

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

**TUESDAY, 22 APRIL 2025  
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM  
AMY STEIN, ACTING CHAIR**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair		X	Arrived 9:23 am
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP		X	
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler		X	
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

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

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director  
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association  
Alex Canady  
Allan Anderson  
Amanda Ross  
Beth Johnson Hysick  
Bhavik Patel  
Cal Leslie  
Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNObdesign  
Casey Ann Beck  
Chelsea Bird  
Cody Worthington  
Daniel Trubman  
David Sidoti  
Eric Press  
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Henry Siebert  
Jane Ahn  
Jay Farrell  
Jenna Schlesinger  
Justin Kaplan  
Justin Lucas  
Justino Navarro, Spring Garden Community Development Corporation  
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy  
Lorabeth Iobst  
Matt Elson, KORE  
Meredith Ferleger, Esq., Dilworth Paxson  
Michael Mattioni, Esquire, Mattioni Ltd.  
Nancy Pontone  
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society  
Patricia Freeland, Spring Garden Community Development Corporation  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Peter Dilsheimer  
Philip Balderston  
Rachael Pritzker, Esq.  
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture  
Sam Turner  
Sean Kennedy  
Shawn McAnally, Designblendz  
Stephanie Pennypacker  
Stephen Maffei

## **AGENDA**

### **ADDRESS: 1501-05 FAIRMOUNT AVE**

Proposal: Construct five-story addition; rehabilitate historic façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1501 Fairmount Ave LLC

Applicant: Shawn McAnally, Designblenz Architecture

History: 1930; Overseas Motor Works; Samuel Brian Baylinson, architect

Individual Designation: 2/13/2015

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, [heather.hendrickson@phila.gov](mailto:heather.hendrickson@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a five-story, mixed-use structure within a now-freestanding historic Art Deco façade at the northwest corner of Fairmount Avenue and 15<sup>th</sup> Street. This façade is all that remains of a 1930s commercial structure. The Historical Commission approved an application for a four-story overbuild on this property in 2016, but that project was abandoned in 2023. Work had begun on the project including partial demolition; everything but the exterior walls was removed, leaving the remaining walls structurally braced.

The current proposal is similar to the building proposal approved in 2016, but one story taller. The materials include brown metal standing seam panels, burgundy fiber-cement panels, and red and brown patterned brick, in a design that emphasizes verticality to complement what remains of the historic structure. A four-story brick outer building would wrap around from the 15<sup>th</sup> Street side to the Swain Street side to emulate the neighborhood's residential scale. The project would include one commercial space and 32 residential units. The new construction would be set back slightly from the existing facades and corner tower, and the historic facades would be restored.

### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct five-story addition and restore historic facades.

### **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:03:21

### **PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 APRIL 2025**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, [PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV](mailto:PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV)**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

- Architect Shawn McAnally and attorney Rachel Pritzker represented the application.

#### DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein opined that the project, which the Architectural Committee has reviewed several times, has progressed to a point that it could be recommended for approval.
- Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the last time the project the Architectural Committee reviewed the project, the applicant presented two different versions of the project, but only one is presented this time. He asked the applicant why only one version of the application has been presented.
  - Mr. McAnally responded that after the previous "in concept" review, the development team met with the community to try to find a compromise between the concerns of the community and those of the Architectural Committee. He explained that it became apparent that the shorter building was more appropriate in the community's eyes; he noted that the height currently proposed is by-right. Mr. McAnally concluded that the reason for only providing one version of the proposal is that the second version was rejected as too tall by the community.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro opined that reducing the height of the building adversely impacted the view of the historic structure. He stated that would have preferred having both options to review.
- Ms. Lukachik noted that the first application presented to the Architectural Committee was an in-concept application for comment only; the current application is requesting final approval. She asked the applicant what was happening at the back of the historic tower and if there was glass proposed for the back. She noted that this was one of the main points brought up by the Architectural Committee when the in-concept application was presented in March.
  - Mr. McAnally responded that, owing to code requirements, they had proposed a recessed solid panel on the back of the historic tower. He noted that they were doing what they could to create shadow lines and to pick up on the details of the tower, but that they were not able to include the glass, owing to the fire code requirements. He also noted that they were focusing as much as they could on getting the other details correct such as the signage, spandrel, and other elements that will be experienced at the pedestrian level.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the details related to the historic building were insufficient for a "final approval" review. She noted that the applicant said they were setting the panel in, but did not indicate how far. She observed that the architectural drawings indicated that some work would be undertaken "as required," but asserted that that was insufficient. She noted there were no details about the restoration that would be reviewed later by the Historical Commission's staff. She noted that the Architectural Committee's charge is to protect the historic fabric, and it was her opinion that there needed to be more details about the relationship between the new construction and the historic fabric. She noted that the drawings do not show how the brick would meet the historic limestone or the details of the storefront. She wondered if the applicant was proposing to repair or replace limestone panels, if patching or pointing would be necessary, and how the inset wall proposed for the north and west sides of the historic structure would be detailed.
- Ms. Stein opined that the Historical Commission's staff had the authority to approve many of the details noted by Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro, but that the applicant did not include details that the Architectural Committee requested during the March meeting. She stated that those details include locating the signage panels in their historic location, using a color other than light gray for the spandrel glass, and

- using a mid-tone glass panel in the tower where a metal panel is currently proposed.
- Ms. Pritzker, the attorney for the application, noted that they thought that they had provided all the necessary details. She assured the Architectural Committee that they would be provided.
  - Ms. Lukachik noted that reducing the height of the parapet was discussed at the March Architectural Committee meeting. She asked the applicant if that was a possibility.
    - Mr. McAnally noted that, if the parapet height was reduced, objects on the roof like the stair tower and elevator penthouses would be more visible and be more distracting than the size of the parapet. He noted that the team made the windows on the top floor slightly taller so that the space between the top of the windows and the top of the parapet was decreased.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicant how much of the setback there would need to be between the tower and the new construction for windows to be installed on the north and west sides of the tower.
    - Mr. McAnally responded that there would need to be a 10-foot setback on each side, which would mean adding four feet to the current dimensions.
  - Ms. Lukachik stated that the application should be granted final approval, with the staff to review the details of the restoration of the historic structure.
    - Ms. Stein agreed that the application merits final approval, with the staff to review details.
    - Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed and asserted that the proposed new construction was compatible, but that the details merit another round of reviews by the Historical Commission.
    - Mr. McCoubrey, who had just arrived at the meeting, declined to opine because he had not seen the entirety of the presentation. He recused from the review.
    - Ms. Lukachik and Ms. Stein agreed with the community organization and the near neighbor and advocated for approval.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Attorney Michael Mattioni, who represented Winston Holdings LP, the owners of the adjacent property at 1507 Fairmount Avenue, said that his clients were in favor of the project, were appreciative of the changes that had been made, and would like to see the project move forward.
- Justino Navaro of the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation spoke in favor of the project and noted his organization's appreciation for the applicant and his team for working so closely with the Community Development Corporation and the neighborhood community to address their concerns.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

- The Architectural Committee members did not agree on a motion and therefore offered no findings or conclusions.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee did not agree on a motion and therefore did not offer a recommendation.

<b>ITEM: 1501-05 Fairmount Ave</b> <b>MOTION: Approval of massing with the details reviewed by Architectural Committee</b> <b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b> <b>SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro</b>					
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	2	2		1	2

**ADDRESS: 301-03 N FRONT ST**

Proposal: Demolish structure; construct multi-unit building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 301 N Front Street LP

Applicant: Mark Wallace, Kore Design Architecture

History: 1997

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to demolish a 1½-story non-contributing building in the Old City Historic District and construct a four-story-plus-basement structure containing two single-family dwellings. The proposed structure would have three basement level parking spaces along with a roof deck and pilot house. The property at 301-03 N. Front Street is located along the north side of Vine Street between N. Front Street on the west, and N. Water Street on the east. Across N. Water Street from the property is a large vacant lot where a 26-story mixed-use building is being constructed. That project was approved by the Historical Commission in October 2021. The properties directly adjacent to and north of 301-03 N. Front Street are contributing properties to the Old City Historic District.

A very similar version of this project was reviewed “in-concept” by the Architectural Committee in October 2024, and by the Historical Commission in December 2024. The Historical Commission voted to approve the applicant’s revised application in concept. Since this “in-concept” review, there have been changes to some materials, but the overall massing and details have stayed the same.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish non-contributing structure
- Construct four-story structure with basement and roof deck

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not*

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 APRIL 2025**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV**

**PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

*destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends approval of the demolition of the non-contributing structure and construction of the four-story building, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:32:22

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Matt Elson represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Stein noted that the Architectural Committee had previously reviewed alternate versions of this application for demolition of a non-contributing building and construction of a residential building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to explain what had changed from earlier versions of this application.
  - Mr. Elson noted that there had been material updates since the earlier versions of the application and that they were attempting to unify the three facades by limiting the material palette to mainly brick and standing-seam metal siding. He noted that they had altered some of the window styles and sizes to better fit the rhythm of the existing structures on the street and limited the variety of window styles. He noted also that the roof deck was updated by replacing the solid parapet wall with a metal railing and reducing the mass of the access structure by sloping the area over the stairs. Lastly, he noted that the elevation of the first floor had been lowered.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the height of the pilot house could be reduced from 10 feet to eight feet.
  - Mr. Elson responded that it could be possible, but that they would not know until the elevator installation. He explained that the height was noted as 10 feet as that was the allowable height according to zoning. He said that, if the height of the pilot house could be reduced, they certainly would be amenable to reducing it.
- Ms. Lukachik opined that she preferred the current application to the previous version as there are fewer materials, the windows have been squared off to match the neighborhood better, and the palette has been improved.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant if the windows were true-divided-light or applied muntins with spacer bars.
  - Mr. Elson responded that, as proposed, they were not true-divided-light; he stated that they are proposing internal muntins between the glass. He noted that they would be willing to discuss applied-surface muntins.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the windows were a nice feature, and that they should appear to be true-divided-light.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert commented that the project would be more appropriate if it were all brick and including the pilot house.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The height of the pilot house should be reduced to the extent possible, preferably to eight feet.
- The windows should appear to be true-divided-light and not internal “sandwich” muntins.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9, provided the height of the pilot house is reduced to the extent possible and the windows are or appear to be true-divided-light.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the height of the pilot house is reduced to the extent possible and that the windows appear to be true-divided-light, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

<b>ITEM: 301-03 N Front St</b> <b>MOTION: Approval with conditions</b> <b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b> <b>SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro</b>					
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: 2211 and 2213 PANAMA ST**

Proposal: Construct fourth-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Danielle Bendesky & Robert A Borski/Bhavik Patel & Ketki Soin

Applicant: David Sidoti, 3rdStoryPhilly

History: c. 1963

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

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

**OVERVIEW:** These applications propose to construct fourth-floor additions with roof decks on two adjacent rowhouses that were built in c. 1963 and are classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. Similar fourth-floor additions and roof decks were approved for 2225 Panama Street in 2019 and 2227 Panama Street in 2021. The currently proposed additions are designed by the same architect and identical, but the properties have different owners.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 APRIL 2025**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**



The additions and decks will be visible from the public right-of-way. The standard established by the Roofs Guideline, inconspicuousness, is not the standard that should be applied in this case because the properties are classified as non-contributing in the historic district. The inconspicuous standard is designed to protect historic buildings that contribute to districts. Additions and roof decks can be visible on non-historic buildings and new construction without adversely affecting their surrounds. Conspicuous additions and roof decks are generally prohibited on contributing buildings because they change the spatial characteristics of the historic buildings, and therefore the viewer's perceptions and understandings of those buildings. The question in this case is whether the additions and decks would adversely impact the historic district, not the buildings themselves, which have no historic value. In addition, these buildings are part of a row of non-contributing buildings that spans this side of the block and are relatively short and squat compared to the historic buildings around them. Adding height and mass will not adversely affect the surroundings. Even with the proposed additions, they will not be as tall as the surrounding historic buildings. The character of the environment will be protected.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct a fourth-story rear addition on each house
- Construct a roof deck on each house

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The buildings are not historic, so no historic materials would be destroyed with the construction of the additions and decks. The size, scale, proportions, and massing of the proposed additions and decks are compatible with the surroundings and will protect the integrity of the historic district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the proposed additions and roof decks, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:43:39

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects David Sidoti and Sam Turner represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Stein inquired about the addition projects that were approved on this block in the past at 2225 and 2227 Panama Street. She asked if all the dimensions and details, including the setbacks, were the same on the current proposals.
  - Mr. Till responded that the staff did not check the exact setbacks for the previous projects.
  - Ms. Gutterman commented that the setback looks greater on the older design. She asked if the setback for the current proposals could be increased.
  - Ms. Stein commented that it looks like the railings for these proposed additions

would be visible with the current setback. She asked the applicants to elaborate on the design.

- Mr. Turner responded to the Architectural Committee's questions. He explained that the roof deck structures for both properties would not use pilot houses for access but staircases that open directly onto the decks. They have currently set the railings back the minimum required five feet, but they are willing to negotiate that detail.
- Mr. McCoubrey interjected to point out that the current proposed setback begins from the sloped front edge of the dormer, not from the mansard roof edge, so that interpretation of the five-foot minimum may be wrong, and he suggested that it be set back from the edge of the main roof.
- Mr. Turner responded that the current setback is from the property line but can see how the zoning interpretation could point toward the roof edge. He also pointed out that the positions of the stairways are slightly different on each property as well but that the design of the parapets limits the views of them from the street.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicants to comment on the color choice.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro observed that the black color stands out much more than the previous additions that were approved.
  - Mr. Turner responded that the current shutters, garage doors, and trim on the houses are black so that they were looking to match those colors on the additions. He acknowledged that the dark color choice can be more visually noticeable and is willing to work on that detail.
  - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro about the colors and suggested it should be a lighter gray. The black color could still be used in the windows, but the mansard should be lighter. He also asked about the proposed material for the cladding on the party walls.
  - Mr. Turner responded that it would be a vertical fiber cement siding like on the mansards.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The properties at 2211 and 2213 Panama Street are non-contributing resources to the Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District.
- The proposed additions will not negatively affect the historic character of the district, provided some small changes are made to reduce visual impact including increasing the setback of the deck railings and changing the proposed colors.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The applications will satisfy Standard 9, provided that some small changes are made to reduce visual impact including increasing the setback of the deck railings and changing the proposed colors to a lighter shade. The buildings themselves are not historic, so no historic materials would be destroyed with the construction of the additions and decks. The size, scale, proportions, and massing of the proposed additions and decks are compatible with the surroundings and will protect the integrity of the historic district.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the setback of the railings is made from the edge of the roofs, the cladding materials for the party walls is a vertical fiber cement siding, and the colors of the mansard cladding are lightened, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

<b>ITEM: 2211 and 2213 Panama St</b> <b>MOTION: Approval with conditions</b> <b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Lukachik</b>					
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	5				2

**ADDRESS: 257 S 4TH ST**

Proposal: Remove addition, roof, and dormer; construct roof over parking pad; add windows

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: M Dwell Two, LLC

Applicant: Jane Ahn

History: 1810; Three-story rear addition in 1981

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application proposes to remove a non-historic three-story rear addition on a Federal rowhouse that is both individually designated and listed as a significant resource in the Society Hill Historic District. It also proposed to remove a portion of the rear slope of the roof of the main block of the house along with the rear dormer and construct an inset roof deck with rear railing in its place. It further proposes to construct a live roof and door structure around a portion of a concrete parking area at the rear of the property and to add two windows to the exposed north side façade of the house, which currently contains five windows. The building was constructed c. 1810 and is three-and-a-half stories tall with a gable roof and brick façade. The three-story addition proposed for removal is located behind the main block of the building and dates to 1981. The current front façade, north façade and roof were reconstructed to their current forms in 1963. Prior to 1963, the front façade had a first-floor storefront and the north wall of the building was covered by a neighboring garage. Upon removal of that garage, the owner, in consultation with the Historical Commission and Redevelopment Authority, reconstructed that façade with a new brick veneer, added the current windows with shutters, and rebuilt the chimneys and side roofline to match the rest of the row. The new proposed roof deck will be at least partially visible from some surrounding public pedestrian walkways including St. James Place and St. Joseph's Way.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Remove a three-story non-historic rear addition
- Remove a portion of the rear roof slope and dormer and construct an inset roof deck
- Construct a live roof and door structure around the rear parking pad
- Add two windows to the north facade

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The proposed roof deck does not satisfy Standard 9. Its construction requires the removal of the historic rear slope of the roof and rear dormer of the house.
  - The proposed live roof and door structure for the rear parking pad satisfies Standard 9. It does not affect any historic materials and is compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building.
  - The proposed addition of two windows to the north wall is compatible with Standard 9. While an end wall like this one would likely not have had any windows in it if it were original, the wall as it currently stands with existing windows was reconstructed in 1963 with the approval of the Historical Commission. The addition of two more windows does not further impair the architectural features of this property.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - The removal of the 1981 rear addition satisfies standard 10. It is itself a non-historic addition that was reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission in 1981. Its removal will not impair the essential form or integrity 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.*
  - The proposed roof deck does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline. Its construction requires the removal of the historic rear slope of the roof and rear dormer of the house and will be visible from surrounding public rights-of-way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the removal of the 1981 addition, pursuant to Standard 10. Approval of the live roof and door structure for the parking pad, pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the addition of two windows to the north wall, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:59:59

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect and property owner Jane Ahn represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Stein commented that the application was difficult to understand based on the

- materials submitted. It was hard to tell where demolition was being proposed, what portions of the house were original, and what were later. She added that the Architectural Committee really needs to see existing and proposed drawings on the plans. She stated that the Architectural Committee should discuss this application in two parts, the proposed demolition of the rear addition and the proposed new work.
- Ms. Ahn responded that her goal is to get as much feedback as possible on the submitted plans. She explained that the addition proposed for removal is clearly visible on photographs and is located at the rear, where a garden space would have been originally. She is proposing to remove that addition, which dates to the 1980s, and construct a garage door and roof over the paved parking area behind it. She elaborated that her overall goal is to reimagine this large house of over 5000 square feet with more open space by removing that addition, reconfiguring the rear open space, and by adding an open deck at the rear. That deck would be made by removing a portion of the rear roof slope while maintaining the dormer. She also pointed out some nearby decks as inspiration and reiterated that the proposed deck would be minimally visible from the surroundings.
  - Ms. Stein asked if the applicant had investigated the condition of the rear brick wall that would remain after removing the addition.
    - Ms. Ahn responded that there are currently a series of large openings in that original rear brick wall that connects the main house to the addition.
  - Ms. Lukachik asked for clarification about the primary and alternate deck proposals.
    - Ms. Ahn explained that the alternate design proposes to keep the rear dormer on the main block of the house while cutting out portions of the roof around it to place the deck. The deck would be accessed by doors that would be installed in the dormer sides and the rear edge would have planters installed along it to serve as a railing. She added that the deck would not be visible from the pedestrian level.
    - Ms. Gutterman commented that she is not in favor of removing any of the roof structure for the deck and that it would not be appropriate to do so even with the modifications that have been made to the building over time. She also suggested that the applicant include more images and drawings showing current state of the building as compared to her proposed changes, particularly with regard to the east wall that will be exposed by the removal of the 1980s addition. It is important to know the state of that wall in order to figure out how the new openings in it should be treated. She additionally suggested that a deck could be added at the second-floor level off the back of the house.
    - Ms. Ahn asked if the Architectural Committee was suggesting she not remove the 1980s addition.
    - Ms. Gutterman clarified that the addition can be removed in compliance with preservation standards, but that the applicant needs to do some probes and research to determine what will remain of the east wall after the addition is removed and how that will affect the proposed new openings in that wall.
    - Mr. D'Allesandro agreed with Ms. Gutterman's comments. He suggested the applicant stay away from the roof level and construct a deck below the roof level. He reiterated the comment regarding understanding the conditions of the east wall before removing the addition.
    - Ms. Ahn asked for some clarification regarding the comments about the appropriate location for a deck.
    - Ms. Gutterman suggested that a small four- or five-foot deck could be built off the rear wall supported by the building instead of cutting away the roof.

- Mr. McCoubrey interjected to ask about the proposed garage structure.
  - Ms. Gutterman responded that the application proposes a green roof with a garage door, not a full garage structure.
  - Ms. Ahn clarified that it is a roof structure that covers the parking pad and not an open structure.
  - Mr. McCoubrey suggested that there is room for a sizable deck over the parking pad that would not impact the house. He added that it is nice to see someone proposing to remove a 1980s addition and that the house does retain an original rear ell beside that. He continued to explain that understanding the original east wall and its openings will be important and he agrees that cutting away the gable of the main roof is difficult to support.
  - Ms. Ahn reiterated that the alternate deck design she submitted retains the dormer and cuts away less of the roof than the initial design.
  - Ms. Gutterman, Mr. D'Alessandro, and Mr. McCoubrey reiterated that cutting away any original roof fabric does not comply with historic preservation standards and cannot be recommended for approval.
  - Ms. Gutterman suggested that, since the original rear ell will be retained, it could provide access to a deck placed on top of the parking area, as suggested by Mr. McCoubrey.
  - Ms. Ahn responded that, owing to the elevations, it would be difficult to do so.
  - Ms. Gutterman posited that the applicant and her architect could explore some possibilities related to a deck over the parking pad, but that modifying the original roof does not satisfy preservation standards. The Architectural Committee is never going to recommend approval of removing part of the original roof to create a terrace. It simply does not meet the standards.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and added that more documentation is always appreciated as well and specified that, for a final application, complete demolition plans should be included.
  - Ms. Ahn asked if there was any configuration for a deck at the roof level that the Architectural Committee could recommend approval. She highlighted how in the alternate deck design, the area of roofing on the south side of the dormer is not visible to any surrounding pedestrian areas. Would it be possible to just remove that portion of roof and leave the north side intact?
  - Mr. D'Alessandro explained that the issue at hand with the deck is the demolition of original roof, not necessarily the visibility. The Architectural Committee seeks to retain as many historic features and as much historic fabric as possible. Removing part of the original pitched roof significantly changes the volume of the historic building. It does not satisfy historic preservation standards.
  - Ms. Stein highlighted that this building is very special to the Society Hill neighborhood. The Historic Commission recognized its significance when it individually designated it in 1957. The Historical Commission's task is to ensure the retention of original design elements and materials. In this case, the roof lines are very important. Ms. Stein added that it is equally important to understand the openings proposed for the walls as well, especially in the revealed wall after the 1980s addition is removed. It is important for the Architectural Committee to understand which parts are original fabric and what is being altered.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the proposed new windows for the north wall.
  - Mr. Till explained that the north wall currently contains five windows with shutters on them and that the applicant is proposing to add two more windows.
  - Ms. Gutterman commented that details will have to be submitted for these

elements for a final application, but that, unlike the roof deck, the windows will likely satisfy preservation standards.

- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the neighboring houses show arched top windows on the rear and that they may reflect what the original windows in the rear of this house looked like before the 1980s addition.
  - Mr. Till added that the row of four houses, including this one and its neighbors, was extensively reworked in the early 1960s under consultation with both the Historical Commission and the Redevelopment Authority, though the files on the properties focus on the front façades and not the rears.
- Ms. Gutterman recommended that the property owner and her architect perform exploratory work on the rear wall before removing the 1980s addition.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission individually designated this property, and it is a significant resource in the Society Hill Historic District.
- A final application should include more details on the proposed demolition of the rear addition and how it will affect the original rear wall that will be exposed.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The removal of the 1980s rear addition satisfies Standard 10. It is a non-historic addition that was reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission in 1981. Its removal will not impair the essential form or integrity of the historic building.
- The proposed addition of two windows to the north wall is compatible with Standard 9. While an end wall like this one would likely not have had any windows in it if it were original, the wall as it currently stands with existing windows was reconstructed in 1963 with the approval of the Historical Commission. The addition of two more windows does not further impair the architectural features of this property.
- The proposed live roof and door structure for the rear parking pad satisfies Standard 9. It does not affect any historic materials and is compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building.
- The proposed roof deck does not satisfy Standard 9 or the Roofs Guideline. Its construction requires the removal of the historic rear slope of the roof and rear dormer of the house. The proposed roof deck would result in the removal of too much original roof fabric and would adversely alter the historic massing of the building.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the roof deck, and approval in-concept of the rest of the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

<b>ITEM: 257 S 4<sup>TH</sup> ST</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial of the roof deck, approval in-concept of the rest</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro</b>					
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: 28 S 2ND ST**

Proposal: Construct roof deck with two pilothouses and a pergola

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 28S2 LLC

Applicant: Beth Hysick, Brighton Architecture + Design LLC

History: 1835; Edwin Hall & Co.; Venetian Gothic storefront added in 1865

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes constructing a rooftop deck, two pilot houses, and a pergola on a four-story building in the Old City Historic District that was individually designated in 1976.

The deck will be setback 11'-6" from the front elevation and built up from the roof plane by 3'-5" on average on wooden posts. The pilot houses and pergola will be between 9'-6" and 10' in height and setback from 2<sup>nd</sup> Street by at least 50' and from Strawberry Street by at least 21'-7".

The submitted drawings propose 42" aluminum railings around much of the deck, some of it with glass infill, as well as a planter box on the south side. The pilot houses will be clad in vinyl siding in earth tones. The prefabricated pergola is a powder-coated aluminum, also in a neutral color, with a slat wall along the north property line.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct roof deck with pilothouses and a pergola.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Roofs Guideline: Not Recommended: Changing the configuration or shape of a roof by adding highly visible new features (such as dormer windows, vents, skylights, or a penthouse)*
  - An on-site mock-up showing locations of the railing, pergola, and north pilot house



- would be helpful to evaluate the degree to which the roof deck would be visible from the public right-of-way. The north side seems especially likely to be visible given the short height of the neighboring building, which allows long views of the roof edge from both 2<sup>nd</sup> and Strawberry Streets.
- The adjacent property at 26 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street is non-contributing to the historic district and appears to have been truncated from its historic height. If a taller building were constructed there in future, it would significantly reduce any visibility of this roof deck.
  - *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.*
    - If an on-site mock-up shows that the railing, pergola, and pilot house(s) would be significantly visible from the public right-of-way, the Commission can better evaluate the compatibility of the roof deck's scale and materials and its impact on the historic structure and surrounding historic district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided that an on-site mock-up shows that the railing, pergola, and northern pilot house would be minimally visible, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:28:20**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Beth Johnson Hysick of Brighton Architecture and Design represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Gutterman suggested that often glass railings such as the one proposed in this application are more, not less, visible, owing to the reflection of sunlight. She further stressed that visibility of the front railing from long views along N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street would be important to consider, and that the railing should be inconspicuous from that street.
  - Ms. Hysick responded that they would be willing to do an on-site mockup to evaluate the visibility of the deck and its accessories.
- Ms. Stein asked if the proposed vinyl siding could be changed to a fiber cement siding or vertical panels.
  - Ms. Hysick said she would check with the property owner but was confident that change was possible.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the raised position of the deck causes the railing to be elevated higher, increasing its visibility.
- Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the impact of the deck on the roofing material and future maintenance of it.
  - Ms. Hysick responded that the roof was being replaced as part of this project and that the deck will rest on the parapet walls rather than the roof surface.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the visibility of the deck supports and asked for more information about the relationship between the posts and the existing walls.
- Ms. Lukachik asked if the area under the deck would be open.
  - Ms. Hysick responded that that was the plan but that they would consider enclosing the edge of the deck, if suggested by the Architectural Committee.

- Ms. Stein suggested that doing so at the north side would improve the design.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed and said he wanted more information about how the posts would rest on the parapet.
- Ms. Hysick said those details might be on the structural plans, which were not submitted, but that she would provide those plans for future reviews.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- An on-site mockup should be done to evaluate the visibility of the roof deck and its accessories.
- Vinyl siding is not an appropriate material for the historic context.
- Structural plans would be helpful to evaluate the way that the support posts are mounted on the roof parapet.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9, provided that the vinyl siding is changed to another kind of cladding.
- The application satisfies the Roofs Guideline, provided that an on-site mockup shows the proposed deck, railing, pergola, and pilot houses are inconspicuous.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that structural plans are submitted; a mock-up shows that the deck is inconspicuous from the street; the underside of the deck is enclosed; and the cladding of the pilot house is revised; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

<b>ITEM: 28 S 2<sup>nd</sup> St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval with conditions</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro</b>					
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: 1730 WHARTON ST**

Proposal: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pelican Point Investments LLC

Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit

History: 1888; Eighteenth Street Methodist Episcopal Church/Friendship Baptist Church; J.

Franklin Stuckert, architect

Individual Designation: 9/14/1988

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes legalizing vinyl windows installed throughout the building at 1730 Wharton Street. Located at the southeast corner of Wharton Street and S. 18th Street, the former 18th Street Methodist Episcopal Church, constructed about 1888, historically featured wood windows with marbled blue glass. Between fall 2018 and summer 2019, many of the historic windows were removed without Historical Commission review or approval. The original frames and some of the original marbled blue glass windows remained.

At its 14 August 2020 meeting, the Historical Commission adopted the Architectural Committee's recommendation for an application proposing complete restoration of the building's exterior as part of a conversion to multi-unit residential use. The approval was conditioned on the windows being wood or aluminum-clad wood at the side elevations, including the installation of stacked double-hung windows in the double-height openings, provided the muntin patterns matched those of the historic windows, and the mullion between the windows at the new floor level was as minimal as possible; the marbled blue glass windows were retained, restored, or replicated in the front façade openings and communal spaces; and the louvers at the corner towers were retained, with the understanding that glass or operable windows may be installed behind them. In May 2021, Historical Commission staff approved window shop drawings by Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation that proposed all new wood windows sufficiently replicating the historic appearance and included the character-defining marbled blue glass where appropriate. It appears that Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation went out of business, and the windows shown in the approved shop drawings were never purchased. Instead, vinyl windows with grilles between the glass and of sizes which in no way fit the masonry openings were installed throughout the building in early 2025 without any approvals or permits. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the exterior work and a Stop Work Order at the request of the Historical Commission's staff, prompting this request for legalization from the property owner/developer.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Legalize window replacement.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:40:53

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Meredith Ferleger, architect Rich Villa, and owner-developer Khalfani Leslie represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Ferleger explained that the original window company selected for the project went out of business. Soon after, a neighborhood organization filed a conservatorship action, seeking to take control of the redevelopment that was already underway but was not moving fast enough for the neighbors. She explained that the property owner then became subject to the jurisdiction of the court, which put a tight deadline on the developer to make progress on the project. She concluded that this process is what led to the quick installation of the vinyl windows.
  - Ms. Stein responded that the windows that were installed do not meet historic preservation standards and asked what next steps will be taken to correct them.
- Mr. Villa stated that the original openings were not changed, but were filled with windows that did not replicate what was shown on the original drawings. He stated that they are looking for options that will satisfy historic preservation requirements.
  - Ms. Stein reiterated that the vinyl windows do not satisfy preservation standards and asked about next steps. She asked if the developer intends to purchase new windows.
- Mr. Leslie stated that it has been difficult to get to this stage. He stated that they have looked at different window manufacturers. He stated that they looked into the option of mapping the design of the original look on the glass, so that it looks as if it is a tint that goes on the interior of the window. He stated that the other option is to retrofit the glass.
- Ms. Stein asked if quotes for appropriate windows had been obtained from other companies after Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation went out of business.
  - Mr. Leslie responded that he has tried to meet deadlines as far as the development timeframe and the neighbors' requests. He explained that the vinyl windows secured the building so that the interior work could continue. He stated that the deposit with Seaquay was transferred to a window company in Arizona, and the cost skyrocketed.
  - Ms. Stein responded that Mr. Leslie could submit an application for financial hardship, and that his attorney could advise him on that process. She reiterated that the vinyl windows do not respect the building or the masonry openings, and the Architectural Committee cannot recommend approval.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted the huge cost difference between the vinyl windows which were installed and the appropriate windows to replicate the historic appearance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- In May 2021, the Historical Commission's staff approved window shop drawings by

Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation that proposed all new wood windows sufficiently replicating the historic appearance and included the character-defining marbled blue glass where appropriate.

- Vinyl windows with grilles between the glass that do not fit the masonry openings and include infill material were installed throughout the building in early 2025 without any approvals or permits.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The vinyl windows do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

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

<b>ITEM: 1730 Wharton St</b> <b>MOTION: Denial</b> <b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Lukachik</b>					
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: 1600-06 E BERKS ST**

Proposal: Construct eight townhouses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Harry Siebert

Applicant: Thomas Keller, CANNObdesign

History: 1885; St. Laurentius Church; Edwin Forrest Durang, architect; demolished in 2022

Individual Designation: 7/10/2015

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct eight three-story townhouses on a vacant lot in Fishtown. St. Laurentius Church, which was designated in 2015, stood on the site until 2022, when it was demolished. The church was vacant at the time of designation and the property owner, the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, claimed that it was in such poor condition that repair was infeasible. After designation, a developer placed the church property under contract and designed an adaptive reuse plan, but a community group obstructed the project and eventually thwarted the plan to reuse the historic church. In 2020, the Archdiocese sold the property to a second developer, who applied to the Historical Commission to demolish the church, claiming that the towers were structurally unstable and posed a public safety hazard. The Department of Licenses and Inspections agreed with the structural assessment and requested that the

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 APRIL 2025**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Historical Commission review the application on an emergency basis. The Historical Commission reviewed the application in July and August 2020 and approved some demolition of the historic church to abate the unsafe conditions but required the property owner to either retain part of the front façade or salvage elements of the front façade for incorporation into new construction at the site.

The owner of the property demolished the church in its entirety and apparently did not preserve any materials or features from the front façade. In March 2025, the developer at the time of the demolition sold the property to a new developer, the current applicant.

The application proposes to construct eight three-story townhouses, four facing E. Berks Street and four facing E. Wilt Street. Side facades would face Memphis Street. The townhouses would include pilot houses and roof decks. They would be clad in brick veneer and have large, industrial-looking windows and projecting metal entry stairs on the front facades and smaller windows on the side facades. The westernmost townhouse on E. Wilt Street would be larger than the rest and include arched windows.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct eight three-story townhouses.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines do not apply because no historic resources survive at the site and the surrounding neighborhood is not designated as historic. There is no basis for judging the compatibility of the proposed new construction with a designated historic resource.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends denial because the application does not account for the conditions that the Historical Commission placed on the demolition in 2020.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:59:38

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Developer Henry Seibert and architects Carey Jackson Yonce and Thomas Keller represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Farnham noted that the staff is currently recommending denial of the application because there is still the outstanding issue of the unresolved conditions that were placed on the demolition. He stated that the staff does not object to the proposed new construction, but the staff is compelled to recommend denial until the conditions on the demolition are resolved.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicants to explain whether any materials were salvaged during the demolition of the church and, if so, whether any could be incorporated into the new construction.
  - Mr. Yonce explained that his client, the current property owner, did not own the property when the church was demolished. He stated that his client was aware of the church, the Historical Commission's involvement with the church, and its demolition, when they purchased the property, but observed that they purchased a clean site without any salvaged materials. He stated that his client does not

know whether any materials exist elsewhere but is certain that there are no materials at the site. Mr. Yonce stated that his client cannot bring the church back. He also noted that his client is proposing a much more modest development for the site, eight townhouses, not a large apartment building. He stated that his client is new to the property and is looking to move forward, not back.

- Ms. Stein noted that the site is still individually designated. She asked if the applicants were proposing any mitigation for the demolition.
  - Mr. Yonce responded that they are proposing a development that is compatible with the neighborhood.
  - Ms. Gutterman interjected that the design is not appropriate. It looks like a warehouse. She asserted that it is not appropriate to Fishtown.
  - Mr. Yonce replied that he is seeking to provide natural light and beautiful spaces for homeowners.
  - Ms. Lukachik stated that the application materials do not provide sufficient information to judge the proposed development within its context.
  - Ms. Gutterman stated that the proposed townhouses are not compatible with the adjacent school.
  - Mr. Farnham commented, stating that the compatibility of the proposed townhouses with the surrounding neighborhood is not relevant. The surrounding neighborhood is not designated as historic. This site is not located in a historic district. The Historical Commission has not identified a historic resource that warrants protection like a historic district, so there is no basis for judging the compatibility of this proposed development with the surroundings. The Historical Commission has no legal basis for seeking to protect the surrounding neighborhood. It only has the authority to protect historic resources at this site and there are no longer any resources at this site.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the question before the Architectural Committee is whether the applicants can or should comply with the conditions that the Historical Commission placed on the demolition. He opined that a simple change of ownership should not undo all of the hard work of the Historical Commission to save something of the former church.
  - Ms. Stein agreed that the change of ownership does not negate the conditions that were placed on the demolition. She stated that the requirements run with the land.
- Mr. Siebert stated that his development company took ownership of the property just one month ago. He confirmed that none of the materials from the former church remain at the site. He stated that they have tried to develop a generally conservative design that pays homage to the neighborhood but is also suited to contemporary lifestyles.
  - Mr. Yonce explained their design choices including the green window trim, which is a nod to the copper detailing of the former church. He explained that they chose the tan brick to be more neutral and not overwhelm anything. He opined that red brick might have been too bold.
  - Mr. Siebert acknowledged that the windows are a bit larger but are smaller on the Memphis Street façade to have a bit more of a residential scale.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that her organization is disappointed in the loss of historic fabric at 1600 E. Berks Street and

the apparent abandonment of previously agreed upon compromises. She noted that it is disheartening when commitments made during a review process are not upheld. It undermines public trust in preservation efforts. She concluded that this development does not respect either the letter or the spirit of the city's preservation guidelines.

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society observed that the property has changed hands, and the materials from the demolished church are likely long gone. He opined that this site with the adjacent site with the Second Empire school building are eligible for designation and the proposed townhouses could match or be sympathetic to the school. Mr. Beisert then blamed the Historical Commission for not requiring the church building to be braced or requiring other “basic things that they would require in other cities.” He pointed to an example at 3<sup>rd</sup> and Market Streets. He asserted that this is another example of a failure to ensure that these properties or that some portion of the building was braced and saved, or at least partly reconstructed. We just continue the same path. Guess what happened? The developer got what they wanted. They demolished the building. And here we are approving a new project, or maybe not approving it.
  - Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Historical Commission does not advise on means and methods for bracing walls. That is incumbent on the developer.
- Justin Lucas, a neighbor, commented that he has lived down the block from the site for about a decade. He stated that he can see the site from his office window. He reported that he observed the street being closed, the facade falling down, and the demolition. He added that he observed the previous owner taking stones on flatbed trailers and a 14-foot clock face from one hundred feet up on the façade. He stated that the former owner of the property took the clock and sold it. He contended that the Historical Commission has failed because the church cannot be rebuilt, and the materials cannot be recovered. He stated that he supports the proposed design. It is an appropriate height and density.
- Allison Weiss, who represents a community organization in Germantown, claimed that the new property owner inherited all of the contingencies and requirements that were laid out for this property in Fishtown, and that they need to be enforced.
- Eric Press, a neighbor, commented that he is a real estate agent in the area and lives a couple of doors down from the site. He suggested that the proposed buildings could be redesigned to better fit the neighborhood. He suggested that the architect look at brick buildings with arched windows on Frankford Avenue for inspiration.

#### **ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission conditionally approved the partial or complete demolition of the historic church that stood on this site in 2020. The approval required the retention of some of the front wall of the church or, if that was not possible, the salvaging of some materials from the front wall for reuse at the site. Neither the front wall nor any materials were saved.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- A recommendation of denial should be proffered until the Historical Commission has had an opportunity to consider the unresolved conditions on the demolition.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the unresolved conditions.



<b>ITEM: 1600-06 E Berks St</b> <b>MOTION: Denial</b> <b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b> <b>SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro</b>					
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

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:24:49**

**ACTION:** The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:30 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](http://www.phila.gov/historical).