

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

**TUESDAY, 21 APRIL 2026
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 9:01 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		
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		
Sam Weiner	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
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kristin Hankins, Historic Preservation Planner II
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
Joshua Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner I
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design
Aisha Branham, MGA Partners
Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown
Alvin Holm, Alvin Holm AIA Architect
Andrea Swan
Angela King, Temple University
Brian Keech, Temple University
David Traub, Save Our Sites
David Wright, Temple University
Dorothy Krotzer, BCA
Dwight Tyler
Evan Litvin, Lo Design

Felicia Diarra, Landmark Architectural Design
Fran Popek
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Hayley Coolbaugh
Jay Farrell
Jingyi Luo
Kate Jacobi, Mural Arts
Katie Broh, MGA Partners
Katie Brown, BCA
Kevin Bellardine
Kimberly Haas, Hidden City
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Linfan Liu, MGA Partners
Martin Droz, Temple University
Melissa Luo-Hita, BCA
Nancy Pontone
Rebekah Armstrong
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Seth Brown
Steven Cunningham
Uri Jacobson
Valerie Harrison, Temple University

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 137 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Install mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Incentanile Holdings LLC

Applicant: Kate Jacobi, Mural Arts Philadelphia

History: 1855

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing a mural on the south facade of the building at 137 N. 2nd Street. The adjoining buildings at the northeast corner of Elfreth's Alley and N. 2nd Street were demolished in 1966. The exposed party wall is clad with stucco. The mural will be created off site with the panels assembled and installed on-site. The facade will be primed, the mural clothed panels adhered to the wall with acrylic gel adhesive and sealed with clear acrylic, and two additional clear coats applied to protect against UV rays.

The project is being undertaken in cooperation with the Elfreth's Alley Association, Old City District, and Technically Philly. Sean Martana is the lead artist. The mural's design celebrates the work of artisans, tradespeople, makers, and crafters in anticipation of the America 250th celebration.

SCOPE OF WORK: Install mural

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.*
 - The south façade of 137 N. 2nd Street was not exposed until the adjoining buildings at 133 and 135 N. 2nd Street were demolished. The installation will not cover or alter any historic material.
- Section 6.15.a. of the Historical Commission's *Rules & Regulations*:
 - Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.
 - Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.
 - The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees, and staff shall not consider a mural's content as part of its review of any application for a building permit, but may consider size, scale, and relationship to the historic context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a. of the Historical Commission's *Rules & Regulations*.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:04

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Kate Jacobi of Mural Arts Philadelphia represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman inquired if there has been an assessment of the stucco wall's condition.
 - Ms. Jacobi replied that the condition has been evaluated and there will be repairs to the lower portion of the wall.
 - Ms. Gutterman followed up by asking if the stucco is applied directly to the brick wall or if it is secured with lathe.
 - Mr. Jacobi responded that some lathe at the bottom of the wall will be repaired and inspections of the wall are ongoing.
- Ms. Gutterman then asked how the bottom portion of the mural will be protected from contact with cars in the parking lot.
 - Ms. Jacobi acknowledged that protecting the murals from cars will be challenging. Installing bollards or some kind of buffer is being discussed with the owner. She stated that anti-graffiti coating will be applied to the lower portion of the wall.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired if the brick and cornice that wraps around to the side of the building at street level will be retained.
 - Ms. Jacobi replied that the brick and cornice will be retained.
- Mr. Detwiler thanked the applicant for engaging with the Elfreth's Alley Association.
 - Ms. Jacobi noted cooperation with the Elfreth's Alley Association. She added that the mural celebrates the artisans, tradespeople, and makers that historically lived on Elfreth's Alley. She continued that the mural would complement the Dolly Otty Park being developed on the south side of Elfreth's Alley.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites suggested retaining a portion of the edges of the bare wall to frame the mural.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The demolition of buildings at the northeast corner of Elfreth's Alley and N. 2nd Street resulted in an exposed party wall clad with stucco.
- A mural is proposed on the south facade of the building at 137 N. 2nd Street.
- The mural's design celebrates the work of artisans, tradespeople, makers, and crafters.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The mural installation will not cover or alter any historic material, satisfying Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a. of the Historical Commission's *Rules & Regulations*.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a. of the Historical Commission's *Rules & Regulations*.

ITEM: 137 N 2nd St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 302 MARKET ST

Proposal: Demolish two-story building; construct five-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: RS Realty IV LLC

Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: Building from 1840 destroyed by fire

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolishing the two-story brick building at 302 Market Street, which was constructed in 2017, and constructing a five-story building in its place. The new building will have a contemporary design with a first-floor storefront and a masonry facade that employs different colors and textures of brick. It will also feature windows of varied sizes that get smaller on the upper floors and feature a multi-light over single-light design. The front façade will face Market Street, but the rear will not be visible from any public rights-of-way.

The original c. 1840 four-story Greek Revival building on the property was lost in a fire in 2014. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved the existing two-story building at its May 2015 meeting.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish a non-contributing building.
- Construct a five-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 proposed new building will satisfy Standard 9 if the proposed windows are revised. The height of the building fits well within the row and the proposed materials

and other design elements are compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the district.

- The windows on the upper floors would be fenestrated with windows with multi-light top sash with single-light bottom sash. If they are revised to use the same arrangement on both sash, they will satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the upper-floor windows are simplified, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:14:36

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rich Villa represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Villa responded to the staff's recommendation. He explained that his aim was to design a facade that reflects some of the design elements from some surrounding historical buildings, including windows with a multi-light pane over a single light. He went on to explain that proposal steps down the size of the windows while increasing their quantity as the floors increase. The brick colors reflect other examples in Old City as well and the windows will be a putty color. He also highlighted the patterned brick cornice with address numbers installed in it.
- Ms. Stein complimented the variety of buildings existing on the block and stated that she is generally supportive of replacing the two-story building with a five-story building, though she has a few comments on the proposed design. She pointed out that the proposed five-story building is actually a little shorter than the neighboring four-story building and pointed out that the first floor on the new building is quite short. She asked if it could be raised up two or three feet to improve the proportions. She went on to say that a future retail tenant would likely want a sign band there as well and that the thick column of brick on the storefront level is out of character with the surroundings and suggested that a thinner column there with more overall glazing would be an improvement.
 - Mr. Villa responded that the building is actually three stories tall, but it presents as five from the outside. There are two mezzanine levels inside. He is unable to add another floor because of the space the internal stairs would take up. He added that he is able to look into making the first floor taller by adding more glass, he is unsure how that would look with regard to the proportions of all the windows as you move up the building.
 - Mr. Detwiler complimented the application and its inclusion of material details and other elements. He agreed with Ms. Stein's statement that the building should be taller and that could be achieved by raising the first floor, which would make all of the windows align better with their neighbors and improve the project.
 - Mr. Villa commented on the storefront design. He explained he was interpreting some of the old banks in Old City with a front door and side windows. Also, the idea was to have the number of openings increase as you go from the two at the storefront up the building.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that he has no objection to the two openings, but with the height.
 - Mr. Villa agreed and pointed out that the building to the left looks much taller, but

- it is mostly a large cornice. He is happy to look to add more height to the subject building, but he is worried about the stairs.
- Mr. Detwiler also pointed out that the renderings in the application do not accurately show the position of the windows on the neighboring buildings and suggested that detail be added before the Historical Commission meeting.
 - Mr. Cluver commented on the height issue. He pointed out that Mr. Villa has mentioned several times having difficulty fitting in more stairs. He clarified that what the Architectural Committee is suggesting is to increase the height between floors, not add any more stories.
 - Mr. Villa responded that the stair tower would still need to accommodate additional steps in each flight.
 - Ms. Stein pointed out that if he just increases the height for the first floor, he should have space to do that.
 - Mr. Cluver went on to ask a few additional questions. First, he asked Mr. Villa to include a detail of the parapet on the front of the building in future drawings.
 - Mr. Villa responded that the parapet is all stepped-brick and he can include details of it in future drawing sets.
 - Mr. Cluver also asked why side elevations are included if they will be covered by the neighboring buildings.
 - Mr. Villa clarified they are included because they will be required in the final set submitted to L&I to show the fire ratings.
 - Mr. Cluver pointed out that there will be a limited amount of exposed side wall above the right-hand neighbor. He asked what material that wall will be clad with.
 - Mr. Villa responded that it will be a red colored cement board and that he wants to turn back the brick from the façade at least one brick's width.
 - Mr. Cluver asked that those details be added to the drawings as well. He reiterated that he would really prefer to avoid the look of a brick "wallpaper" on the façade and a bit of a return is needed to avoid that appearance.
 - Mr. Villa responded that it may be difficult to include much of a return as he would not want brick hanging over the property line.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested he could also look into using an adhered veneer brick.
 - Mr. Cluver addressed a potential issue with the suggestion of raising the height of the first floor as it will also increase the size of the wall space between the storefront and next floor of windows. He suggested increasing the size of the transom glass to compensate. Alternatively, one could add some sort of first-floor cornice or other transition piece.
 - Mr. Villa responded that he investigate and make sure there is something proportional being added at the first floor.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked if the proposed darker brick is wire cut.
 - Mr. Villa responded that it is not and that it has a finish to it.
 - Mr. Detwiler emphasized that wire cut bricks do not generally look appropriate on facades.
 - Mr. Villa agreed and responded that it has a light glazing on it with a pockmarked surface.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented on the third and fourth-floor windows. He pointed out that the third-floor windows are slightly smaller than those on the fourth floor and suggested that should either be reversed or they should all be the same. He added that he is generally agreeable to the cottage-style light arrangement.
 - Mr. Villa responded that the columns between the windows get thinner as you go up the façade, so that is why the windows are sized as they are.

- Mr. Cluver agreed with Mr. Detwiler's comment and added that some of the drawings make those vertical lines difficult to visualize.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver's comments about the vertical lines on the drawings. He added that, overall, those lines should be more cohesive and not "jump around" as much from floor to floor.
- Mr. Weiner asked for clarification about the mezzanine spaces and if they are located on floors three and five.
 - Mr. Villa responded that floors three and five are the upper parts of the two mezzanine spaces.
 - Mr. Weiner asked if those windows are operable or fixed.
 - Mr. Villa responded that they are double-hung windows but are essentially fixed because they are not easily reachable from the inside.
 - Mr. Weiner asked if they are aluminum clad.
 - Mr. Villa responded that they are vinyl clad.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the windows and agreed with the earlier statements that the windows on floors three and four should be the same or their sizes should be switched. He also agreed with Ms. Stein's comments on the storefront regarding a sign band and reiterated that storefront levels in this area are usually set apart from the upper floors, thus this storefront does not necessarily need to follow the same rhythm as the other windows. He also agreed about raising the height of the first floor.
- Mr. Cluver commented on the applicant's earlier answer that the windows will be vinyl clad. He explained that the Committee usually does not recommend approval of vinyl as a window material on facades in historic districts.
 - Mr. Villa responded that he was mistaken before and that the windows will actually be aluminum clad.
 - Mr. Cluver continued to comment on the storefront. He pointed out the brick pattern on the central column between the door and window and that the pattern goes up to the height of the door and stops. He explained that patterns like this usually support some architectural element and do not just end as it appears to here.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that as the first floor rises, there will be an opportunity to address the brick patterns and adjust the details. He suggested adding some kind of molding or banding at the top of the floor to help define it.
 - Mr. Villa agreed to look into that detailing.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the project. He stated that the new building will enhance the streetscape but agreed that the first floor could be raised. He was unsure about the proposed use of textured brick and added that the address numbers for the cornice could be made either smaller or larger to enhance the design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The overall height of the proposed building should be increased to be at least equal to one of its neighbors.
- The first-floor storefront should be revised to be taller with more detail to set it apart from the upper floors of the building.
- The windows on the third and fourth floors should be revised to be the same size or

- smaller on the higher floor.
- The applicant should make sure to include a brick return on any visible side walls.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9; the details of the storefront, windows, overall height, and brick use are not compatible with the historic district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, with the suggestion that the applicant revise the application based on the comments made.

ITEM: 302 Market St MOTION: Denial, Standard 9 MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 2039 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Construct addition and roof decks with pilothouse; replace slate roofing and windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2039 Spruce LLC

Applicant: Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1880; Francis Stokes House

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a bay and a small one-story building at the rear of the building in order to construct a five-story addition. The application also proposes two roof decks and two pilot houses. The renovation also includes replacement of windows with vinyl windows and the re-roofing of side and rear slate mansard segments with asphalt shingles designed to imitate the appearance of slate.

The addition and work to the side and rear will not be visible from the public right-of-way. It is unclear how visible the front pilot house may be; it will be set back from the front parapet by about 10 feet and reach a maximum height of 10 feet. A visibility study including a mock-up of the pilot house height may be helpful to understand the impact on the historic building and the surrounding district.

The application includes limited information about the juncture between the proposed addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 APRIL 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

and the rear of the existing ell, as well as changes to the rear roof to accommodate the roof deck. A detailed demolition plan and section drawings of these areas would clarify the scope of removal of historic material.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct addition and roof decks with pilothouse
- Replace slate roofing and windows

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.*
 - The proposed railing for the front roof deck is not a compatible material.
- *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.*
 - The front pilot house may be visible from the public right-of-way. Adapting the plan to have both roof decks accessed by the central pilot house would better meet the Standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:42:23

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Agata Reister and developer Uri Jacobson represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The applicant, Ms. Reister, responded to the staff's recommendation and stated that the mansard roof form would not be altered and that deck supports would be installed internally to allow the deck to hover above the roof. She noted that the addition would align with existing cornice lines and use fiber-cement siding with a composite trim. She explained that the rear windows were proposed as vinyl to maintain consistency with prior replacement but expressed a willingness to consider alternatives. Ms. Reister also expressed a willingness to prepare a visibility study for the pilot house and to minimize the pilot house to the extent possible, as well as adjust the materials and detailing based on the Architectural Committee's feedback.
- Ms. Stein commented that the Architectural Committee does not recommend approval of roof decks on main blocks, owing to visibility and suggested a single shared deck on the rear ell.
 - Ms. Reister responded that the decks would be privately accessed and she preferred to keep the front deck unless it would cause a recommendation of denial.
- Mr. Cluver suggested extending the central stair to create a shared deck, agreeing

- with Ms. Stein that the front deck was inappropriate.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that no roof decks exist on this block and that approving one would set an undesirable precedent.
 - Ms. Gutterman strongly opposed the removal of the historic rear bay and part of the rear wall, even if they are not visible to the public.
 - Mr. Detwiler and Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the removal appeared to be driven by maximizing interior space, not preservation of the building and noted that neighboring houses retain their original bays.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that vinyl windows, vinyl railings, and siding on a multi-story bay are inappropriate.
 - Ms. Reister responded that the vinyl window proposal was to maintain consistency with the previous owner's replacements, but that they were open to alternate materials.
 - Ms. Gutterman opined that the lack of visibility should not be a reason to cheapen the historic fabric.
 - Mr. Weiner suggested the use of sash replacement kits instead of vinyl and noted the importance of the mansard detailing and gutter systems.
 - Mr. Jacobson noted that his objective was to keep the front of the building totally historically accurate, but that the rear had all been changed by previous owners and other properties also had vinyl window replacements at the rears.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if the slate was deteriorated.
 - Ms. Reister confirmed that the slate was failing, the dormers showed rot, and the slate is patched with roofing tar. She noted that they are not proposing to remove any slate from the front mansard, that everything loose on the front would be repaired.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that the Architectural Committee typically is open to asphalt-fiberglass shingles as a replacement for slate if the new shingles accurately replicate the slate.
 - Mr. Detwiler interjected that, generally, to his knowledge, the Grand Manor type of high-quality shingle has been approved in the past.
 - Mr. Weiner opined that he was not concerned so much with the shingles themselves, but with how the damaged material underneath is treated.
 - Mr. Detwiler remarked that he is concerned that the applicant is proposing replacing arched windows with square casements.
 - Ms. Reister responded that their proposal includes casements with transoms and noted that there is low visibility where the windows are located.
 - Ms. Gutterman said she would prefer a two-part window and opposed a vinyl infill. She suggested that the windows could be repaired instead of replaced or a metal-clad replacement could be possible.
 - Mr. Detwiler observed that the applicant was planning to insert a stock door into a larger historic opening, and he opined this was another example of a "least expensive" approach and that a stock door replacement would be inappropriate.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Historical Commission does allow for windows of lesser quality on rears and sides that are not visible, even if they do not satisfy preservation standards.
 - Mr. Jacobson responded that the alley was closed off to the public, that it was a very small alley, and that in his opinion, there was nothing historic in the back alley.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that his main concern was the five-story addition at the rear which he believed would overwhelm the rear ell and destroy the historic form. He

noted that the original bays appear to exist on both neighboring properties. He suggested limiting the addition to four stories and aligning it with the main cornice.

- Ms. Reister agreed that they would be willing to do a four-story addition with a bay on the end, similar to that at 2035 Spruce Street.
- Ms. Stein asked Ms. Reister if they would propose extending the addition to the fifth floor.
 - Ms. Reister responded that they would like to extend it to the fifth floor but would find common ground with the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that their preferred material for the rear would be brick.
- Mr. Jacobson asked for clarification regarding the pilot house on the front of the main block and pointed to an existing pilot house on the main block of the building located at the northeast corner of 21st and Spruce Streets.
 - Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Gutterman noted that this pilot house might have existed before the historic district was designated and the Historical Commission assumed jurisdiction.
- Ms. Reister asked if the Historical Commission would be amenable to a pilot house located on the rear ell but the deck itself located on the main block.
 - Mr. McCoubrey explained the Architectural Committee typically did not recommend approval of any part of the deck on the main block of the house.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The demolition and proposed addition are not compatible with the historic character of the property or its context.
- The front roof deck and pilot house should not be located on the main block of the building.
- The project should be resigned with higher-quality, historically compatible materials, including appropriate windows and shingles. The vinyl components should be eliminated.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Owing to the proposed demolition and additions, the application fails to satisfy Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.
- Owing to the proposed incompatible materials like vinyl windows, the application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 2039 Spruce MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1500-10 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate buildings; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Temple University

Applicant: Aisha Branham, MGA Partners

History: 1909; Alfred Edward Burk Mansion, Temple University; Simon & Bassett, architects; 1954, addition, L. Manfredi, architect

Individual Designation: 1/26/1971

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes extensive rehabilitation and restoration of the Alfred Burk Mansion and its associated 1954 addition as well as the conservatory at the rear of the property at 1500 N. Broad Street. The buildings have been vacant for many years and have undergone several stabilization projects.

The scope of work for the main building includes repairs and patching of the masonry, roof and window replacement, and restoration of the front door. A new vestibule is proposed at the rear between the mansion and its addition.

The application proposes a partial restoration of the balustrade along the perimeter wall, using surviving balusters to restore the portion in front of the mansion and installing a metal picket fence between limestone piers on the historic granite base for other portions of the site.

The project proposes the addition of accessibility ramps and site work to replace the parking lot with a lawn which mediates the grade change between the mansion and the conservatory.

The conservatory would also receive masonry repair and restoration as well as a new roof. The elevation facing the mansion would feature large windows and French doors evoking its historic greenhouse appearance, whereas the elevations along Jefferson and Carlisle Streets, and facing north would largely retain their current appearance with some small non-historic openings infilled.

SCOPE OF WORK: Rehabilitate buildings; construct addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 APRIL 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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.*
 - The proposed vestibule is differentiated from the historic mansion but compatible in scale and proportion.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed vestibule requires no demolition of the mansion. If removed in the future, it would not negatively impact the historic resource.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:20:40

RECUSALS:

- Ms. Stein and Ms. Lukachik recused from the review, owing to their firms' involvement with the project.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Katie Broh and Aisha Branham, and Temple University representatives Martin Droz and Valerie Harrison represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked for more details about the vestibule addition at the rear between the mansion and the 1954 addition.
 - Ms. Branham responded that the team had not yet prepared a section drawing. Ms. Broh explained how the vestibule addition was designed to avoid interfering with the cornice of the mansion.
 - Mr. Cluver expressed the opinion that the vestibule addition should be reset from the existing buildings, following the footprint of the first-floor plan.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the amount of glass could be increased on the conservatory to better replicate the historic appearance.
 - Ms. Branham and Ms. Broh responded, explaining that the maximum height of the doors and windows is limited by roof structures which were installed in the past and that the width of the openings is also limited by alterations made prior to the property's designation.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested that the lower rails of the doors on that elevation could be lengthened to match the historic stone curbs.
 - Ms. Branham agreed and indicated that that change may be possible.
- Mr. Detwiler wanted to clarify that the application proposes aluminum replacement windows rather than aluminum-clad wood windows. He asked why that choice was made.

- Ms. Branham spoke to the deteriorated condition of the existing windows.
- Mr. Droz explained that lower maintenance costs were a priority and drove this choice.
- Mr. McCoubrey directed attention to the rendering on page 29 and asked whether it depicted a wall within the perimeter wall or whether it would be a graded slope.
 - Ms. Broh responded that it would likely be a slope but needed to be more fully developed.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the intended use of the lawn between the buildings.
 - Ms. Harrison answered that there is ongoing discussion but that the intent is to host outdoor music and cultural gatherings for the surrounding community that may include the use of tents.
- Mr. Cluver sought to understand the grading work between the mansion and the conservatory.
 - Ms. Branham explained that the existing parking lot is between three and five feet below the conservatory and mansion floor levels but that they are only about 9 inches different. Revising the grade in the area between the buildings will provide an accessible space without requiring extensive ramps.
 - Ms. Broh noted that there is a seven-foot rise across the lot from Broad Street to the rear.
- Mr. McCoubrey steered the conversation to the topic of the restored balustrade. He suggested that, if possible, the stone balustrade should turn the corner for at least one bay on Jefferson St.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, saying that the corner view is really a primary view of the building, and even extending the stone balusters one bay would make that view feel more complete.
 - Ms. Branham said that the design team agreed and was hoping that the project budget would allow for that additional stretch of stone balustrade.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the design of the metal picket fence.
 - Ms. Branham responded that the tripartite design of the metal picket runs was a design nod to the similarly tripartite design of the stone balustrade segments.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed that such an allusion made sense and he supported the design choice.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the portion of the fence between the side gate and the conservatory where the renderings show no piers and commented that it feels like there is a missing element but acknowledged that there might not be a better solution than what is shown.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that an alternative material for stone replacement might be used to build additional piers.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that cast stone, for instance, may be more affordable in greater quantity.
- Mr. Detwiler remarked that he approves of the two proposed signage flags for the front of the mansion.
 - Mr. Cluver expressed a preference for donor recognition on the entablature (as shown in several options) over adding signage to the perimeter balustrade.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the design of the side door on the conservatory and what was driving the design.
 - Ms. Branham indicated that it is a service entrance and code-compliant egress. She said that because it looks out onto the parking lot and the dumpster, the design was chosen to be inconspicuous.
 - Mr. Detwiler felt that glazing might make it look less utilitarian, but that it is not a

hill to die on and he understands the thinking.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed vestibule addition could be recessed from the rear wall of the mansion to make it more deferential to the historic resource.
- The appearance of the conservatory should, where possible, replicate the historic greenhouse appearance.
- The view from the front corner of the mansion is a significant one and, if possible, the restored stone balustrade should wrap around one or more bays of the side elevation.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9; the additions, fencing, and signage are compatible with the historic resource.
- The application satisfies Standard 10; the changes and additions are largely reversible; their removal in future would not compromise the essential form of the historic resource.
- The recommendation of approval is not contingent on adopting any of the suggested revisions offered by the Architectural Committee, but hopefully they will be considered as the plans are refined.

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

ITEM: 1500-10 N Broad St					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik				X	
Amy Stein				X	
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	5			2	

ADDRESS: 6363 OVERBROOK AVE

Proposal: Construct deck on front porch roof

Review: Final Approval

Owner: Steven A. Cunningham

Applicant: Alvin Holm, Alvin Holm AIA Architects

History: 1903; Hoar/McCahan House; Horace Trumbauer, architect; 1920, alterations, W.F. Price

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Contributing 11/8/2019

Staff Contact: Josh Schroeder, joshua.schroeder@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a deck on the front porch of the dwelling at 6363 Overbrook Avenue. The original front porch was open but it was later enclosed. The proposed deck would cover the entire roof of the front porch as well as the car park to the side. The proposed deck would include vinyl railings and a semi-circular platform supported by four new columns extending over the front steps to the porch. An exterior steel spiral staircase to access the roof from the ground would be included on the side opposite the car park.

Construction of the roof deck began in the fall of 2025 without permits or review by the Historical Commission. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a stop work order and violation in January 2026. Images show that a platform over the porch roof, posts for the railing, and bases for the columns have already been constructed. The two outermost second-floor windows on the front façade have been removed, the openings enlarged for doors, and doors and exterior light fixtures installed. The submitted plans show the new second-floor doors as existing, but this change was made as part of the construction of the deck.

SCOPE OF WORK: Construct deck on front porch roof, alter front facade, and add spiral staircase.

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 will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
- *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.*
 - The proposed alterations substantially change the front façade's appearance. The house originally featured an open front porch. An upper-level deck with a more ornate front entrance, steel spiral staircase, and removal of second-story windows is a further departure from the house's original and historic appearance. Therefore, the application fails to satisfy Standards 2 and 9.

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

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

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Schroeder presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Owner Steven Cunningham and architect Alvin Holm represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked why the applicant began the project without permits.
 - Mr. Cunningham replied that he incorrectly believed he did not need a permit for work that did not alter the structure of the house.
- Mr. Weiner asked if a structural engineer had examined the porch to see if it could hold the weight of a roof deck.
 - Mr. Cunningham replied that the porch could hold the weight, but he did not state that an engineer had examined the porch.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that the Architectural Committee cannot recommend approval of vinyl railings but could have offered guidance on appropriate materials, such as composite wood, if the Architectural Committee had reviewed the application before construction began.
 - Mr. Cunningham explained that he chose vinyl for easier maintenance and noted that the railings were not yet installed. He also explained the railing design matches interior railings and the decking itself is composite.
 - Mr. Cluver explained vinyl's shortcomings for historic homes, especially this one.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the primary façade is being substantially altered and asked about the window openings that were cut down for doors.
 - Mr. Cunningham explained that the sills were removed but the lintels and mouldings were retained.
- Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Gutterman criticized the appearance of the exterior spiral staircase and noted it seemed redundant given the access from the second floor.
 - Mr. Cunningham noted that the doors open to bedrooms and he wanted access for visitors.
- Mr. McCoubrey explained that the alterations were highly visible from the street and that the Architectural Committee normally recommended such additions be undertaken at secondary or rear elevations.
 - Mr. Cunningham noted there are numerous other front porch decks in the neighborhood and pointed towards the address list in the application.
 - Mr. Schroeder noted he was not familiar with the list.
 - Mr. Cluver, Ms. Lukachik, and Ms. Gutterman noted the lack of photographs. Mr. McCoubrey explained that more contextual information is needed to determine if there is precedent for decks in the historic district.
- Ms. Gutterman explained to Mr. Cunningham that, owing to the visibility of the alterations and the choices of vinyl and plastic materials, the Architectural Committee cannot recommend approval to the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. Cunningham asked what types of materials could be approved.
 - Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Architectural Committee informs the Historical Commission about whether the project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and this proposal does not. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee could have made suggestions prior to construction if the proposal had been reviewed before work had commenced. Mr. McCoubrey further explained that the proposal's problems extend beyond the selected materials, noting that extensive alterations to the primary façade of a

building designed by Horace Trumbauer and altered by W.F. Price necessitates careful review.

- Mr. Cunningham asked what he needed to do to meet the Standards, noting his financial and time investment.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested that he discuss those issues with the Historical Commission. He explained that information showing any precedents for roof decks would be helpful for the Historical Commission as it makes a decision. He and other Architectural Committee members directed Mr. Cunningham to work with the staff in revising his application to provide better photographs of work already completed and additional information about other roof decks in the historic district.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Architect Horace Trumbauer designed the house at 6363 Overbrook Avenue and architect W.F. Price later altered it.
- The construction and alteration began without permits or approval of the Historical Commission.
- If completed, the proposed alterations would significantly alter the appearance of the historic house.
- Better documentation of comparable roof decks and the work already completed should be provided for review by the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The alteration of window openings and the removal of windows for doors on the front façade significantly alters the home's appearance and fails to satisfy Standard 2.
- The proposed changes will significantly alter the historic character of the house. The new work will not be compatible with the historic building. Therefore, the application fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 6363 Overbrook Ave					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 3440 W PENN ST

Proposal: Legalization of replacement windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kevin Ballardine and Amanda Joachim

Applicant: Kevin Ballardine and Amanda Joachim

History: 1930

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Tudor East Falls Historic District, Contributing, 10/9/2009

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows at 3440 W. Penn Street. In February 2026, a member of the community contacted the Historical Commission with photographs showing that windows at the subject property had been replaced. The original rolled steel casement windows on the first and second floors of the front façade were removed and replaced with vinyl casement windows without proper permits or the Historical Commission's approval. The Historical Commission's staff requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue a violation. It was issued on 3 March 2026. The original window configuration for this style of building in the historic district consisted of a rolled-steel casement window with four eight-light leaves at the first floor, and a casement window with two operable eight-light leaves, and eight fixed lights, at the second floor. The new configuration features nine-light leaves with four on the first floor and three on the second floor, all with grilles between the glass.

SCOPE OF WORK: Legalize window replacement.

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 will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The rolled steel casement windows were a distinctive feature of the front facades of many homes in this historic district. Their removal does not satisfy Standard 2.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The new windows are vinyl and in a different configuration than the originals and therefore do not satisfy Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:30:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Kevin Ballardine represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked if Mr. Ballardine was not aware of the need for a building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 APRIL 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

permit for the window replacement.

- Mr. Ballardine responded that he was not aware that a building permit was required owing to the historic designation of the property. He explained that the replacement was done quickly because ice was accumulating inside of the windows and wood was rotting. He offered to paint them and perform other facade work to make the new windows look more like the original rolled steel windows.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that the new windows are smaller than the original windows, with wide trim around them. He commented that the Architectural Committee does not recommend approval of windows with grilles between glass. He noted that vinyl is not easily paintable.
 - Mr. Ballardine responded that he understands and that this was not intentional.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that the window installers should have known.
- Ms. Stein explained that the Architectural Committee reviews applications based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. She noted that the Historical Commission has more latitude in its reviews compared to the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. Weiner noted that the cost to try to modify and improve the existing windows will still be expensive. He observed that the approvable solution will look phenomenal and add value to the property.
- Mr. McCoubrey explained that Mr. Ballardine can work with the staff on an approvable solution or continue on to the Historical Commission with the current application.
 - Mr. Ballardine responded that he will likely look to work with the staff.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Nancy Pontone commented in opposition to the legalization request.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The original rolled steel casement windows on the first and second floors of the front façade were removed and replaced with vinyl casement windows without permits or the Historical Commission's approval.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The rolled steel casement windows were a distinctive feature of the front facades of many houses in this historic district. Their removal does not satisfy Standard 2.
- The new windows are vinyl and in a different configuration than the originals and therefore do not satisfy Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

ITEM: 3440 W Penn St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 40 SPRING GARDEN ST – BUILDING D

Proposal: Construct three-story addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 500 NNCB Fee LLC

Applicant: Lea Litvin, LO Design

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 seeks in-concept approval for a three-story addition on a two-story building, known as Building D, within the Philadelphia Warehousing & Cold Storage Company complex. The existing building was constructed in 1891 and 1900, first serving as the Ice Machine House and then as a Machine Shop for the company. Although it was built in two phases, the primary elevation facing N. Beach Street appears as a unified façade. It is clad in red brick and detailed with rough-faced stone.

The project proposes to adaptively reuse the building with commercial space on the ground floor and residential units on the upper floors. Adjacent projects in this historic complex (500 N. Christopher Columbus Boulevard, Buildings B and F) were previously approved by the Historical Commission at public meetings. When the adjacent construction is completed, the east and south elevations of Building D will remain visible from the public right-of-way. The west wall of the building will be visible within a private courtyard of Building F that includes the industrial brick stack.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Lower sill heights of first floor windows.
- Construct stairs and accessibility ramp along front façade.
- Construct three-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*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 APRIL 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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 construction of the overbuild should be set behind the building's east, south, and west cornice lines to meet Standard 9.
- Although this is a two-story building, it is approximately 50 feet tall. Since the buildings in the complex are large industrial buildings, a three-story addition proposed as 35 feet in height would not overwhelm Building D's massing or scale, or that of the other buildings in the complex; therefore, the addition satisfies Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:42:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Evan Litvin and owner Seth Brown represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked about the raising of the interior first-floor level and the impact to exterior architectural features on the front façade such as the granite base. He observed that a comparison of the existing conditions photograph and the rendering appeared to show the granite base being raised up.
 - Mr. Litvin explained that the plan is to cut down the granite base to lower front window openings to create doorways. He offered assurance that the historic granite base would not be altered other than the removal of material for the door openings.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the entrance area outside of front door openings. She asked if it was intended to be a terrace or an entry staircase.
 - Mr. Litvin replied that the proposed steps and accessible ramp in front of the building are intended to be functional.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any way to maintain the existing openings and not remove the granite. She expressed concern about the removal of original granite in the areas proposed to be cut down. Ms. Gutterman asked if all existing first-floor windows needed to become doors.
 - Mr. Litvin replied that all first-floor windows are proposed as doors. He explained the requirement for two means of egress for the residential, and two means of egress for the two commercial spaces.
- Mr. Detwiler encouraged the applicant to maintain as many first-floor windows as possible, especially since the proposed entry stairs and ramp would cover part of the granite base. He said he is not opposed to converting windows to doorways but that this should be limited to only what is necessary.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about a bridge or architectural element shown connecting to the front façade. He pointed out that it was shown in one location in the submission photographs and in a different location in the renderings.
 - Mr. Litvin responded that he believed that it is electrical conduit going from one building to the other. He confirmed that it will remain in place as part of the project and they have no plans to change or move it.
 - Mr. Detwiler urged the applicant to be more careful with the renderings and noted that both the electrical conduit and the stone base were not shown accurately.

- Mr. Detwiler asked if the project would alter the stone street paving in front of the building.
 - Mr. Litvin confirmed the paving was not in their scope of work.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the in-concept review was for the upper addition or just the modifications to the lower two floors.
 - Ms. Mehley replied that the focus of the in-concept review was primarily for the proposed massing of the upper floors.
 - Mr. Litvin said their intention for the overbuild was to add three stories with a minimal setback behind the parapet.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that the overbuild appeared to be sitting on top of the existing parapet wall, rather than behind it. She said that it was not clear how the addition related to the roof in the submission documentation.
 - Mr. Litvin said this would be clarified going forward. He said their intention was for the front of the overbuild to sit behind the cornice line.
- Ms. Stein said she thought the proposed overbuild was appropriate based on the massing and proportions shown. She added that the details would matter and that some level of setback would be critical. Ms. Stein continued that a change in materiality between new and old would also be important to understand that something is an overbuild. She said the details will matter to the Architectural Committee when the project is submitted for final review and that the future application would need to refine how the new overbuild relates to the existing building.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein's comments.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the smokestack was remaining in place.
 - Mr. Litvin replied it was not part of their proposal.
 - Ms. Mehley stated that the smokestack was historically designated and protected. She pointed out that it was part of an earlier development approved by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Brown thanked the Architectural Committee for their comments. He said it has been challenging to work with both floodplain issues and the retention of historic elements. Mr. Brown pointed out that proposed elements such as raising the floor and providing ADA access were complex issues but that he was confident they could work out the details for the final review.
- Mr. McCoubrey complimented the overall project and development. He said the development of the historically designated complex was a terrific win.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she had reservations about approving the application in concept and that there were not enough details shown in the application.
- Ms. Lukachik pointed out that it was an in-concept application so they could not approve much more than what the applicant provided.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The three-story overbuild is appropriate in its massing and proportions.
- To accommodate floodplain requirements, the interior first-floor level must be raised and new exterior entrance stairway and ramp added.
- The conversion of first-floor windows to doorways by cutting down the granite base

- can be approved, provided that only the openings required for egress were altered.
- The renderings should be revised to ensure that existing and proposed details are accurate.
- The overbuild should be set behind the parapet and the materiality between new and old should be distinguished in the applicant's future submission for final approval.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9 as the three-story addition would not overwhelm Building D's massing or scale, or that of the other buildings in the complex.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 40 SPRING GARDEN ST – BUILDING D					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Weiner					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman		X			
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	6	1			

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:04:39

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:16 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.