

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

**TUESDAY, 23 JUNE 2020
REMOTE MEETING ON WEBEX
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		
Suzanne Pentz		X	
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Jennifer Robinson, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Sean Narcum, Peter Zimmerman Architects
- Harrison Haas, Attorney, Cozen O'Connor
- Thomas Witt, Attorney, Cozen O'Connor
- Kevin Brett
- Tina Geary, InHabit Architecture and Design
- Susan Wetherill
- Gregory Peluso
- John Vaida
- Margaret Manzer
- Christopher Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture

ADDRESS: 2126 CYPRESS ST

Proposal: Partially demolish and reconstruct three-story structure; add fourth story and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Douglas Bollinger

Applicant: Sean Narcum, Peter Zimmerman Architects

History: Refaced, c. 1960 townhouse

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish most of a three-story non-contributing structure and construct a four-story house with deck. The fourth story would be set back from the front façade. Although the staff may approve demolitions of non-contributing structures in historic districts, it is forwarding this application to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission to evaluate the proposed new construction. The Rules & Regulations state:

When reviewing applications for non-contributing buildings, structures, sites, and objects within an historic district, the Commission, its committees, and staff shall place particular emphasis on the compatibility of materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing with the historic district.

This application is therefore under review for the proposed building's compatibility with the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish the second and third stories and roof of the existing building.
- Reconstruct second and third stories and construct a fourth story and deck.
- Install garage and entry doors; metal-clad casement windows at the second, third and fourth stories; deck at fourth story; and painted wood cornice.
- Stucco the facades.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The inventory for the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District describes this building as having been refaced ca. 1960, identifying it as non-contributing. The proposed demolition does not destroy any historic or significant fabric.
 - Although the buildings immediately adjacent to and in front of the subject property are either three-stories or less, there are buildings on both ends of this block that appear to be four-stories, as is proposed by the applicant.
 - Overall, the staff is not opposed to the proposed design of the reconstruction and new addition. However, some rethinking of the details could help the project fit in better with the context of the block. Though the houses directly across the street from the subject property are finished with smooth-coat stucco, they also feature brick at the water table and in some cases at the sills. The staff has some concerns about the exclusive use of stucco to finish the façade. Additionally, the staff finds that the placement and proportions of the windows as proposed for the

front façade do not effectively carry out the existing rhythm of street. Rethinking this detail could help the design better fit into the context of this block.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the façade finish, as well as the proportions, placement and details of the fenestration, are reconsidered to better reflect the context of the historic district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:06:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sean Narcum represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Narcum introduced the project, noting that their design took into account the massing, size, scale and features of other buildings within the historic district, following Standard 9 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines. Mr. Narcum also pointed out that the use of stucco to finish the façade and the use of casement windows were both design choices used to gesture to elements seen on this block.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicant elaborate on some of the ways the design addressed its surrounding context, in particular the windows.
 - Mr. Narcum responded that their window design, in part, gestured to the casement windows across the street at 2125 Cypress Street. Casements are common in early twentieth-century buildings in the historic district. Mr. Narcum also explained that they did not believe that the existing ribbon windows in the non-contributing building respected the rhythm of the fenestration seen on the block. He said that the use of casement windows and their arrangement on the front and side facades helps to sensitively distinguish this as a twenty-first century design.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that their design for the windows really placed the emphasis on the corner of the residence, rather than the front façade.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern about the proposed use of stucco to finish the entire façade, as well as the amount of glazing which took away a significant amount of masonry, both of which she said resulted in a loss of the spirit of the house. Ms. Gutterman said that she believed the design had gone too far in distinguishing itself from the existing structure.
- Mr. Cluver questioned the use of stucco to finish the facades, noting that while the block did have some buildings with stucco facades, they were all on the opposite side of the street from the subject property.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the scale of the proposed windows gave them more of an industrial appearance than a residential one. He added that the windows should not extend down to the floor as was proposed.
- Several members of the Architectural Committee observed that the existing water table could serve as an opportunity to introduce some contrasting material so that the façade was not entirely stucco. The use of brick was suggested at the piers, which could help to tie the new design into the adjacent properties.
- Mr. Narcum again contended that the proposed building was compatible with the streetscape and historic district. The cornice line matches the neighbors. The fourth

floor is set back to be inconspicuous from the street. The stucco and windows relate to several buildings on the block.

- The Committee members responded that the overall design was compatible, but the façade material and windows needed adjustment.
- Mr. Narcum disagreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The overall volume, scale, massing and setback of the proposed design are appropriate for the block.
- The proposed glass railing at the deck level should be replaced with a simple metal picket and all HVAC equipment must be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The existing water table could serve as an opportunity to introduce some contrasting material so that the façade was not entirely stucco. The use of brick at the piers could help tie the new design into the adjacent properties.
- Reducing the size of the proposed windows would help make the design appear more sympathetic to its context.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The design as proposed does not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 2126 CYPRESS ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler					X
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 1505 GREEN ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jodie L. Greco; 1918 Fairmount Avenue LLC, equitable owner

Applicant: Christopher Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture LLC

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 1505 Green Street is a three-story, five bay, brick, Italianate/Greek Revival row house constructed in 1859. This application proposes to add a third story to an existing two-story ell, and construct a three-story addition at the rear of the property. The existing rear ell consists of three sections, an original two-story section with a pitched roof, a second two-story section with a flat roof, and a third one-story section. An 1858-60 historic map shows that the pitched-roof section of the ell dates to the building's original construction. The existing rear ell reflects its historic two-story height and general form but, according to building records, was altered in the 1960s and 1980s. A one-story rear addition that runs along the main block's rear wall was added during the twentieth century. The rear ell and rear of the building are not visible from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish the rear one-story addition.
- Demolish the roof and rear portion of existing ell.
- Demolish sections of the rear of the main block on the first, second, and third floors.
- Add a third story and extension to the existing ell.
- Construct a three-story 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 will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The brick on the rear ell will remain in place and all existing window openings of the rear ell should remain in place in order to satisfy Standard 2.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed third story on the existing ell requires the removal of the roof and chimney. The red brick of the historic ell should remain in place and the addition should be a compatible material in order to satisfy Standard 9.
 - The proposed general form and massing of the three-story addition satisfies Standard 9.
 - The proposed materials of both the existing addition and new addition do not satisfy Standard 9.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed work removes significant sections of the rear wall of the main block, therefore not satisfying Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:34:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Christopher Carickhoff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked how much of the main block will be kept. She noted that most of the rear wall of the main block is being removed.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that the floors of the main block will remain, but they are removing rear portions of the wall to allow access to the addition.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how the walls are currently framed. She inquired if it was party wall to party wall.
 - Mr. Carickhoff replied that it is party wall to party wall with bearing walls in between. He noted that the rear wall does not seem to be a bearing wall for the joists.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the staff overview indicated that the rear of the property is not visible from the public right of way. He inquired if there was rear access to the building.
 - Ms. Mehley and Mr. Carickhoff confirmed there is no public access to the rear of the property, noting there is three-foot service alley behind the property that is for residents only. Ms. Mehley confirmed that it has locked gates at both ends of the block.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated a major concern is the amount of original material being removed from the main block. He said his second concern is the removal of the original rear ell which is a character-defining feature of the building.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if there is a bearing wall where the historic ell attaches to the main block.
 - Mr. Carickhoff replied that there was not a wall at the second floor.
 - Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that there was a wall at the third floor.
 - Mr. Carickhoff acknowledged this and noted that because of the direction the joists are running, there could be a joist under this that is not seen.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the scheme proposed is a great way to maximize the number of units you can get in and provide light and air. However, it does come at the cost of compromising the original configuration of the main block and ell. He continued that, while there are certainly opportunities to add to the rear of the property, he thinks that doing so in a way that preserves the exterior of the main block and the components of the original ell would be more desirable.
- Mr. Carickhoff pointed out that this the building sits on a double wide lot and most of the buildings on the block have rear ells that are back-to-back to one another. He noted that the new addition will back up against the neighboring ell. Mr. Carickhoff added that the way the new addition would continue the pattern of the ells on the block.

- Mr. McCoubrey stated that this happens to be a unique double-bay house, which as such had more generous exterior space associated with the main spaces inside.
- Mr. Cluver said that looking at this from a big picture perspective, the design is very contemporary, not fitting within the historic character and including a lot of demolition of existing fabric. He continued that in terms of impact on the historic district, if it is not visible from the public right-of-way, the impact to the district is negligible. Mr. Cluver said that the question of visibility from the public right-of-way is really a critical one for this project. He noted that this would be a defining aspect and would determine how he would vote on this.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the neighboring properties. He stated that the rendering indicates that the new addition and revised ell would extend further back or north than the neighboring ells. Ms. Stein stated that it appeared that they would extend extensively beyond the neighboring buildings.
 - Mr. Carickhoff confirmed they would extend beyond the adjacent structures.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the extent of the original rear ell and if they had looked carefully at the different components of the existing ell and how it evolved.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that information on the changes to the rear ell were provided by staff in the project overview.
 - Ms. Mehley said that the information was found in historic maps and building permits.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that, when he looks at the project rendering, he does not see any of the original wall of the main block surviving.
 - Mr. Carickhoff pointed out areas of the main block that remain.
 - Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Gutterman note that these areas will be covered with new stucco. Ms. Gutterman added that the entire wall of the main block is being removed.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that the demolition is limited mainly to the areas where the new addition connects to the main block, describing areas where the wall will remain and where it would be removed. He added they are planning to keep as much as they can.
- Mr. McCoubrey said the treatment given to the rear area makes it appear new rather than original material.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rear of the building is not visible from the public right-of-way.
- The service alley that runs behind the property has locked gates at both ends and is not accessible to the general public.
- Extensive material is being removed from the rear wall of the main block.
- The historic ell should be assessed more carefully to determine evolution of the sections and existing materials.
- The changes to the rear the property including the rear wall, historic ell, and new addition do not successfully differentiate between historic and new.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The extent of the proposed changes to the rear ell does not satisfy Standard 2.
- The proposed treatment of the historic ell and new addition do not satisfy Standard 9.

- The proposed work removes significant sections of the rear wall of the main block, therefore failing to be reversible and satisfy Standard 10.

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

ITEM: 1505 GREEN 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				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein		X			
Total	3	2			2

ADDRESS: 222-30 BROWN ST

Proposal: Remove front paving, side paving, and front planting area; install brick pavers

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Holy Trinity Romanian Orthodox Church

Applicant: Tina Geary, InHabit Architecture and Design LLC

History: 1815, Architect William Strickland

Individual Designation: 11/29/1960

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Holy Trinity Romanian Orthodox Church, originally St. John's P.E. Church, was designed by William Strickland and constructed in 1815. This application proposes alteration to the exterior landscape, focusing on the front and side areas of the church. No alternations are proposed to the church building or existing fencing as part of this application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove monuments from front area of church and store for future re-installation.
- Remove existing circular driveway and front planting area along Brown Street; replace with brick pavers.
- Remove concrete walkways that run along the east and west sides of church; replace with brick pavers.
- Install concrete foundations for future brick walls along Brown Street; cover foundations with brick pavers.
- The existing fencing will not be altered or removed as part of this project.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JUNE 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

- *Standard 1: A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.*
 - Historic photographs show that the front of church property has been used as a driveway and delivery area for over 150 years. The front landscape elements have been altered over time. The removal of the front planting bed and existing driveway and proposed installation of new brick pavers satisfies Standard 1.
- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - Monuments located in the front area will be removed and safely stored during construction.
 - No distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces and spatial relationships will be removed as part of this project, satisfying Standard 2.
- *Standard 8: Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*
 - The applicant's drawings indicate that the area of construction will disturb property approximately one foot below grade. The exception to this is the perimeter along Brown Street where concrete footings will be installed 3'-3.5' feet below grade. Area of disturbance along Brown Street shall be excavated carefully in order to satisfy Standard 8.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, and 8.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:55:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Tina Geary represented the application.
- John Vaida, President of Holy Trinity Romanian Orthodox Church Parish Council, represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Mehley stated she visited the site on 22 June and observed a grade change near the northeast corner of the property that is currently not reflected in the application. She noted that the northeast entrance in this area has a masonry step that the northwest entrance does not. Ms. Mehley added that she observed that the landscaped area around the church does contribute to its historic character and noted three or four trees had recently been removed.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the project goal and intent.
 - Ms. Geary explained that this is phase one of a two phase project that the church wishes to implement over time. She said that this phase focuses on the pavers. She pointing out that the trees had caused the existing pavers to come up in many areas and also the existing pavers had degraded over time. Ms. Geary continued that Phase Two would widen existing gate openings so that a car could go through to facilitate for events such as weddings, funerals, and other events noting that this area currently cannot be accessed by

vehicles. She added that the application includes foundations for the church's future plans to recreate historic brick walls that can be seen in an 1869 photograph.

- Mr. McCoubrey asked if there is currently vehicular access to front of church.
 - Ms. Geary stated there is no current vehicular access but there is church parking in an area off of American Street.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the monuments in the front planting area.
 - Ms. Geary responded that the church does not have records for these and some of these were in place when they acquired the church property. She said that they do not have a record for the large stone that is flush to the ground and is not aware if anything is under it. Ms. Geary noted that the large vertical stone is a monument to war veterans.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the fountain-like object in the front planting area.
 - Ms. Geary replied that it will be stored and not re-installed but the other monuments and objects will be placed in the planting areas flanking the church entrance.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the future plan to widen the gated openings and requested information about how much fencing would be removed.
 - Ms. Geary replied that they would need at least nine feet for vehicle access but they have not delved into these details because it is a future project and more than the church can presently handle.
- Ms. Stein asked if having vehicles come to and park in front of this church is realistic and wondered if the gate shown in the 1869 accomplished this type of access. She wondered if this would be possible given the sizes of current vehicles and turning radius requirements. Ms. Stein pointed out that churches in urban areas often work with their local governments to apportion sidewalks and street parking spaces in front of the church for their needs. She continued that she is concerned that they are planning for something that may not work at the end of the day and noted they do not have drawings showing the information, including details on curb cuts, etc. Ms. Stein commented that the existing driveway and gate opening may never have had vehicular access.
 - Ms. Geary responded that this is potentially true. She explained that the church wants to be more attractive to its members and has been told that members cannot even gather out front owing to the condition of the paving and size of area in front of church.
- Ms. Gutterman said she agrees with Ms. Stein and does not believe it is appropriate to have a parking area in front of this historic property in any manner. She also pointed out the availability of parking at the rear of the property on N. American Street.
 - Ms. Geary responded that the intent is not to park in this area but for vehicular drop-offs near the front steps of the church.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that until the applicant and the church work out key details and do more research, this application is premature. Too many questions are unresolved.
- Mr. Cluver said he supports the notion of a paved area in front where the congregation can gather when they come out of church. He continued that they can evaluate the application on its merits because nothing on the drawing shows vehicular access.
- Ms. Geary noted that she had discussed with the church the possibility of adding a small planting area along Brown Street between the two existing gates.

- Ms. Geary pointed out that at the moment, the church's goal is to create a gathering space that is flat and level.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that that is not how it has been presented to the Committee. He stated that it has been portrayed as setting the stage for future access of vehicles to the front of building. He also expressed concerns about impervious surfaces and contributing to stormwater runoff.
 - Ms. Geary confirmed that all plans would go through the appropriate city approvals for matters such as stormwater.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein that vehicles entering this area is not appropriate. He remarked, however, that landscaping changes can be made to accommodate it as a gathering place.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned the detail showing pavers installed over concrete, expressing concern that pavers will start failing owing to this type of installation.
 - Ms. Geary responded that this installation method was recommended by the paver manufacturer. She added that the church requested concrete owing to existing landscape issues.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the application is incomplete. Others disagreed.
- Ms. Geary addressed grade change on property and step down in northeast corner. She stated the intent was to grade down toward that corner and this is why it was not shown on the plan.
 - Ms. Stein asked if the existing step was part of the original Strickland design.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that the staff can investigate.
- Ms. Stein said if they could work out the details, she could accept the paving but would be opposed to car access. She said the application before them does show a foundation for a future wall, but she is not sure that really works because they do not know what the future wall and layout will look like. Ms. Stein added that the plan indicates there will be no work to the fence, but she does not know how you can lay the wall foundation without pulling out the fence.
 - Ms. Geary replied they withdraw the foundation from the application.
- Ms. Geary said that the trees were removed recently but the intent is to re-plant more appropriate street trees in these areas.
- Mr. Cluver commented that their plan shows bricks going all the way to the sidewalk but he would encourage a planting bed along Brown Street and removing the foundation from the scope of work. He noted they may never be able to use the foundation if they put it in now but if they do a planting area this could be more easily excavated in the future if they do get approval for a wall and foundation.
- Mr. Vaida spoke on behalf of the church and restated the reasons noted earlier by Ms. Geary for pursuing this project. He spoke of their plans for redoing the paving and the church's desire for better access to the front of the building.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission does not have the authority to regulate trees on a site like this and does not have to take the trees into consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This application is the first part of a two-part landscaping plan that seeks to eventually enable vehicular access to front of the church.

- Monuments and object must be moved to allow for repaving and new landscaping. More information is needed on the monuments.
- Allowing vehicular access directly to front of church is not appropriate for the historic building.
- The proposal for the foundations for walls is premature owing to a lack of information about the future wall layout and design.
- Tree removal and replanting is not within the Historical Commission jurisdiction.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Altering the entryways, gates, and driveways to accommodate modern vehicles and parking does not satisfy Standards 1 and 2.
- Additional information on the monuments and objects to be removed should be provided to satisfy Standard 2.
- The area of disturbance should be excavated carefully in order to satisfy Standard 8.

FAILED MOTION: The Architectural Committee rejected a motion to recommend approval, provided the foundation is removed from the scope of work and a planting buffer is created along Brown Street, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, and 8.

ITEM: 222-30 BROWN ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Cluver 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			
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	2	3			2

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

ITEM: 222-30 BROWN 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				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein		X			
Total	3	2			2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:21:30

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:21 a.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Architectural Committee are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio 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.