

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

**TUESDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2026
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 9:01 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		
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		Arrived 9:27 a.m.
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		
Sam Weiner	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
- Joshua Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Alex Bruno, Leake Engineering
- Andy Cantu
- Asli Basoglu
- Brenden Garza, National Liberty Museum
- Chrissy Clawson, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
- Dorothy Boersma
- Eran Aharonovich
- Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
- Harry Leong
- Hsing-Yuan Chen, HYC Architect PC
- Jay Farrell
- John Cunningham
- Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
- Nancy Pontone

Roy Aharonovich, Vich Properties
Sam Xu, Constrecture LLC
Sara Pochedly, Toner Architects
Stephanie Magagna, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Trevor Cordivari, Lauren Thomsen Design
Zamir Garcia, M Architects

DRAFT

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 321-23 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Install mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: National Liberty Museum

Applicant: Brenden Garza, National Liberty Museum

History: E.W. Clark Bank, National Liberty Museum

Individual Designation: 6/30/1970

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install five rectangular murals on the east facade of the National Liberty Museum as part of an institutional revival and in preparation for the America 250th celebration. The murals would symbolize and highlight the museum's mission and values and activate this walkway that leads to the Ben Franklin Museum.

The five rectangular spaces where the murals would be installed were originally windows when the building was the E.W. Clark Bank. Those windows were infilled with brick at some point after 1959. The murals would be placed on the brick infill panels. The National Liberty Museum has chosen the mural artist Carrie Kingsbury of Promiseland Murals. The artist is proposing to use the parachute cloth method, painting with Nova Color Acrylic paint with an anti-graffiti coating and adhering the mural panels to the wall with a gel adhesive.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install five rectangular mural panels.

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.*

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Brenden Garza, Public Programs Manager at National Liberty Museum, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman raised a concern about the proposed method of installation and asked if the installation would be reversible without damaging the brick. She expressed worries about potential damage to the masonry surfaces if it were removed in the future.

- The staff pointed out that the brick in question is not historic. It is non-historic infill.
- Mr. Garza responded that the parachute method used by the mural artist involves a permanent adhesive similar to that used by Mural Arts Philadelphia. He acknowledged that while the method was designed to withstand the elements, there exist alternative methods that would be less permanent. He noted that, owing to the type of grant funding they received, the lifespan of the mural was intended to be between 10 to 15 years.
- Mr. Cluver mentioned that, since the murals would be applied to infill brick rather than historic materials, he had fewer concerns about potential damage.
- Mr. Detwiler emphasized the beauty and quality of the non-historic brick, noting that typically murals are done on less aesthetically pleasing surfaces like stucco. He supported the mural project but expressed the desire for a more reversible attachment method.
- Mr. Weiner inquired about the intended duration of the murals and the possibility of rotating installations and asked the dimensions of the mural panels.
 - Mr. Garza responded that the murals are intended for a long-term installation, noting that they could last up to 15 years. He provided the panel dimensions as 7'-6" by 5'-10".
- Ms. Gutterman suggested reviewing multiple installation methods with the Historical Commission for its input.
 - Mr. Garza mentioned that an aluminum signboard could be a less destructive option.
- Ms. Stein asked if the National Park Service had been consulted, owing to the alleyway's proximity to the Ben Franklin Museum.
 - Mr. Garza noted that National Liberty Museum would be consulting with the National Park Service after bringing the project through the Historical Commission's process to make sure that murals would be feasible.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired if there were any precedents for the proposed mural system that had been approved by the Historical Commission. He echoed Ms. Gutterman's suggestion to present both proposed methods, including attachment details, to the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. Farnham confirmed that the Historical Commission had approved similar murals attached to non-historic masonry previously; however, he noted he is not familiar with an instance when such a mural was removed from a masonry surface.
- Ms. Stein expressed support for the mural project, which was echoed by Mr. McCoubrey.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The murals would be installed on non-historic brick infill panels. It is essential that the applicants explore and present options for removal that minimize damage, potentially using a less invasive installation method.
- The applicant should present multiple mural installation methods to the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application would satisfy Standard 9 if multiple installation methods were presented and the least invasive method was ultimately chosen.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the alternative method of attachment is presented to the Historical Commission, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 321-23 Chestnut St					
MOTION: Approval with a condition					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1823 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Insert garage; remove additions; add roof deck with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Patrick Duffy

Applicant: Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design

History: 1856; rear addition 1896

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several alterations to the rear addition and rear roof at 1823 Delancey Place, a contributing property in the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The existing rear addition may date to an 1896 alteration by Furness & Evans, with the rear copper bay added by 1916 at the latest. The rear of the building is on Cypress Street, a service alley with many garage entrances and visible decks on this block.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Insert garage entrance at rear
- Remove one-story bump out over man door at rear
- Remove existing non-historic rooftop addition on main block
- Construct rear deck with pilot house on rear addition

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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 proposed scope for the rear of the building is compatible with the historic features and environment, satisfying Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:23:18

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Lauren Thomsen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler thanked Ms. Thomsen for a thorough application. He explained that he knows the building's quirks well, having looked at it previously with a prospective buyer, and he commended Ms. Thomsen on her design solutions. He asked if the structural work required to open the ground-floor wall for the garage entry had been studied.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that she worked with Larsen & Landis Structural Engineers to ensure that a garage door could fit in that space. She acknowledged that the alteration would require a lot of steel. She explained that the intent is for the chimney in the wall above the garage opening to remain. The steel structural framing would be inserted below the main living level and above the garage in the rear.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that the alteration to the rear bay would typically give him pause, but that knowing how complicated this space is on the second floor, he considered the alteration to be an appropriate solution. He asked if the roofing on the mansard is proposed for replacement.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that the sloped roof areas of the mansard will not be replaced, but the flat roof area will.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the existing pilot house is actually a very early pilot house, but that removing it would be an improvement. He noted that it opens out onto the neighbor's roof. He asked about the cladding material of the new pilot house and suggested that the siding detail be similar to the one being removed.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that she was planning on using fiber cement siding in a tone which is in keeping with the mansard.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the infill material on the side wall where a bay is being removed. He suggested that it be infilled with brick.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that the material has not yet been selected but that there should be salvaged brick available to use.
- Mr. McCoubrey thanked Ms. Thomsen on her clear presentation. He asked about the transition area of copper to brick at the base of the bay and over the man door.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that the goal was to maintain as much existing copper as possible in the intervention. She stated that the rendering is showing an existing piece of copper above the head of the man door, but that it looks out of place. She offered to eliminate it in favor of a proper cornice for a brick wall. She cautioned that they do not yet know what is behind the copper in that area.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that the existing copper end bracket be dropped down and repurposed.

- Ms. Gutterman noted that the plans do not show a deck on the main block of the building. She asked if there is a deck proposed for that area, owing to the pilot house having two doors, one of which opens onto the main block.
 - Ms. Thomsen responded that the access door is strictly to service the mechanical equipment on the main block roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey expressed no opposition to the removal of the bump out and agreed with the earlier suggestion of reusing the copper bracket.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that this space is very dark, and this is a rare instance where removal of historic fabric will help the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes a roof deck on the rear ell, not on the main block of the building.
- The existing pilot house will be replaced by a smaller pilot house positioned off of the main block.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed scope for the rear of the building is compatible with the historic features and environment, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided brick is used as infill where the kitchen bay is being removed on the side, and salvaged copper including the bracket is reused in the modification on the side, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1823 Delancey PI					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1601 S 13TH ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate church for residential use

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Annex Investments II

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1892; St. John's Baptist Church; Samuel Hall Day and Charles E. Oelschlager, architects

Individual Designation: 6/12/2020

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, Theodore.Maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: In January 2026, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved an in-concept application to convert the former St. John's Baptist Church in South Philadelphia to residential use. That application proposed to renovate the Romanesque Revival building and insert additional floor levels inside to convert it to a 26-unit apartment building.

The overall scope of the project, which was approved in concept, has not changed. The applicants have submitted a revised in-concept application seeking clarity on the form of the dormers that the Commission would approve, as the dormers have a significant impact on the design of the interior spaces and the financial viability of the project.

The first version of this project proposed four gabled dormers on the Tasker Street elevation. The Historical Commission's staff and the Architectural Committee suggested that combining the dormers into one or more shed dormers would make the dormers less obtrusive.

At the January 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission, the applicant presented a revised proposal with two wider shed dormers on each side of the building. The Commissioners opined that these revised dormers remained obtrusive and were not compatible with the overall massing. The Commissioners also recommended that the applicants explore a variety of roofing materials to replace the slate.

The applicants have submitted a revised dormer scheme showing four shed dormers on the Tasker Street elevation and five on the opposite side. They have also submitted a roofing estimate with various materials.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install new roof dormers
- Replace roofing

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 new dormers have a significant impact on the building. During a previous review, a variety of suggestions were offered about the form and number of dormers which would best mitigate this impact, but no consensus was found.

- *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.*
 - As stated above, the proposed dormers will have a significant visual impact. Careful design may mitigate this impact and meet the Standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, provided the proposed dormers are redesigned to be smaller and better blend with the existing historic roof structure, pursuant to Standards 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:43:57

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sara Shonk Pochedly of Toner Architects represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Lukachik asked why the combined dormer scheme reviewed by the Historical Commission had been abandoned. She asked if the applicants declined to explore that solution or if the Historical Commission had rejected it.
 - Ms. Pochedly stated that the property owner was trying to find a solution that both the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission supported before completing the final plans.
 - Ms. Lukachik commented that she found the combined shed dormer preferable to the four smaller dormers.
- Ms. Stein inquired about plans to maintain the small areas between the dormers and how the applicant intended to install sufficient flashing and refresh paint, siding, and roofing in the very narrow spaces.
 - Ms. Pochedly clarified that the proposed dimension between the dormers is 2'-6" and that the team is confident that the space is sufficient for the installation and maintenance of those components.
- Mr. Cluver expressed the opinion that the shed dormers are more successful than the gable dormers but that the proposal for the larger dormers featured a lot of siding. He suggested that adding more windows with mullions and limiting the cladding on the front of the dormers would make them appear more compatible with the historic building and less obtrusive visually.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed that cheek walls closer to the window would appear more historically accurate. He suggested a slight variation on the dormer scheme previously reviewed by the Historical Commission, with combined dormers, but a narrower dimension closer to 16 feet wide, which would match the overall dimension of these smaller dormers.
 - He agreed with Mr. Cluver that additional windows and more space between the two large dormers would mitigate the visual impact.
 - Mr. Detwiler referred to the submitted plans and noted that the trusses shown could meet the dormers at a mullion point.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed with his colleagues that additional glazing would improve the appearance of larger dormers, similar to clerestory windows.

- He also noted that the depicted windows, which do not have a height listed in the drawings, appear tall and that reducing their height would also improve the dormers' appearance.
- Mr. McCoubrey further noted that shrinking the larger dormers slightly would also pull them away from features such as the parapet of the masonry facade facing 13th Street.
- Mr. Detwiler concurred that, if the wider dormers can be pulled away from features including the tower, the design will be more successful.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that double windows on the dormers would help break up the mass.
- Mr. Detwiler sought clarification about the proposed roofing material.
 - Ms. Pochedly answered that they were considering asphalt shingles, which will roughly suggest a slate appearance.
 - Mr. Detwiler said that, if the roof was slate, the dormers could be sided in slate, but that asphalt shingles were an inappropriate cladding for the dormers and that siding would be better.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the dormer siding should be colored like the roof.
- Ms. Pochedly asked for feedback on the roofing material and referred to the submitted estimates which showed that the cost of slate would be \$200,000 more than slate-like asphalt shingles. She mentioned that the owner is concerned about the viability of the project and hoping to get a firm approval of the asphalt shingles.
 - Mr. Cluver pointed out that slate, given its long lifespan, would likely be cheaper in the long run.
 - Ms. Pochedly noted that the owner was unable to secure insurance for the existing slate roof and that inability is driving the full roof replacement.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant had submitted specific products or samples for review by the staff. Mr. Detwiler asked if the Commission had approved asphalt shingles as replacement for slate in similar situations.
 - Ms. Pochedly replied that while she had not submitted samples to the staff for this in-concept review, she had done so in the past while obtaining approval for similar projects and that asphalt had been approved as a replacement for slate in several projects she had worked on.
- Mr. Weiner asked about the age of the existing slate roof.
 - Ms. Pochedly replied that she did not know the age, but that it was in need of repair.
 - Mr. Weiner and Mr. Detwiler suggested that repair of the existing roof may be possible and would likely meet insurers' requirements.
 - Mr. Weiner pointed out that the synthetic slate product included in the submitted estimate from a roofing contractor has a relatively short lifespan of approximately 25 years. He said slate lasts 100 years.
 - Mr. Cluver reiterated that slate is cheaper in the long term and said that though he understood that a project like this is driven by "first cost," the Architectural Committee's job it to look at the long-term preservation of the building.
 - Mr. Detwiler said that in his opinion the Architectural Committee would prefer either new slate or repaired slate.
 - Ms. Pochedly replied that the developer will not move forward with the project if slate is required. The project is not financially viable with slate.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Combining the dormers into wider shed dormers could meet the Standards if changes are made, including reducing the cladding on the front of the dormers and reducing the dormers in size from those previously considered by the Historical Commission.
- That slate roofing requires a higher upfront cost but lasts a long time. Also, the existing slate roof may be able to be repaired.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, as the proposed dormers remain too obtrusive.

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

ITEM: 1601 S 13th St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 8226 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Construct multi-unit residential building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Vich Properties LLC and VP 8226 Germantown LLC

Applicant: Stephanie Boggs Magagna, Klehr, Harrison, Harvey, Bransburg LLP

History: 1760; Detweiler House; new façade, 1800

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks in-concept approval for the construction of a four-story mixed-use building and parking spaces at 8226 Germantown Avenue. The “Detweiler House,” an eighteenth-century stone house, occupies the southeast portion of the lot. No exterior alterations or additions are proposed for the historic building. The new building will occupy the northeastern portion of the lot with new parking at the property’s rear. The new building’s size and massing has been reduced compared to previous proposals. The new building’s exterior

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 FEBRUARY 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

is largely clad in off-white stucco and will have a slate mansard roof with dormers. Portions of the ground floor's public facing façade will feature stone similar in appearance to the historic building.

Two previous versions of this project have undergone in-concept review by the Architectural Committee, most recently in November 2024. At that meeting the Committee recommended denial, stating that the new construction's massing, size, and architectural features were not compatible with the historic property. The application was withdrawn before review by the Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story building with parking.
- Interior renovation of historic building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed new construction does not alter the historic building's exterior appearance nor any historic features. The proposed massing, size, and scale does not overwhelm the existing building. The proposal satisfies Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed new construction does not connect to the historic building nor does this proposal contain any exterior alterations to the historic building. Therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept of the new building and parking, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:04:12

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Schroeder presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Zamir Garcia of M Architecture; attorney Stephanie Magagna of Klehr, Harrison, Harvey, Branzburg, LLP; and owner's representative Roy Aharonovich of Vich Properties represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler noted his appreciation to the applicants for taking previous comments from the Architectural Committee and community seriously and commended their current design.
- Mr. Cluver agreed but noted that the dormers on the top floor appear top heavy and suggested a fascia or small cornice over the windows or door that tuck under the main cornice that continues across the top of the mansard roof. Mr. Cluver also

- suggested better continuity amongst the lite sizes across all of the windows and doors. Mr. Cluver then for clarification on the exterior materials.
- Mr. Garcia confirmed the exterior would be real stucco with a fine sand finish.
 - Ms. Stein asked if any steps were being taken to protect the Detweiler House itself and if any applications for work to the building would be presented to the Architectural Committee at a later date.
 - Mr. Aharonovich confirmed that they will restore the historic building and turn it into a residence, aiming to keep the original features as much as possible.
 - Ms. Magagna noted that only interior work will be undertaken at the historic house.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if the rear bay on the Detweiler House was being retained.
 - Mr. Aharonovich confirmed the bay would remain.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if the applicants had secured approvals for entering the parking area from the neighboring property.
 - Ms. Magagna replied that the owner had purchased the neighboring property at 8224 Germantown Avenue and that there was an existing easement for parking access.
 - Mr. McCoubrey complimented the applicants for respecting the Detweiler House's historic relationship to the surrounding landscape.
 - Mr. Aharonovich stated they planned to integrate the new construction into the overall landscape of the property while respecting the Detweiler House's unique position on the lot.
 - Mr. Detweiler noted that much of the Detweiler House's interior fabric was original and historic and encouraged its retention. He also commended the semi-green parking area as compatible with the property's historic landscape.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The new construction's exterior will be clad in real stucco.
- No exterior changes will be made to the Detweiler House.
- The Detweiler House's interior retains a significant amount of historic fabric and features.
- The new construction's materials, size, and massing are compatible with the neighborhood, which is part of a National Register historic district, although the Detweiler House is only individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and not part of a historic district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The new construction's appearance, size, massing, and orientation do not detract from the Detweiler House's historic appearance or its relationship to the surrounding landscape and therefore the application satisfies Standard 9.
- The new construction does not alter or connect with the historic Detweiler House's exterior, therefore the application satisfies Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 FEBRUARY 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ITEM: 8226 Germantown Ave					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 5416-26 LENA ST

Proposal: Convert three-story garage building for residential use

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John A. Cunningham, Birdtalon LLC

Applicant: Hsing-Yuan Chen, HYC Architect PC

History: c. 1914-30

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Germantown Urban Village Historic District, Contributing, 2/9/2024

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert a currently unused industrial building in the Germantown Urban Village Historic District into apartments. The building was constructed between 1914 and 1930 and is three stories tall with a fieldstone façade and faces Lena Street. To accomplish the conversion, the application proposes to install new windows and storefronts in existing openings on the front façade of the building and insert a series of new window openings in a side façade that faces the adjacent Earlham Street. The application also proposes to re-stucco the side façade and install a lightwell on the roof. In addition, an existing paved storage area surrounded by a CMU wall will be repurposed into a parking lot with an added egress door. The new windows and window openings will be visible from the adjacent Lena and Earlham Streets.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install new windows and storefronts
- Insert new window openings
- Install new stucco
- Install a lightwell

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 new windows, storefronts, window openings, and lightwell satisfy Standard 9 provided that the materials used are compatible. They will be differentiated from old features and are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property.
- The proposed new stucco will satisfy Standard 9 provided that it is toned down to better blend with the historic character of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the new windows and storefronts are made with compatible materials and the new stucco is revised to a darker color that is more compatible with the historic materials of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:28:55

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Hsing-Yuan Chen and developer John A. Cunningham of the Birdnest Group represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the new windows proposed for the side elevation. She asked if the applicants considered using a window that was larger and more similar to the industrial windows on the front of the building.
 - Mr. Chen responded that their first design had larger windows proposed but, after consulting with a structural engineer, they learned they would not be able to install larger windows without also installing an extensive steel support structure for the wall.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked the architect to clarify that, with the current window proposal, they do not need to install new steel framing inside.
 - Mr. Chen answered that they do still need to install some additional framing, but it will be much lighter. The heavy framing would cause budget issues.
- Mr. Weiner asked if there was a way to combine the current single windows or least move them closer together to give the look of double-wide windows.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed.
 - Mr. Detwiler added that seeing five double windows would be better than the current ten single strips.
 - Mr. Chen referred to the floor plans for the project and pointed out that the windows currently are positioned on either side of interior partition walls.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that they could still position double windows with the centers straddling the interior walls. They do not necessarily need to be true paired windows either and they could just be repositioned to appear as a single unit from the outside.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed that redesigning the windows should be possible without having to redo the interior layout; better windows would look more appropriate.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested that, if they combine two of the windows with a mullion between them, they would roughly be the same width as the windows on the front. He also suggested removing the vertical band below the windows as it emphasizes the verticality too much. They should be aiming for an appearance of

- punched openings on each floor, which would emphasize the industrial look more.
- Mr. Chen responded that he would look into all of these suggestions.
 - Ms. Gutterman clarified that they do not need to be giant openings that would require the wall to be reframed, but just large enough to combine the many single openings they currently show into pairs with single lintels above them.
 - Mr. Chen responded that the suggestions make sense and they should be able to make the recommended adjustments.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked if there were any historic photographs of the front façade.
 - Mr. Till responded that the staff was unable to find any.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that the proposed second and third-floor windows on the front look good but suggested that the first-floor openings could be adjusted to look more in keeping with the industrial nature of the building and could be made more compatible with the upper windows. As proposed, they look a little too much like a contemporary storefront. Since the building is simple, small details like these stand out more.
 - Ms. Stein also suggested adding a low, approximately eighteen-inch, base below the curtain walls of the storefront windows, which would make them more durable.
 - Mr. Cluver disagreed and explained that he likes the cleaner glass system that recalls the look of a garage door.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested it could be a panel system.
 - Ms. Stein added that the bases would not have to be masonry. Both expressed worry that without a base the system would not survive as long.
 - Mr. Cluver agreed with the comment about the durability and suggested that, if a base is used, that it is set back within the opening and not even with the stone facade.
 - Mr. Chen agreed that they would not install anything even with the façade.
 - Ms. Stein asked if they are infilling any of the façade or adding new stone.
 - Mr. Chen confirmed that they are not infilling anything and using the historic façade as is.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if they are proposing to paint the CMU wall surrounding the parking area.
 - Mr. Chen responded that they are only planning to clean it and paint it. They are not adding any new material.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented on the staff recommendation about the stucco. He suggested starting with the color of the existing mortar on the front as a reference for the shade for the stucco or going a little darker than that.
 - Mr. Chen asked if he was referring to the stucco on the side wall.
 - Mr. Detwiler confirmed he was and asked about the staff recommendation.
 - Mr. Till explained that the staff felt the proposed stucco color was too light and that it should be toned down and made a bit grayer to better fit in with the industrial nature of the building.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed and added that they are looking for less contrast between the stucco and the front façade.
 - Mr. Detwiler further explained that typically what he would do for a project such as this is to look at the mortar color on the front and use that as a base for the palette. That shade or a few steps darker would likely work well.
 - Ms. Stein inquired about the roof. She commented that there is visibility of the roof from various long views and asked if they are proposing to place mechanical units on

- it. If so, that needs to be specified on the application, and they should show where they will be located.
- Mr. Chen responded that they are planning on placing mechanical units on the roof, roughly near the back side close to the party wall.
 - Ms. Stein asked if the equipment will be one large unit.
 - Mr. Chen clarified there will be a small condenser for each apartment.
 - Ms. Stein asked that they show that detail on the application before they present it to the Historical Commission and they would also ideally provide a sheet showing the sight lines.
 - Mr. Chen agreed to add the requested materials.
 - Mr. Weiner inquired if the applicants have done any work to the existing stone on the façade or plan to restore it. In one of the submitted images, it looks like it has been cleaned up.
 - Mr. Chen responded that it definitely needs some attention.
 - Mr. Weiner asked when the photograph was taken.
 - Mr. Chen answered that is it one or two years old.
 - Ms. Stein asked if the image showing a cleaner facade is a rendering or real photograph.
 - Mr. Chen responded that it is not a rendering but was cleaned up a bit for the presentation.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if they were planning on re-pointing and cleaning.
 - Mr. Chen confirmed they will be.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked them to consult with the staff on proper cleaning and pointing methods.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed skylight over the light well and its compliance with the building code. She asked if they are using it for ventilation.
 - Mr. Chen responded that it is operable, so it does provide both light and air.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested they use a true stucco for the side wall and not something like an EIFS product, which is a plastic, stucco-like material.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that he thinks this is a great proposed reuse of the building.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if they have images or drawings of the other two facades of the building.
 - Mr. Chen responded that they did not include them because they are not doing any work to those facades; they are blank party walls.
 - Ms. Gutterman commented that they still need to be included in the application and asked that they be added in for the review at the Historical Commission meeting.
 - Mr. Chen agreed to do so.
 - Ms. Stein commented that overall, the application lacks some drawings and details that they normally expect to see. She urged the applicants to add those details to the application before the next Historical Commission meeting.
 - Mr. Chen commented that they will.
 - Mr. Detwiler expressed support for the project overall and commented that projects like this were why this district was created.
 - Mr. Chen commented that he will incorporate all their comments and notes into the next version of their application.
 - Mr. Cunningham, the developer of the building, asked for some clarification on the first-floor windows on the front façade. He asked if the proposed treatment for the center opening is acceptable as is.

- Mr. Detwiler responded that although it has four divisions in it, it could still be refined to have better proportions and a relationship to the upper floors. As is, it looks a little too much like an off-the-shelf storefront.
- Mr. Cunningham agreed and added that they will be restoring the stone on the façade and cleaning up and repainting the CMU wall.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested they look to the existing stone as a guide for a good color to paint the wall.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The windows proposed for the side façade should be revised and grouped together into pairs to better reflect the industrial design of the building.
- The first-floor openings on the front façade should be revised to more closely relate to the upper floors and the industrial history of the building.
- The stucco proposed for the side facade is too light in color and should be revised to be closer in tone to the mortar on the front façade.
- The application currently lacks information on several aspects of the project including the proposed placement of rooftop mechanical units, plans for restoration of the front façade, and the proposed treatment for the south and west facades.
- With revisions based on the comments made today, the Historical Commission could likely approve the application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9. The proposed new windows, storefronts are not compatible with the architectural features of the property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval if the suggested revisions are implemented, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 5416-26 Lena St					
MOTION: Denial as submitted, but approval with revisions					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Detweiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1018 WINTER ST

Proposal: Demolish and reconstruct upper floors with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ken Leong and Marie Chin

Applicant: Sam Xu, Constrecture LLC

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 4/25/1974

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolishing the majority of the primary façade, roof, and rear ell at the building at 1018 Winter Street and reconstructing the building with a contemporary design and materials. The building was constructed in 1830 and retains a high level of historic integrity with its form, features, and materials. The property at 1018 Winter Street is individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Although the rear of the property has a parking area, the back of the building is not visible from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish majority of second and third floors including roof and dormers.
- Construct second and third floors including front façade.
- Construct pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spacial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The application proposes a significant amount of demolition, including the front façade's second floor, roof, and dormer. Therefore, the application does not meet Standard 2.
- *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.*
 - The proposed alterations to the front façade in terms of materials, features, scale, and proportion do not meet Standard 9.
 - The proposed increase in size and massing at the rear of the property overwhelms the original form and environment of the historic building and does not meet Standard 9.
- *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 and proposed new construction permanently alter the historic building's form and integrity; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*

- The location of the proposed pilot house at the rear of the property could meet the Roofs Guideline if other aspects of the application were revised to meet Standards 2, 9, and 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:58:41

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sam Xu and owner Harry Leong represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked about the need for extensive demolition of the building. She observed that, although the applicant provided a series of photographs showing the present condition, the applicant did not provide a structural report. Ms. Stein explained that the Architectural Committee often reviews applications for buildings that have been vacant for years and require extensive repairs. She requested that the applicant explain the need for so much demolition at an individually designated building.
 - Mr. Xu stated that the inside and outside of building have been modified over time. He pointed to the extensive deterioration and explained that the intent of their proposed scope of work was to improve the overall condition of the building.
- Ms. Stein observed that the aerial photos in the application show that a small section of the building has been removed at the very back. She commented that the main roofs appear intact and asked Mr. Xu if they were leaking.
 - Mr. Xu confirmed that there is no water infiltration from the main gable roof.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that, for the Architectural Committee to consider the proposed demolition scope, they need a structural report with an assessment stating that the house must be demolished. She said that, even if demolition was allowed, the new design would need to maintain a compatible front elevation. Ms. Stein asserted that the applicant and owner cannot demolish the house because they wish to build something new. They need to preserve the historic house if possible.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the current proposal would be considered a demolition.
 - Ms. Gutterman added that the question in her mind is whether it is a case of demolition by neglect.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that, typically, in a situation like this, the expectation would be that the main block of the house would remain intact, and the rear of the property could be considered for removal. He commented on the lack of visibility of the rear area of the building but stressed that the Architectural Committee would still need to review a structural report stating whether it could be saved.
 - Mr. Xu inquired if maintaining the front portion of the property and building new in the rear would be an acceptable proposal.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee would need to review a drawing of the revised proposal and would still need a structural engineering report with an assessment of the building's condition.
 - Mr. Xu confirmed they would obtain structural engineering report.
- Mr. Xu pointed out that adjacent and nearby buildings on Winter Street had been modified.

- Ms. Gutterman replied that the adjacent buildings may or may not be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, so it would be difficult to say what sort of review process was undertaken that led to the approvals of those alterations.
- Ms. Mehley stated that adjacent buildings are historically designated. She explained that the single building to the left at 1016 Winter Street and the three buildings to the right at 1020, 1022, and 1024 Winter Street are all individually designated.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that, for this review, the Architectural Committee needs to remain focused on the building at 1018 Winter Street, which is individually designated.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that changes to the adjacent buildings may have been undertaken prior to their historic designations.
- Mr. Gutterman said that the Architectural Committee is not saying that the applicant cannot change the rear of the property but that he will need to tell them what they are planning to do.
- Mr. Detwiler stated they should also preserve as much original fabric as possible in the process. He said the Historical Commission often allows modifications of rear eaves.
- Mr. Leong explained that the building at 1018 Winter Street belongs to his family and he currently lives around the corner. He said that he maintains the front of the building because it is not presently occupied. Mr. Leong commented that his intention with the proposed design was to maintain the front of the building as much as possible with changes to the back of the building. He said the building was his childhood home and that his intention was to move back into the building.
 - Mr. Weiner pointed out to Mr. Leong that that is not what his application is proposing.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed and pointed out that the application drawings show a completely new front facade and new interior. She said that this is not an acceptable intervention to an individually designated property. Ms. Gutterman recommended that the applicant and owner think about restoring the front elevation of the building and maintaining the gable roof and dormer. She said that rear of the building could be modified with a compatible renovation or new construction in terms of massing and scale.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed that any new construction would need to occur at the back of the building, not at the front.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- A structural engineering report should be submitted with an assessment of the building's structural integrity and identification of unsafe areas.
- To satisfy the Standards, the proposal should be revised to maintain the building's main block and limit changes to the rear that are compatible with the materials, features, scale and proportion of the main block.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2, owing to the significant demolition proposed for the front façade’s second floor, gable roof, and front dormer.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 as the proposed front façade alterations are incompatible in terms of the materials, features, scale, and proportion. The proposed increase in size and massing at the rear of the property overwhelms the original form and environment of the historic building.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 10 because the proposed demolition and new construction would permanently alter the historic building’s form and integrity.

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

ITEM: 1018 Winter St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Detweiler					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:19:55

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:21 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.