

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

**TUESDAY, 28 OCTOBER 2025
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
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
Joshua Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

Brielle DuBose
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Ian D'Elia
Jason Morris
Jay Farrell
Juan Tejedor, Voith & Mactavish Architects
Lea Litvin, Lo Design
Michael Silver
Miles Colescott, Voith & Mactavish Architects
Perry Garvin
Sam Xu
Scott O'Barr, Voith & Mactavish Architects
Tina Marie Hartnett

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1221 PINE ST

Proposal: Replace bays; install roof deck, window in doorway, and basement stair

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1221 Pine 1 LLC

Applicant: Scott O'Barr, Voith & Mactavish Architects

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 3/27/1962

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

Staff Contact: Josh Schroeder, joshua.schroeder@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make several exterior alterations to 1221 Pine Street, an 1820s building that has been vacant for many years. The house was individually designated in 1962 and is Contributing to the Washington Square West Historic District. The original building, constructed in the late 1820s, is a four-story brick house on the corner of Pine and S. Camac Streets. Attached to the rear is a three-story brick, late nineteenth-century addition. The building's primary use has been residential, although various stores and shops occupied the first floor on the corner of Pine and Camac Streets, as evidenced by the storefront bay windows on the south and west sides of the house.

The application proposes to replace deteriorated front and side bay windows in kind and install a painted wood bulkhead door to replace a missing door to the basement. At the side yard facing S. Camac Street, the application proposes to remove the metal fence and gate and replace it with a red brick wall with painted wood gate to match the existing wall. The application proposes to remove a basement window, currently facing a recessed well, and replace it with a new painted wood basement entry door. Stairs will be installed leading to the new basement entrance in the side yard and will be hidden behind the extended brick wall. The application also proposes removing the door into the side yard, facing S. Camac Street, to allow for installation of a new six-over-six, painted wood double-hung window to match the appearance and alignment of the adjacent windows, which were installed in 2021. Finally, the application proposes to install a roof deck and enclosure to keep new condenser units out of public view. Wood modular roof pavers will be installed over the existing rear flat roof and a painted wood railing will be installed. The existing roof access door at the rear dormer will remain.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace front and side bay windows; install bulkhead door in front; replace door into side yard with window; replace basement window with door; install steps to basement; replace iron fence with brick wall and wood gate; install deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The brick wall extension and new wood gate to replace the existing metal fence will match the existing brick wall in appearance and match a configuration that existed just prior to designation, retaining the buildings historic character and satisfying Standard 2.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature*

shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

- The in-kind replacement of the front and side bay windows, as well as new bulkhead doors to replace missing doors, will match the historic design, satisfying Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The added stairs and new basement door will be obscured from view by the extended brick wall. The new window, replacing a door to the side yard on the addition, will match the existing fenestration pattern and match recently replaced adjacent windows, satisfying Standard 9.
 - The deck will be on the rear addition roof. A screened enclosure will hide mechanical equipment from view and will itself be partially blocked from view by the new deck railing. The new deck will be compatible with, but distinguished from, the rear addition of the building, satisfying Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:08

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Schroeder presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Scott O'Barr, Juan Tejedor, and Miles Colescott represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Amy Stein asked if the Historical Commission had previously approved a roof deck.
 - Mr. Schroeder replied that he was not aware of any approved roof deck. He stated that some photographs show what appears to be a temporary wood railing on the roof, but he indicated that he did not know its purpose.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated his opposition to demolishing the existing iron fence in the rear side yard, stating that ironwork is a defining feature of historic properties in Philadelphia, and therefore the proposal did not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He also opposed removing the side door and installing a window, noting the impact to historic fabric for the proposed window opening, difficulty matching the infill of the doorway to the existing wall, and the potential loss of the door, frame, and transom.
 - Mr. Detwiler then asked Mr. O'Barr for the justification for the proposed alterations.
 - Mr. O'Barr responded that the brick wall would provide privacy. He also pointed to a 1959 photograph of the house, which showed that a brick wall and wood gate predated the existing iron fence. The iron fence that Mr. D'Alessandro sought to preserve was installed at some point after 1959. It is not historic.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that the iron fence for reuse should be donated for reuse, noting that it appeared to be salvaged nineteenth-century material.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro restated his opposition to removal of the fence, and to the replacement of the doorway with a window.
 - Mr. McCoubrey stated that photographic evidence clearly demonstrated that the

brick wall predated the iron fence, and therefore rebuilding the brick wall is appropriate.

- In response to Mr. D'Alessandro's assertion that the new brick would not match, Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Detwiler stated that the staff can ensure the new brick wall matches the existing brick's appearance.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Mr. O'Barr for the justification for replacing the side door with a window.
 - Mr. O'Barr noted that two doors, near each other, led from the kitchen into the side yard. He noted that only one door was necessary and replacing one with a window would better serve the kitchen floorplan. He also noted the new window would align with the existing windows.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if the brick facade would be modified as it did not appear that the proposed window opening and existing doorway were in the same location.
 - Mr. O'Barr confirmed that the brick façade would be modified.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the proposed alteration did not respect the existing masonry opening and noted the prospective difficulties from filling in the doorway and cutting into the wall.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked if the brick adjacent to the window was original.
 - Mr. O'Barr replied that they believed it was. He had inspected the site and found that the existing door appeared to be in its original location as there was no evidence the nearby brick had been cut.
- Mr. Detwiler turned to the proposed roof deck. He suggested aligning the railing with the exterior wall beneath to avoid a top-heavy appearance, noting the roof's substantial overhang. Mr. Detwiler also suggested keeping the mechanical equipment enclosure as low as possible.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that he appreciated that there are few options for the mechanical equipment but suggested placing them on the flat roof portion, rather than the pitched roof, if feasible.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that the proposed guardrail might present a "quasi-historical" appearance but indicated that the Committee usually recommends a simple picket design.
 - Mr. O'Barr stated they hoped the design would add privacy.
 - Mr. Detwiler supported the railing's design but expressed concern that its diagonal portions might be interpreted as a wall when viewed at certain angles.
 - Ms. Stein noted that the diagonals in the railing are only 1-inch or ¾-inch in thickness, so there should be enough transparency.
- The Committee members suggested that the property owner donate the iron fencing for reuse elsewhere, rather than send it to the landfill.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The side yard of 1221 Pine Street historically featured a brick wall with wood gate. The existing iron gate was likely salvaged and therefore historic fabric but is not a character defining feature of 1221 Pine Street.
- The rear side door and doorway facing Camac Street is a character defining feature.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application partially fails to satisfy Standard 9, as removing the rear side door,

altering the masonry opening, and making a new opening for the replacement window, would destroy historic materials and features.

- The application satisfies Standard 2, as replacing the existing iron fence with a brick wall and wood gate will restore the house's historic appearance.
- The application satisfies Standard 6, as the in-kind replacement of side bay windows and the installation of new bulkhead doors to replace missing basement doors, will match the historic design.
- The application's proposed roof deck satisfies Standard 9, provided the proposed wood railing aligns with the external brick wall below, as the railing will be compatible with, but distinguishable, from rear addition and a screened enclosure will hide mechanical equipment from public view.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of replacing the door with a window, provided the window is installed in the existing door opening, the doorway features are retained, and the exterior wall is not altered; and approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the roof-deck railing aligns with the exterior wall below, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ITEM: 1221 Pine St, side door removal and window installation					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ITEM: 1221 Pine St, remainder of application					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro		X			
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	4	1			2

ADDRESS: 614 PINE ST

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Qian Jin Real Estate LLC

Applicant: Sam Xu, Constrecture, LLC

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes an addition on the two-story portion of the rear ell of 614 Pine Street, with a roof deck over the entire rear ell serviced by two pilot houses. Window openings on the rear of the main block and rear ell would be altered, and two skylights are proposed for the rear slope of the gable roof. The proposed work would not be visible from Pine Street but would be from Waverly and Addison Streets as well as a pedestrian greenway which runs from Pine Street to Addison Street.

The Architectural Committee reviewed previous versions of this application and voiced concerns about the intersection of the front pilot house with the roof of the main block as well as the proposed use of metal panel cladding. The Committee asked that the fenestration be revised to something more compatible with the existing windows.

This application responds to previous feedback by proposing the entire addition be clad in brick. The fenestration plan now features one-over-one double-hung windows on the rear ell, with some windows enlarged and others relocated to match the window openings on the second and third floors. After the staff recommendation was completed, the applicant submitted the window plan for the rear of the main block, which is unchanged from the previous submission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

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

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The addition will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment, provided the pilot-house cladding and main-block windows appropriate, and therefore satisfy Standard 9.
- *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 roof deck and pilot house would require the demolition of a small portion of the roof of the main block, though the amount of demolition is reduced compared to the original proposal.
 - The proposal depicts the pilot houses clad in metal panels or stucco. Metal panels would not be compatible with the historic resource and would be highly visible from

- the pedestrian path and other public views. Appropriate cladding materials include stucco and fiber-cement siding.
- The roof deck with pilot houses would be inconspicuous and minimally visible from the public right-of-way and would not damage or obscure character-defining historic features, provided the cladding material is compatible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the pilot-house cladding and main-block windows are compatible, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:30:00

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman expressed the opinion that the metal panel cladding proposed to clad the pilot houses is incompatible with the historic district. She referred to the note on the plans that says that the pilot houses will be clad in either metal panels or stucco and asked when the selection would be made.
 - Mr. Xu answered that he was hoping that the Architectural Committee would provide guidance on the selection.
- Ms. Gutterman asked why the front pilot house needed to sit on the rear slope of the main block.
 - Mr. Xu replied that the pilot house needed to be at that location to engage the existing stair tower of the house and that it had been already shifted back from the location that was initially proposed.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested that the location of the pilot house should be reconsidered. It should not sit on the roof of the main block.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. He argued that two pilot houses, even serving roof decks for different units, was not necessary.
 - Others noted that the Historical Commission has approved numerous pilot houses on the rear slopes of gable roofs.
- Mr. Detwiler highlighted issues that might arise from the location of the front pilot house. He suggested that a cricket would be necessary to shed water.
 - Mr. McCoubrey recommended moving the front pilot house off of the main block, acknowledging that shifting the stair may reduce the interior living space on the third floor of the ell.
- Mr. McCoubrey also asked for clarification of the proposed demolition for the windows with Juliet balconies on the rear of the main block.
 - Mr. Xu said that the proposed openings would be extended down to floor level but would otherwise be unaltered.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed to an area of the plan that shows the proposed third floor overhanging a small area where the existing two floors at the rear of the ell are set back about a foot. He sought clarification of how that would look on the elevation.
 - Mr. Maust zoomed in on the relevant elevation drawing.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the third floor appeared to be cantilevered somewhat.
 - Mr. Xu agreed that it was cantilevered.
- Mr. Xu drew the Architectural Committee members' attention to a change from the previous submission. The rear pilot house has been narrowed so that it sits away from the west elevation and allows the metal picket railing to run uninterrupted along

- that elevation.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the plans specified the ceiling height of the proposed third floor.
 - Mr. Xu responded that the ceiling height is between 8'-9' and 8'-10" tall and explained that the floor height was being raised about 13" to better meet the level of the third floor of the main block of the building.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated that there are other ways to provide roof access other than a pilot house, which requires the removal of historic material.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that he did not support the proposed Juliet balconies on the rear of the main block and suggested that the historic openings should be maintained.
 - Ms. Gutterman requested that the applicant provide more detailed drawings of the areas that had been discussed before the next review.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The window plan for the rear ell is more compatible than previous submissions.
- The use of brick for the addition is also a welcome change after previous versions proposed metal panels and stucco.
- Metal panels are not compatible with the historic context and should not be used on the pilot houses.
- The proposed Juliet balconies for the rear of the main block are not compatible with the historic resource.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, owing to the proposed enlargement of window openings on the rear of the main block.
- The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline, owing to the impact of the front pilot house on the gable roof.

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

ITEM: 614 Pine St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detweiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 413 S 3RD ST

Proposal: Demolish rear one-story addition; construct two-story addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Gail and Michael Silver

Applicant: Lea Litvin, Lo Design

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This review in-concept application proposes to remove a one-story, non-historic conservatory addition and construct a two-story addition along the rear ell at this rowhouse at the northeast corner of S. 3rd and Stamper Streets. The building at 413 S. 3rd Street was constructed in the early nineteenth century as part of a row of speculative houses. In 1989, a small rear addition was demolished and the side-yard conservatory addition with glass roof and clerestory windows was constructed along Stamper Street using an existing garden wall. The proposed two-story addition will be constructed on the existing footprint of the conservatory addition and will include a small roof deck. Owing to its location along Stamper Street, the addition will be highly visible from the public right-of-way. Although it is a narrow, alley street, some houses face Stamper Street. The application also proposes a deck on the addition at the second floor, a new screening railing for existing mechanical equipment at the third floor, and a new railing for an existing flat roof section at the fourth floor. It is unclear whether the fourth-floor area is currently accessible, or a new door is proposed.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish existing one-story addition.
- Construct two-story addition.
- Replace screening for mechanical equipment.
- Add railing at the fourth floor.

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 works 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.*
 - This building and the adjacent row have a documented history of rear additions and alterations over time. The proposed scale, proportion, and massing could meet Standard 9 if the proposed addition was set in slightly from the outer corner of the main block of the building.
 - Although a contemporary-style addition can be appropriate for a historic building, in this specific location, the design should be more visually compatible with the historic building and environment to meet Standard 9. Owing to the visibility of the addition and its location directly across from the front of residences along Stamper Street, the design should employ historically compatible materials and features to meet Standard 9. The massing of the proposed addition is appropriate, but the windows and doors visible from the street should be reduced in size to be more in keeping with the existing punched openings. The cladding of the addition should be compatible with the historic building and environment.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken*

in such manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.

- The proposed demolition of non-historic materials meets Standard 10.
- The proposed new addition may meet Standard 10 if the existing window openings in the main block and rear ell are repurposed as doorways on the interior of the new addition. This will allow for the restoration of the window openings in the future if the addition is removed, therefore meeting Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, 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.*
 - Additional information about the proposed fourth-floor roof deck including the means of access should be provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept of the massing of the addition, but not the fenestration, cladding, or other design features, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Approval in concept of the screening and railings, provided the access to the fourth-floor deck exists, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:53:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the in-concept application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Lea Litvin represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler inquired about the proposed cladding material for the exterior walls. He observed it was represented by a green color in the renderings.
 - Ms. Litvin responded that they have not yet specified a cladding material but are open to the Architectural Committee's feedback on materials.
- Ms. Litvin stated that the staff's comment about setting back the addition from rear corner of the historic building along Stamper Street was a design change that they had already been considering. She agreed this would be a good way to differentiate between the old volume and the new.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with this proposed revision.
- Mr. Detwiler stated the proposed addition looked like a glass box minus the roof and noted there was not much wall shown. He recommended that there be more solid wall and less glass on the addition. Mr. Detwiler added that, at nighttime, it will read as a glowing box.
 - Ms. Litvin said that adding larger windows to the addition was based on concerns that the historic main block does not get a lot of light and air movement along Stamper Street. She noted that they understand the design of the addition must be compatible with the historic building, but they are also trying to bring more natural light and air through its volume.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that he is fully in support of windows, but it is the proportion of windows to wall that is his concern. He said the design as presented has too much window and not enough wall surface.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired if a flat roof is proposed for the addition.
 - Ms. Litvin confirmed a flat roof is currently proposed.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the amount of proposed demolition to the rear wall of the main block. She noted she is specifically asking about the second floor of the addition.

- Ms. Litvin explained that they would prefer an opening about seven feet, which is approximately twice the size of the existing window opening. She acknowledged the structural considerations of this type of change. Ms. Litvin said the idea was to make the addition feel cohesive with the space in main house and that the owners intend for it to feel like one space.
- Ms. Gutterman expressed concern about the fabric being removed from the 1830 building. She asked about the width of the overall wall.
 - Ms. Litvin pointed out that it is 11 feet wide and they would create a 7-foot opening as part of the project. She stated that the current window opening measures 3'-6" wide.
 - Mr. Detwiler said that they could accept the change from a window to a doorway but acknowledged the smaller the modification the better.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro said he recommends keeping the existing masonry opening, lintel, and fabric and only lengthening the window since the window is fairly large.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the fourth-floor roof deck. She asked about the current outdoor space and if they were planning to add a railing to make this usable deck area.
 - Ms. Litvin explained that it is an existing deck but there was currently no guardrail. She pointed out that visibility of an existing access door was blocked by the rear dormer. Ms. Litvin said they were planning for a metal guardrail.
- Mr. Detwiler said he wanted to discuss the long span of windows over the garden wall. He asked if they were extending the ceiling height of the rear room on the first floor. Mr. Detwiler commented that the row of windows appeared to be more of a contemporary design. He noted that he did not have a strong opposition to that personally.
 - Ms. Litvin confirmed that the ceiling height of the first-floor addition would be lower than the conservatory roof. She pointed out that there is already a strip of windows existing in this location.
- Mr. Detwiler said that the existing English garden conservatory appearance has a very different feeling than the new addition. He continued that the new addition would be a lot more permanent and solid compared to the existing glass conservatory.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the new location of the long row of windows. He asked if they would be higher on the wall than the existing windows.
 - Ms. Litvin confirmed that the row of windows would be placed higher. She explained that the first floor of the addition will be a kitchen and the owners would like to be able to open and close them.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he did not object to the location of the addition or the proposed massing.
- Ms. Litvin requested feedback on the types of materials the Committee could approve in this location.
 - Mr. Detwiler recommended that the applicant look around the neighborhood for examples of materiality that would be appropriate for the addition, noting that the neighborhood mixes modernism with the traditional massing very well from the 1960s to today. He added that it does not have to be brick, it could be some type of stone, perhaps limestone or something else.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that the Architectural Committee was looking for compatibility with existing materials in the neighborhood.
- Mr. Detwiler recommended that the roof should be pitched away from the existing building.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, stating that flat roofs collect everything, snow, ice, and leaves.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The scale and massing of the proposed addition is appropriate for the historic building and neighborhood context.
- Adding screening and railings to the third and fourth floor rear roofs is appropriate.
- The addition should be stepped back from the main block's rear corner along Stamper Street.
- Demolition of the main block's rear wall for new openings should be minimized as much as possible.
- The roof design should be sloped adequately to shed water away from the historic building.
- The fenestrations and materials should be compatible with the neighborhood context.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed scale, proportion, and massing could satisfy Standard 9 if the proposed addition was set in slightly from the outer corner of the main block of the building. The design's fenestrations and materials should be more visually compatible with the historic building and environment to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed demolition of non-historic materials satisfies Standard 10. The proposed new addition may satisfy Standard 10 if the demolition of the rear wall and existing window openings on main block walls are minimized. This will allow for the restoration of the window openings in the future if the addition is removed, therefore meeting Standard 10.
- The proposed mechanical screening on the third-floor roof and railing on the fourth-floor roof deck is appropriate and satisfies the Roof Guidelines. The final application should provide details of the screening, railing design, and materials.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the massing of the addition and the screening and railings, but not the fenestration, cladding, or other design features, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 413 S 3rd St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Detweiler SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 2017 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Legalize windows and doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Margaret Szumski

Applicant: Jason Morris

History: 1885

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing windows and doors installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit on the front and rear facades at 2017 Sansom Street, a former stable and carriage house that was used for auto repair in later years. The existing windows and doors on the front façade were non-historic. In 2000, the Historical Commission approved one-over-one double-hung windows for the front façade. In 2024 and 2025, the Commission's staff responded to several inquiries about staff-level approvals for replacement windows and doors at this property. The staff responded that, despite the owner's desire to install casement windows, there was no historic documentation of casements in the window openings, and the staff was limited to approving double-hung windows for the front façade. Several months later, despite the guidance, the Commission's staff observed that new casement windows were installed on the front façade, with the lintel of the first-floor glass block-infilled opening lowered to be in line with the lintel above the doorway. A new garage door and entry door had been installed as well. The new entry door fills the entire height of the opening, which required the removal of the transom. At the rear, which had multi-light windows and doors in very deteriorated condition, new casement windows were installed. The existing doors were refurbished, with new glass without muntins. No building permits were obtained for the work. The Commission's staff requested that the Department of Licenses and Inspections issue a violation for the unpermitted work. The violation was issued on 3 April 2025. The property was listed for sale on 1 October 2025. An online advertisement of the sale indicates that the building was recently extensively rehabilitated and is being marketed for \$5.5 million. However, the City's Eclipse permitting system indicates that no building permits have been issued for the property. Soon after the sales listing, the applicant was made aware of the violations on the property, prompting this request for legalization.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize windows and doors installed without permits.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The new casement windows do not match the old windows in design. The transom was removed for installation of the new front entry door. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:13:51

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 OCTOBER 2025

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Realtor and developer Jason Morris represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein summarized the exterior front-facade work done without permits as three second-floor windows changed from double-hungs to casements, one first-floor window opening changed from glass block to a fixed window with the lintel lowered, the metal garage door replaced with a wood garage door, and the front door and transom removed and replaced with a full-height door. She observed that the rehabilitation of the building is a positive and questioned if a portion of the work could be approved.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed and commented that the new garage door is acceptable.
- Mr. Detwiler claimed that this is a situation where someone flipped a property and knowingly bypassed all building permits required for the work. He stated that he does not have sympathy for the applicant and that, while some of the work was done nicely, there are other aspects which would not have been approved. He noted that the property is for sale and there are violations that need to be cleared before the property is sold. He stated that the applicant is asking for forgiveness instead of permission.
 - Mr. Morris stated that there was never a request made to the Historical Commission regarding the replacement of the windows, as the staff has claimed. He stated that several window companies were asked to provide quotes, and that the company selected was responsible for seeking and obtaining approval and permits. He clarified that this is not a flip, and the property has been owned by the same person for almost 40 years, who is his friend. The owner broke her hip, then a wrist, and then the other wrist, and requested operability of the windows. She was unable to operate the existing double-hung windows. He referenced the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. He stated that the owner chose casement windows because they are able to be operated. He stated that the owner spent a lot of money on the project, which included brick repointing as well. He stated that he has received rave reviews about the property from neighbors.
- Ms. Stein asked Mr. Morris if he or the property owner had contacted the Historical Commission's staff to inquire about windows.
 - Mr. Morris responded that neither he nor the property owner contacted the Historical Commission.
 - Ms. Chantry clarified that a window company that had been asked to provide a quote for the new windows contacted the Historical Commission. That company was informed that the Historical Commission's staff was limited to approving double-hung windows, not casement windows, despite those being the owner's preference.
- Ms. Stein asked if Mr. Morris was aware that the work required the Historical Commission's approval as part of the permitting process.
 - Mr. Morris responded that acquiring approvals and permits was the subcontractor's responsibility.
 - Ms. Stein clarified that, ultimately, the property owner is always responsible for obtaining all permits and approvals.
 - Mr. Morris responded that he is assisting the owner because she is older and because of the confusion with regards to the permitting from the subcontractor. He reiterated that casements with cranks were important to the owner so that she

- can operate them and get fresh air.
- Ms. Gutterman explained that the owner or her representative should have obtained the requisite permits and approvals including those from the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Morris stated that he has been involved with several properties on this block and has worked with the Historical Commission in the past and is not responsible for this lack of permitting. He stated that he reached out to the Historical Commission after he learned of the violation for work without permits.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the lowering of the lintel over the first-floor window.
 - Mr. Morris responded that the existing opening had been heavily modified and raised at some point.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that Mr. Morris is incorrect, and that the header of the window was always taller than the garage door and entrance door. She invited him to produce photographs that would prove otherwise.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the removal of the door and transom.
 - Mr. Morris responded that it was an aesthetic decision to replace the entry with a full-height door to match the look of the new garage door.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that the historic windows and doors on the rear facade, which were replaced without a permit or approval, had many muntins, and now they have no muntins. He explained that this would have been part of a discussion with the Historical Commission had the permitting process not been circumvented.
- Ms. Stein asked about visibility of the rear of the building from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Morris stated that Ionic Street at the rear is a dead-end alley. He referenced many homeless people previously living behind the property.
 - Ms. Chantry displayed a photograph taken from Chestnut Street which clearly showed the rear of the building, owing to a recent demolition on Chestnut Street.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if a glass rail was installed outside of the second-floor rear doors.
 - Mr. Morris confirmed that a glass rail was installed so that no one falls out of the opening.
 - Ms. Gutterman indicated that it should have been reviewed as well.
- Mr. Morris asked the Committee to consider the before and after photographs to appreciate the level of improvements that he made to the property.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the improvements should have been permitted.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that Mr. Morris should have known that this work needed building permits and the Historical Commission's review, given the prior experience he claimed with historic buildings.
 - Mr. Morris stated that he has a lot of experience as a commercial realtor in selling historic commercial properties and helping buyers "sort their way through the Historical Commission" but in this case he was helping a friend whose deceased husband had wanted to rehabilitate the building. He asked for forgiveness because of the belief that the window subcontractor had received all required approvals. He apologized for not being more involved in the process. He stated that he was under the impression that the work completed would be looked upon as an improvement rather than something that displeased the Committee.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that the rehabilitation may be an improvement, but one that would have benefited from the Historical Commission's review and building permits. The building was completely rehabilitated inside and out without a single building permit.
- Mr. Detwiler asked the Historical Commission's staff if the mortar used for repointing was appropriate.

- Ms. Chantry responded that the staff does not know what was used because there was no consultation.
- Mr. Morris stated that the mason he employed was one that a former Historical Commission staff person recommended.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Windows and doors were installed on the front and rear facades and a first-floor masonry opening was altered without the Historical Commission's approval or building permits.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The new casement windows do not match the old windows in design. The transom was removed for installation of the new front entry door. The window opening was resized. A glass railing was installed. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 2017 Sansom St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:37:02

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:37 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.