade has been altered from the original. The floor levels have been changed.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that his goal would be to recreate the façade precisely. The current drawing is just a first pass at a design.
- Ms. Stein stated that the proposed overbuild overwhelms the historic building. She objected to the fact that the overbuild does not acknowledge that the buildings below it are very different. The overbuild covers both historic buildings as though they are one. The overbuild should respond to the two different buildings below.
 - o Mr. Schultz acknowledged that the design could be improved. He stated that the floors directly above 700-02 are intended to be a void.
 - o Ms. Stein suggested a change in materials or articulations.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the building at 704 Chestnut Street should maintain its independence from the overbuild. He suggested that perhaps the entire overbuild needs to be set back from Chestnut Street. He also noted that the three sections of the building do not seem to relate to one another.
- Mr. Detwiler objected to the two glass stories in the middle and stated that the proposed building reads as three separate sections that are unrelated to one another. They need to be unified.
 - o Mr. Schultz stated that they could consider redesigning the glass section.
- Ms. Stein suggested that they prepare alternate designs to give the Architectural Committee some choices.
- The Committee members discussed the project and decided that it did not make sense to approve or deny it while the architect and his client are still working on the concept. They stated that the project is moving in the right direction but still needs significant design work to resolve the relationship between the reconstructed façade and the addition and to better integrate and unify the various pieces of the new building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jay Farrell stated that demolition and reconstruction should not be considered. He stated that the reconstructed façade at 704 Chestnut looks “pasted on.” He suggested salvaging elements from the 704 building to recreate them. He suggested that the Athenaeum would have documentation of the historic building. He said that the Evening Telegraph was important, and the newspaper provides a branding opportunity. He suggested cantilevering the upper stories.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The historic storefront at 704 Chestnut Street was entirely removed and replaced before designation, as a 2007 photograph shows.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The design has improved since the last iteration but still requires additional study and revision.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibitions against demolition.

ITEM: 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: D'Alessandro					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro					
Justin Detwiler					
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik					
Amy Stein					
Total					

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:34:20

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:06 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Architectural Committee are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio 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.