

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

**TUESDAY, 25 MARCH 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 9:04 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

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

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

The following staff members were present:

- Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association
- Philip Balderston
- Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
- Cody Worthington
- Daniel Trubman
- David Traub, Save Our Sites
- Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
- Jared Keichline, Renewal by Andersen
- Jay Farrell
- Jeff George
- Jerry Roller, JKRP
- Justin Kaplan
- Keith Mock, Tun Legacy Foundation
- Lorabeth Lobst
- Marissa Howard, JKRP

Michael Mattioni, Esq.
Michelle Kleschick, Parallel Architecture Studio
Pat Freeland
Pat Dailey, Tun Legacy Foundation
Peter Dilsheimer
Rachael Pritzker, Esq.
RJ Poper, WSA
Seth Brown
Sherman Aronsen
Shawn McAnally, Designblenz Architecture
Sophia Quast
Stephanie Pennypacker
Susan Wetherill

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 15-17 AND 19-25 S 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct three-story building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Tun Legacy Foundation, Inc.

Applicant: Roxanne Marshall, Wolfe Scott Associates, Inc.

History: Parking lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story structure for use as a restaurant at 15-17 and 19-25 S. 2nd Street in the Old City Historic District. The site is currently a surface parking lot and is classified as non-contributing in the historic district. Therefore, the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over the undeveloped site is review-and-comment only, meaning that the Historical Commission and its advisory Architectural Committee may offer non-binding comments on the application at public meetings, but may not approve or deny it.

The design of the proposed restaurant structure is based on the historic Tun Tavern. The historic tavern was constructed in 1683 about 250 yards southeast of the site in question. The original Tun Tavern is associated with the founding of six prominent organizations, the US Marine Corps, US Navy, Pennsylvania Freemasons, Society of St. George, St. Andrew's Society, and the Friendly Sons and Daughters of St. Patrick. The historic tavern was demolished in 1781. The design of the new structure is based on a historic drawing of Tun Tavern. The new structure would be three stories tall, clad in brick, with a gabled section along 2nd Street and a more contemporary section at the rear. An open plaza would be located at the northwest corner of the site.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a three-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The new structure will be compatible with the size, massing, scale, and architectural features of the property and the Old City Historic District.

STAFF COMMENT: The application satisfies Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:14

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Keith Mock and Pat Dailey of the Tun Legacy Foundation represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MARCH 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver stated that he was very happy to see the proposal and said that the reconstructed tavern will make a great contribution to the historic district. He stated that he had a few suggestions. He asked the design team to verify that the pane configurations of the windows are correct. He suggested that they lighten the weight of the trim at the gable ends and the dormers. He also suggested reconsidering the spacing of the porch balusters, which currently seems a little tight.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he is in favor of the project and noted that the details need to be considered carefully. He observed that the dormers look a little big and clunky. He suggested that the design team look at the reconstruction of the tavern that was undertaken by architect Brognard Okie for the Sesquicentennial in 1926. It was a very accurate reconstruction.
 - Mr. Cluver agreed with Mr. Detwiler and suggested that the dormer walls should be thinner.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that there is too much brick below the second-floor windows. He again suggested referencing the 1926 reconstruction.
 - Mr. Mock stated that all of the suggestions were good ones and that he would consider them. He also noted that people have expectations about the Tun Tavern, so the design team needs to balance the actual tavern with people's expectations of it.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the rainwater drainage system.
 - Mr. Mock explained the system to him.
- Ms. Stein asked why the chimney does not project from the gable end.
 - Mr. Mock responded that chimneys did not project from facades until the Federal period. He stated that this chimney is designed in the early eighteenth-century manner.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about lighting.
 - Mr. Mock stated that there is some contemporary exterior lighting, but it is all hidden.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the third-floor terrace on the contemporary rear building.
 - Mr. Mock responded that it is not shown on the construction drawings because it is not yet funded.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application is subject to review-and-comment jurisdiction only.
- The Sesquicentennial reconstruction of the Tun Tavern was very accurate and may answer some outstanding questions about window, dormer, and other details.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the application satisfies Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 29 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition, replace windows, rebuild storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Long River Investments, Inc.

Applicant: Michelle Kleschick, Parallel Architecture Studio, LLC

History: 1914

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition, adding a fourth floor above the front block and a third floor at the rear. This addition would be set back from 2nd Street by five feet and extend above the current parapet by approximately 10 feet. A roof deck at the third-floor level is also proposed at the rear.

The addition would be clad in vertical siding in a beige color. No details are provided for the rear roof deck.

The application also proposes work to the front facade of the existing building, including replacement of the one-over-one double-hung windows on the second and third floors (the two-over-two windows will be refurbished and repainted), and a new first-floor storefront system including a new first-floor cornice.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rooftop addition and roof deck.
- Replace windows at second and third floors.
- Replace first-floor storefront, including cornice.

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.*
 - o Further investigation should be undertaken to understand what material from the original storefront may survive behind the current cladding and which could be incorporated into the new storefront.
 - o Some of the upper floor windows may be original to the building and should be retained if they can be refurbished.
- *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 rooftop addition would be conspicuously visible from the public right-of-way. Shifting the addition farther from the historic façade may limit its impact on the property's character-defining features.
 - o Few details are provided for the siding proposed for the addition, and it is not clear that it is an appropriate material for this context.
- *Storefronts Guideline: Identifying, retaining, and preserving storefronts and their functional and decorative features that are important in defining the overall historic*

character of the building. The storefront materials (including wood, masonry, metals, ceramic tile, clear glass, and pigmented structural glass) and the configuration of the storefront are significant, as are features, such as display windows, base panels, bulkheads, signs, doors, transoms, kick plates, corner posts, piers, and entablatures. The removal of inappropriate, non-historic cladding, false mansard roofs, and other later, non-significant alterations can help reveal the historic character of the storefront.

- o Investigation of the fabric behind the current cladding may provide more clarity about the dimensions and materials of the historic storefront beyond what can be vaguely determined from historic photos.
- o The cornice should incorporate end brackets, clearly shown in the 1929 photo (below) and shown on other cornices on this block.
- o Drawing on historic photographs of other storefronts in the area may yield a more historical design. For instance, the proposed sidelights by the doors do not appear to have precedent on this block, where paired doors are common. A contrasting material below the store window may also be more appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefronts Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:31:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Michelle Kleschick represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked about the original pane configuration of the upper windows. He wondered whether the windows at the right of the elevation might have been multi-light, either four-over-four or six-over-six to match the two-over-two at the left.
 - o Mr. Maust replied that he could not be sure but that given the early date of the best available photograph, 1929, and given that the facade dates to 1914, the one-over-one windows, which survive, may be original.
 - o Ms. Kleschick noted that the windows Mr. Detwiler asked about are wood windows that are in poor condition.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey commented that he thought they could be the original windows.
 - o Mr. Maust clarified that he had seen one photograph from the 2000s that showed one or more missing sash, suggesting that at least one sash may be replacement.
- Mr. Cluver shifted the conversation to the addition and expressed the opinion that it could be shifted back another five feet to reduce the visibility from the street. He referred to the submitted floor plans and suggested that by altering the kitchen in the fourth-floor apartment to follow the layout of that on the floor below, and by moving a walk-in closet into the bedroom, also as shown in the apartment below, another five feet of setback could be easily achieved.
 - o Ms. Kleschick replied that she would discuss that possibility with the owner.
- Mr. McCoubrey thanked the applicant for submitting a nearby storefront design as a reference point and suggested that she discuss the matter with the Historical Commission's staff. He questioned whether the storefront was appropriate.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. McCoubrey and described the current proposal as "a little clumsy." He pointed out that there are many historic storefronts in Philadelphia that might provide reference points and suggested carefully

- reviewing the available historic photographs of this property as well.
- Mr. Cluver returned to the topic of the historic windows to be replaced and noted that given their simple configuration, quality replacement windows would not have a significant negative impact on the front elevation.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed and noted that they could be easily replicated with the correct detailing of the frame.
 - o Mr. D’Alessandro suggested that the owner could explore having replacement sash made rather than trying to purchase commercial windows.
- Mr. Detwiler turned his attention to the windows in the rooftop addition and criticized the space over those windows as well as the fact that the windows there are slightly larger than the windows below. He suggested reducing the height of the parapet to make the addition feel less top-heavy.
 - o Ms. Stein, referring to the side elevation, noted the three-foot tall parapet and agreed that it could be reduced in height, which would be an improvement.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked if the roof was designed to be occupied.
 - o Ms. Kleschick answered that that was their original intent but that plans had changed and the parapet could be lowered as a result.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the cornice at the top of the historic facade is missing one element that should be replicated.
 - o Ms. Kleschick asked for clarification of the missing element.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey directed everyone’s attention to a photograph of the existing conditions and a board that appeared to have been nailed on to cover a molding element, seen on the 1929 photograph. The molding had possibly fallen off or become damaged.
- Mr. Cluver asked if there was a plan for handling drainage where the current slope of the roof meets the front of the addition.
 - o Ms. Kleschick said that they had not yet settled on a drainage plan.
 - o Mr. Cluver and Mr. Detwiler emphasized that details such as the drainage plan should be submitted when requesting final approval.
- Ms. Stein asked for more information about the material of the proposed siding, noting that the application only specifies that it will be vertical and beige in color.
 - o Ms. Kleschick said the design team was looking for guidance from the Historical Commission about the appropriate material that would make the addition inconspicuous.
 - o Ms. Stein recommended looking for successful additions throughout the neighborhood for inspiration. She noted that she did not recommend wood siding, but that metal may be more appropriate for the neighborhood and that the Historical Commission has approved panelized systems in the past.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rooftop addition should be shifted further back if possible.
- The one-over-one windows could be original to the 1914 facade but that appropriate replacements would be acceptable.
- Details of a plan for drainage where the existing roof slope meets the addition should be submitted for final approval.
- The upper cornice should be repaired as part of the project.

- Details of the cladding material should be submitted before review at the Historical Commission meeting.
- The applicant could engage the Historical Commission staff's to discuss an appropriate first-floor storefront.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, given the conspicuousness of the proposed rooftop addition.
- The storefront part of the application fails to satisfy the Storefronts Guideline, but a refined configuration could be acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, given the missing details and pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefronts Guideline.

ITEM: 29 N 2nd St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 709 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pine Assets Holdings LLC

Applicant: Michelle Kleschick, Parallel Architecture Studio, LLC

History: 1836

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition with pilot house with roof deck on a Greek Revival rowhouse at a contributing property in the Society Hill Historic District. It also proposes to construct a roof deck on top of the existing three-story rear ell and a second smaller roof deck over an existing rear garage building. The building was constructed c. 1836 and is four stories tall with a gable roof, red brick façade, a three-story rear ell, and a detached rear one-story garage that faces Delancey Street. The proposed addition will be located behind the existing three-story rear ell and will replace an existing small one-story addition and small rear yard, extending to the back of the current detached garage. The addition will be clad in red brick on its rear façade and red fiber cement panels on its exposed party wall. The main roof

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MARCH 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

deck will be constructed on top of the current three-story rear ell and be accessed from a pilot house that will be located on top of the new addition. A second smaller rear deck will be constructed behind the new addition and on top of the existing garage building and will be accessed from the second floor of the addition. The upper floors of the addition and rear deck will be visible from Delancey Street along with the existing garage, which will remain unaltered on its Delancey Street facade. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission approved several similar rear additions to neighboring properties on this block in October and November 2022. At those reviews, the staff, Committee, and Commission found that this block of Delancey Street was not residential in character and mostly contains rear garages and parking structures with only a single house fronted on it.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a three-story rear addition with pilot house
- Construct a roof deck on top of the existing rear ell
- Construct a second roof deck on top of the existing garage

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed addition satisfies Standard 9. It will be differentiated from historic portions of the house and is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic property.
 - o The proposed rear deck satisfies Standard 9. It will be differentiated from historic portions of the house and is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic property.
 - o The proposed roof deck satisfies Standard 9. It will be located on an existing rear ell and not be very visible from surrounding public rights-of-way.
- *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 decks are located on the rear ell and garage building and not the main block of the house. This work satisfies the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the proposed addition and decks, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:48:37

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Michelle Kleschick represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Kleschick briefly summarized the project and pointed out that her firm also designed the neighboring additions that were called out in the staff's overview. She

explained that she is looking to replicate the overall ideas of those previous additions at this location.

- Mr. Cluver referred to the axonometric view and asked about the rear dormer on the main block of the house and whether it is being removed or altered for access to the roof deck.
 - o Ms. Kleschick responded that there is already an existing door in that dormer, and they are adding a pilot house to the new addition as a second means of egress.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked for clarification and pointed to the demolition plan appearing to show a window in that dormer.
 - o Ms. Kleschick responded that she believes there is a door but will go back and confirm her belief. She added that there does need to be a second means of egress for this deck since it is on the fourth floor.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey commented that the dormer does look to be altered in one of the photographs provided, but it is not entirely clear.
- Mr. Cluver commented on the proposed placement of the air conditioning units. He suggested they be moved to be more in the center of the roof instead of close to the edge.
 - o Ms. Kleschick agreed to discuss the placement with the client.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the air conditioning units should be relocated.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the height of the pilot house and if that height could be reduced.
 - o A Ms. Kleschick responded that it could be reduced a little bit.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that it would be helpful to have another axonometric rendering from the rear for the next phase of review to better show the dormer and other aspects of the design.
 - o Ms. Kleschick agreed.
 - o Ms. Stein added that a section view would also be helpful. She continued to explain that it is difficult to tell how the heights compare between the different components of the building.
 - o Mr. Detwiler suggested that the applicant also add some more details on materials for aspects such as the deck surfaces.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that while he is generally in favor of the design, he thinks that more details need to be shown on the application.
 - o Ms. Stein agreed and pointed out that the cladding materials are not specified on the drawings.
 - o Mr. Till pointed out that cladding materials are specified in the cover letter for the application, but not in the drawings.
 - o Ms. Stein asked the applicant about cladding materials.
 - o Ms. Kleschick responded that the rear will be faced in red brick and the exposed side wall in a complementary colored panel.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The overall design and massing of the proposed addition is acceptable.
- The application needs more detail on materials and additional drawings and renders added to be adequately reviewed.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application is incomplete.

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

ITEM: 709 Pine St 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 3819 THE OAK RD

Proposal: Replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Prince and Melissa Holloway

Applicant: Jared Keichline, Renewal by Andersen

History: 1849; Ivy Cottage

Individual Designation: 3/7/1974

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing 52 Renewal by Andersen Acclaim series Fibrex windows on all elevations of the building at 3819 The Oak Road. The property was recently purchased by new owners after years of deferred maintenance. The house is set back approximately 70 feet from the street. According to the application, 27 of the 52 windows are not visible from the public right-of-way, and the application proposes to replace these within the existing masonry openings, but without muntins, as a means of cost-savings to put towards the visible windows. The standard Renewal by Andersen installation process is to insert the window into the existing frame. The applicant is aware of the build-down that this creates and is proposing full replacement of the entire framing system and wood brick moulding to replicate the historic appearance, with no aluminum capping on the exterior. The other installation option available is to insert into the existing frame and retain the exterior brickmould, which creates the slight build-down of the visible opening. The projecting bay on the left side of the building is also proposed for replacement owing to its deteriorated condition.

The Historical Commission's staff routinely approves non-historic windows in openings that are not visible from the public right-of-way and is recommending approval of the Fibrex windows for the rear elevation for this reason. The Historical Commission's staff has requested additional

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MARCH 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

information from the applicant regarding Renewal by Andersen's ability to replicate the unique appearance of many of the windows on this building, and regarding reconstruction of one bay on the side of the building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace all windows with Renewal by Andersen Acclaim series Fibrex windows.
- Reconstruct bay on side of building.

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 The proposed windows do not match the historic windows in materials and, for the non-visible windows, design; however, windows that do not replicate the historic appearance can be approved when they are not visible from the public right-of-way. Given the setback of the building from the street, the proposed product may be acceptable for visible windows, provided the applicant can demonstrate the manufacturer's ability to replicate the historic appearance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Jared Keichline of Renewal by Andersen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Architectural Committee started its discussion by reviewing the proposed replacement of a double casement diamond-paned window. Mr. Keichline stated that he could replicate the diamond pattern, but that he would use a simulated vertical checkrail and the window would function as a single casement.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the public visibility of the rear windows from the school fields located behind the property.
 - o Mr. Keichline responded that he could not see the rear of the building from the private school fields, which are private, not public, property.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the windows on this building are character-defining features, and any replacement of them needs to be done correctly. He observed that some windows are simpler than others.
- Mr. Detwiler recommended restoration rather than replacement for the most character-defining windows.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that many of the window sash could be removed and restored by a skilled carpenter.
 - o Mr. Keichline responded that he is trying to help the homeowner move forward with the project and make the house habitable. He asked the Architectural Committee to help him help his client.
- Mr. D'Alessandro cautioned against a rehabilitation of the house without a historic

preservation-minded design professional guiding the work.

- o Mr. Keichline responded that there is a contractor handling the larger project, much of which has already been permitted. This application is solely for window replacement.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed concern that the Renewal by Andersen window details will not meet the requirements needed for this very significant building.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the application is incomplete. He explained that a complete application needs to have a photograph of each building elevation, with each window keyed to a window schedule that fully defines the proposal for each unique window.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed that the application is incomplete and should include drawings showing the existing and proposed windows for each unique opening, including the brickmould and the setback within the masonry opening.
 - o Mr. Keichline reiterated that he is trying to assist the property owner with this scope of work so that the owner can move into the house as soon as possible.
- Ms. Chantry noted that she spoke with the property owner in December 2024 and provided him with contact information for local window contractors who would be able to sufficiently replicate the appearance of the historic windows, or potentially restore some of the existing windows, but it appears that he did not move forward with those contacts.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Historic windows can often be restored rather than replaced.
- Many of the windows at this building are character-defining features.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed windows do not match the historic windows in materials and potentially design.
- The application did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate the manufacturer's ability to replicate the historic appearance of the windows.
- The application does not provide information about reconstruction of the side bay.

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

ITEM: 3819 The Oak Rd MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 234-36 S 8TH ST

Proposal: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Christina Chung and Jeffrey George

Applicant: Don Munera

History: 1810; Mills House; Robert Mills; moved from 9th and Locust to 8th Street, 1978

Individual Designation: 2/22/1978

District Designation: Washington Square West Historic District, Significant, 9/12/2024

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize five, first-floor windows on the Locust Street (north) façade that were replaced in February 2025 without the Historical Commission's approval. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the unpermitted windows. The replacement windows are incompatible with this historic building in style and material.

The house originally stood at 228 S. 9th Street. It was one of three similar houses in a row that was constructed about 1810. In 1978, the rowhouse was moved to the corner of S. 8th and Locust Streets and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. At the original location, the building had no windows on the side facades, which were party walls. When the building was relocated to the corner of 8th and Locust Streets in 1978, one of the former party walls was exposed, and windows were added. The fenestration pattern on the north facade, which was exposed with the move, was based on the windows at the house at the end of the original row, 230 S. 9th Street. Also, a two-story rear ell was added after the building was moved.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement*

of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

- o The wood windows were replaced with vinyl windows that have interior muntins. The replacements windows do not replicate the historic windows in design, configuration, or material.
- o The removed windows date from ca. 1980 when the house was moved, and brick cladding was added to the street-visible north façade. The north façade window openings were based on the openings in the associated building at 230 S. 9th Street. The replacement windows should be compatible with those on the primary façade facing 8th Street; therefore, the new windows do not meet Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:26:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Jeff George represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff read a statement from the contractor, Don Munera. In his written statement, Mr. Munera noted that the existing windows were badly deteriorated and were installed incorrectly. He argued that wood replacement windows would have deteriorated similarly to the original wood windows. The statement declared that the new vinyl windows were trimmed out like wood windows with six pane upper and lower sashes. He observed that the new windows were not prominently visible, owing to the six-foot masonry fence on the north side of the lot that is 20 feet from the house.
- Mr. Cluver expressed regret that the applicant chose a vinyl window. He continued that either aluminum-clad wood windows or fiberglass windows with simulated divided lights would have been appropriate.
- Mr. D'Alessandro declared that until the leaks are resolved the windows will be susceptible to water deterioration.
 - o Mr. George noted that the new vinyl windows will be painted to match the existing windows, all of which are severely deteriorated.
 - o Mr. Detwiler opined that vinyl windows are inappropriate and that "sandwich" muntins are unacceptable because they do not replicate the shadow line found in traditional, true divided light windows.
 - o Mr. Cluver speculated that paint will not endure on vinyl windows.
- Mr. George detailed numerous repairs he has made and significant expenses he has incurred improving the house. He expressed frustration at the notion of having to replace the new vinyl windows.
- Mr. Cluver reiterated that this problem would have been avoided by following proper procedure.
 - o Mr. George stated that his contractor did not think that the Historical Commission's approval was needed because the windows are in a side facade. He was not trying to avoid the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Deteriorated wood windows on the first floor of the north facade were replaced.
- The replacement windows are vinyl with “sandwich” muntins.
- The new windows were not approved by the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The installation of first floor vinyl windows with “sandwich” muntins fails to satisfy Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial pursuant to Standard 6.

ITEM: 234-36 S 8th St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1501 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Construct six-story addition; rehabilitate historic façade

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: 1501 Fairmount Ave LLC

Applicant: Shawn McAnally, Designblenz Architecture

History: 1930; Overseas Motor Works; Samuel Brian Baylinson, architect

Individual Designation: 2/13/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a six-story, mixed-use structure within a now-freestanding historic Art Deco façade at the northwest corner of Fairmount Avenue and 15th Street. This façade is all that remains of a 1930s commercial structure. The Historical Commission approved an application for a four-story overbuild on this property in 2016, but that project was abandoned in 2023. Work had begun on the project including partial demolition; everything but the exterior walls were removed, leaving the remaining walls structurally braced.

The current proposal is similar to the building proposal approved in 2016, but two stories taller. The materials include brown corrugated metal, mahogany fiber-cement panels, and red and brown patterned brick, in a design that emphasizes verticality to compliment what remains of the historic structure. The building would include one commercial space and thirty-two residential

units. The new construction would be set back from the existing facades and corner tower, and the historic facades would be restored. Along Swain Street, a setback at the fourth floor has been created to provide a sense of scale more in line with the residential surroundings.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six-story addition and restore historic 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.*
- *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.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:42:41

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Shawn McAnally represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked Ms. Hendrickson why the application was changed to "in concept."
 - o Ms. Hendrickson explained that the applicants were in continued discussions with community stakeholders and that an alternate proposal for the new construction was proposed at the last minute and so instead of withdrawing from the meeting, the applicants wished to discuss the submitted proposal and the new proposal with the Architectural Committee, therefore requested to change the review level to "in concept" as opposed to "final approval."
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant to discuss the second proposal as they were already familiar with the submitted proposal.
 - o The applicant noted that the main difference between the proposals was the building height and the level of setback from Fairmount and 15th Street. He explained that the second option was one floor shorter than the submitted proposal and had less setback from the historic facade, about five to nine feet. He noted that the way that the building stacked and aligned with adjacent structures was consistent between the two proposals as was the intent for materiality and how the facade was being treated as a whole. He stated that the main emphasis for the project was the existing historic ornate Art Deco structure. He further explained that the material choice of metal panel was to pay homage to the previous use of the historic building as an auto body shop and dealer in the 1930s and 1940s. He noted the use of brick to wrap around to the Swain Street side and match materiality and height of the residential corridor.

- Mr. McCoubrey asked if there would be any windows in the corner near the tower in the second proposal.
 - o The applicant responded that windows were still being explored for that corner, owing to the proximity of the proposed building to the existing two-story portion of the historic facade.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the taller proposal was eligible for by-right zoning.
 - o The applicant replied that it was not; therefore community support would be needed for the height increase. He explained that they were trying to find the balance between what was best for the community and what celebrated the historic facade in the best way.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicant if the setback from the two-story tower was the same on both the north and west sides in the second proposal.
 - o The applicant responded that they were close, if not the same.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the setback along the south side from the edge of the existing facade to the new building was the same as it was on the east side.
 - o The applicant responded that there was one foot difference. He confirmed that there was a compositional logic behind the design relative to the tower.
- Mr. Cluver, speaking of the second design, asked the applicant if there would be an absence of windows on the proposed new construction on both sides behind the historic tower.
 - o The applicant explained that it was something needed to be explored further, but with the two-story structure in its proximity it may be in its best interest to give it some breathing space. He noted that across the two proposals there would be relief between the historic structure and the new construction to give the historic site breathing space to be celebrated and keep the context similar.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the plan on page six of the submission package, where it noted "existing wall to be removed" around the historic tower. He asked if that meant opening it up within the space.
 - o The applicant replied in the affirmative. He explained that the photographs of the existing structure showed that only the facade remained; there was some support behind the facades but that was all that remained of the previous structure. He furthered that the roof and parts of the historic structure were removed by the previous owner and wood supports were all that were maintaining the integrity of the structure.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the second floor of the tower and if there was glass on the north and west walls or if it was solid.
 - o The applicant replied that the north and west walls had been filled in and were solid and would likely remain solid, but that the ones that faced south and east would be glass to return it to what it looked like previously.
- Mr. Cluver asked if it was a two-story opening on the inside.
 - o The applicant explained that currently there was a small platform inside but that originally it was a two-story volume, and the intent was to get it back to two stories.
- Mr. Cluver asked if there had always been a spandrel.
 - o The applicant replied that there was a spandrel panel in the middle with glass above and their intent was to match that.
- Mr. Cluver noted that, according to the historical photograph, the spandrel panel was a glass spandrel and that there were two stories of glass and that just part of it had a solid back. He added that, in the historical photograph, there was also a band between the solid-backed glass and the clear glass above which he did not see in

- the applicant's proposed elevations. He noted mullions in the proposed elevations, which were absent in the historical photograph.
- o The applicant responded that they were trying to get the design as close as they could to the original concept.
 - Ms. Stein added that the historical photograph showed a two-story portal effect due to the dark spandrel glass. She opined that the use of any light-colored material in the spandrels would create a horizontal line in what originally felt like a two-story spandrel. She noted that the reflective quality achieved with a back-painted spandrel was a critical design component in her opinion.
 - Mr. Cluver discussed the two-story glass element in relation to the amount of light that was able to pass through, historically. He speculated that this would have been both when the lights were illuminated in the showroom but also would have had a transparent quality during the day. He noted that if the tower was filled in on the north and west side, this quality would be lost. Evaluating the two proposals, Mr. Cluver opined that the original proposal, which pulled back from the south facade, could have allowed that sense of transparency through the east and west windows. He noted that part of what he liked about the new proposal was that the addition really responded to the tower in his opinion. However, he lamented the loss of transparency. He explained that the tower treatment would have an impact on which concept would be preferred.
 - Mr. Cluver asked the applicant if the sign bands seen in the historical photograph, which were found above the storefronts, were gone.
 - o The applicant noted that in the proposals they kept the signage bands in select locations where they would still make sense based on the retail use of the ground floor and the apartment entrance.
 - Mr. Cluver said that the bands should be in the same location as in the historic photograph. He noted that the parapet height in the rendering looked lower than in the historic photograph.
 - o The applicant noted that the measurements were site verified but that they could be double checked.
 - Mr. McCoubrey voiced concern about the coloring of the proposals, noting that he believed the colors to be too dark which added to the looming quality of the overbuild of the new construction. He opined that they should be lighter in value and similar to a brick building.
 - o The applicant noted that the rendering was showing on the darker side but that the intent was that it would be closer to the brick tones but still differentiated from the limestone and the brick.
 - Mr. McCoubrey questioned the materials, noted that two were called out but that the rendering showed three patterns.
 - o The applicant explained that the horizontal piece between the windows was fiber cement and that the flat vertical panels between the corrugated standing-seam metal was the same material but in the flat version.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that he liked the color palette and that he felt optimistic about the project. Speaking of the windows on the proposed east elevation towards Swain Street, he opined that the division of the vertical elements and the window spacing seemed awkward.
 - o The applicant responded that they were trying to add more muntins to align with the residential houses along Swain Street to keep a residential feel.
 - o Mr. Detwiler opined that the applicant could put more vertical strips on the taller building due to it being a solid wall as it wrapped the corner. He noted that he

believed it could help the building feel less massive and solid.

- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the parapet space should be reduced as much as possible.
- Ms. Lukachik stated that she preferred the second proposal, the one that was shorter and closer to the tower. She added that she thought the submitted proposal was overwhelming. She did note, however, that depending on how the windows were modified by the applicant, she could change her mind.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that he thought the window placement was important to help the design feel less heavy and that he almost preferred the taller one because even though it was larger, it felt lighter at the corner due to the window placement.
- Ms. Lukachik opined that the taller version felt shoehorned into the design and had no relationship to anything whereas the shorter version felt more purposeful and added symmetry to the side elevation. She added that what the applicant does with the blank wall will matter.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that he was more interested in the existing historic facade and thought the more attention that was given to that structure the less he was concerned about the new work. He noted that he did not like the height but that relieving and having the historic stonework and the tower independent was better to him.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the transparency of the tower was a wonderful quality that added lightness and was amazing for its day and he would want that element preserved.
 - o The applicant pointed to the three-dimensional drawings in the application package and noted that, with the building pulled back, more transparency would be allowed than if the building was shorter and closer to the tower.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that there were not just two primary facades with the tower, but four primary facades that could be seen from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Lukachik opined that there was a way to have windows on all four sides of the tower, allowing light to come through, while at the same time going with the shorter proposal which would not overwhelm the block. She also suggested that fake windows could be used.
- Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed and noted that original design and original openings must be respected.
- Mr. Cluver noted to the applicant that one view that would be very helpful when this review returns to the Architectural Committee would be a view looking down Fairmount Avenue from the west looking east as well as a view looking down 15th Street, looking north.
- Mr. Cluver wondered if the Committee was required to make a motion on in-concept applications.
- Ms. Stein commented that it would help the architect to make a motion so that they could present the opinion of the Historical Commission when they go back to meet with the neighborhood.
 - o The applicant agreed with Ms. Stein.
- Ms. Stein noted her excitement about the preservation of the unique building w. She stated that she believed the additional height was warranted to preserve the memory of the tower so that her vote would be for the submitted taller version.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Attorney Michael Mattioni, representing Loonstyn Holdings, LP, spoke in favor of the revised proposal and against the original taller proposal.

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that the new construction should be a more neutral architectural backdrop for the historic building. He suggested using fewer materials, less detailing, and commented that it would be better if the overall construction were shorter.
- Patricia Freeland, representing the Spring Garden Civic Association and the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, spoke in favor of the original submitted proposal and thanked the developers and their professionals for engaging with them during the planning process. She could not comment on the revised proposal as they had yet to review the revised plans.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The treatment of the tower will be a critical design component. Restoring to its historic appearance would be preferred. The ability of light to pass through the tower is a character-defining feature of the historic structure.
- The signage bands should be in the same location as in the historic photograph.
- The parapet should be lowered as much as possible.
- The window treatment on the overbuild behind the historic tower should be modified and this will be a critical design component.
- The applicant should provide three-dimensional views looking east down Fairmount Avenue and north from 15th Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application, in concept, satisfies Standard 6 because the historic structure would be restored and repaired in-kind.
- The application, in concept, satisfies Standard 9. Each of the two proposals would need to be tailored in different ways to satisfy Standard 9.

FAILED MOTION: On a motion to recommend approval in concept of the alternate, shorter proposal, provided that window openings are added to the corner element of the tallest section, the parapet is lowered, and the corner tower includes as much glass as possible, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, the Architectural Committee vote resulted in a 3 to 3 tie and the motion failed.

ITEM: 1501 Fairmount Ave MOTION: Approval in concept of alternate, shorter proposal MOVED BY: Detwiler 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	3	3			1

ADDRESS: 500 N CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS BLVD

Proposal: Construct six-story rooftop addition; cut openings; install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 500 NCCB FEE LLC

Applicant: Jerry Roller, JKRP Architects

History: 1891; Philadelphia Warehousing & Cold Storage Company

Individual Designation: 1/8/2021

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes final approval for constructing a rooftop addition at 500 N. Christopher Columbus Boulevard. This complex of buildings, historically known as the Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, was constructed between 1891 and 1910. When the property was designated in 2021, the eight-story building known as “Building B” was deemed contributing. This project would convert Building B from its original use as a storage warehouse to residential use.

The proposed six-story rooftop addition would be constructed on the historic building. The proposed cladding is glass and metal arranged in a grid pattern. Windows would be inserted on three facades of the historic building. Currently, the building has a small number of windows but adaptive use to residential space requires the addition of a significant number of new window openings. As part of the conversion to the new use, the existing mural is proposed to be moved to the west elevation of “Building C.” The owner is working with Mural Arts on this element of the project.

The Historical Commission approved this project in-concept at its January 2024 meeting. The revised application for final approval has incorporated key recommendations made by the Architectural Committee during the in-concept review. They include restoring the “ghost signage” at the top of the building, revising the exterior grid color from black to gray, and creating a sample window opening.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The application satisfies Standard 9 as the new addition will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The application satisfies Standard 10 as historic “Building B” will retain its essential form and massing once this project is complete. Both the roof addition and window

openings could be infilled if a future owner wished to return it to its original appearance as a storage warehouse; therefore, the in-concept proposal meets Standard 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:28:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Jerry Roller and Marissa Howard, attorney Brett Feldman, and owner Seth Brown represented the in-concept application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Feldman and Mr. Brown provided background on the project and summarized the challenges and goals of converting Building B to a new use.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the test window opening and asked if it was a 90-degree cut. He explained that historically when a building had thick masonry walls, often splayed window jambs were used to allow for greater light inside the buildings. He recognized that it would increase the size of the steel installed and that this is an interior change and would not alter the historic exterior appearance.
 - o Ms. Howard confirmed the test openings were 90-degree cuts and acknowledged his recommendation.
- Mr. Detwiler said it would be helpful for the Historical Commission to see proposed window details for the new openings. Mr. Detwiler said he appreciated the test window opening and the photographs recording it but that it would be helpful to see how the proposed windows would be inserted into the walls. He said this is important to show because the new window openings are one of the biggest parts of the project and showing window details is crucial. Mr. Detwiler and Mr. Cluver agreed on this point and stated that a revised submission for the Historical Commission's meeting should show window details such as heads, jambs, and sills.
 - o Ms. Howard responded that their plan was to work with the Historical Commission's staff on this type of detailing. She explained that they had not yet selected a window and wanted to make sure the detailing was correct.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the size of windows shown on the south façade.
 - o Ms. Howard replied that the typical window on the south facade would be seven feet by six feet.
- Mr. Cluver asked why specific windows show a sill and header. He said he liked the way it breaks up the heavy grid pattern and also retains a sense of the building's history.
 - o Ms. Howard explained that windows showing sills and headers are historic windows and openings already in place.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the north elevation of the building. She said that there does not appear to be an elevation or rendering of the north elevation in the application. Ms. Stein also asked about the future location of the mural.
 - o Ms. Howard responded that the mural would be located on the west façade of Building C, facing Interstate 95. She noted that they did not include a full elevation drawing of the north façade in the application.

- Ms. Stein and Mr. Detwiler both stated that the application should include more information about the north elevation. They observed the north elevation includes balconies. Mr. Detwiler said he was curious to see how the south wall of the overbuild appeared. They both commented that the balconies could visually break up the north façade. Mr. Detwiler suggested that elevation drawings or renderings should be provided in a revised application for the Historical Commission in order to receive project approval.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested a change to the cornice area of the overbuild. He recommended introducing a stepped coping in the cornice area to create relief. Mr. McCoubrey referenced the step in the cornice at the top of the historic building as an example of this. He said a step or reduced height in the overbuild's cornice would give it a lighter feeling.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the building's mechanical units. She asked where they would be located and if the units would be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - o Ms. Howard replied the mechanical equipment would be located on top of the overbuild. Mr. Roller said the mechanical units would not be visible from the ground level.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated the location of the mechanical units should be added to a revised application presented to the Historical Commission for final approval. Mr. Cluver said that a roof plan should also be added to the final application.
- During the review, the applicant sent an email with the north elevation drawing to Ms. Mehley. She shared it through Zoom, and it was visible to Architectural Committee members and all meeting attendees. Ms. Howard explained that the north elevation would have the same materials as the rest of the overbuild and the façade material color would primarily match the darker graphite seen on the other three facades.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the inner panels on the north façade be a light tone with the grid members being the graphite color.
 - o Mr. Cluver observed that going with a lighter color on the inner panels would reinforce the grid pattern.
 - o Ms. Stein asked if they were talking about a slight difference in tone rather than a dramatic color difference.
 - o The Architectural Committee members agreed that they are suggesting a more subtle color difference rather than a dramatic one.
- The Architectural Committee members agreed that they liked the balconies shown on the north elevation.
- Mr. Cluver and Ms. Stein responded positively to changes to the ghost sign on the south façade. They stated that the greater visibility of the ghost sign and the reduced number of windows in the signage area worked well.
- Mr. Cluver remarked that the changes to the window size and arrangement add a nice variation to the south façade.
- Mr. Detwiler asked how far the windows would be set back from the masonry openings.
 - o Mr. Roller said they are currently planning a setback of approximately four inches. He explained that once the brick is cut it will absorb water. He noted that the window will be designed to sit back in the masonry opening with a metal flange on the sides and sill.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed this sounded like a good approach.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites pointed out that this project is truly an overbuild,

appearing as one building set on top of another. He said he is not opposed to the project but wanted to point out how the imagery of Philadelphia is changing and that overbuilds are becoming prevalent. He encouraged everyone to think about this and if this is a direction the city wants to go in. Mr. Traub commented that this project provides a forecast of the way a future Philadelphia may look.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The overall project and design plans met the standards.
- Building B is the final building of the historic complex seeking the Historical Commission's approval for an adaptive reuse project. The Historical Commission has approved redevelopment plans for all other buildings within the former Philadelphia Warehousing & Cold Storage Company complex.
- The current submission should be revised prior to the Historical Commission's review. The revised version should include the following:
 - o Window details for new openings including head, jamb, and sills.
 - o A rendering of the north elevation. This should be comparable to current renderings in the application showing the general appearance, materials, and colors.
 - o The plans and elevations should be revised to include location and height of the mechanical systems and penthouse, and the stepping of the parapet.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The addition will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The addition will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.
- "Building B" will retain its essential form and massing once this project is complete, satisfying Standard 10. If desired, a future owner could restore the roof and window opening to return it to its historic appearance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the final application is revised based on the Committee's comments, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 500 N Christopher Columbus Blvd					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:57:23

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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