

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

**TUESDAY, 21 FEBRUARY 2023
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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 III
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner I
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner I
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

Thomas Larkin
Chris Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture LLC
Ethan J. Rhodes
Ron Galati
Lynnae Schwartz
Michael Heinzer
Juliet Whelan
Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO Design
Beth Johnson, Brighton Architecture + Design LLC
Sean Farrell, Bellweather Design Build
Jordan Gravely
Jay Farrell
Ian Kosten, Kosten Expediting
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 123 N VAN PELT ST

Proposal: Construct four-story addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gerald Gordon

Applicant: Ian Kosten, Kosten Expediting, LLC

History: 1880

Individual Designation: 4/28/1970

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the full rear wall and first and partial second-story extensions of the three-story building and to construct a four-story addition with a large pilot house and roof deck. The building was constructed circa 1880 as part of a row of three-story, two-bay wide buildings with mansards. The proposed addition would extend in height and depth beyond the additions of the neighboring buildings to the north and south, both of which are visible from Race Street. Rather than aligning with the existing floor levels, the addition is offset, creating split levels and a large overbuild of the rear and roof. The addition would be clad in concrete board and feature large casement and fixed windows, as well as a recessed second-floor balcony with a glass railing. The two-tier roof deck would be surrounded by a concrete board parapet, and condensing units would be located near the front of the main roof. While other properties on the block have larger rear additions, none extend up and over the height of the main block.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear wall and existing extensions.
- Construct four-story addition with pilot house and roof decks.

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 but 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 removes the whole rear wall of the existing historic building, failing to comply with Standard 9.
 - o The proposed scale, proportion, and massing alters the spatial relationships that characterize the building and its surroundings, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
 - o While other properties on the block have larger rear additions, none extend up and over the height of the main block. The staff suggests that a three-story rear addition that aligns with the height of the existing building would be more appropriate.
- *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 decks and stair tower overwhelm the existing building and will be conspicuous from the public right-of-way. Although the application includes a line-of-sight drawing that indicates the addition will not be visible from directly across the street, it does not take into consideration views from down the block or from Race Street. The application fails to comply with the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval of a three-story addition that aligns with the height of the existing building and depth of neighboring buildings, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:15

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Juliet Whelan and permit expeditor Ian Kosten represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Whelan opened the discussion by stating that the proposed addition, roof deck, and pilot house would not be visible from N. Van Pelt Street.
 - o Ms. Stein replied that the proposed massing, demolition of historic fabric, and impact on the property as a whole are also relevant considerations, owing to the individual designation of the property. She noted that the proposed addition includes an overbuild of the main block and would result in the removal of the entire rear wall.
- Ms. Stein asked if the applicant had a response to the staff's recommendation that the addition should be limited to three stories in height and shifted so that the rear wall is not entirely demolished.
 - o Ms. Whelan asked where the roof deck access would be location if the addition were to be lowered to three stories in height.
 - o Ms. Gutterman suggested that a pilot house on the rear ell would be more appropriate, and that perhaps a smaller roof deck could be sufficient.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Roofs Guideline calls for decks to be located on rear or secondary portions of buildings rather than on main blocks.
- Ms. Gutterman voiced concern about the weight of the overbuild and its mechanical equipment on the historic structure.
- Ms. Whelan expressed a willingness to eliminate the roof deck on the main block but explained that reducing the height of the rear addition would complicate the project.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that a conventional straight stair rather than a split-level stair would help with the height of the addition.
 - o Ms. Whelan pointed out that doing so would not lower the height of the pilot house.
- Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. Detwiler that the split-level stair is problematic in that it requires more demolition of the rear wall.
 - o Ms. Whelan stated that the rear wall demolition is driven by the desire to have more open interior space. She questioned why the Historical Commission would try to preserve the rear wall.
 - o Ms. Gutterman explained that the rear wall of the main block is an exterior wall, even though it is not visible from the public right-of-way. Therefore, complete

demolition of it on this individually designated property does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the rear ell is original to the house.
 - o Ms. Whelan responded that she does not believe the existing rear section is original to the construction of the main house.
 - o Ms. Gutterman opined that this part of the building could be original.
 - o Mr. Cluver referenced the 1916 Sanborn map, which shows the neighboring buildings all had matching rear ells, suggesting that they might be original.
- Mr. Cluver summarized that the most problematic aspect of the proposed scope is the overbuild onto the main block.
 - o Mr. Detwiler concurred, adding that the removal of the rear wall makes this different from other rear ell demolitions.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that, if windows are proposed for replacement on the front façade, the applicant should retain the existing frames or work with the staff to determine appropriate replacement materials.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 123 N. Van Pelt Street is individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
- The building was constructed c. 1880 and the existing rear ells were likely part of the original construction.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As proposed, the application fails to satisfy Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, owing to the overbuild onto the main block, the demolition of the rear wall, and the height of the proposed rear addition. The project could be improved somewhat by removing the overbuild component from the scope.

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

ITEM: 123 N VAN PELT ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 1703 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Thomas Larkin

Applicant: Elizabeth Johnson, Brighton Architecture + Design LLC

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house at 1703 Mt. Vernon Street, a rowhouse and contributing property in the Spring Garden Historic District. The proposed location of the roof deck is at the front of the property facing Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there are no roof decks located at the front of properties on this block or in the immediate vicinity. The roof deck would maintain the required five-foot setback from the street mandated by the zoning code, which would be in addition to the existing two-foot overhang of the property's cornice. The applicant contends that, if the deck appears visible at this seven-foot setback, the size of the deck will be reduced, and the setback increased at time of construction. The proposed pilot house would be a 6' x 6' x 10' structure built over an existing roof hatch where a spiral staircase would then be installed.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct 20' x 18'8" roof deck, including a 6' x 6' x 10' pilot house, and new interior spiral stair to access the roof deck.

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.*
- *Section 6.10.c.6 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations: "The staff shall review and may approve without referral to the Architectural Committee and the Commission permit applications proposing:...the alteration of secondary elevations and site features that face service alleys and/or are not visible or have limited visibility from public rights-of-way."*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial as proposed but approval of a roof deck that is pulled back further from the front façade or located on the rear ell of the property, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.10.c.6 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:28:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Elizabeth Johnson represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 FEBRUARY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Ms. Gutterman noted her concern for the precedent this project could set in building roof decks at the fronts of houses. She expressed that she was particularly concerned with the amount of overbuild this roof deck would necessitate. She contended that if the roof deck were allowed it would need to be pushed further back on the main block, but preferably be located on the rear ell.
 - o Ms. Johnson asked if there would be consideration of the pilot house remaining at the proposed location and the deck shifting to the back portion of the main block. She contended that the proposed location of the pilot house would be the most feasible, owing to an existing roof hatch opening.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that planning around the existing roof hatch was impacting the proposal negatively, and the proposed deck should be on the rear ell of the home. She contended that an alternate route to the deck would need to be found by the applicant.
- Ms. Lukachik agreed with Ms. Gutterman, adding that the extra work to make a new roof opening would be minimal in relation to the whole project, and the construction plans should not be dictated by the existing roof opening and should be dictated by its location on the rear ell.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the height of the proposed pilot house, stating it could be lower than 10 feet.
- Mr. Detwiler urged the applicant to consider lowering the deck to make it closer to the roof.
 - o Ms. Johnson emphasized the steep roof slope, which caused the additional deck height in the rear.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that the applicant would need to get permission from party wall neighbors to put weight on the party walls.
- Mr. Detwiler postulated that the party walls may need to be extended higher, not just for the pilot house, but potentially to create a barrier for the deck also.
- Mr. McCoubrey urged the applicant to be cognizant of the project's visibility from N. 17th Street.
- Mr. Detwiler noted he believed there to be long views from the side street, another reason for the deck to be pushed back.
- Ms. Stein commented on the necessity of extending whatever chimneys are on the roof tops, and that those changed would also need to come before the Architectural Committee and be part of the proposal.
 - o Ms. Johnson responded that all surrounding chimneys have been capped.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed roof deck may be visible from N. 17th Street.
- The pilot house does not have to be built on top of an existing roof hatch.
- The pilot house does not have to be 10 feet in height.
- The roof deck could be located on the rear ell.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Allowing a roof deck to be built on the front of a property could set a bad precedent.

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, owing to the location of the proposed deck on the main block of the building and the potential for visibility of the deck and pilot house from the public right-of-way.

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

ITEM: 1703 MOUNT VERNON ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 7028 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Subdivide parcel; construct three-story four-unit building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 7028 Ridge Avenue LLC

Applicant: Christopher Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture LLC

History: 1850; rear addition replaced 2000

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Ave Roxborough Thematic Historic District, Contributing,
10/12/2018

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to subdivide the parcel at 7028 Ridge Avenue and construct a three-story, four-unit building on the subdivided vacant lot. No work is proposed for the historically designated building on the property. The rear addition of the historic building dates to 2000 according to zoning permit documents. The new building would not connect to nor touch the historic building, nor does it block character-defining features of the historic building. The design of the new construction is industrial in style, and the new building would be located along a section of Ridge Avenue that features numerous architectural styles.

The Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District was designated in 2018 with the goal of protecting the oldest buildings on a five-mile stretch of Ridge Avenue, which resulted in the designation of 188 individual properties. The purpose of the thematic historic district was not to strictly regulate new construction. Because this new building neither alters or removes historic fabric of the designated parcel nor block views of character-defining features of the building, the staff recommends approval.

SCOPE OF WORK:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 FEBRUARY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Construct three-story four-unit building on subdivided parcel.

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 work is completely detached from the historic resource and therefore does not destroy historic materials which characterize the property. The new building is differentiated from the old and is compatible with the overall variety of architectural styles on Ridge Avenue, satisfying Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chris Carickhoff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman opined that the building should look new rather than historic.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the red brick industrial appearance is acceptable, but that the west-side elevation should also have a brick return of approximately one bay.
- Mr. Cluver suggested changing the proposed vinyl siding to a panelized fiber cement system.
 - o Mr. Carickhoff responded that he is open to these suggestions and will see how they work with the budget.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the front doorway could sit on a base of brick or other durable material to aid in future maintenance.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested the addition of a water table or other type of base pulled up to the first-floor level. He observed that many buildings in the historic district have brick or schist water tables, and it would fit with the style of building proposed. He agreed that there are a wide variety of buildings on this section of Ridge Avenue. He commented that the proposed building is nicely detailed with quality materials proposed. He thanked the architect and owner for proposing quality materials.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested panels in lieu of glazing for the bottom of the second and third-floor front windows to mimic what is shown for the first floor. The panel would be located under the sill line of the main windows. He suggested making the frame detail consistent on all front-façade windows. He suggested changing the sidelight next to the front door to have a panel below as well.
- Mr. Cluver asked about a requirement for providing an accessible entrance.
 - o Mr. Carickhoff responded that they do not believe an accessible entrance is required because the building will only have four units, but that if it does need to be accessible, the east side entrance can include a ramp.

- Mr. Detwiler noted that the application materials do not include a west elevation drawing. He asked to have the drawing included with the materials for the Historical Commission's review.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that the adjacent building which is not part of this property, is set back significantly from the street, allowing for greater visibility of the west elevation of the new building. He suggested reducing the amount of brick on the east elevation so that it allows for brick on the west elevation. He suggested using the same amount of brick for each side elevation.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed and suggested simplifying the brick arches on the east elevation to allow for more brick on the west elevation.
 - o Mr. Carickhoff agreed that having brick on the west elevation is important, and that he will provide a drawing of the west elevation and discuss the addition of brick with his client. He thanked the Architectural Committee for its comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- No work is proposed for the historically designated building on the property.
- The new building would neither connect to nor touch the historic building, nor does it block views of the character-defining features of the historic building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed work is completely detached from the historic resource and therefore does not destroy historic materials which characterize the property. The new building is differentiated from the old and is compatible with the overall variety of architectural styles on Ridge Avenue, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided:

- A west elevation drawing is submitted for the Historical Commission's review that includes red brick on this elevation,
- A base or water table is incorporated into the façade that extends under the front entranceway,
- The material on the side elevations is changed from vinyl to a fiber cement panel system,
- The window frame details are reconsidered to be consistent, and
- Paneling in lieu of glazing is used on the bottom of the second and third-floor front façade windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 7028 RIDGE AVE MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver 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	6				1

ADDRESS: 3135-49 W MONTGOMERY AVE

Proposal: Construct 14 townhouses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 3135-49 Montgomery Ave LLC

Applicant: Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO Design

History: 1907; Temple Beth Israel; Sauer & Hahn; Demolished after roof collapse in 2020

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct 14 townhouses on a vacant site. The Historical Commission designated the property in July 1993 for the synagogue building that stood on the site. The synagogue, Temple Beth Israel, was designed by the architectural firm of Sauer & Hahn and completed in 1907. The large domed roof of the building collapsed in 2020. The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) declared the building Imminently Dangerous on 1 August 2020 and then demolished the building to abate the public safety hazard in late 2020. At the time, L&I reported to the Historical Commission that the framing of the collapsed roof was pushing outward on the exterior walls of the synagogue along Morris Street and Montgomery Avenue and the remaining building needed to be demolished immediately in the interest of public safety. Since the demolition, the staff suggested that the property owner apply to have the designation of the site rescinded because the resource has been lost but the owner has not submitted such an application to date. The application must be reviewed because the site remains designated, but there are no historic resources at the site for the Commission to protect.

The application proposes to construct 14 townhouses on the empty lot. The Historical Commission and advisory Architectural Committee are charged with applying the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to building permit applications. The Standards assert that new construction should be compatible with the site and its environment. Given that no historic resources exist at the site and that the site is not in a historic district listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, there is no basis for the Historical Commission and Architectural Committee to assess the compatibility of the proposed new townhouses with the site and its environment. The Historical Commission should decline to review the application on its merits and simply approve it as submitted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 FEBRUARY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct 14 townhouses.

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 Historical Commission and Architectural Committee have no basis for judging the differentiation and compatibility of the townhouses with their site and environment because no historic resources have been identified at the site or in its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:58:14

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Carey Jackson Yonce represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he agreed with the staff's assessment of the situation. He noted that no historic resources survive at the site. He stated that the Historical Commission would have rescinded the designation if the owner had made such a request, in which case the Historical Commission would have had no jurisdiction.
 - o Mr. Yonce stated that the owner would have applied to have the designation of the property rescinded, but that would have taken longer than a simple permit approval.
 - o Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that there are no historic resources at or near the site and therefore no basis for a review on the merits.
 - o Mr. Farnham apologized for taking the Architectural Committee's time with this matter and noted that the Law Department indicated that a public review was mandatory.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission designated the property in July 1993 for the synagogue building that stood on the site.
- The synagogue building at the site collapsed in 2020. The Department of Licenses and Inspections declared the building Imminently Dangerous on 1 August 2020 and then demolished the building to abate the public safety hazard in late 2020.
- No historic resources survive at the site.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- There is no basis for judging the differentiation and compatibility of the townhouses with their site and environment because no historic resources have been identified at the site or in its environment.

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

ITEM: 3135-49 W MONTGOMERY AVE					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 4241 MAIN ST

Proposal: Legalize alterations to front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael P. Boscaino

Applicant: Michael P. Boscaino

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize recent façade alterations to 4241 Main Street. These alterations include the replacement of older aluminum siding with vinyl siding, capping of building and storefront cornices and window frames, window replacement, and the installation of exterior lighting and cameras. This work was conducted without building permits or the Historical Commission's approval, and the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation in early November 2022 at the Historical Commission's request.

Photographs from the time of designation show that aluminum siding was present on the building prior to its designation in 1983. Photographs from the applicants and taken by staff in late 2022 show that the siding was briefly removed, exposing brick and stone details underneath, as well as Italianate building and storefront cornices, which were then covered in siding and additional capping. Pairs of double doors were installed in the storefront window openings, and the second-floor bay and third-floor windows were also capped. It is unclear whether the upper floor windows themselves were replaced as well.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize exterior façade alterations including siding replacement, capping of cornices and window frames, window replacement, and installation of lighting and cameras.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Main Street Manayunk review criteria restated in the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations include:

- *Section 6.9.b.2: Facings: Refacing of facades, bays, cornices with inappropriate materials such as aluminum siding, or brick veneer shall be prohibited. Existing inappropriate facade facings shall be removed at the termination of the useful life of the facing. Any inappropriate facing material lawfully in existence shall not be repaired or altered in any substantial manner.*
 - o The existing inappropriate façade facing was removed at the termination of its useful life and refaced using an inappropriate material in vinyl siding.
- *Section 6.9.b.3: Elements: Original window and door openings, sills, lintels, and sashes shall be retained and repaired whenever possible. Replacement elements shall match the original appearance in proportion, form, and materials as closely as possible.*
 - o Replacement windows do not match the sash form of the original windows.
 - o Capping covers original window frames.
- *Section 6.9.b.4: Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.*
 - o The storefront alterations are not compatible with the materials of the original building.

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - o The siding and cornice capping covers and obscures the historic character of the property.
 - o The new windows and window capping alter original features and historic character.
- *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, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - o The new windows and frame capping do not match the old in appearance or materials.
- *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 siding, windows, and capping are incompatible with the architectural features of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the legalization of recent exterior work including siding replacement, capping of cornices and window frames, window replacement, and installation of

lighting and cameras pursuant to the Main Street Manayunk review criteria and Standards 2, 6, and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:04:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Michael Boscaino represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Boscaino offered a summary of how he came to purchase the property and explained the reasoning behind the recent alterations. He highlighted the poor condition of the cornices and the money that would be required to restore them. He explained that, under the siding, the upper floors are fronted with brick, but the lower floor is fronted with a faux brick siding. He added that his finances would not have supported a full restoration. He also added that he wanted to have the option to open the windows up on the first floor.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant did not know that he needed to apply for a permit before performing alterations.
 - o Mr. Boscaino responded that he did not and that he does not have a background as a developer. He added that the contractors he worked with implied that a permit was not necessary. He was unaware of the Historical Commission's review requirements until an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections viewed the project.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant was aware that the building was in a historic district when he purchased it.
 - o Mr. Boscaino replied that he was not. He added that the work has been praised by neighbors and that he was forced to perform the siding replacement after the building was struck by a car and the existing siding was irreparably damaged.
- Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee would apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to the project and that the applicant was making more of a financial hardship argument. He explained that the Historical Commission has a separate Committee on Financial Hardship, which evaluates hardship claims. He added that there are separate specific guidelines for the Main Street Manayunk district. If the applicant had applied for a permit, these standards would have been pointed out to him as part of that application process.
- Mr. Cluver clarified that the building had aluminum siding on it at the time of designation.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that one of her main concerns is with the window changes and not exclusively the siding. She explained that she is particularly opposed to the casing and covering added to the second-floor windows and how that changes the appearance of the window.
 - o Mr. Boscaino clarified that those elements are limited to capping. He also added that the first-floor windows are going to have their locksets removed and that he wanted to balance the possibility of opening them up fully with issues of security.
- Ms. Gutterman emphasized that the new windows greatly change the open appearance of the storefront. It was changed significantly from being a traditional storefront appearance to something else that is more closed off.
 - o Mr. Boscaino expressed willingness to change the windows.

- Mr. McCoubrey explained that the need to remove the old aluminum siding does not mean the applicant was allowed to replace it with new vinyl siding and that this work should have been taken as an opportunity to restore the original appearance of the façade.
 - o Mr. Boscaino admitted that he was in error in not knowing the guidelines related to the historic district.
- Mr. Detwiler explained that the most likely original appearance of the storefront would have been similar to its neighbor at 4239 Main Street, with a transom detail positioned above a central door flanked by two windows that align with the height of the door.
 - o Mr. Boscaino responded that the current window openings were not altered as part of this project.
- Mr. Detwiler clarified that, if the storefront were to be modified, the neighbor building's design would be a good comparison point. He added that the brick seen under the siding on the upper floors looks like it is in fairly good condition overall.
 - o Mr. Boscaino agreed about the condition of the brick on the upper floors but highlighted the poor overall condition of the first floor. He further explained the high cost that would be necessary to restore the cornices.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned the specific condition of the cornices wondering whether they need significant replacement or a less intensive surface restoration.
 - o Mr. Boscaino pointed out major missing pieces of the cornice.
- Ms. Stein observed that the neighboring property at 4239 Main Street had a similar capped cornice at the time of designation but that one has been since restored.
 - o Mr. Boscaino emphasized that he understands the points made related to restoration, but his finances do not support him restoring this property at this time.
- Ms. Gutterman reminded the applicant that there is a separate Committee on Financial Hardship that could review that information.
 - o Mr. Boscaino offered to change the storefront but asked to have the siding legalized as is.
 - o Ms. Gutterman explained that the Architectural Committee cannot legalize alterations, as it is an advisory committee, and that decision would be made by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Cluver clarified that the Architectural Committee would make its recommendation to the Historical Commission. He went on to explain that he sees two potential options for this review. The first option would be a complete restoration of the front facade. He stated that he understands Mr. Boscaino is not prepared to do an extensive restoration project like that and is not currently financially prepared to do so. The second option would be to leave the siding as is based on an argument that the building had siding at the time of designation, and then fix some details including the appearance of the windows on the second floor and changing the new first-floor windows to be more in line with a traditional storefront appearance.
 - o Mr. Boscaino stated that he would be open to Mr. Cluver's second option.
 - o Mr. Cluver clarified that the Historical Commission is the entity which would have to approve a potential compromise plan, as the Committee is advisory only.
- Mr. Boscaino returned to address an earlier comment on comparing the storefront of his building to the adjacent storefront at 4329 Main Street. He commented that he would be open to realigning the window openings to correspond with the door height.
 - o Mr. Detwiler clarified that he did not mean to suggest specifically realigning the current window openings alone but was offering a comparison point that could be

used if the storefront was fully restored to its original appearance. He added that the staff could make suggestions on details in that case. He noted that the owner did not remove any historic details from the façade, even if they are mostly covered up. He explained that the Committee is tasked with evaluating all projects for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and that ultimately, the decision regarding this work will be made by the Historical Commission.

- o Mr. Boscaino responded that he is open to making changes to the storefront windows and appearance of the second-floor windows. He emphasized that he made the building safe with this work when it was not safe before and did improve upon its earlier appearance.
- Mr. McCoubrey added that he is not sure what remains behind the vinyl beneath the new siding at the storefront level, but that the applicant may find evidence of historic details under it. He added that covering the cornice with vinyl does not particularly protect it and he would want to see the cornice restored as part of any work to the storefront level.
 - o Mr. Boscaino responded that he believes no historic material remains beneath the faux brick on the first floor. He added that the building has looked this way since at least the time of designation.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that in the photograph from 2003, the storefront windows extended all the way up to the bottom edge of the cornice. He added that there has been a lot of effort on Main Street to bring storefronts back to their original appearances. He pointed out the neighboring properties as examples.
- Mr. Boscaino asked about next steps in this review process.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee would make a recommendation to the Historical Commission. He added that the Historical Commission, which will meet to review the application on 10 March 2023, could consider additional broader factors that the Committee cannot.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, agreed with comments made by the Architectural Committee. He suggested that the owner look into the City's 10-year tax abatement program for the rehabilitation of properties, as it may help to offset costs to correct the work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Alterations were made to the facade of the building without required building permits, which included siding replacement, capping of cornices and window frames, window replacement, and installation of lighting and cameras.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The alterations that were made to the building are not compatible with the historic appearance of the property or with the character of the Main Street Manayunk Historic District.
- The alterations made to the property do not meet the guidelines laid out in the Main Street Manayunk review criteria listed in the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations nor do they satisfy Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to the Main Street Manayunk review criteria and Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ITEM: 4241 MAIN ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 2118 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lynnae Schwartz and Leslie Serchuck

Applicant: Sean Farrell, Bellweather Design Build

History: 1865

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks approval to remove the existing deck at 2118 Pine Street and construct a new roof deck of similar plan and dimensions. The building stands at the corner of Pine Street and S. Van Pelt Street and has a mansard roof.

The existing deck was constructed in 2004 with a building permit that was issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I), but without referral to or review by the Historical Commission. Once L&I's error was discovered, the permit was revoked, and the application was referred to the Historical Commission for review. Owing to L&I's mistake and the fact that the deck was already under construction, the Historical Commission approved the deck with the conditions that it be set back five feet from Pine Street and have an open metal picket rail fence.

The deck constructed under the unusual circumstances in 2004 now needs to be replaced. The question for the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission is whether the property owner has a vested right in a deck that may not meet preservation standards.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing deck and construct new deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 FEBRUARY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

- *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.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the proposed deck fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline because the deck will not be inconspicuous and minimally visible from the public right-of-way. The staff suggests that the Architectural Committee also apply the standard review criteria when formulating its recommendation and leave the broader question regarding vested rights to the Historical Commission.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:36:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sean Farrell represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked the staff whether the application would constitute repair or reconstruction.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale responded that she believes the existing deck and its structure needs to be removed and replaced, rather than repaired.
- Mr. Farrell explained that the existing deck was constructed by the previous owner in 2004 and the current owner wants to replace it in kind and maintain the home in good repair. He noted that there has been minor patching of the roof over time, but now both it and the deck need more work. He explained that, owing to the split nature of roof, the structure is bigger. He noted that the owner has and intends to color-match the trim and roof screens with the historic cornice and trim, and that there would be no view of a pilot house or staircase, just the railing.
 - o Ms. Gutterman asked whether it is just the deck that needs maintenance or the roof underneath.
 - o Mr. Farrell responded that both are in need of work, especially the rear roof, identified in the plans as the mechanical room under rear deck.
 - o Mr. Farrell explained that the owner has never received a violation on the property and wants to do everything properly.
- Mr. McCoubrey explained that the existing and proposed deck do not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and would not have been allowed if it had gone through a normal review, as it is highly visible. He opined that the deck should be limited to the rear ell without significant overbuild to create the mechanical roof. He noted that the question of whether the owner has a vested right in the deck is a question for the Historical Commission and not the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that, if the deck were to be replaced in kind, there are some improvements that could be made to reduce its impact. He noted that the thick, tall wooden posts that are currently part of the metal railing system are highly visible, and a new consistent-height metal picket railing and post system would be less visible. He also noted that there is an existing planter in the five-foot setback that is

- proposed to be replaced in kind and opined that there should be no plantings or other visible features in the setback.
- Mr. Cluver commented that the triangle keynotes on the plans are confusing and questioned what they key to.
 - o Mr. Farrell responded that they are intended to correspond to the type of railing to be used for each area.
 - Ms. Stein asked whether the height of the space identified on the proposed plans as mechanical space is so tall because the current deck has a recessed hot tub, which is being eliminated in the proposed plan. She suggested that the height of the rear deck be lowered, and the wall reduced or eliminated.
 - o Mr. Farrell responded that the HVAC condensing units are proposed for the area identified as the mechanical space.
 - o Ms. Stein asked how many condensing units are proposed.
 - o Mr. Farrell responded that two large units are proposed.
 - Ms. Stein opined that, if the proposal is for full replacement of the existing deck, this is the time to reduce and improve the deck. She suggested that the applicants consider reducing the deck to the rear ell, which is approximately 13' x 16' and can probably accommodate two condensing units. She argued that the existing deck was approved in 2004 under duress, and that this is the time to improve it and be more sympathetic to a property that has high visibility and that doing so will be an improvement to neighborhood and district.
 - o Mr. Farrell agreed that this is an opportunity for improvement. He responded that, owing to the size of the house, the mechanical units are quite large, but noted that he can discuss options with his client.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested moving the mechanical units to the party wall side of the main block roof and that the deck be limited to the rear ell. She argued that the Architectural Committee would never agree to a deck this size on the main block, with plants on front edge of a five-foot setback.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing deck was approved under duress and unusual circumstances in 2004.
- The existing deck is deteriorated and must be replaced.
- The Historical Commission should review the current proposal as though it is a new deck, applying the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines.
- Improvements could be made to the design of the deck, including limiting the deck to the rear ell, eliminating the mechanical room and the six-foot wall that surrounds it, and replacing the thick wood posts with a more delicate metal picket system.
- No plantings or other equipment should be located at the front of the main block roof.
- The mechanical equipment should be located so that it is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As it currently exists and as proposed, the deck is not inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 2118 PINE ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
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: 2519 S GARNET ST

Proposal: Demolish rear porch; construct two-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ronald B. Galati Jr.

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1910; James H. and John T. Windrim, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval to demolish a rear porch and construct an addition. The building is a two-story, semi-detached residential building designed in the Prairie/Arts & Crafts style constructed in 1910. The applicant is proposing to remove the original rear porch and construct a two-story rear addition.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove rear porch.
- Construct two-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 proposed addition is generally compatible with the historic house. The one aspect that does not comply with Standard 9 is the width of the addition. The addition would be approximately two feet wider than the historic main block and project beyond its south elevation. The width also requires the south elevation's historic roof profile to be altered. As proposed, the new addition does not meet Standard 9. The

application would meet Standard 9 if the south wall of the addition was set back behind the façade of the main block and its roof connected with the rear roof of the main block.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed addition permanently removes the small original rear porch. This area of the property is private and not visible from the public right-of-way. If the applicant documents the porch in photographs and dimensions, a future owner could restore the appearance of this porch; therefore, this application could meet Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:50:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Jordan Gravely of Toner Architects represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler said that, given the style of the house, the roof overhangs wrapping the building are a significant character-defining feature of the historic building. He pointed out that the back return of the eave as it is currently appears reads very clearly, but, as proposed, it does not. He said he is not opposed to the addition but recommends pulling the addition back because the back corner of the building should continue to read as it does now.
- Mr. McCoubrey said the addition could be pulled back and then bump out as a bay further down to maintain the width but it would visually be disengaged from the main block. He added this could also relate better to the porch in the front.
 - o Ms. Gravely inquired if would be appropriate for the addition's hip roof to mirror the way that the front block roof line wraps.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that the addition can be designed two ways. He noted that, since it is an addition, it can be distinguished visually from the historic area of the building, or it can be a similar style. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the path of differentiation is perhaps the better one to take here.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that it would be helpful to have a site plan included in the application to better understand how the addition sits on the property and its impact on the adjoining residence.
 - o Mr. Detwiler asked for a site plan as well with the adjacent properties indicated on the plan.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired if any of the other buildings in this row have additions but also noted that the Architectural Committee has approved previous additions within this historic district. He said the important question is the visibility and how the addition engages the historic main block of the house.
- Ms. Stein pointed out the brick pilaster on the rear corner where the south wall meets the existing rear elevation. She said this detail may be a good suggestion as to how far to set in the addition. Mr. Detwiler agreed with this.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out the window light pattern is a four-over-four whereas the historic building is a six-over-six or eight-over-eight. He continued that the proportion of the lights is different and the addition's windows appear as a picture-framed

- windows while the historic windows have sills with trim. Mr. Cluver said this may be intentional design aspect or not but there is a degree of detail that he does not understand, particularly with the roof overhang.
- o Ms. Gravely responded that the intention for the roof was to try to make it recede. She stated that he understands the point of perhaps distinguishing the roof or the addition in a different way. She replied that owing to the planned use of fiber cement siding, the window details will be different than historic brick construction but noted this is something they can revisit.
 - Mr. Detwiler observed that the plan to fully demolish the first-floor rear wall is a significant move. He asked if they could maintain more of that wall. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with this and made recommendations where this may be done.
 - o Ms. Gravely replied that they can reconsider the rear wall. She added that the staff recommended documenting the existing rear porch that would be demolished. Ms. Gravely confirmed this would be done in the event that a future owner wished to rebuild.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The new addition proposes an alteration to the historic roof overhang that significantly alters the historic character of the main block.
- The new addition is wider than the historic building and is visible from the public right-of-way.
- The application is missing a site plan. A site plan should be added prior to Historical Commission meeting in order to better communicate the new addition's relationship with the parcel and adjacent properties.
- Although no additions have been constructed in this specific row of building, new additions have been approved for other buildings in the Girard Estate Historic District.
- The first-floor rear wall is proposed for full demolition.
- Architectural details on the new addition, such as windows, should be further developed to ensure compatibility with the historic main block.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new addition is wider than the historic main block and projects beyond its south elevation. The width also requires the south elevation's historic roof profile and overhang to be altered in a manner that negatively impacts the historic character of the building. Windows and other architectural details should be further developed for compatibility with the property and historic district. As proposed, the new addition does not meet Standard 9.
- o The proposed new addition permanently removes the small original rear porch and removes the entirety of the first-floor rear wall. As proposed, the application does not meet Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 2519 S GARNET ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					
John Cluver					
Rudy D'Alessandro					X
Justin Detwiler					
Nan Gutterman					
Allison Lukachik					
Amy Stein					
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:06:05

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:26 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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