

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

**TUESDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2023
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair		X	
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP	X		Left at 9:48 am
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler	X		Left at 10:56 am
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		Acting Chair
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
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner I
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

Alyson Ferguson
Betty Mon
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Commissioner Cheryl Bettigole, Philadelphia Department of Public Health
Chris Carickhoff
David Lo
Debra McCarty
Dennis Carlisle
Doug Seiler, Seiler+Drury Architecture
Jacalyn Pollock
Jake Blumgart
Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design
Jay Farrell
Joan Finger
Joe Pyle, The Scattergood Foundation

Judy Ha
Kathy Dowdell
Kevin K
Kimberly Haas, Hidden City Philadelphia
Lisa Ostroff
Maya Lindsay
M. Ehrler
Meredith Ferleger, Esq., Dilworth Paxson
Nancy Bastian, cbp Architects
Nancy Pontone
Nathan Farris, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Nicholas Connolly, cbp Architects
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Ralph Woerheide
Sara Enes, Philadelphia Department of Public Health
Seth Cohen, VSBA
Stephanie Pennypacker
Stuart Lacheen
Tim Shaaban, Astoban Investments
Vanessa Raymond-Garcia
Wen Lin
Y. Cook
Zuoda He

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 4641 E ROOSEVELT BLVD

Proposal: Construct health center building
Review Requested: Final approval
Owner: Thomas Scattergood Foundation
Applicant: Nathan Farris, Esq., Ballard Spahr LP
History: 1813
Individual Designation: unknown
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval to construct a new municipal health center on the grounds of the historic Friends Hospital in the Frankford section of Philadelphia. Established by the Quakers in 1813 as the first private psychiatric hospital in the United States, the Friends Hospital complex is composed of numerous historic and modern buildings set on 99 acres. The date that the Historical Commission designated Friends Hospital is unknown. No documentation of a designation at a Historical Commission meeting exists. It appears that the hospital was added to the Register in the early 1970s in response to the proposed Pulaski Expressway, a highway that would have cut across the hospital grounds and connected the Betsy Ross Bridge to Route 309. In addition to its local designation, Friends Hospital is a National Historic Landmark.

The new health center building would be located along the main entrance drive from Roosevelt Boulevard to the hospital complex. It would be two stories in height and clad in three types of

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

brick with a cast-stone base. The windows would be aluminum. A painted metal screen would block views of the mechanical equipment on the roof. The service area at the rear of the building would be enclosed with a brick-clad wall and have a metal gate. A material samples page in the drawing set identifies the materials.

The Historical Commission granted in-concept approval of the massing, size, scale, and location of the new health center building, pursuant to Standard 9, at its July 2023 meeting. The massing, size, scale, and location of the building as currently proposed are identical to that approved in concept in July 2023.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct health center

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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 As already determined by the Historical Commission, the massing, size, scale, and location of the new construction proposed in the application satisfy Standard 9.
 - o The architectural features of the proposed building satisfy Standard 9.
 - o The proposed building will be differentiated from yet compatible with the property.
 - o The proposed building is designed to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends final approval of the application, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:58

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Nathan Farris, architect Seth Cohen, Joe Pyle of the Scattergood Foundation and Health Commissioner Cheryl Bettigole represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farris, the attorney, introduced himself and stated that he represents the Scattergood Foundation, the property owner, which is developing this health center in partnership with the City of Philadelphia's Department of Public Health. He reminded the Architectural Committee that the Historical Commission granted final approval of the demolition of Lawnside and in-concept approval of the construction of the new health center building in June 2023. He stated that his team is here today to present the design details of the health center building.
- Mr. Cohen, the architect, presented the overall site plan. He pointed out the entrance to the health center on Langden Street with the reconstructed entry gates, stone wall, and fence. He explained that they need to widen the entry drive to accommodate a right turn exit only lane to create a safer environment. He stated that they have relocated the ADA parking spaces, which have been added to the central parking lot. He stated that the change creates a safer environment for the users, adds to the open space, and enhances the buffer of trees. He pointed out the new trees in the parking lot to enhance the experience of the center of campus as well as to address

- stormwater management issues. He noted the lighting fixtures that are being proposed there for the project. He said that they are fairly simple. He noted the light posts they will use for pedestrian walkways and within the parking area, and a very simple wall sconce for the entrances and service areas around the building. He pointed out the entry gate that will be reconstructed and slightly relocated. He discussed several context photographs of campus. He observed that the main building is clad with a light stucco, which corresponds to the cladding they have chosen for the new building. He showed photographs of the allee of trees that they will be restoring. He stated that many trees have been lost or removed over the years, and their intent is to restore the trees. He displayed the second-floor and roof plans and stated that it is their intent to locate the mechanical equipment on the roof with a screen to block the views of the equipment from the campus. Mr. Cohen discussed the elevation drawings. He stated that the materials for this project are mostly masonry including three colors of brick. The bricks will be arranged in a pattern that creates a kind of fluid, undulating movement. The building will have a cast-stone base. The mechanical screen is a metal roof panel system. The porch roof will be a standing-seam metal roof. The site walls will have cast-stone caps. Mr. Cohen stated that the building will have a large open porch, which is intended to be welcoming and like those found on Quaker meetinghouses. He described the brick patterning on the building. He explained the detailed wall section drawings. The walls are CMU with brick on the exterior. He stated that the various brick colors are woven together, and this weaving of brick is used to soften the variation in those colors. He observed that the appearance changes depending on the time of day, the season, and how the sun is hitting the facades. The viewer's experience changes with time and light. He noted again that trees wrap around almost the entire building. He stated that the brick variations and the trees create dynamic yet very subtle patterns on the façade. Mr. Cohen showed a rendering of the entry section of the building and discussed the porch and the drop off that occurs at the end of the building. He noted that the shape of the building allows views to the main building at Friends Hospital. He opined that the new health center building will be nestled within the landscape. He showed a second rendering, looking toward the building from the entry gates.
- Mr. Cluver noted that Mr. Cohen had referred to the new building as dynamic and undulating but had also said that it was inspired by Quaker meetinghouses; he suggested that Quaker architecture was neither dynamic nor undulating. He asked how the proposed building relates to the campus as a whole in terms of its architectural expression. He also suggested that the provided photographs of the campus were too small to be helpful. He asked the architect to explain how the proposed building responds to its historic context.
 - o Mr. Detwiler agreed that the photographs were too small.
 - o Mr. Cohen agreed to provide larger context photographs.
 - o Mr. Cohen stated that the proposed building is an intentionally simple and modest building but still has some energy to it. The facade is flat but is given a dynamic and undulating quality through the use of simple materials such as the masonry. The building “nestles” into the campus. It relates to the stucco of the main and other buildings, which have a relatively light gray palette of materials. He asserted that the proposed building is within that color palette. He stated that the building has been carefully sited in relation to the allee of trees. As you move along this entry drive, you experience the trees and changing façade. Also, the shape of the building at the end is oriented towards the main building. The angle of the health center building was designed to reference the core of the campus.

- o Mr. Farris explained that the property owner, the Scattergood Foundation, employs a campus architect who has developed a master plan for Friends Hospital. That architect has reviewed the health center plans and concluded that the proposed building fits very well into the context of the campus.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the material choices for the project are very successful. He applauded the design for using real materials including brick and cast stone. He stated that he sees a high level of detail in that treatment. However, he questioned the long, solid mass of the proposed building. There are no shadows. It is just one long plane. The main building is large but has relief to it. The trees will shield the health center building, but they lose their leaves for half the year. He noted that the width of that building of the proposed building is only slightly smaller than the main building. He asked the architect to create some sort of relief or shadow lines on the building.
 - o Mr. Cohen stated that it is a large building with a complex program. He noted that he was not trying to replicate the design intent of the main hospital, but instead trying to create references to it and draw inspiration from it. He stated that they can take a closer look at the modulation of the facade.
- Mr. D'Alessandro, the preservation contractor on the Architectural Committee, stated that he was concerned about the flatness of the health center facades. He exclaimed that the whole exterior wall is nothing but one plane.
 - o Mr. Detwiler noted that the windows are set flush with the facade. They are set on the veneer, not the backing CMU.
 - o Mr. Cohen assured the Architectural Committee that the building will be structured accordingly.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the coping at the roof line is flat but should have a shape to it. He also suggested that the windows should have sills so that water drips off and does not run down the facade.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the site wall around the service area and postulated that it might be visible from Roosevelt Boulevard. He asked if the service area should be relocated.
 - o Mr. Cohen responded that the visibility varies with the time of year and the evolution of the tree canopy. He contended that the service area would be very much hidden behind existing landscape trees, shrubs, and ground cover as well as new landscaping. He added that the wall around the service area is designed to correspond to the wall along Roosevelt Boulevard and the entrance to the campus.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the modifications to the entrance at Roosevelt Boulevard. He acknowledged that a lane must be added to the entrance. He asked if they plan to move one or both piers along the driveway.
 - o Mr. Cohen stated that they need to move both piers owing to the current configuration and the need for a turning lane. He stated that the appearance of the piers and other features will be maintained but moved slightly.
 - o Mr. Detwiler stated that the original relationship of the piers "is kind of wonderful." He observed that he is not opposed to widening the driveway to accommodate necessary changes, but the appearance of the entranceway with piers and gates should be maintained. He stated that he would hate to see the entrance redesigned.
 - o Mr. Cohen responded that they are not proposing to redesign the entrance. He acknowledged that they need to adjust the width slightly but will otherwise retain it.

- Mr. Detwiler stated that the screen for the mechanical equipment stands up too high, leaving a gap at the bottom. He asked if mechanical equipment would be seen through that slot. Mr. Detwiler also asked the applicant to provide a sample of the screen material.
 - o Mr. Cohen replied that there is a slot of space at the base of the screen for multiple reasons. It allows water and air to pass through. He also noted that the roof is not flat, but is slightly sloped, and the slot allows for the slope. He explained that the screen wall is set back quite a bit from the facades and the open slot at the bottom will not be visible from the ground.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia reported that he appreciates the efforts that the architects are making to ensure that this building fits into its historic context. He also stated that he appreciates the advice the Architectural Committee has given the applicant. He noted, however, that the Committee recommended denial when it reviewed the first application. He acknowledged that the Historical Commission then approved the first application, despite the Committee's recommendation of denial. He implied that the Historical Commission's vote to approve the first application was illegitimate because the vote count had only been 7 to 4 in favor of the approval with all ex officio members voting in favor and the chair voting in opposition. He stated that the Preservation Alliance along with three community partners has appealed that decision. Mr. Steinke contended that inserting this building on a National Historic Landmark site is a bad decision. He stated that it requires demolishing the 1859 building known as Lawnside, the superintendent's cottage for Friends Hospital. He claimed that the building has suffered from years of demolition by neglect by Friends Hospital. He added that a former City Council member supports his appeal. Mr. Steinke opined that this is an extremely unsafe location for a new health center. Roosevelt Boulevard is Pennsylvania's most dangerous highway. He asserted that it is a bad public policy decision by the Department of Public Health. Mr. Steinke then claimed that the Department of Public Health will close District Health Center 10 on Cottman Avenue when this health center opens, leaving hundreds of thousands of Northeast Philadelphia residents with a very long commute to reach this site. Finally, he acknowledged that most of his remarks were directed at issues outside the Historical Commission's purview.
- Commissioner Bettigole, who heads Philadelphia's Department of Public Health, stated that Mr. Steinke was very much mistaken when he claimed that the Department planned to close Health Center 10. She stated that she has made a commitment to expand access to health care, which is desperately needed in that area. She noted that she was the clinical director at Health Center 10 and it will remain open. It will not close when this new health center opens. She stated that she wanted to make sure that the record is clear on the false claim that Health Center 10 will close. She stated that Mr. Steinke offered a fable, a fable that is false.
- Mr. Farris remarked that he wanted to clarify something that Mr. Steinke said. Mr. Farris stated that the Preservation Alliance appealed the approval of the demolition of the Lawnside building but it did not appeal the in-concept approval of the design of the new health center building. An in-concept approval is not appealable because it is not a final decision. Mr. Steinke has not appealed the design of the new building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- The Historical Commission granted in-concept approval of the massing, size, scale, and location of the new health center building, pursuant to Standard 9, at its July 2023 meeting.
- The massing, size, scale, and location of the building as currently proposed are identical to that approved in concept in July 2023.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The “uninterrupted mass and scale” of the proposed health center building and its “extreme flat planes” are not compatible with the historic site.

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

ITEM: 4641 E ROOSEVELT BLVD					
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 Guterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				

Mr. Cluver excused himself from the meeting.

ADDRESS: 2112 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish rear of building; construct 13-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bruce and Lisa Ginsberg

Applicant: Eric Leighton, cbp Architects

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the majority of the four-story, 53-foot, Second Empire brownstone building at 2112 Walnut Street and to construct a 13-story, 165-foot tall addition behind the remaining front portion of the historic building. The proposal would leave the front façade and portions of the exterior side party walls in place but remove the entirety of the rear as well as the roof and most interior floors. The fourth-floor front mansard of the existing building would become a screen wall to an open patio behind. The application provides little information on the treatment of the historic front façade, with the only notes being “existing masonry to be restored” and “roof shingles.” The addition would be clad in glass curtain walls

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

and vertical metal siding and decks at each floor. Renderings provided in the submission demonstrate that the addition would be highly visible from Walnut Street, and it would also be highly visible from and extremely out of scale with Chancellor Street, a small street with several historic carriage houses that dead ends at this property.

The application resembles a project on the neighboring properties at 2108 and 2110 Walnut Street that was approved by the Historical Commission in 2016. However, there are notable differences between the projects. The adjacent parcel at 2110 Walnut Street was a vacant lot at the time of designation, and the overbuild on the historic building at 2108 Walnut was shown as being limited to four-stories and being set back to the point of being inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The proposed addition for 2112 Walnut Street would be set closer to the front façade than 2108 Walnut Street and would extend three stories taller than the addition at 2110.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish majority of existing building
- Construct 13-story addition

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New addition, 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 project demolishes over half of the historic building, destroying historic materials. The new work will be overly differentiated from the old and incompatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing, failing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. The application fails 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 If removed in the future, the form and integrity of the historic property would be impaired, as only the front façade would remain. The application fails 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 The proposed addition would be highly conspicuous and visible on the site and from the public right-of-way. The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.
- *14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition. No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be*

reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

- 14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish. *The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.*
 - o Section 14-1005(6)(d) prohibits the Historical Commission from approving a demolition, the razing or destruction of a building entirely or in significant part, unless it finds that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it may be reasonably adapted. The proposed work constitutes a demolition in the legal sense, in that the historic building would be razed or destroyed in significant part. The application does not demonstrate that the demolition qualifies for the public interest or inability to reuse exception. The application must be denied.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, the Roofs Guideline, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibition against demolition.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:45:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Meredith Ferleger, architects Nicholas Connolly and Nancy Bastian, and developer Tim Shaaban represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Ferleger introduced the project team. She noted that the application was originally submitted in August but withdrawn for additional consideration.
- Ms. Bastian walked the Architectural Committee through the project, explaining that the existing building is 38 feet wide, by about 128 feet deep. The 2110 Walnut Street infill and overbuild project are located next door. She explained that 2112 Walnut Street is currently used as law offices, and they are proposing to return it to residential use. She noted that there is an older one-story addition on the rear of the property, and that the rear yard is used for parking. She explained that there would be a 12-story addition and eight-story overbuild, set back approximately 33 to 34 feet from the front property line, which is slightly further back than the new construction at 2110, which extends up at nine and 17-foot setbacks. She explained that the proposed addition is roughly in line with the setback of the addition at 2108 but is taller because the property is not as deep. She commented that they are proposing to maintain about 80% of exterior walls, including the side party walls, and are trying to incorporate some interior spaces into the design.
- Ms. Stein noted that the staff had three primary comments: the first, that the application constitutes a demolition. The second, the massing of the new addition exceeding that of the adjacent properties and being highly visible. And the third, the design of the addition itself. Ms. Stein argued that removing structural floors as well as the rear and roof at a contributing historic building is a demolition.
 - o Ms. Bastian responded that the new floor assembly has to be created because the addition constitutes a high-rise building. She noted that they did something similar at 2108 Walnut.

- o Ms. Gutterman responded that the addition at 2108 was smaller and less visible and opined that the current project creates a facadectomy.
- Ms. Gutterman explained at the Committee members have reviewed the application and asked the applicants to respond to the staff comments and recommendation.
 - o Mr. Shaaban reiterated that the proposed project is similar to the project next door at 2108 and 2110 Walnut, which utilized an open lot for new construction and an overbuild on the historic building at 2108. He commented that the historic building at 2108 was treated similarly as is proposed for 2112 Walnut, with all interior floors removed and replaced with non-combustible material. He noted that 2112 also proposes to maintain the interior first floor and basement but to eliminating floor structures and interiors. He reiterated that it is taller but a smaller square footage than neighboring building.
- Ms. Bastian referred to the rendering on sheet A006, opining that that gives a good sense of the visibility from the street, and that it will rise 17 feet from the first setback of 2110.
- Ms. Bastian referred to the view from Chancellor Street and access to parking. She explained that the materials of the proposed addition will match those of the new construction at 2110 Walnut Street. She opined that they tried to set back the addition and salvage as much of the existing building as possible.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why they could not put a separation wall between the new and existing construction. He argued that there are ways to create fire protection without having to demolish so much of the existing building. He opined that the proposal constitutes too much demolition.
 - o Mr. Shaaban responded that they would be happy to look into retaining as much as possible, but that they are driven by the Code and building standards.
 - o Mr. Detwiler replied that the codes require such great interventions because the proposal is too much for the historic building.
- Mr. Detwiler referred to the photograph on page 9 showing the giant party wall with no articulation of 2110 Walnut Street from Chancellor and argued that it shows everything that is insensitive about a project like this. He opined that such a project would have a negative effect to the district. He explained that he understands the need to make a party wall solid but that there are ways to articulate it, and that designers should look at ways to better articulate party walls so they do not become massive billboards of material.
 - o Ms. Ferleger opined that the portions of the building being altered are not visible from the public right-of-way and that most portions of the building proposed for removal are not part of the original historic fabric.
 - o Mr. Detwiler disagreed, noting that the rear is visible from Chancellor Street.
 - o Ms. Gutterman also disagreed, noting that they are proposing to remove floor structures and roof that support the front wall, which is in the public right-of-way.
 - o Mr. Shaaban responded that it is an east-west structure, so the removal of the floors will not impact the front.
 - o Mr. Shaaban responded that they were held to a party wall standard for 2110 Walnut Street but have provided some articulation for 2112 with setbacks articulation of wall on both sides that creates some differentiation, and that the western wall will have horizontal and vertical details. He explained that final materials will be addressed later.
 - o Ms. Gutterman responded that their application is for final approval, so those details should already be worked out.

- Ms. Stein argued that the massing of the proposed addition is highly conspicuous from multiple rights-of-way and towers over the historic structure and district. She explained that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards call for overbuilds to be as inconspicuous as possible. She noted that the adjacent one is visible, and this addition would be three stories taller and more visible. On that point alone, she argued, the design is not approvable because it is not inconspicuous. She explained that she cannot understand why the building must be this tall. She reiterated Mr. Detwiler's point that, if this much demolition is necessary, the overbuild is simply too tall.
 - o Ms. Bastian opined that they have pushed the massing back as far as they can. She explained that it would be slender and taller and acknowledged that it would be visible, but opined that it would have less massing towards Chancellor Street.
 - o Ms. Ferleger responded that the property is not as deep as 2110 and 2108, so they have created more compressed taller and slender design.
 - o The Committee members asserted that, if the lot is smaller, the addition should be smaller, not larger.
- Ms. Ferleger commented that there is an eight-foot easement behind the carriage house and a small easement through 2114 Walnut to allow parking access at the rear.
- Ms. Ferleger disagreed that the proposal constitutes a demolition, arguing that the court has made it clear that the preservation ordinance should be applied broadly.
- Mr. Shaaban stated that he has no intention of damaging the Belgian block historic paving along Chancellor Street.
- Mr. Detwiler reiterated that the rear of the building is visible from Chancellor Street and that, while the first floor may not be original fabric, the upper floors with the rear bay and mansard are original historic fabric that would be removed as part of the project.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Neighbor Jacalyn Pollock spoke in strong opposition. She explained that she lives in English Village on St. James Place and has rented a parking spot on Chancellor Street for many years. She explained that the new construction at 2110 Walnut Street has a negative impact on the area, and that the "shipping container party wall" is visible not just from Walnut and Chancellor Streets, but from English Village. She argued that just because something happened next door does not mean it should also be allowed to happen here. She contended that the project is insensitive to maintaining the historic infrastructure of Belgian block on the historically designated Chancellor Street. She opined that the proposed tandem parking is outrageous, and that there should be traffic studies and shade/shadow studies to show the impact of the proposed construction on the neighboring carriage houses. She argued that there is nothing thoughtful about the project, that it is disgusting from an architectural standpoint, has a negative impact on the neighbors, and is a money grab.
- Attorney Carl Primavera noted that he submitted a letter on behalf of unit owners in 2108 and 2110 that echo the comments from staff and the Committee. He recalled working on the overbuild project at the Curtis Institute project on Locust Street, which had to go through a public interest review to remove historic fabric and that the addition was made inconspicuous. He opined that the proposed project should go through the hardship process owing to the extent of demolition.
- Chancellor Street neighbor Joan Finger remarked on the horrible siding of 2110 Walnut Street. She also questioned the parking access for the 2112 Walnut project.

She argued that the proposal demolishes all but the façade of a historic building and replaces it with a brand-new building in a historic area. She stressed that the construction will negatively impact the character of the carriage-house block of Chancellor Street, towering over the district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing building is a four-story rowhouse. The application proposes to construct a 12-story addition that is roughly three times the height of the existing building and would be highly visible from multiple rights-of-way.
- The application proposes to remove interior floors as well as the roof and rear wall and to replace all interior floor structures with non-combustible materials.
- The project proposes to demolish significant portions of the building, creating a facedectomy, and destroying historic materials.
- Except for the first-floor addition at the rear, the rear of the building appears to retain its historic features, including the bay window and mansard roof.
- The proposed overbuild is out of scale with the historic building and its context along both Walnut and Chancellor Streets.
- The proposed materials are incompatible with the historic district.
- The level of demolition required demonstrates that the project is incompatible with the historic building and its context.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project demolishes over half of the historic building, destroying historic materials. The new work will be overly differentiated from the old and incompatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing, failing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. The application fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- If removed in the future, the form and integrity of the historic property would be impaired, as only the front façade would remain. The application fails to satisfy Standard 10.
- The proposed addition would be highly conspicuous and visible on the site and from the public right-of-way. The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.
- Section 14-1005(6)(d) prohibits the Historical Commission from approving a demolition, the razing or destruction of a building entirely or in significant part, unless it finds that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it may be reasonably adapted. The proposed work constitutes a demolition in the legal sense, in that the historic building would be razed or destroyed in significant part. The application does not demonstrate that the demolition qualifies for the public interest or inability to reuse exception. The application must be denied.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, the Roofs Guideline, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibition against demolition.

ITEM: 2112 WALNUT ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					X
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				

ADDRESS: 241-43 CHESTNUT ST, UNIT G

Proposal: Construct rooftop pergola

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Steven Gelbart

Applicant: Douglas Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architecture

History: 1856; Lewis Building; Stephen D. Button, architect

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes a rooftop pergola on the building at 241 Chestnut Street. The Historical Commission approved the roof deck and pilot house in 2021.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rooftop pergola.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The rooftop pergola as currently proposed would be highly visible from the public right-of-way. The application photographs show the visibility of the building's roof area from Chestnut Street and Independence National Historical Park; therefore, the application fails to satisfy this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:27:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. Seiler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Gutterman asked Mr. Seiler to explain the owner's reasons for installing a pergola and to respond to the staff's recommendation of denial.
- Mr. Seiler explained the impact of the fire on the building and pointed out that a deck previously existed that was available for use by the owner. He continued that the Historical Commission did approve a new deck and pilot house and construction is currently underway. Mr. Seiler said there is now a question of shade as it is a pretty harsh environment up on the rooftop and noted that they used portable umbrellas held down by weights on the previous roof deck. Mr. Seiler stated that the intent of the pergola is to keep the right-of-way visual of the roof deck clean and orderly and minimize the disruption to the skyline as much as possible. He stressed they are proposing a pergola of a modest footprint with a height that is lower than the pilot house.
- Ms. Stein said that the renderings provided are very helpful. She noted they do show that the pergola is highly visible and not inconspicuous. Ms. Stein said that because of the visibility it is unlikely that the Architectural Committee can recommend approval.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he supported Ms. Stein's statement.
 - o Ms. Gutterman pointed out that they have no jurisdiction over freestanding umbrellas.
- Mr. Detwiler said that it is unfortunate that this site has such long views and is highly visible. He said that it is clear that the applicant tried to minimize the visibility of the pergola. He thanked Mr. Seiler for the high-quality submission, which was organized and clear.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The pergola is being proposed to allow for shade on the approved roof deck, which is currently under construction.
- The owner previously used freestanding umbrellas for shade and the intent of the fixed pergola is to have a less cluttered appearance where the roof deck area is visible from the public right-of-way.
- The pergola design, with a modest footprint and slim metal structure, is intended to be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The rooftop pergola as currently proposed would be highly visible from the public right-of-way. The application photographs show the visibility of the building's roof area from Chestnut Street and Independence National Historical Park; therefore, the application fails to satisfy this guideline.

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

ITEM: 241-43 Chestnut St, Unit G					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Stein					
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: 6190 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Stuart LaCheen

Applicant: Betty Mon-Mon & Assoc. for Christopher Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture, LLC

History: 1870, first-floor commercial addition in 1938.

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to build a third-floor addition on the rear ell of a contributing building in the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District. The historic portion of the building was constructed circa 1870, and, while a first-floor commercial addition was built in the twentieth century, the historic structure remains prominent, especially the third-floor mansard roof. The proposed addition would encroach on the rear mansard and necessitate the demolition of the rear dormers.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct third-floor addition on rear ell.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The proposed addition would cut into and obscure the mansard roof and demolish the rear dormers.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be*

differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

- o The proposed addition would cut into and obscure the mansard roof and demolish the rear dormers.
- o *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 The demolition of portions of the rear mansard would not be reversible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:35:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chris Carrickhoff, expediter Betty Mon, and property owner Stuart Lacheen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler said he was not opposed to a third-floor addition in principle, but that he objected to the overhang. He noted that pulling the addition back to being in line with the existing first- and second-floor ell would be preferable. Mr. Detwiler also suggested that giving this third-floor addition a mansard could be appropriate and that shifting the overhang back would allow the retention of one of the existing rear dormers.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Lukachik indicated agreement.
- Ms. Stein wondered if there was a better option for where to gain the space provided by the overhang in the current proposal, indicating the rear of the lot as a different possibility.
- Mr. Lacheen explained that the addition is needed for office space and that the rear of the lot is needed for parking. When asked about pulling the overhang back, he said that the square footage is necessary for the use.
- Mr. Carrickhoff proposed eliminating the overhang on the room closest to the existing mansard, "office #3" on the plans, but retaining the overhang for the room further back, "office #4" on the plans.
 - o He then suggested an overhang off the back of the building, above the basement egress, rather than off the side.
 - o Mr. Detwiler commented that this could be an option, but that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission would need to respond to architectural drawings instead of an idea.
- Ms. Lukachik and Mr. D'Alessandro both encouraged the applicant to work within the existing footprint rather than designing from the inside out.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed overhang would compromise the rear mansard and dormers of the building, which are character-defining.

- There may be other ways to achieve the same square footage in an addition without the overhang on the proposed location.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition would detract from the historic character of the building and does not meet Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 6190 RIDGE AVE					
MOTION: Denial, pursuant to standards 2, 9, and 10.					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
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	5				2

Mr. Detwiler excused himself from the meeting.

ADDRESS: 3733 LANCASTER AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Henry Pemberton

Applicant: Wen Lin, Lui Consulting and Construction LLC

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Powelton Village Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/2022

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition on a contributing property in the Powelton Village Historic District. The addition will approximately double the length of the building while leaving a minimum setback at the rear of the property of approximately 25 feet. The building was constructed in 1875 and is three stories tall with a flat roof. The rear of the building is not visible from any public rights-of-way, but is visible to neighbors, including those along the private Pearl Court. The addition may be slightly visible from viewpoints between twin buildings along Baring Street. The application also includes landscape plans for the rear yard as well as proposed cladding materials for the addition.

An application which proposed a similar scope was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its July 2023 meeting, at which time the Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. The Historical Commission reviewed the application at its August 2023 meeting and voted to deny the application but provided recommendations to the applicant to reduce the length of the addition, enlarge the windows on the addition, use compatible materials, and include a landscape plan. The applicant has submitted this revised application and is responsive to the Commission's recommendations.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a three-story rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed new addition does meet Standard 9. It is too differentiated from the historic main block and is generally compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building.
- *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 new addition does meet the Roofs Guidelines because it will not be conspicuous from the public rights-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:56:42

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Wen Lin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Lin presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He outlined the changes that have been made since a previous application was denied by the Historical Commission. They have increased the setback at the rear and included a landscape plan for the yard. They altered the windows to be larger and match the existing windows on the historic block. They are proposing to use a wood-like in appearance cement board for siding. Overall, the square footage of the proposed addition has been significantly reduced. He added that they included new roof access so that the owner could have access for maintenance of the mechanical equipment that will be placed there.
 - o Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification about the inclusion of a roof deck.
 - o Mr. Lin confirmed that there will be no roof deck.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how much setback there was for the rear yard.

- o Mr. Lin explained that the setback averages 35 feet with it being 25 feet on its short side and 45 feet on its longest.
- Ms. Stein commented that the massing and scale of the addition is much improved compared to the previous application and is much more appropriate for the neighborhood.
 - o Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. He added that it does not seem to have any major impact on the historic façade at the front of the building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant was planning on demolishing the rear wall of the original building.
 - o Mr. Lin answered that they are keeping the rear wall.
 - o Ms. Stein and Mr. Till added that retaining the original rear wall was a change made to the first application when it was first revised.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Debora McCarty, Powelton Village resident, commented on the roof access. She asked for the reason why it was added and expressed concern that tenants could use it to access the roof even without a deck. She added that she also appreciates the changes made to the application and the inclusion of a landscape plan.
 - o Ms. Gutterman answered that the applicant explained the roof access was put in for maintenance of mechanical equipment and that there is no deck on the roof. It will be the owner's responsibility to prevent tenants from accessing the roof and is not an issue over which the Architectural Committee has jurisdiction.
 - o Mr. Lin reaffirmed the use of the roof access would be for maintenance and not for resident use. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro added that the owner would be responsible for installing a secure, locked door to control access.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed addition does not detract from the historic character of the original building or the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
- The proposed roof access is minimally visible and not visible from any surrounding public rights of way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition meets Standard 9. It is differentiated from the historic main block and is generally compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building.
- The proposed addition meets the Roofs Guidelines. It will not be conspicuous from public rights-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

ITEM: 3733 Lancaster Ave
MOTION: Approval
MOVED BY: Stein
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	4				3

ADDRESS: 1423 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building; construct seven-story building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: K of C Federal Credit Union
Applicant: David Lo
History: 1980; K of C Federal Credit Union; Arthur Basciano, architect
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for the construction of a seven-story, mixed-use building with ground floor commercial space and apartments on floors 2 to 7. The existing two-story building was constructed in 1980 and is Non-contributing to the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District. Demolition of the existing building can be approved without a finding of financial hardship or public necessity. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

The proposed building would stand 75 feet tall in the middle of the 1400 block of Spruce Street (primary elevation) and the 1400 block of Bach Place (secondary elevation). The ground floor commercial storefront is mostly glass, with corrugated metal and buff brick. Floors 2 to 7 of the Spruce Street façade are divided in half vertically, with the west side being horizontally laid buff brick and the east side being vertically laid brown brick. The north, east, and west elevations will be clad in cementitious boards and painted to match the brick on the Spruce Street facade.

All buildings on the north side of the 1400 block of Spruce Street and the south side of the 1400 block of Bach Place, except for the easternmost parcel, are within the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District and all but one is Contributing. These buildings are two and 3.5 stories tall, except the western-most structure, which is 19 stories tall. The contemporary Kimmel Center on the south side of Spruce Street is not within the district. There is little historically significant context fronting Bach Place; only one building's primary facade fronts this street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct seven-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 proposed building's height, brick pattern on the Spruce Street façade, and cementitious material on the highly visible east and west facades are incompatible with the historic context and therefore the application does not meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed building could be removed from the historic site in the future, leaving all surrounding contributing structures intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:06:17

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Zuo De He and developer David Lo represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Lo to respond to the staff's comments.
 - o Mr. He addressed the arrangement of materials on the Spruce Street façade and the use of cementitious materials on the east and west facades. He expressed flexibility regarding the alternative materials and their arrangement.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern regarding a seven-story building at the mid-block location.
- Ms. Stein concurred with Ms. Gutterman emphasizing that the context is being ignored and that the building towers over adjacent structures. She noted that the use of materials and window configurations are out of character with the historic district.
 - o Mr. He responded that the use of two colors of brick references the variety of brick colors found in the historic district. He said the revised design will use one color of brick.
- Ms. Stein also identified the commercial, first-story canopy location as odd because the letters are too tall and the canopy is too high up on the façade to be functional.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the brick should wrap the corner so as to avoid disclosing that it is a veneer.
- Ms. Lukachik inquired about the roof plan, double stairs, access, and parapet wall height.
 - o Mr. He intoned that the roof deck will be accessible by both sets of stairs. He committed to the inclusion of a roof plan in the revised drawings.

- Ms. Gutterman wondered if consideration was given to stepping the upper floors of the building back to minimize the height difference within the context on the block.
 - o Mr. Lo opined that the height was chosen to conform to zoning regulations and that the proposed height is integral to the project's feasibility.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes the construction of a seven-story, mixed-use building with ground-floor commercial space and apartments on floors 2 to 7.
- The proposal is within the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.
- The block on which it is proposed is composed of tall buildings at Broad Street and 15th Street ends and two to 3.5-story buildings in between.
- The Spruce Street façade features two colors of brick, one laid vertically and one laid horizontally, that divide the facade in half vertically from the second to seventh story.
- The east and west facades are proposed to be clad in cementitious material and will be prominently visible, owing to the height of the proposed building.
- No roof deck is identified on the submitted plans.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposal is not compatible with the contributing buildings on the block in height, materials, and window dimensions and therefore fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1423 Spruce St MOTION: Denial; Standard 9 MOVED BY: Stein 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

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:27:30

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:29 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.