

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

**TUESDAY, 26 NOVEMBER 2024
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		
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
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner III
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Alex Gauzza, ISA
Allan Moore
Andrea Salomon
Ariana Kenyon, Velocity Energy and Home Solutions
Beth Miller
Bill Klotz
Chelsea Torres, Velocity Energy and Home Solutions
Daniel Trubman
Dariya
David Ade
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Dennis Carlisle
Devon Beverly, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Doreen DiMonte
Dustin Dove

Erin Abraham
Evan Litvin, Lo Design
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Hannah Boettcher
Janice Woodcock
Jay Farrell
John Keegan
Jonathan Broh, AIA
Jonathan Wallace, AVL Architecture & Development
Joseph Bernardino
Judy Neiswander
Katie Robinson, JKRP
Kevin King, VMA
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Kristin Demarco, ISA
Larry Spector
Lea Litvin, Lo Design
Mark Merlini, Brickstone
Mason Lehman, AOS
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison
M. Willhoit
Nathan Farris, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Nino Cutrufello
Paul Boni, Esq., Society Hill Civic Association
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Pooja Patel
Rich Lazer
Rob Nydick
Roberta Spivek
Robert Morris
Roy Aharonovich
Sam Olshin, AOS
Sandra Eng, Becker & Frondorf
Sharlene Yulita
T. McKenna
Zachary Winters

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 301-15 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Rector Wardens and Vestrymen of St. Peter's Church

Applicant: Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 301-15 Lombard Street, at the northwest corner of S. 3rd and Lombard Streets, is a surface parking lot associated with St. Peter's Church to the north and St. Peter's School to the west. With this application, St. Peter's Church and School jointly propose to build a classroom, office, and gymnasium/assembly building on the site. The surface parking lot at 301-15 Lombard Street is classified as Contributing for its archaeological potential in the Society Hill Historic District.

The building will include a tall one-story section at the northern end and a shorter two-story section at the southern end of the site. The massing of the proposed building will recall the massing of a public school and rowhouses that historically stood on the site but were demolished several decades ago. The building will be clad in brick and fiber cement lapped panels and include curtain-wall windows. A lawn with trees will separate the building from S. 3rd Street to the east. The building will not have a basement.

The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a design for a parish hall with basement parking at the site in 2019, with the requirement that the property owner conduct an archaeological investigation. Following that approval, Phase I and II archaeological investigations were conducted, which concluded that:

Based on the limited information potential of the surviving fragmentary building remains and backyard deposits, the proposed redevelopment of the project site will not affect any significant archaeological resources. No further archaeological assessment is considered necessary in connection with the planned construction of the new parish hall.

The Historical Commission approved a revised version of the parish hall without the basement parking in 2021, at which time it acknowledged that the archaeological investigations had been completed. The parish hall project was eventually abandoned for the current project.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.*
 - o The archaeological investigation has been completed and the final report submitted to the Historical Commission.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not*

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 NOVEMBER 2024

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.

- o The proposed building, which is similar in size and scale to the buildings approved in 2019 and 2021, would be differentiated from the old and would be compatible with the massing, size, scale, materials, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:18

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sam Olshin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Olshin observed that the Historical Commission has approved two earlier versions of this project for St. Peter's Church, which were not implemented. He explained that the current project is a joint project between the church and St. Peter's School. Mr. Olshin described the site and its history. The site is currently a surface parking lot but was the site of a public school and a few rowhouses, all of which were demolished in the 1950s. Mr. Olshin displayed images of buildings in the neighborhood that inspired his design, including some Modern buildings of the 1960s and 1970s. He explained that the proposed building was sited to preserve trees along 3rd Street. He noted that they are working with an arborist. Mr. Olshin described the proposed building. The northern volume will house a large space that will be used as a gymnasium by the school and a parish hall by the church. The southern section of the building will include offices for the church and music and art spaces for the school. He described the exterior materials including brick, fiber-cement, metal, and glass. He noted other features on the building including a terrace, pergola, and Juliet balconies. Mr. Olshin displayed several renderings of the building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the solar array on the roof.
 - o Mr. Olshin responded that the solar array is included as an alternate and will be implemented if the funding is available. He explained that it will be flat on the roof, behind a parapet, and therefore not visible from the street.
- Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Olshin to elaborate on the siding material.
 - o Mr. Olshin explained that it will be a fiber-cement material that will lap like clapboards but will be larger than clapboards because the building is institutional, not residential.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that he liked the proportion of the siding.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he approved of the baton detail on the siding as well as the coping at the roofline.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Mr. Olshin to provide a rendering of the north façade facing the church for the Historical Commission's review. The application includes an elevation drawing but not a rendering. He noted that the façade was rather flat and plain.
 - o Mr. Olshin agreed to provide the rendering.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the site plan should include the church building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the glass would be clear or colored.

- o Mr. Olshin stated that it will be clear glass.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the Juliet balconies.
 - o Mr. Olshin stated that the balconies are like those on nearby I.M. Pei-designed houses. He noted that the windows are large to maximize natural light and ventilation into the interior spaces.
- Mr. Detwiler praised the design for breaking down the masses and reducing the scale.
- Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Olshin discussed the brick size and color as well as the mortar.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro concluded that Mr. Olshin was taking the appropriate factors into account and would select a brick that worked with the nearby historic buildings.
 - o Mr. Detwiler counseled that the brick should be compatible with the brick at the church and school, but not match them.
- Ms. Stein commended the design team and stated that the current design is an improvement over the two earlier, approved designs.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the organization's zoning and historic preservation committee had not yet had a chance to review the proposal, so he had no comment at this time. He suggested that the applicants add some photographs of the immediate neighborhood to their application before the Historical Commission reviews it.
- Judy Neiswander stated that the proposed building is a truly contextual design for the neighborhood. She asked if the cap at the parapet of the southern part of the building would be included on the northern part of the building.
 - o Mr. Olshin stated that the same cap would be included on the northern part of the building.
- Roberta Spivek stated that she owns 320 Lombard Street. She noted that she submitted written comments with photographs of her house to the Historical Commission. She reported that her house is one of three in a row of colonial houses. She objected to the proposed building, asserting that it would block her views of St. Peter's Church. She claimed that the building would be "huge" and out of scale" with the neighborhood. She asserted that the building was unnecessary because it would stand empty other than school days and Sundays. She objected to the loss of "open space," the surface parking lot, where she watches children play.
- Doreen DiMonte stated that she owns three properties on Lombard Street across from the site. She claimed that "algae" would form on the fiber-cement siding on the new building if it is not properly maintained. The "green algae ... could become very unsightly." She contended that the lawn along 3rd Street would be used by drug dealers. She noted that she currently parks at the church's surface parking lot but would be forced by the construction to park on the street and would be susceptible to criminals congregating on the lawn next to the new building. She objected to the possibility of construction at the site and concluded that she does not want masons laying brick across the street for three years.
 - o Mr. Olshin stated that the building would be properly maintained and the lawn adjacent to it would be gated, preventing drug dealers from congregating.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The archaeological investigation of the proposed construction site has been completed and the final report submitted to the Historical Commission. The report concluded that “the proposed redevelopment of the project site will not affect any significant archaeological resources.”
- A public-school building and rowhouses historically stood on the site of the surface parking lot. The buildings were demolished before the Historical Commission began regulating the site.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- As demonstrated by the archaeological report, the application satisfies Standard 8.
- The proposed building will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, materials, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. The application satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

ITEM: 301-15 Lombard St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: D'Alessandro 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: 1021 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Remove structure, construct structure, reconstruct facade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: BJP 1021 Owners LLC, Brickstone Realty

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKRP Partners LLC

History: 1953; Mercantile Library: Martin, Stewart & Noble, architects

Individual Designation: 9/12/1990

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove most of the former Mercantile Library structure, construct a structure with retail space at the first floor and a parking garage at the upper floors and on an adjacent site, and reconstruct the front façade of the library to replicate the historic façade. The extant parking garage at 1025-29 Chestnut Street, which has frontages on Chestnut and 10th Streets and wraps around the north and west sides of the library, is being demolished and reconstructed. The parking garage is not designated, and its demolition and

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 NOVEMBER 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

reconstruction are not within the Historical Commission's jurisdiction, except where it will extend onto the library lot at 1021 Chestnut Street.

The Mid-century Modern style library at 1021 Chestnut Street, the Mercantile Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia, opened in 1953. The library closed in 1989 after the Free Library determined that rehabilitating the building including asbestos abatement would cost more than the building was worth. With the closure of the library branch, the building was left vacant. The Historical Commission designated the library in 1990. The City owned the property until 2006, when it was sold to a private developer. That developer was unable to find a viable reuse project and sold it to an architectural firm in 2011. The Historical Commission approved the rehabilitation of the building for the offices of the architectural firm in 2012, but the project proved infeasible. The current owner purchased the property in 2016. The building has been vacant for 35 years and has significantly deteriorated during that time. The front façade is extremely deteriorated and has been boarded; a mural depicting the façade was painted on the boarding in 2018. The interior has no partitions or finishes. The roof is deteriorated.

The application proposes to remove most of the library structure, construct a parking garage with ground-floor retail on the site and adjacent site, and reconstruct the front façade to replicate the historic library façade. The application demonstrates that the stainless steel and glass portion of the front façade of the library is severely deteriorated and cannot be salvaged. The masonry-clad piers at the outer edges of the front façade would be retained and incorporated into the reconstructed façade. Behind the façade, the new structure would include retail space at the first floor and parking decks above. The Chestnut Street elevation above the rebuilt façade would be clad in a screen of metal fins.

While a proposal to remove most of the library structure appears at first glance to constitute a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88) in the preservation ordinance and invoke the demolition restrictions at 14-1005(6)(d) of that ordinance, the staff contends that the sole resource at the site is the front façade, which cannot be salvaged but will be faithfully reconstructed. The application proposes to remove the party walls, rear wall, and roof, but those elements are not character-defining or visible from the right-of-way. The library is flanked on the north and west by the multi-story parking garage and on the east by the 15-story Jefferson Building. The lone photograph included in the nomination of the library building depicts the front façade as a two-dimensional object. The volume of the library is not discernable, and the roof and rear wall are not visible. The staff suggests that the front façade of the library building is the historic resource, and, with its faithful reconstruction, this project will not constitute a demolition.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Reconstruct historic façade at first floor; construct parking garage

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Rehabilitation Standards of 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 historic character of the property is entirely encapsulated in the front façade, which will be faithfully reconstructed. This project satisfies 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.

- o The severity of the deterioration of the front façade necessitates its replacement. The new façade will match the old façade in all respects. This project satisfies Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The construction of the new structure behind and above the façade will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new structure will be compatible with yet differentiated from the historic façade in massing, size, scale, and architectural features.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:43:09

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Cluver recused, owing to his architectural firm's involvement with the project.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Jonathan Broh and Kevin King represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Broh stated that his firm, JKRP Architects, is the architect of record for the project. He explained that Mr. King and his firm, Voith Mactavish Architects, prepared the documentation and detailing for the restoration of the historic façade.
- Ms. Stein stated that she agrees with the application and the staff that the front façade of the library is the historic resource and that it cannot be salvaged, owing to extensive deterioration. It must be rebuilt. She stated that rebuilding it should not be considered a demolition in the legal sense. She concluded that the front façade is the historic resource at the site, and it must be reconstructed.
 - o Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the overbuild above the historic storefront should be moved up or back to give the historic storefront more room.
 - o Ms. Stein stated that she liked the proposed metal fins above the historic storefront but agreed that they could be shifted up or back. She noted that the solution for separating the historic and new sections at the Western Union building on the 1100-block of Locust Street provides a model.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed that the joint between the new and the old is the most critical part of this design. He objected to moving the fins back because that would break the street wall. He suggested moving the fins up slightly to achieve better separation between the historic façade and the new fins. He suggested one to two feet, maybe 18 inches.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed that raising the fins slightly is the best option.
 - o Mr. Broh displayed drawings showing the relationship of the storefront and the fins and pointed out where he could shift the fins upward. He noted that the

current separation is six inches. He concluded that he could accommodate the request to shift the fins upward.

- Mr. Detwiler asked about the proposed signage. He asked if the Mercantile Library sign survived.
 - o Mr. King explained that the historic signage has been lost, but new signage will be created in the same material, font, and font size for the new retail tenant.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the original doors survive at the front façade.
 - o Mr. King stated that the original doors do not survive. He explained that they will recreate the historic doors, but that the dimensions of the kickplate will change slightly, owing to ADA requirements. Mr. King indicated that they could adjust the bottom rails on the storefront windows to align with the enlarged kickplate.
 - o Mr. Detwiler rejected that suggestion and indicated that the storefront dimensions should replicate the historic dimensions as much as possible. He suggested that they make the kickplate as thin as possible while still meeting the ADA code.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the transparency of the original front façade was its most important characteristic. He asked if the applicants intended to maintain or recreate that transparency.
 - o Mr. Broh displayed a section drawing of the front façade and showed how the parking level would be pulled back from the façade to give the retail space at the first floor the openness and transparency of the historic space.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the staff should review the details of the reconstructed façade including a glass sample and the finish of the metallic mullion.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the façade would be custom fabricated, or if it would be an off-the-shelf storefront system.
 - o Mr. King stated that it would be a custom replication of the historic façade. He added that they are in discussions with a fabricator and are using the architect's original plans for the façade as a basis of their design.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the metal fin system for the façade of the parking garage. He expressed a concern that the fins might not be easily replaced when damaged if they are custom made.
 - o Mr. Broh responded that the fin system is not a custom product. Fins can be replaced if they are damaged.
- Ms. Stein asked about an enclosed hallway on the first floor, behind the reconstructed façade. She asked if it could be pushed back, away from the front façade, so that it would not limit the openness of the interior space when seen from the exterior.
 - o Mr. Broh stated that he could set it back.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey suggested that it should be set back to the line of the soffit for the garage above, about 14 feet.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The historic character of the property is entirely encapsulated in the front façade, which will be faithfully reconstructed.
- The severity of the deterioration of the front façade necessitates its replacement. The new façade will match the old façade. The reconstruction of the façade is not a

- demolition in the legal sense if it is reconstructed faithfully.
- The construction of the new structure behind and above the façade will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new structure will be compatible with yet differentiated from the historic façade in massing, size, scale, and architectural features.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. Therefore, this application satisfies Standard 2.
- The reconstructed façade will match the historic façade. This application satisfies Standard 6.
- The proposed new construction will be differentiated from, yet compatible with, the historic resource. Therefore, this application satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the application including the demolition and new construction, provided the original façade is faithfully reconstructed, and the finned façade of the garage is shifted upward, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards, 2, 6, and 9.

ITEM: 1021 Chestnut St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver				X	
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5			1	1

ADDRESS: 1900 S 16TH ST

Proposal: Convert church complex to multi-family residential and event space

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1900 S 16th Owner LLC

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design

History: 1889; St Elizabeth's Episcopal Church, William M. Camac, Furness, Evans & Company, architect; church and clergy house, 1897; campanile, 1902, Bailey & Truscott, architects

Individual Designation: 7/25/1967

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert the former St. Elizabeth's Protestant Episcopal Church to multi-family residential and event space use. The Historical Commission approved a similar application in December 2021, but that work was not undertaken. This submission

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 NOVEMBER 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

reflects an effort to balance costs and income by reducing the size of some units while creating an event space in the sanctuary which can generate revenue. The primary changes from the 2021 approval to the current application are as follows:

- Undertake fewer window modifications
- Remove new detached building from scope
- Construct exterior exit stairs and stair enclosure addition for required egress
- Rebuild ramp for ADA compliance and relocate door
- Add dormers on third level at south ancillary building
- Remove deteriorated cupola
- Insert new openings for door and window in tower for commercial space

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert church complex to multi-family residential and event space use

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed alterations for this adaptive reuse are largely compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic property, satisfying Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the removed stained-glass windows are stored in a secure location, the cupola is retained, and the new door and window in the tower are reconsidered, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the December 2021 Historical Commission approval of a similar scope.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:04:16

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Janice Woodcock and Erin Abraham represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Abraham confirmed that the removed stained-glass windows would be stored on site, per the Historical Commission's approval of 2021.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the appearance and condition of the stained-glass windows, and if some windows could be retained.
 - o Ms. Woodcock responded that they are mostly geometric white, yellow, and clear glass squares, with horizontal divisions. She explained that the windows with religious iconography are in the proposed event space, but they are single pane, in very poor condition, with air coming through them.
- Ms. Abraham explained that the cupola is proposed for removal because it is significantly deteriorated.
- Ms. Woodcock stated that the owner is willing to retain the cupola in consideration of a bit more flexibility for the other changes proposed to make the project viable.
- Ms. Woodcock explained that the owner is seeking approval of a window and door in the base of the tower in order to allow the interior space to better interact with the

- street. She confirmed that the intention is to have that space function as a cafe with a walk-up window. She agreed that the door could be relocated inside of the gate.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the proposed four-over-one hung windows and if that design is based on historic documentation.
 - o Ms. Woodcock responded that it is not based on historic documentation, and if such documentation exists, the window design can be changed to reflect it.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked about the door and window grouping shown on the proposed north elevation of the sanctuary. He stated that it is awkward in appearance and asked if the lintel heights could match.
 - o Ms. Abraham stated that the window is an existing opening, but the door opening is new.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked if the emergency exit stair is technically required, or if it could be omitted owing to the unit count on the floor. He asked the applicant to look into it further.
 - Mr. Cluver asked about the windows that will be blocked by the new elevator.
 - o Ms. Woodcock responded that the windows will still look like windows from the exterior.
 - Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed ADA ramp on Bancroft Street. He questioned if the door could remain in the center bay, if the ramp were shifted to turn onto Mifflin Street.
 - o Ms. Woodcock explained that the existing ramp is too steep for wheelchair access, and the building's new use requires an accessible route. She stated that the door location had to change in order to accommodate the new ramp's length and proper slope. She noted that a lift had been considered instead of a ramp but was not chosen because of the appearance and maintenance concerns.
 - Ms. Stein asked if the ramp could be taken down to the basement rather than up to the first floor.
 - o Ms. Woodcock responded that they could look into that option, but that it would take away from the proposed kitchen space in the basement. She offered to design the ramp with less substantial materials, if that would help with the appearance.
 - Ms. Stein asked about the potential to have the ramp be a switchback design on the south side of the building.
 - o Ms. Woodcock responded that they could look into that option, but the plans reviewer would need to allow for an entrance on the side of the building rather than the main entry on Bancroft Street.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested that the ADA ramp could start in the parking lot on the south side of the building, have the switchback in the parking lot, and the last segment could wrap around the corner onto Bancroft Street with the existing center door used, and with stairs coming up on the north side rather than the south side.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked about the new dormer on the south side of the sanctuary. He suggested that it be clad in a lighter material such as shingles, rather than brick.
 - o Mr. Cluver suggested that it be reduced in size.
 - Mr. McCoubrey thanked the applicants for the quality and thoroughness of their application materials. The Committee members agreed that it was a very clear application to understand.
 - Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed signage on the north side of the tower.
 - o Ms. Woodcock explained that there is a desire to have a small sign in that location for the cafe, but the details would be part of a separate signage application.

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the spacing of the new dormers on the south side of the school building. He observed that they are not evenly spaced, although they do align vertically with the existing bays below.
 - o Ms. Woodcock responded that the new dormers are not symmetrical because one of the four was omitted based on the 2021 discussion with this Committee.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that the spacing is appropriate given the existing bays below.
- Ms. Gutterman returned to the question of the new door and window proposed for the tower. She suggested the applicant remove it entirely, or study putting the door and window on the side through the gate, as opposed to on the street-facing side.
- The Committee members encouraged the applicant to make revisions based on the discussion in time for review by the Historical Commission at its next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission approved a similar application in December 2021, but that work was not undertaken. This submission reflects an effort to balance costs and income by reducing the size of some units while creating an event space in the sanctuary that can generate revenue.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed alterations for this adaptive reuse are largely compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic property, but there are several aspects of the new proposal which require revisions or reconsideration.
- In order to fully satisfy Standard 9, the cupola should be retained, the door and window in the tower removed or relocated, the ADA ramp revised per the discussion, the dormer for Stair D changed in material or reduced in size, the signage either removed or fully defined, the stained glass windows reevaluated for retention, and the historic appearance of the original windows researched further.

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

ITEM: 1900 S 16th 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: 8226 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Construct multi-unit residential building
Review Requested: Review In Concept
Owner: Vich Properties LLC/VP 8226 Germantown LLC
Applicant: Michael Phillips, Klehr Harrison
History: 1760; Detweiler House; new façade, 1800
Individual Designation: 5/28/1957
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house at 2200-04 Locust Street. The property is a significant historic resource to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District
Overview: This application seeks in concept approval for the construction of a four-story building at 8226 Germantown Avenue. An eighteenth-century historic stone building, known as the “Detweiler House,” stands at the southeast corner of the property. This application proposes to construct a four-story residential building on the yard adjoining the historic building and the rehabilitation of the historic building as part of the property’s overall redevelopment. No part of the historic building will be demolished or significantly altered as part of the new construction; the application proposes to adaptively reuse the historic building as an amenity space for the residential building. The new construction will be larger and taller than the historic building, clad with red brick, and feature a dark slate mansard roof with dormers.

An earlier version of this project was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its July 2024 meeting. That application featured a larger five-story building with more decorative architectural features that connected to the historic building at the rear. The Committee voted to recommend denial of that design, owing to its size and architectural features being incompatible with the historic building. That application was withdrawn before it was reviewed by the Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story building with parking.
- Rehabilitate historic 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.*
 - o The proposed new construction meets Standard 9. It does not alter or connect with the historic building. The proposed massing, size and scale are larger than the historic building, but not overly so, and the architectural features are sufficiently compatible with the historic building.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed new construction does not connect to the historic building and could be removed from the site in the future, leaving it intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept of a new building in the location shown in the application.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:39:46

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Michael Phillips and architect Dariya Medynska represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Phillips provided a brief history of the project and mentioned that the Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier design for the same property over the summer. That design has been revised based on comments from the Committee as well as from the Planning Commission.
- Ms. Medynska described the design approach of the proposed new building and how it interacts with the historic Detweiler House on the site. She pointed out that the size of the proposed building has been reduced and the proposed materials have been revised and the overall design simplified.
- Mr. Cluver asked how the height of the proposed building compares to the hotel across the street.
 - o Ms. Medynska replied that she did not have the exact height of the hotel currently available, but that both buildings are four stories tall. In addition, she pointed out that the proposed design has the first floor of the building sunken slightly compared to the Detweiler House, owing to the slope of the site and the overall height proposed is around 39 feet.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded that it is important to know the heights relative to one another and how they compare.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the Detweiler House property is not located in a locally designated historic district but was individually designated very early and is in a National Register district. He opined that they should focus on the new building as it compares to the Detweiler House specifically. He went on to say that the proposed design does not relate well to the Detweiler House and has instead focused more on the overall neighborhood. The scale of the proposed building is too large compared to the Detweiler House and the angle at which it is positioned relative to the street does not match the historic building and its corner blocks views from the north. He described that relationship as “awkward” and suggested looking into ways to improve how the front is seen from the sidewalk. He asked the applicant about the distance between the Detweiler House and the proposed new building.
 - o Ms. Medynska replied that the distance will not be less than six feet.
 - o Mr. Detwiler described that as very tight. He added that he appreciates that the design has been scaled down, but still thinks it is too tall at the sidewalk-facing side compared to the historic building.
 - o Ms. Medynska commented that the design does propose new landscaping including retaining walls in front of the new building, which they intended to help disguise the ground floor.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that the overall height is his issue, not the lowest point. He added that the proposed large amount of brick is also an issue. Chestnut Hill has large numbers of schist and stucco buildings, including the Detweiler House, and the brick is less compatible with the stone environment. He suggested adding some schist to the design, potentially as a base or first-floor cladding.

- o Ms. Stein asked if the building could be pushed back so that the front aligns with the peak of the roof of the Detweiler House.
- o Mr. Detwiler suggested that the design could also incorporate steps so that the front portion is lower than the back. He emphasized the siting of the historic building on the lot and how it would be disturbed by the proposed building.
- o Ms. Medynska pointed out that they are proposing using schist as a material for the retaining walls.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the landscaping changes. The Detweiler House is elevated from street level and by adding retaining walls in front of it, the relationship with the house and the street is being changed. He also commented that the windows for the proposed building are too small and there is too much masonry surrounding them. In addition, the bay on the front that extends up to the mansard is too large and it should be treated more like a dormer at the roof level.
 - o Ms. Stein added that the mansard design itself is incorrectly detailed. It should be pushed back from the plane of the walls whereas it appears to currently be placed outside of that plane. Mr. Cluver agreed and suggested they look at the mansard on the hotel across the street for an example of a better wall relationship.
 - o Ms. Medynska agreed to look into redesigning the mansard.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey added that the mansard also appears too tall and pointed out that the height of the dormers should be approximately level with the top of the roof.
 - o Ms. Stein asked that any future application include elevation drawings as the renderings that are included do not show the proportions as accurately.
 - o Mr. Phillips commented that they would include more views in any future application. He added that their design relates well to the height of the four-story hotel across the street.
 - o Mr. Detwiler responded that, in his view, the hotel across the street is not a great point of comparison as it is a Victorian building that was “colonialized” in the 1950s. He suggested looking to other examples for inspiration. He added that he also feels that the renderings do show the proposal well. The new building is sited oddly compared to the Detweiler House. The difference in scale makes the Detweiler House feel low and short. He suggested that they focus more on the site they are building on rather than seeking comparisons with other buildings in Chestnut Hill
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the grade around the Detweiler House was being changed.
 - o Ms. Medynska confirmed that the grade is not being changed.
- Ms. Stein also commented on the height of the proposed building. She pointed out that the two buildings that will be located on either side of it are both two stories tall and the proposed building is four.
 - o Ms. Medynska replied that the neighboring building to the north has three stories and that the hotel across the street has four while another building on the same block has five.
 - o Mr. Detwiler clarified that the neighboring building to the north has a sunken ground floor, so it is approximately two-and-a-half stories tall.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the neighboring building sits out against the sidewalk while the Detweiler House has a significant setback. The proposed building sits between them and presents a large blank wall to one side while blocking views of the Detweiler House. The proposed building does not really

reflect either of its neighbors well and should better acknowledge how it presents itself to the street. He suggested that the design could be adjusted to abut the party wall of the neighbor to the north.

- o Mr. Detwiler suggested that perhaps the proposed building could be thinner at the front and then step out as it goes back to potentially help with the size and massing issues.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Attorney Nathan Farris, who represents a neighbor, opposed the application. He specified that they are not opposed to the redevelopment of the site, but contend that the proposed building is too large and needs further refinement to fit within the neighborhood. He also pointed out that the proposed design will need zoning relief to be built.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented on the application. He praised the proposed materials but agreed that the size is too large and the mansard design is awkward.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property was designated in 1957 and is one of the earliest designated properties on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
- The overall scale of the proposed building is too large and tall for the historic site. The proposed building is out of proportion with the historic building and will block or otherwise obscure its views.
- The design and scale of the mansard and dormers is not compatible with the historic building.
- The proposed materials should be revised to include more stone.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 as the proposed new construction is not compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the eighteenth-century building and its environment.

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

ITEM: 8226 Germantown Ave MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler 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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 NOVEMBER 2024

17

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ADDRESS: 1902, 1927 AND 1942 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Construct buildings on three lots

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Callahan Ward

Applicant: Nino Cutrufello, Callahan Ward

History: 1902: c. 1889, demolished before designation; 1927: built 1889, attributed to Willis G. Hale, significant, demolished after designation; 1942: c. 1889, contributing, demolished after designation.

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, 1/29/1986

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct three buildings on three vacant lots in the Diamond Street Historic District. The applicant is proposing a consistent development program with one building design that would be constructed on multiple lots. One project will be reviewed under “review and comment” jurisdiction, while the other two will be reviewed under full review jurisdiction by the Historical Commission. The Diamond Street Historic District was designated in 1986 and at that time the lot at 1902 Diamond Street was vacant, and therefore, the building proposed for 1902 Diamond Street will be considered under “review and comment” jurisdiction only. At the time of district designation, there were buildings standing at 1927 and 1942 Diamond Street, so the Historical Commission will have full jurisdiction over those proposed building designs. The properties at 1902 and 1942 Diamond Street are lots within rows of typical Philadelphia three-story rowhouses. However, the property at 1927 Diamond Street was located within a more elaborate and ornate row attributed to Willis G. Hale and classified as “significant” to the district. The building at 1927 was a three-story rowhouse with a mansard roof, rectangular gothic windows, and an open full width front porch tucked under the second and third stories. Unfortunately, only three buildings in this row survive, and only one survives that resembles the building that stood at 1927 Diamond Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three buildings on three vacant lots.

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 design for 1927 Diamond is not compatible with the buildings in the Willis G. Hale-designed row.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the applications for 1902 and 1942 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff recommends denial of the application for 1927 Diamond Street but notes that it would recommend approval of a design that is more reflective of the massing and detailing of the surviving buildings on that row, pursuant to Standard 9.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Alex Gauzza and Kristin DeMarco and developer Nino Cutruffello represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked the applicant to explain the choice of using one design for three infill vacant lots.
 - o Ms. DeMarco explained the design choice of using soldier course and inset running bond rows to align with the historic horizontal bands of the facades on the block of 1902 and 1942. She also opined that the same design would work for the vacant lot at 1927 as there are no surrounding buildings for comparison as it was surrounded by two vacant lots.
 - o Ms. Gauzza added that there were many vacant lots on the north side of the street and very little remaining of what was historically there so their design was more reflective of the predominant building type of the block instead of recreating something that had been there.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicants if they had measured the cornice heights of neighboring buildings in all three locations.
 - o Ms. Gauzza responded that the way the building was designed, the parapet height was flexible so they would be able to accurately build each building at the same height of the neighboring properties.
- Ms. Stein noted that the proposed window heights are 18 inches to two feet lower than the existing historic window height, which would be noticeable in the way light reflected off the glass, affecting the rhythm along the rows. Ms. Stein explained the need for elevation drawings for each site which show the adjacent buildings and context.
- Mr. Cluver remarked that the row on the south side of the street was quite intact and that any design that does not respect the windowsill lines and the rhythms they create will not fit into the historic district. He noted that the cornices changed halfway down the block for example at the lower numbered section, the cornices were flatter and towards the higher numbered sections, the cornices were projecting, and the infill buildings must respect the character of both sections. He opined that the infill buildings should not be identical.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the proposed parapet was oversized and, if it were shortened, the windows could line up on the second and third floors.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicant about the vinyl material proposed for the sides of the buildings and noted that the Historical Commission does not typically approve vinyl siding. He wondered if the applicants were aware of any future development projects. He noted that stucco would be a more appropriate side material.
 - o Ms. Gauzza noted that the adjoining lots were all individually owned, but not by their client Callahan Ward. She noted some of the renderings predict future infill; they stated that they assume that the vinyl material will be a short-term solution to what would hopefully become a continuous facade.
 - o Mr. Cutruffello noted that the building at 1934 Diamond, which appeared to be new construction, currently had vinyl siding.
- Mr. Cluver shifted the conversation to 1927 Diamond and noted that the context there was much weaker than at the other two lots. He noted that this block did have

bookend historic buildings, and that the Architectural Committee would be looking to have the rooflines and windowsill heights match what was there. He noted that the Architectural Committee would be consistent with those requirements as this block gets increasingly developed. He suggested that, while the specifics of the design of the original might not be something that is replicated, the general massing, the sense of there being a porch at the ground level, and the windowsills aligning would be a huge step in the right direction.

- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the chimney feature on the left part of the facade would have risen above the roofline, so the chimney feature should rise above the proposed roofline and not be at the same height as the roofline.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant if the widths of all three properties were the same and how the design adjusted for that.
 - o Ms. DeMarco responded that the lots were 16 to 17 feet wide.
- Mr. McCoubrey declared that it was great to see infill housing happening in this district, but noted that the missing teeth of the district should correspond to the whole.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the brick work seemed to him to be a selection of brick panels and that he was opposed to the lack of sills. He noted that the masonry work did not appear to satisfy historic standards.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant about the property dimensions, noting they all appeared to be different lengths.
 - o Ms. Gauzza explained that Ms. Stein might be referencing the lot footprints and not the footprint of the buildings.
 - o Ms. DeMarco noted that they included a site plan in the application, and the design was within the by-right lot coverage and height for the buildings.
- Ms. Stein noted that the rear details could matter if the back of the buildings could be seen from the public right-of-way which might be applicable to 1942 and 1902 Diamond as they were at the ends of the blocks. She stated that the building sizes must be catered to the adjoining lots and that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission will need plans and site plans of each of the properties independently.
 - o Ms. DeMarco agreed that they can include those documents.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission will require elevation drawings for each site that show the adjacent buildings and context.
- The Historical Commission will require plans and site plans of each of the properties independently.
- Buildings on the south side of the street, the even numbered properties, should respect the rooflines, windowsill lines, and cornice types of existing historic rows.
- Stucco would be a more historically appropriate alternative to vinyl siding.
- For the 1927 Diamond Street, the design of the original structure would not need to be replicated but the general massing, the sense of there being a porch at the ground level, the aligning of rooflines and windowsill lines would make the design more historically appropriate and ultimately successful.
- The rears of the buildings at 1942 and 1902 Diamond Street might be visible from

the public right-of-way and their design should be catered to the adjoining lots.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1902, 1927 and 1942 Diamond St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 6337 WOODBINE AVE

Proposal: Install solar panels

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David Mustapha

Applicant: Ariana Kenyon, Velocity Energy and Home Solutions

History: 1918; Walter F. Price

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing solar panels on the roof of 6337 Woodbine Avenue, a contributing property to the Overbrook Farms Historic District. This property has a gable-front main roof with four intersecting gable dormers – two on each side – which makes the roof of this property a very visible feature in long views from Woodbine Avenue. The proposed solar panel layout would follow the entire ridge of the roof on the western side and there would be panels on the front slope and rear slope of the eastern side of the main roof.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install solar panels on front-gabled roof

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 COMMITTEE, 26 NOVEMBER 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

- o The roof profile is a character defining feature of this historic property. The addition of solar panels would alter the appearance of this defining feature.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial as proposed but notes that it would recommend approval of an application that proposes solar panels for less conspicuous areas of the roof, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:32:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Ariana Kenyon and Chelsea Torres represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The applicant responded to the staff's recommendation by saying that there was no less conspicuous way to install the solar panels on that type of roof structure that would provide the homeowner with an electrical offset that would make the project viable.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the highest levels of visibility were the areas out towards the gable end on Woodbine Avenue.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that, if there was any way to keep the panels behind the front dormers, it would reduce their visibility significantly.
 - o Mr. Cluver added that if they were placed behind the ridge of the dormer that could be a compromise.
- Ms. Stein commented that the proposed layout is chaotic and that rotating the panels both horizontally and vertically was problematic. She suggested that, if they were tiled in the same direction behind the dormer ridgeline, they would be perceived differently.
 - o The applicant responded that the nature of the layout resulted from the usage; if all of the panels were oriented in the same way, they would not achieve the desired offset of the utility bill. She noted that the proposed system allows 92% of the current electric bill to be recovered.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the layout was solely driven by the power requirements and if the number of panels was reduced, if the property owner would proceed with the solar project.
 - o The applicant responded that reducing the panels would not give the property owners the total offset of their utility bill. In that case, they would pay for the solar panels and continue to get an electric bill.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the issue is precedence. Which is more important, the historic nature of the building or a reduction to the electric bill? She opined that the historic nature of the building takes precedence. Ms. Gutterman wondered if there was a way to mitigate the difference, for example to make the panels more regular or push them behind the chimney so that they would be less visible from the public right-of-way. One should be able to install solar panels on this roof while respecting the character-defining historic features of the house.
 - o The applicant responded that they could propose installing a smaller system but did not know if the owner would approve a smaller system.
- Mr. Cluver wondered about the proportional impact to the property owner if the panels in front of the front dormers were removed.

- The applicant asked if the Architectural Committee wanted the panels to be oriented the same, either all in portrait or all in landscape.
 - o Mr. Cluver responded in the negative, saying that he understood the orientation of the panels mattered for solar capture, but he suggested that the panels could have a consistency or regularity to them. He pointed to the panels on the front part of the roof not being aligned as an example. He noted that the seeming randomness of the layout is what attracted the eye, that the more regular it would be, the less the eye would be drawn to it.
- Ms. Stein explicated to the applicant that, if they were to make the adjustments to the solar panel layout as was suggested by the Architectural Committee and resubmit the drawings, it would be possible to get approval from the Historical Commission during its meeting because the adjustments are minor.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- If the solar panels are pushed back to behind the ridgeline of the front two dormers, they would be less conspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- If the panels are organized in balanced and regular fashion, they would not attract the eye and therefore be less conspicuous.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application as presented fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 6337 Woodbine Ave MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 415-17 AND 419 S 15TH ST

Proposal: Construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 415-19 S 15th St LLC

Applicant: Lea and Evan Litwin, Lo Design

History: 1860 to 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application for final review proposes constructing multiple rooftop additions and a four-story rear connector building at 415-17 and 419 S. 15th Street. Both properties are contributing historic resources in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The building at 415-17 S. 15th Street was constructed circa 1860 as a three-story building with two-story wings on each side and stables at the rear. The mansard roof was added between 1880 and 1900. The building at 419 S. 15th Street was constructed circa 1870 as a four-story rowhouse.

By 1922, the building at 415-17 S. 15th Street was converted from a private home to a group home by the Pennsylvania Society to Protect Children from Cruelty. In recent years, the properties were connected on the interior, and until recently provided support services for children. During the twentieth century, multiple changes and additions have occurred at the rears of the buildings and properties.

The rears of both properties are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. There are two small non-accessible alleyways and rear yards along Lombard Street, but these areas offer limited visibility to the back of both properties.

An in-concept application for this project was approved by the Historical Commission in December 2023.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rooftop additions and four-story rear connector 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.*
 - o The proposed size and massing of the four-story connector at the rear of the properties meets Standard 9. The majority of the connector building will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - o The proposed size and massing of the fourth-floor addition at the rear of 419 S. 15th Street meets Standard 9. This addition will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - o The proposed size and massing of the fourth-floor addition on 415-17 S. 15th Street at the corner of S. 15th Street and Waverly Street generally meets Standard 9. The majority of the proposed addition matches the height of the mansard roof with the exception of one area that rises up and exceeds the height of the mansard roof. The

proposed contemporary design and materials intentionally differentiates it from the historic portion of the building. The proposed simple forms, streamlined detailing, and gray fiber cement cladding are compatible with the historic building and meet Standard 9.

- o The proposed connector between the two properties along S. 15th Street is set back significantly along S. 15th Street. Although it removes a small portion of the mansard roof, it generally meets Standard 9. This wing of the building at 415-417 S. 15th Street maintains its original form that dates to the circa 1860 construction.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o Removal of historic fabric is limited. Demolition proposed is focused on non-historic additions and areas of the property that are not visible from the public right-of-way. The proposed additions and alterations maintain the historic integrity of the designated property and could be reversed in the future; therefore, the proposed scope of work meets Standard 10.
- *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 third and fourth-floor addition on 415-17 S. 15th Street at the corner of S. 15th Street and Waverly Street could meet the Roofs Guidelines if the highest point of the addition was reduced slightly to match the height of the mansard roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the addition's height is reduced to the height of the mansard roof, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:42:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Lea and Evan Litwin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver said the two-story rear addition facing Waverly Place appears larger than the in-concept version previously presented.
 - o Mr. Litvin pointed to the in-concept aerial view diagram provided on page 12 of the current application and noted that it showed a fourth-floor addition but with a slightly different configuration extending from front to back along Waverly Place.
- Mr. Cluver said he recognized that there were additional setbacks in the current version and appreciated these changes. He pointed out that the in-concept renderings showed an addition that was not as prominent.
- Mr. Litvin said that one of the differences between the in-concept and current application is their team's decision to remove a non-historic third-floor addition on the carriage house. He said this change was made in part because they felt this addition took away from the original form of the carriage house. Mr. Litvin stated that the contemporary design of the third and fourth-floor addition creates a separation between two and is intended to highlight the carriage house's historic character.
- Mr. Cluver said that one of the objections that he has to the design of the addition is the strange overhang on the top level. He noted that the transition in the design from

a solid wall proposed in the in-concept drawings to a visual void in the current proposal does not work. Mr. Cluver pointed to page 55 and said the current ratio between the two-story addition and the two-story carriage house is not successful.

- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the original three-story overbuild on the carriage house was red brick. He commented that the proposed addition seemed less aggressive as presented in the in-concept submission and that their current design looks as if a Le Corbusier structure landed on top of the carriage house. Mr. McCoubrey asserted that a third story of red brick and a penthouse with a setback may be more compatible.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the third-story connector element between the historic buildings along S. 15th Street is acceptable. He pointed out that there is some information that appeared to be missing from the plans such as the front steps and asked that this be clarified in the final submission to the Historical Commission.
- Ms. Stein stated that she is unclear about the extent of demolition. She recognizes there are aerial and axonometric views included with the submission that show demolition but stated that demolition floorplans are the best way to communicate what is being removed. She said that the lack of demolition floorplans makes her nervous because she is unsure what is being demolished and what is being retained.
 - o Mr. Litvin summarized the areas to be removed during the demolition. He noted that there are several areas that will be demolished but considers it to be surgical demolition rather than extensive.
 - o Ms. Litvin said they can provide demolition floorplans in their revised application for the Historical Commission's meeting. She noted that these plans already exist, but they did not want to create a larger submission package than necessary.
 - o Ms. Mehley said that the staff conducted historic research prior to the in-concept submission and provided information to the applicant about construction history of different parts of the building to determine contributing and non-contributing elements. She added that the staff could visit the property prior to the Historical Commission's meeting to review the areas slated for removal.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the windows are scheduled for replacement as part of the project.
 - o Mr. Litvin replied that they may be replaced and that, if this is added to the scope, they will work with staff on the window replacement.
- Mr. Cluver requested more annotations on the drawings to clarify the scope of work.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites spoke in support of the overall project and commended the applicant's sensitivity to the site and location. He noted that, despite the Architectural Committee's concerns, the project is moving in the right direction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The height of the addition should be reduced to the mansard roof height.
- The northeast corner of the addition should be less obtrusive.
- Demolition floorplans should be added to the revised submission.
- Annotations should be added to provide scope details.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- o The proposed size and detail of the two-story addition at the northeast corner of the property does not meet Standard 9. To meet Standard 9, the proposed addition

- should be reduced to the height of the historic mansard roof and its design details should be refined to be more compatible with the historic carriage house.
- o The application does not include detailed demolition drawings. If demolition floorplans are submitted with the revised application, the determination can be made if the application meets Standard 10.
 - o The proposed two-story addition facing Waverly Street could meet the Roofs Guidelines if the highest point of the addition is reduced slightly to match the height of the mansard roof and design elements are refined to be more inconspicuous.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 415-19 S 15th St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 1108 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Legalize rear addition, replace windows, restore cornice

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: DML Worldwide LLC

Applicant: William Klotz, Restoration Development Group

History: 1800

Individual Designation: 3/30/1965

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize a rear addition built between December 2023 and March 2024, without the Historical Commission's review, at 1108 S. Front Street. The Historical Commission did approve interior demolition and make-safe permit applications in August and December 2023, respectively, but those permits did not cover the new construction. When Historical Commission's staff visited the site, they saw that the unpermitted addition was under construction despite a Stop Work Order issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections on 9 February 2024. Two previous versions of this application have been reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission, and ultimately denied.

This revised application calls for removal of the roof deck and pilot house. For the front façade, the applicants are now proposing a cornice modeled after a historic photograph of another property in the row and six-over-six wood or wood-clad windows, as well as a six-panel

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 NOVEMBER 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

fiberglass door.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize unpermitted rear addition
- Alter front cornice and dormer
- Replace of windows and door on front elevation

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The rear addition is very large in comparison to the historic structure. Removing the pilot house and roof deck is an improvement, but the rear addition is still very visible from the public right-of-way and changes the established spatial relationships of the property.
 - o The bright white siding of the rear addition is out of keeping with the neighboring masonry structures.
 - o A two-story masonry addition with a roof deck on the rear ell rather than the main block may be able to satisfy this Standard.
- *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.*
 - o From the submitted floor plans, it appears that at least some of the existing rear walls were demolished without the Historical Commission's approval.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 3:08:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Joseph Bernardino and Bill Klotz represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Bernardino spoke about the work to the front dormer, explaining that it had undergone structural work but retained essentially the same appearance.
 - o He further indicated a willingness to work with the Historical Commission to arrive at acceptable windows for the front elevation, including the dormer.
 - o Finally, he noted that the applicants had responded positively to the staff's recommendation that they base the front cornice on a historic photograph of 1104 S. Front Street from the Historical Commission's archives.
- Mr. McCoubrey replied that the Architectural Committee had assessed the work to the front elevation at previous public meetings as work that could be done with staff-level approvals. He suggested that the unpermitted rear addition was of greater concern.
 - o He reiterated that the overall height of the rear addition and the cladding material

had been identified as obstacles to legalization at the Historical Commission's meeting.

- o He also noted that the Architectural Committee has previously asked for section drawings of the building showing how the addition interacts with what was there previously.
- Mr. D'Allesandro commented that because this is a legalization application, the applicant should be providing much more information than they have.
- Mr. Bernardino noted that the applicants had had conversations about revising the cladding to something which appeared more like masonry.
 - o Mr. Maust noted that that had been a suggestion the staff had made to the applicants but that the submission included no details about those revisions apart from the rear elevation drawing being colored in grey.
- Mr. Klotz joined the conversation and indicated the applicants' willingness to use stucco on the rear addition rather than siding.
- Mr. Cluver expressed the opinion that three stories is fundamentally too tall.
 - o Mr. Klotz remarked that the pilot house and roof deck are being removed, which brings the building to the three-story level of the neighboring buildings.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the rear wings of the neighboring buildings are two stories, not three.
- Mr. Klotz asked if moving the rear wall of the third floor by eight feet would be acceptable to the Historical Commission
 - o Mr. McCoubrey said he was not sure that that would make a significant difference.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The changes to the front elevation can be reviewed at the staff level.
- The use of stucco as cladding and the shortening of the third floor might improve the application but would need to be documented before the next public meeting in order to be considered.
- The lack of section drawings continues to make it difficult to assess the impact of the unpermitted work to the historic structure.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9; the rear addition is too large and clad in incompatible materials given its visibility from the public right-of-way.
- The degree to which the application satisfies or fails to satisfy Standard 10 is difficult to assess given the lack of section drawings.

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

ITEM: 1108 S Front St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman					X
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4				3

ADDRESS: 252 QUINCE ST

Proposal: Legalize as-built roof and dormers

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Danielle Harvey

Applicant: Jonathan Wallace, AVLV Architecture & Development

History: 1806, William Smith

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: Washington Square West Historic District, Contributing, 9/13/2024

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the as-built roof and dormers at 252 Quince Street, which deviate from the plans approved by the Historical Commission in December 2023. Deviations from the approved plans include the removal of original roof and framing, removal of front and rear cornices, construction of a roof above the location of the original roof, and installation of new dormers that differ in proportions from the approved dormers. This application for legalization was prompted by a staff site visit and subsequent issuance of a violation by the Department of Licenses and Inspections for construction that exceeded the approved plans. The Historical Commission reviewed the application at its meeting on 8 November 2024 and remanded it back to the Architectural Committee for a new review. The Commissioners suggested that their primary concern was the alignment of the cornices with those of the neighboring buildings.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize as-built roof and dormers.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The gable roof, which was constructed above the location of the historic roof,

and dormers, which were constructed taller than approved, are incompatible with the historic property and environment and fail to satisfy Standard 9.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The historic integrity of the original 1806 roof and cornices was permanently altered with full removal, failing to satisfy Standard 10.
- *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 Front and rear dormers were constructed 10 inches taller than approved plans and the dormer cornices are oversized. As currently constructed, the dormers are highly visible from the public right-of-way and fail to satisfy the roof guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the cornices align with those of the neighboring buildings, as suggested by the Historical Commission, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:28:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jonathan Wallace and contractor Zachary Winters represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Winters explained that they discovered that the original roof rafters were undersized, warped, and rotted. He continued that the original rafters were pocketed directly into the front and rear walls and their removal caused the front brick cornice to collapse. To meet building code, the original 3" x 5" rafters were replaced with new 2" x 10" rafters to meet the building code requirements. The installation of new building materials put the new roof slightly above the adjacent roofs.
- Mr. Winter pointed to an existing conditions photograph showing the front cornice area. He explained that the lower 2" x 10" rim board will be covered in the future by the rebuilt brick cornice. Mr. Winters said they will have new bricks made to match the historic cornice bricks that fell out during the roof construction. He said that the upper board will be altered to fix the roofline issue and align it with the adjacent cornices. He pointed to the new detail section drawing submitted with the revised plans. Mr. Winters explained that the drawing shows that they will remove six inches from the front edge of the rafters and that this will create the appearance of alignment with the adjacent buildings.
 - o Mr. Cluver asked if the break point between the area removed and the new roof's full height will be visible from the street. He noted that, based on street level photographs shown in the application, it appears that should not be visible. Mr. Winters confirmed the narrowness of Quince Street contributes to the limited visibility of the roof area from street level.
- Mr. Winters stated that there is a half wall inside the top floor supporting the dormer and, owing to it, they are able to remove this section of the roof and not compromise the structural integrity of the new roof.

- Ms. Stein said that this is an acceptable solution as long as it is structurally stable.
- Mr. D'Alessandro noted that it is unusual to have a dormer supported by a half wall. He questioned if it will be structurally sound.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey interjected that the important point is that their solution will resolve the current misalignment of the cornices, and they will need to ensure the structural integrity of the roof.
- Mr. Winters explained that during the demolition they uncovered a fourth floor, or third-floor ceiling, with undersized 2" x 4" floor joists. As a result, the full floor was removed and rebuilt.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Winters if the change in the height of the roof will be visible once the cornice alterations proposed are complete.
 - o Mr. Winters confirmed that the change will not be visible.
- Mr. McCoubrey said his only other concern is the as-built overhang or cornice on the dormers. He noted that the extent of projection is likely increasing the visibility of the dormers.
 - o Mr. Winters replied that they will trim the dormer cornices back to what is shown in the original drawings.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey indicated that they do not need to add an additional detail but to add to the notes on the detail drawings indicating that they will be cutting back the current as-built projecting cornice and providing the planned dimensions.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites said that Quince Street is a beautiful and historically important street in Philadelphia. He noted his appreciation for the Historical Commission's review of building projects in this area of the city and its willingness to work with the applicants to resolve current issues with the as-built dormers and roof.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicant has submitted revised roof details showing the proposed solution for visually aligning the front and rear cornices with the adjacent buildings in the row. When implemented, this change will remove the visibility of the increased height of the roof.
- Although the applicant intends to cut back the as-built projecting cornice on the dormers, this is not annotated or indicated on the drawings. This information should be added to the drawings before the Historical Commission reviews the application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- If the gable roof cornices are reconfigured to align with the adjacent buildings' cornices and the projection of the dormer cornices are reduced, the application will satisfy Standard 9.
- Although the original 1806 roof and cornices was removed during construction, if a future owner wished to return the roof to its original form, the dimensions and slope of the original roof could be replicated from the adjacent buildings. For this reason, this application meets Standard 10.
- If the projection of the dormer cornices is reduced, the application will meet the Roofs Guidelines. The reduced size of the cornice will allow the new dormers to be less conspicuous.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the cornices align with those of the neighboring buildings and dormer cornices are reduced in size, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 252 Quince St MOTION: Approval with conditions Moved BY: Stein 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	4				3

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:42:51

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:44 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.