

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

**TUESDAY, 22 JULY 2025
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

- Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Josh Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Cal Leslie
- Christine Clawson
- Daniel Trubman
- Derek Spencer, Gnome Architects
- Dustin Dove, Fairmount Civic Association
- Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
- Jake Blumgart, Inquirer
- Jay Farrell
- Jeffrey Pond
- Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
- Julia Hayman
- Katie Tice
- Matt Fromboluti
- Matt Millan, Millan Architects

Michael Bannerman
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Dilworth Paxson
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Patricia Freeland, Spring Garden Civic Association
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Raymond DePiano
Rich Leimbach
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Reuvan Mosheyev
Ryan Nubling, Gnome Architects
Sam Xu, Constrecture, LLC
Sarah Brufke
Stephanie Pennypacker
Virgis Anusauskas

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2337-41 PENNSYLVANIA AVE

Proposal: Construct two-family semi-detached dwelling

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Reuvan Mosheyev

Applicant: Matthew Millan, AIA, LEED AP

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: none

District Designation: Spring Garden, Non-Contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a semi-detached, two-family, four-story dwelling with roof decks accessible from pilot houses. A non-contributing two-story building stood on the lot at the time the Spring Garden Historic District was designated. The building was demolished in 2022. Owing to the fact that a building stood on the lot at the time of designation, the Historical Commission has plenary or full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

The proposed building would include a central drive aisle that leads to interior garages on the ground floor. The proposed façade would feature a central recess and corner windows trimmed in cast stone to break the overall width of the building into rowhouse-like vertical massing. The cornice at the third floor would be in line with the rowhouse to the east while the overall height of the building would match the three-unit townhome complex to the west. The materials are proposed to be cast stone, red brick, and vertical metal siding in Dove Gray. The windows would have dark bronze frames and sash.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story building with roof decks on vacant lot.

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.*

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:38

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Matthew Millan and property owner Reuvan Mosheyev represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if the fourth floor and pilot houses were aligned with the existing building to the left.

- Mr. Millan responded that they were and acknowledged that the rendering was misleading. He noted that the rendering was provided by a third party, and the scale seemed to be slightly off.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the rear elevation. She acknowledged the letter from the community questioning the design of the rear facade.
 - Mr. Millan replied that the rear façade would look like it is shown in the architectural drawing. He recalled three rounds of discussions with the Spring Garden Civic Association and noted that the proposed building had changed significantly, including the rear elevation, in response to concerns from neighbors who would see that space from adjacent streets.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the material choices and noted that it was difficult to tell from the renderings what was happening at the solid masonry wall adjacent to the lintels.
 - Mr. Millan explained that there would be cast stone in the center corner windows and that there would be red brick to the right and left of those.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the railing at the roof deck, which appeared to him to be an opaque material.
 - Mr. Millan explained that it looked to be a bronze glass in the rendering, but that it would in fact be a transparent glass; the opaque quality was an unintended result of the rendering.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the railing was set back five feet at the rear but not at the front and asked whether it would be required to set the railing back five feet on the front as well.
 - Mr. Millan noted that they met the five-foot setback requirement from the front of the building and, since the glass railing was behind the parapet, it would actually be about six and a half feet from the front of the building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the two-inch gap between the parapet and the glass railing and wondered if it should be larger as debris was likely to get stuck in that gap. He suggested that it should be at least six inches.
 - Mr. Millan responded that they had determined that the proposed space provided sufficient room for cleaning purposes.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that all of the first floors were taller than the floors above at other buildings on the block and that this proposal breaks that continuity with a much shorter first floor than the upper floors. He asked the applicant to explain this design choice.
 - Mr. Millan explained that it was driven by the desire to construct four floors within the height limits and that the only way to do this without having a subterranean floor was to set the first floor just above the sidewalk level.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the height of the first floor.
 - Mr. Millan replied that it was about nine feet floor-to-floor, about an eight-foot-high ceiling.
 - Ms. Stein pointed out to Mr. Detwiler that the first floor was to be used as a pass-through space.
 - Mr. Detwiler explained that he was aware of the plan for the first floor but pointed out that the step in the facade materials was not continuous with the neighboring buildings. He noted that the rendering showed the first-floor doors and the windows aligning at the head, but that the elevation did not; the doors dropped slightly from the head of the window.
 - Mr. Millan noted that the rendering may be of an earlier version of drawings. He explained that the second-floor sill heights were still the same so that it did not

reduce the height of the cast stone from the sidewalk up to the top of the cast stone base.

- Mr. Detwiler opined that the doors felt even lower and smaller and cave-like and that he thought if they had a transom above them or if they extended a little higher it would be better. He noted that he believed they should align, that they were just far enough apart that he thought they looked odd. He explained to the applicant that he thought it would be beneficial to establish a base to the building and have a little more height on the windows and doors.
- Mr. Detwiler added that the windows in the neighborhood were punched openings with muntins. He acknowledged that the proposed façade had a punched-opening effect but that the proposed windows were much larger. He also noted that the fourth-floor and pilot-house windows were missing muntins. He said that he would prefer to see the introduction of some sort of muntin and while the window did not need to be 12 panes, it should have some definition. He noted that the public comment about the rear facade objected to the large expanses of sheet glass. He suggested that they be broken down into smaller sections to bring the project to a residential scale.
- Ms. Stein noted her appreciation to the applicant for the adjustments he had made and the work that he had done with the community on the massing and materiality. She said that she thought that it was a successful infill design and appropriate to the historic district. She noted her concern with the driveway entrance and its cavernous feel. She opined that the dark, unmonitored space was not good urban planning for any neighborhood. She suggested that there should be a more solid or opaque garage door so that no one could look in.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed and said that he wished that the width of the garage opening was narrower. He noted that looking into a giant slot of a driveway was not very appealing to the pedestrian; therefore, a solid door or a denser gate would be a friendlier neighbor to the streetscape. He asked the applicant if it would be possible to narrow the driveway.
 - Mr. Millan responded that there would need to be enough space for two cars to pass each other. He noted that he would defer to the civil engineers on whether the drive could be narrowed.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked if the driveway was a shared space.
 - Mr. Millan responded in the affirmative and noted that there were stacked garages to the left and right of each of the units. He said that he understood Mr. Detwiler's point and that he would speak with the engineers to see if they had any different ideas.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Dustin Dove of the Fairmount Civic Association commented that the curb cut was not appropriate, owing to a driveway creating conflict points with pedestrians and limiting the space available to plant trees. He also objected to the large sizes of the residences, explaining that "mega mansions" were not appropriate for the neighborhood of apartments. He also questioned the public input process. He stated that he is a board member of the Fairmount Civic Association and objected that the Historical Commission had not notified the Fairmount Civic Association of this project, even though the association is one of the coordinating Registered Community Organizations (RCOs) for this neighborhood. He asked the Historical Commission to postpone the review to allow the civic association to offer input.

- o Mr. Millan responded that he was consolidating and reducing the number of curb cuts and would be planting new street trees. He also noted that he had worked extensively with the primary civic association in the area, the Spring Garden Civic Association.
- o Mr. Farnham objected to Mr. Dove's assertion that the Historical Commission had failed to properly notify the RCOs of this project. He stated that the Historical Commission had met its notice requirement and that it is not obligated to notify RCOs in the way that the Zoning Board of Adjustment is.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The project would meet the Standards with a few minor adjustments.
- The floor measurements and the exterior material selections should be re-examined.
- The drive aisle should be adjusted so that it will not be a dark, unmonitored space for pedestrians to pass.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The height of the first floor should be adjusted so that it is more like those of the adjacent buildings. The heights of the first-floor windows and door should be increased to be more compatible with the adjacent buildings.
- The large windows of undivided glass should be divided with muntins.
- The glass railing should be set back from the edge of the parapet to allow for cleaning between the parapet and railing. The glass, which is proposed to be clear, should not be changed to opaque glass.
- The design of the drive aisle should be revised. The drive aisle should be closed off with an opaque or denser gate so that pedestrians cannot look into a dark drive aisle.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, but approval of a slightly revised design as indicated, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2337-41 Pennsylvania Ave MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 148, 150, 152, 154, 156, AND 158 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Demolish two buildings and construct six-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Balticorp, LLC

Applicant: Derek Spencer, Gnome Architects, LLC

History: c. 1800 (148), c. 1755 (150), c. 1925 (152)

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984 (148 N 2nd St), 8/11/1982 (150 N 2nd St)

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing (148 to 152 N 2nd St) and Non-Contributing (154 to 158 N 2nd St), 12/12/2003

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes constructing a six-story building across six parcels in the Old City Historic District. Two of these parcels were individually designated, a third is Contributing to the district, and the remaining three properties are non-contributing to the district.

As proposed, the development calls for the full demolition of structures at 152 N. 2nd Street (contributing) and 156 N. 2nd Street (non-contributing) as well as the rear portions of 148 and 150 N. 2nd Street (both individually designated).

In 2017, an application was made to reclassify 152 N. 2nd Street as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. At that time, the Historical Commission determined that the building was constructed within the historic district's period of significance and denied the request, confirming its contributing classification to the district.

A 2018 proposal for development of the lots from 152 N. 2nd Street north to the lot now addressed 160-64 N. 2nd Street was reviewed in-concept by the Historical Commission. That application consisted of a six-story hotel building with a much taller tower set back from the street and proposed altering the building at 152 N. 2nd Street for use as an entrance lobby. The Historical Commission offered feedback on that proposal but declined to adopt a motion of approval or denial.

As part of the development, the applicant also proposes reconstructing the third floor and garret of 148 N. 2nd Street, which were demolished sometime between 1915 and 1960.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish two buildings and construct a six-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.*
 - o The use of brick and maximum height are compatible with the immediate surroundings within the historic district.
 - o The proposed massing looms over the historic structures to be retained. Its monolithic mass could be better broken up.

- *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 proposal calls for significant demolition, including of the contributing building at 152 N. 2nd Street in its entirety and large portions of the rears of the buildings at 148 and 150 N. 2nd Street, which appear to date from at least the mid nineteenth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: As currently proposed, the application includes demolition that could not be approved by the Philadelphia Historical Commission without a finding of necessity in the public interest or that the historic resource in question could not be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. No such argument is put forward in the application. Such an argument must be made in any application for final approval.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:33:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Derek Spencer of Gnome Architects represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein expressed concern about the amount of demolition proposed as well as the massing of the new building, which “crowds” the historic resources that would remain. She suggested that the proposed building would have a negative impact on the historic district.
 - o Ms. Stein further recommended that stepping down the height of the portion of the new building along Quarry Street might mitigate the negative impact, but also that retaining some of the rear portions of the buildings at 148 and 150 N. 2nd Street would give some more breathing room to the front blocks of those buildings.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein and argued that the vernacular scale of this portion of Quarry Street would be lost. He also said the six-foot setback behind the corner buildings was insufficient. He hoped that the building could serve as a bridge in height between the smaller buildings to the south and the larger buildings to the north.
 - o Mr. Detwiler supported the proposal to rebuild the upper portion of 148 N. 2nd Street, which had been demolished in the mid-twentieth century.
 - o Additionally, Mr. Detwiler cited the Historical Commission’s decision in 2017 that the building at 152 N. 2nd Street is contributing to the historic district and advised that he thought the structural issues on the front facade could be successfully addressed. He also expressed an openness to portions of the rear of that building being absorbed into the new structure or demolished, if the front could be retained and reused.
- Ms. Lukachik drew on her expertise as a structural engineer and remarked that, after reviewing the engineer’s report, she was convinced that some portions of the building at 152 N. 2nd Street might need to be repaired but concluded that none of the structural issues are insurmountable or require demolition.
- Mr. D’Alessandro agreed that the structural issues of 152 N. 2nd Street should be addressed with repairs.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that step-downs in massing, especially along the Quarry Street elevation, would help the proposed building fit into its surroundings.

- Mr. Spencer noted that his firm had recently designed a six-story building nearby at 225 Quarry Street, then part of 151 N. 3rd Street, which had been approved by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the Architectural Committee had recommended denial of that project on Quarry Street.
- Ms. Lukachik expressed an openness to the maximum height proposed but suggested that it needed to be shifted away from the historic buildings.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed, asking for a dialogue between the proposed mass and the historic buildings. He also advocated for more breathing space at the rear of the historic buildings and a step-down along Quarry Street.
- Mr. Spencer pointed out cornices below the second and third floors of the proposed building and described them as attempts to acknowledge the strong, though varied, lines of cornices, awnings, and eaves on the block and neighboring blocks. He also drew the Architectural Committee's attention to the simple cornice at the top of the proposed building.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that he appreciated those touches but wished that there was more variety in the proposed massing, reflecting the immediate varied context.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the proposed usage of the historic buildings
 - Mr. Spencer responded that 148 and 150 N. 2nd Street will likely be commercial and noted that 150 N. 2nd Street is already configured as offices. He said there is a possibility that there would be one apartment included in 148 N. 2nd Street.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Julia Hayman expressed opposition to the proposed massing and the loss of historic fabric and suggested that, given its masonry composition, the front wall of 152 N. 2nd St should be able to be repaired or rebuilt.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance also commented that the massing would overwhelm the historic buildings. He stated that the proposed demolition would have to meet the restrictions laid out in the historic preservation ordinance.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society agreed with the other public comments and suggested that the new development here be leveraged to fund the preservation and restoration of the historic resources.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed massing is too large for and close to the historic buildings. The height and massing should be reduced as the new building moves toward Quarry Street.
- The building at 152 N. 2nd Street is a contributing property to the Old City Historic District. The applicant must demonstrate to the Historical Commission that there is no feasible reuse for it before the Historical Commission can approve its demolition.
- The structural defects described in the engineer's report for 152 N. 2nd Street could likely be addressed through reasonable repairs.
- The rebuilding of the upper floors of 148 N. 2nd Street, removed in the mid-twentieth century, would be acceptable, provided the re-creation followed historic preservation standards.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, as the overall massing is overly large and monolithic for its proximity to the historic buildings on these parcels as well as the surrounding Old City Historic District.

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 10 as it proposes the complete demolition of a building that is contributing to the Old City Historic District and the rear portions of two individually-designated buildings.

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

ITEM: 148, 150, 152, 154, 156, and 158 N 2nd St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 614 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Qian Jin Real Estate LLC

Applicant: Sam Xu, Constrecture, LLC

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition on the two-story portion of the rear ell of 614 Pine Street, with a roof deck over the entire rear ell serviced by two pilot houses. Window openings on the existing three-story portion of the rear ell would be significantly altered, requiring the partial removal and rebuilding of that wall using salvaged brick. Two skylights are also proposed for the rear slope of the gable roof.

The proposed addition and roof decks would not be visible from Pine Street but would be visible from the side and rear from Waverly and Addison Streets as well as a pedestrian greenway which runs from Pine Street to Addison Street.

When the Architectural Committee reviewed a previous version of this application, the addition, including a parapet wall around the roof decks, was to be clad in metal panels. The application has been revised to show the addition clad in stucco, with brick portions remaining uncovered and a metal railing in place of the parapet wall. The front pilot house has been shifted back, requiring a reduction in the portion of the slope of the roof to be removed. The fenestration pattern on the third floor of the ell has been revised slightly as well.

At its July meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed and remanded the application to the Architectural Committee for further review.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct addition on two-story portion of rear ell.
- Construct roof deck and two pilot houses.

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 windows on the rear of the main block and the third floor of the ell are incompatible with the historic resource.
- *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 roof deck and pilot house would require the demolition of a small portion of the roof of the main block.
 - o While the addition would not be visible from Pine Street, the rear of the property is visible from a pedestrian greenway as well as Waverly Street and Addison Street.
 - o The third-story addition is very tall with a very large floor-to-ceiling height. The addition should be reduced in height by several feet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the fenestration pattern on the rear wall of the main block and on the rear ell is revised to be more compatible with the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:01:25

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sam Xu represented the application

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked for clarification about the extent of demolition and worried about both the structural implications of the proposed work and potential drainage problems that may result. She wished that demolition plans had been provided and expressed uncertainty about whether the addition was truly buildable as drawn.
- Mr. McCoubrey also asked for more detailed drawings of the areas where the new construction met the existing building. He suggested that the existing third floor of the rear ell could be retained as it is and an addition of similar scale constructed behind it. Like Ms. Stein, he expressed uncertainty about the extent of work to the existing third-floor portion. Finally, he criticized the increased height of the proposed addition.
- Mr. D'Alessandro criticized the extent of demolition and argued that a more appropriate scope would confine work to the rear ell without touching the main block of the building.

- Mr. Detwiler agreed with the staff that the proposed window sizes and detailing are incompatible. He objected to the proposed cladding of the pilot houses, specifically that the metal panels would be multi-colored.
 - Ms. Stein acknowledged that the applicant had reduced the use of metal panels from the earlier application but suggested that the pilot houses could also be clad in stucco.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Ms. Stein asked why the project requires two pilot houses.
 - Mr. Xu responded that the roof decks would be private, each accessed by one of the two apartments that would occupy the top floor. The building currently has six apartments and would continue to have six apartments after the renovation.
 - Ms. Stein observed that, with the pilot houses and the proposed height of the addition, it would be a sizeable building with a significant visual impact on the surrounding right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman requested clarification of the impact that the front pilot house would have on the existing roof structure, given that it would seem to interrupt the end of the roof trusses.
 - Mr. Xu indicated that he was seeking to address the concerns of the Historical Commission and the neighbors about the appearance of the addition and would work with structural engineers once the project was approved. He reported that he had demolition plans that he could share with the Historical Commission.
- Ms. Stein asked for clarification regarding the location of the rear wall of the main block in relation to the addition. She suggested that the drawings were inconsistent or incomplete.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed that a demolition plan was necessary to understand the project. She echoed some earlier comments, indicating that any alterations should be limited to the rear ell and should not impact the main block if possible.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the height of the proposed third floor makes the addition meet the rear of the main block right at the existing cornice line. He inquired whether the floor height of the third-floor addition could be lowered at all.
 - Mr. Xu responded that the floor height was not being lowered but that the addition would add about two feet of height overall.
- Ms. Stein pointed out a dotted line that suggested that the entirety of the third floor on the ell would be demolished.
- Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Gutterman both expressed objections to the demolition required of the rear wall of the main block to accommodate the shifted stair and pilot house.
 - Mr. McCoubrey also objected to the large windows proposed for the rear wall of the main block.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association agreed with many of the Architectural Committee members' concerns. He invited the architect to meet with the Society Hill Civic Association and advocated for further attention and maintenance to the front and side facades, which are outside the scope of the proposed work.
 - Mr. Xu responded that the owner is planning maintenance of the west wall of the rear ell in the future, and the proposal includes condensers to be located on the roof which would facilitate removal of the units currently mounted on the west wall.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JULY 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The extent of demolition appears excessive but the scope of it needs to be clarified.
- The structural implications of the demolition to accommodate the front pilot house are concerning.
- The proposed front pilot house would alter the pattern of water drainage on the roof; a drainage solution should be proposed.
- An addition on the rear ell that did not engage with the main block would be more compatible with the existing building.
- The cladding on the pilot houses should be revised to be more compatible with the building; stucco may be appropriate.
- Additional information, including demolition plans and drawings of various details, are necessary for the scope of the project to be understood.
- The proposed window replacements for the rear wall of the main block and the west wall of the ell are incompatible in size and style with the historic building and the surrounding district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition is incompatible with the historic building in height, cladding on the pilot houses, and proposed windows, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9.
- Owing to the extent of demolition, which may compromise the historic building, the application fails to satisfy Standard 10.

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

ITEM: 614 Pine St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 310 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Install solar panels

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James Bannerman

Applicant: James Bannerman

History: 1980; Cypress Court; H2L2 Architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing solar panels on the street facing and rear roof slopes of a 1980 rowhouse. The height of the flush-mounted panels is 6 inches above the asphalt-shingled roof surface. The panels will be visible directly across Spruce Street, further east and west on Spruce Street, and from Bell's Court to the north. The rear roof slope is not visible from St. Peters Way, on the west side of the house, but is visible from the 300 block of Cypress Street, through the rear parking lot. Solar panel systems were available at the time the 300-310 Spruce Street row houses were constructed.

The most recent National Parks Service (NPS) guidance (2022) is that solar panels are appropriate when the building's historic character is not diminished. NPS Sustainability Guidelines recommend solar panel installation when it does not:

“...damage historic roofing material or negatively impact the building's historic character and is reversible.”

The installation of street-visible solar panels will not adversely impact the Society Hill Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install solar panels on the front and rear slopes of a side gable 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 features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
- *Roof Guideline I 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 solar panels will not damage historic roofing material or diminish the building's historic character.
 - o The solar panels will not adversely impact the Society Hill Historic District.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 1:25:44

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Michael Bannerman represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked where the location of conduit and related mechanical equipment would be located.
 - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff replied that the location of these components was not clear from the submitted materials.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern that solar panel installation at 310 Spruce Street will disrupt the uniformity of the 300-310 Spruce Street roofs.
- Mr. Detwiler intoned that the solar panels would be visible from public streets and walkways.
 - Ms. Gutterman declared that the visibility of the solar panels will not negatively impact the building's character-defining features.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the proposal would have a negative impact.
- Mr. D'Alessandro worried that an approval would invite additional solar panel proposals that would alter the character of the row of buildings on Spruce Street.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the project would be improved by properly organizing the solar panels on the roof.
 - Mr. McCoubrey concurred, supporting a better organization of the panels and the setting back the panels on the rear slope.
 - Mr. Detwiler observed that some panels may need to be deleted from the design to properly organize the roof design.
- Ms. Stein expressed support so long as the panels are on a grid, have proper setbacks, and no exposed conduit or utilities are visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired if all the proposed panels are needed to supply the necessary electricity for the needs of the house.
 - Mr. Bannerman responded that the proposed panels would not be sufficient to meet the house's electrical needs.
- Ms. Stein wondered if the utility boxes and conduit could be located inside the house.
 - Mr. Bannerman responded that they are proposed for the exterior.
- Mr. Detwiler opposed conduit on the exterior and suggested more panels could be added by relocating the roof vents.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association suggested adding a rectangular frame around the solar panels to better organize them.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed solar panels satisfy historic preservation standards because they will be inconspicuous and compatible with the design of the house.
- The installation of solar panels on this house will not adversely impact the Society Hill Historic District
- The layout of the solar panels lacks uniformity and should be made more regular.

- The conduit between the panels and the controls should be run in the interior of the house if possible.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9, provided that the solar panels are placed in an orderly manner, the conduit is internal to the building, all mechanical equipment is hidden from public view, and that the roof in good condition prior to the installation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the panels are placed in an orderly manner, the conduit is internal to the building, all mechanical equipment is hidden from public view, and that the roof in good condition prior to the installation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 310 Spruce St MOTION: Approval with conditions 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	5	1			1

ADDRESS: 1208 SAINT JAMES ST

Proposal: Replace front entry door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sarah Brufke

Applicant: Sarah Brufke

History: c. 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the front door of 1208 Saint James Street, a building constructed about 1870 and classified as Contributing to the Washington Square West Historic District. The existing front door appears to be a non-original wood replacement. The application seeks to replace the current front door, owing to its deteriorating condition, with a six-panel fiberglass replacement and additionally proposes to repair or replace a portion of the existing door frame while preserving the existing transom. The proposed door is a stock size that may not fit the current opening without modifications. Not enough information is provided regarding the existing door, its dimensions, and how the existing frame would be modified to install the pre-hung door to be able to fully assess the application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace non-historic wood door with fiberglass six-panel door.
- Repair or replace door frame.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The proposed fiberglass six-panel door does not match the old in design, texture, or materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the proposed door replacement due to incompleteness, but potential approval of a door that closely approximates the dimensions and detailing of an appropriate historic door, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:53:42

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Sarah Brufke represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Brufke explained that she is proposing to install a new front entry door because the existing one will barely lock, owing to warping. The new door would be the same color and as similar in design to the existing door as possible. She noted that she is unable to afford a custom door. In addition to the locking problems, she would like to reduce the noise that the defective door allows into her residence.
- Ms. Stein inquired if the existing door is original to the home.
 - o Ms. Mehley responded that the door was in place at the time of designation, is solid wood, and appears to fit the historic opening.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if it was possible to repair the existing door and locks instead of replacing them.
 - o Ms. Mehley responded that the staff does not have that information and suggested the owner answer.
 - o Ms. Gutterman additionally explained that a fiberglass door will not necessarily reduce the noise coming into the residence, especially with a window adjacent to it.
- Ms. Stein commented that a lot can be done to refurbish the existing door including installing new weatherstripping and other adjustments to the way it is hung. She added that the existing door clearly has value, given the stated cost of a replacement. It makes financial sense to keep the historic door.
 - o Ms. Brufke responded that she has had several contractors look at the door and they have said that the frame itself is rotted and that the door does not fit properly within the frame. She added that a new construction project across the street may have caused shifting that impacted the door.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the existing door and frame are both worth saving. He stated that the owner will face unexpected issues when installing a new door. He

- pointed out that the lock looks like it might be poorly installed and asked whether the issue is with the door closing or locking.
- Ms. Brufke responded that it is difficult to shut and lock the door specifically in the summer. She added that it only really became a problem in the last year.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the door changing with the weather is natural and that the lock needs to be adjusted and potentially replaced. Alternatively, a second locking mechanism could be installed that would function in the summer. A fiberglass door will not offer the same level of security as a solid wood one and adjustments to the locks and repairs to the small, rotted portions of the frame would likely cost much less than a replacement fiberglass door. He stated that the Architectural Committee is trying to save the applicant both money and future difficulty.
 - Ms. Gutterman pointed out that it sounds like the frame would need to be replaced if a new door is installed and the application does not provide any details about the new frame. The application is incomplete.
 - Ms. Brufke confirmed that replacing the frame would be part of the new door installation.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the frame and door are likely not warped and that the issue probably stems from some door hardware instead. He remarked that restoration or repair would be a better solution than replacement. He added that it would cost less too.
 - Mr. Detwiler explained that any new door will be inferior to the existing one and that it will likely need to also be replaced again in the future. He added that a good carpenter will be able to fix the current issues with the door and frame and that the repaired door will ultimately be better quality and last longer than a fiberglass replacement. He also added that, if the door sits in direct sunlight for a part of the day, it should not be painted black because it will absorb heat and change size.
 - Ms. Brufke replied that it is never in the sun.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the closing problem was limited to the locks or includes the entire door.
 - Ms. Brufke responded that the issues seem related to the heat and she is sometimes able to more easily shut the door at night. However, in the summer, she often needs to lift the door up while closing it.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that, if she needs to lift the door, the issue could potentially be fixed by tightening the hinges. Hinges sag over time and sometimes need to be repositioned. He added that a carpenter could likely fix the issues for much less than the replacement cost and not have to tear out the entire frame to do so. Adjustments to parts of the door and how it is hung may fix the problem.
 - Ms. Brufke responded that she has been told by a few contractors that the frame needs replacement.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated that a good carpenter should be able to fix the door and avoid the larger problems that would occur when trying to replace the entire frame.
 - Ms. Gutterman commented that the application does not detail anything about modifications to the existing door frame.
 - Ms. Brufke explained that it would be a pre-hung door.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that a pre-hung door would not be a good solution for this situation.

- Mr. Detwiler commented that, for a door replacement, the Architectural Committee would expect the existing frame to be maintained and repaired with a new door slab put in the existing frame. He agreed that removing the current door, refurbishing it, and rehangng it with new hinges, weatherstripping and other hardware could be accomplished by a good carpenter and would result in a better, more secure door than a replacement door.
- Ms. Brufke pointed out that the existing door lock is a well-made expensive one.
- Mr. Detwiler questioned whether it was installed correctly.
- Ms. Brufke reiterated that she has lived in the home for five years and the door has only really had these current issues for the last one to one and a half years. She is open to having another carpenter look at the situation, especially if that will cost less than a replacement, but she explained that the repair people she has had look at the situation have all suggested replacement.
- Ms. Mehley suggested that the owner and the staff could discuss the door after the meeting and the staff could provide some contact information for other carpenters.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that, if the door needs to be lifted to be closed, adjusting the hinges might solve the problem. Doors sag over time as hinges bend out of alignment.
- Ms. Brufke explained that it does take a lot of effort for her to close it all the way and she worries that the issue will get worse. She would like to get the project done in an economical way that the Historical Commission can approve.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro states that he appreciates the applicant applying to the Historical Commission for approval in advance instead of trying to legalize after the fact.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed with Ms. Mehley's suggestion that the staff could provide contact information for carpenters.
 - Ms. Brufke agreed.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro also offered to assist the staff if needed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing front entry door at the property is an older, but probably not original, wood door.
- Retaining and repairing the extant door would likely be less expensive and more effective than replacing it.
- A pre-hung, generic fiberglass door is not an appropriate replacement.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6, as the existing door and door frame could be repaired and reinstalled rather than replaced.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6, as the proposed replacement door is not compatible with the historic character of the property.
- The application is incomplete, in that it provides no information about how the proposed pre-hung door would be installed within the existing door frame.

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

ITEM: 1208 Saint James St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
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: 1730 WHARTON ST

Proposal: Legalize windows, with modifications

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pelican Point Investments LLC

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Dilworth Paxson

History: 1888; 18th Street Methodist Episcopal Church/Friendship Baptist Church;

J. Franklin Stuckert, architect

Individual Designation: 9/14/1988

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing aluminum windows installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit throughout the building at 1730 Wharton Street. Some of the windows and infill would be modified to better fill the masonry openings. Located at the southeast corner of Wharton Street and S. 18th Street, the former 18th Street Methodist Episcopal Church, constructed about 1888, historically featured wood windows with marbled blue glass. Between fall 2018 and summer 2019, many of the historic windows were removed without the Historical Commission's review or approval. The original frames and some of the original marbled blue glass windows remained.

At its 14 August 2020 meeting, the Historical Commission adopted the Architectural Committee's recommendation for an application proposing complete restoration of the building's exterior as part of a conversion to multi-unit residential use. The approval was conditioned on the windows being wood or aluminum-clad wood at the side elevations, including the installation of stacked double-hung windows in the double-height openings, provided the muntin patterns matched those of the historic windows, and the mullion between the windows at the new floor level was as minimal as possible; the marbled blue glass windows were retained, restored, or replicated in the front façade openings and communal spaces; and the louvers at the corner towers were retained, with the understanding that glass or operable windows may be installed behind them. In May 2021, the Historical Commission's staff approved window shop drawings by Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation that proposed all new wood windows sufficiently

replicating the historic appearance and included the character-defining marbled blue glass where appropriate. It appears that Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation went out of business, and the windows shown in the approved shop drawings were never purchased. Instead, aluminum windows with grilles between the glass and of sizes that do not fit the masonry openings were installed throughout the building in early 2025 without any approvals or permits. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the exterior work and a Stop Work Order at the request of the Historical Commission, prompting this request for legalization from the property owner/developer.

In April 2025, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application for legalization and recommended denial. The application was continued several months to allow the applicant to work on a revised proposal, which was presented to the Historical Commission at its July 2025 meeting. The Historical Commission considered the revised application, offered recommendations for additional information to be submitted, and voted to remand the application back to the Architectural Committee for review of the revised application and the details to be provided. The revised application requests permission to retain most of the aluminum windows but proposes modifications within some masonry openings to attempt to better fill the openings like the historic windows had. The revised application also proposes a new design within the monumental opening on Wharton Street that is intended to simulate the historic design.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize replacement windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The new windows, even with proposed modifications, do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:14:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Neil Sklaroff, owner and developer Cal Leslie, and architect Rich Villa represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Sklaroff explained that the application provides more information based on comments from the review by the Historical Commission. He stated that these details relate to the accessible entrance, the proposed recess of the existing windows into the masonry openings, and the stationary sash to be installed at the arched openings.

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the original window frames remain. He questioned why the windows documented by the Seaquay Architectural Millwork shop drawings were not purchased.
 - Mr. Sklaroff responded that the original frames do not remain, and the shop drawings were from a company that is no longer in business. Also, the new windows were cost prohibitive.
- Mr. Sklaroff stated that the revised proposal includes moving the windows back approximately three inches into the masonry openings. The windows are currently installed at the outside edges of the openings.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the windows have grilles between the glass, which is a divided light type that the Historical Commission does not typically approve.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the windows installed without approval are a significant deviation from windows that would satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- Mr. Sklaroff stated that the number one priority should be to preserve the building, which the owner is doing. He noted that the Historical Commission has evolved over the years in terms of what it approves for window replacement applications. He stated that it is the feeling of the owner and the architect that the windows installed in the building are what the market demands at this point, for such a conversion from religious use to multi-unit residential.
- Ms. Gutterman asked why the new windows are so much smaller than the masonry openings.
 - Mr. Leslie responded that, specifically for the 18th Street side, the brick that surrounds the interior of the window was eroded, and being three courses of brick, they had to mortar and repair the openings to maintain the arches. In doing so, adjustments were made for the sizing of the windows that were installed.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to submit photographs of the deteriorated window openings for review by the Historical Commission. She stated that, even if the brick had to be repaired, the repairs would not have required the six inches or more framing that was added to reduce the window opening sizes.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that he has never encountered such a solution to fix damaged brick at window openings. He questioned the explanation.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the building is more than just the brick, and the historic windows were character-defining features of the church building. He opined that the historic blue glass could have been reused, given that it did not include religious iconography that might be objectionable to some. He stated that the installation of vinyl Colonial-style windows in a building that is in no way Colonial is about the worst design solution he could imagine. He stated that the size of the windows is unacceptable.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the Seaquay Architectural Millwork shop drawings should have been used. He again questioned if the original window frames remained. He suggested that the window installation was done based on needing to do something fast rather than something historically appropriate.
 - Ms. Gutterman reiterated that the window company went out of business.
 - Mr. Detwiler accused the owner of purchasing stock windows that were the quickest and cheapest solution. He observed that there is blue glass remaining over one of the doors.
- Mr. Leslie clarified that when he purchased the property, the first-floor windows on the S. 18th Street side were metal non-historic replacements, and the second-floor windows were gone, and the openings were boarded up.

- Ms. Gutterman remarked that the metal non-historic windows at the time of purchase were of a better design than what was recently installed, because they extended the full width of the openings.
- Mr. D'Alessandro claimed that the application provided no details of the proposed scope.
 - Mr. Sklaroff directed the Architectural Committee's attention to the new architectural detail drawing provided to show the windows and infill recessed into the brick openings. He noted that the drawings also now provide more details about the monumental window on Wharton Street, and the accessible entrance, which had occupied a good deal of discussion time at the Historical Commission meeting.
 - Mr. McCoubrey countered that the only change to the application since the review by the Historical Commission is the recessed window detail. He explained that there was so much time spent on the accessible entrance during the Historical Commission's review because the information regarding the windows was incomplete and difficult to understand.
- Mr. Leslie stated that all windows recently installed, and any proposed new parts to the window openings, are vinyl in material.
- Mr. Villa stated that the drawings have been revised to show a setback of three inches for the windows and infill, and the addition of a fixed window at the top of any arched opening. He confirmed that all existing windows are proposed to be retained. He acknowledged that the window recess detail is not shown correctly.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the third-floor side windows do not sit on the windowsills, but rather there is an infill panel under each window.
 - Mr. Villa responded that a floor was inserted at that location.
 - Ms. Gutterman clarified that the new floor is at the location of the spandrel panel between the windows, and that the issue with the window and sill is due to the extra wood blocking added by the contractors when the windows were being installed.
- Ms. Lukachik commented that the owner should have come to the Historical Commission when he learned that Seaquay Architectural Millwork went out of business, and the Commission could have worked with him on other options that were potentially more economically viable, rather than coming to the Commission now asking for approval of these windows.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the owner should just take old shop drawings and get those windows created regardless of the cost.
- Ms. Gutterman redirected the discussion to the windows that were installed, and whether or not they are acceptable in terms of material, size, appearance, and installation.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that this application does not make a claim of financial hardship.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society commented that he is sympathetic to this type of building reuse and questioned if there is a way to set a schedule for the window replacement over several years, so that the owner does not face one big expense at once.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- In May 2021, the Historical Commission's staff approved window shop drawings by Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation that proposed all new wood windows sufficiently replicating the historic appearance and included the character-defining marbled blue glass where appropriate. Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation went out of business, and the windows shown in the approved shop drawings were never purchased.
- Aluminum or vinyl windows with grilles between the glass and of sizes which do not fit the masonry openings were installed throughout the building in early 2025 without any approvals or permits.
- This revised application requests permission to retain most of the aluminum or vinyl windows but proposes modifications within the masonry openings to attempt to better fill the openings like the historic windows had, and to recess the windows and infill approximately three inches into the masonry openings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The new windows, even with proposed modifications, do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 1730 Wharton St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:45:15

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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