

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

**TUESDAY, 23 JUNE 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 9:00 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		
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		
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
- Olivia Dec, Intern
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Kristin Hankins, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Joshua Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Andrew Biggin
- American Swedish Historical Museum
- Andrew Cole
- Andy Gray
- Al Wulff, Wulff Architects
- Brenna March, Gnome Architects
- Brittany Scherer
- Dane Jensen
- Derek Spencer, Gnome Architects
- Eileen Quigley, Esq.
- Ellen Feringa

Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Hassan Qureshi
Jay Farrell
J. Toro
Justin Bright
Justino Navaro
Nancy Pontone
Ori Feibush
Patricia Freeland
Rustin Ohler, HDOA
Ryan Solimeo, HDOA
Sara Pochedly, Toner Architects
Scott Woodruff
Theresa Stuhlman, Philadelphia Parks and Recreation
William Walther
Xiaofan Wu
Ximena Conde, Philadelphia Inquirer

DRAFT

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1000 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Construct addition and roof decks; modify storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1000 Spruce Street LLC

Applicant: Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architects

History: 1872; Charles Borie House

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Daniel.Shachar-Krasnoff@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the rowhouse at 1000 Spruce Street, constructed 1872, including the rehabilitation of the ground-floor commercial space and seven apartments and the expansion of a one-story mid-century commercial building with a three-story addition. Exterior alterations would include reopening the glazed storefront on the east façade, constructing roof decks, demolishing a non-contributing hyphen, and constructing a two-story addition on a one-story commercial building at the rear on S. 10th Street. The roof decks do not appear to be visible directly across S. 10th or Spruce Streets. The addition will be clad in brick to match the primary façade of the of the one-story commercial building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Reopen glazed storefront on the east façade.
- Construct roof decks.
- Demolish non-contributing hyphen.
- Rehabilitate one-story commercial building.
- Construct a three-story addition above the one-story commercial building.

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.*
 - Reopening the east façade storefront is appropriate as the 1987 brick infill is not original.
 - The roof decks are not visible from across S.10th or Spruce Streets.
- *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 hyphen to be demolished is not original and lacks significance.
 - The addition is set back five feet from the primary façade.
 - The proposed addition to the one-story commercial building would be compatible with the building and district if a cornice and/or other restrained ornament is added.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a cornice and/or other restrained ornament is added to the addition to the commercial building, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:57

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey noted that, although the pilot houses would not be visible directly across S. 10th or Spruce Streets, they would likely be visible further down these streets because the building is on a corner lot.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that the railings have been designed to be as transparent as possible and, although the pilot house may be seen at some distance, their locations have been situated to minimize visibility.
- Mr. McCoubrey was curious about the infilled basement windows on the S. 10th Street facade.
 - Mr. Ohler stated that two windows are infilled now and the other contains an air conditioner unit. When a tenant is identified, the Historical Commission will be contacted to determine the treatment for the basement windows.
- Mr. Cluver wondered why the Roofs Guideline was not referenced in the staff recommendation. He expressed concern that the roof decks occupy too much of the roof.
 - Mr. Krasnoff acknowledged the Roofs Guideline's relevance to the application. He also noted that the proposed pilot houses have been designed to minimize visibility.
- Mr. Cluver suggested combining the pilot houses on the corner building into a single staircase.
 - Mr. Ohler opined that the Building Code requires separate stairs if the building has more than one unit. A common commercial stair is required if the pilot houses are combined.
- McCoubrey suggested reducing the pilot house cornices to minimize visibility.
 - Mr. Ohler agreed to reconsider the cornices.
- Mr. Detwiler wondered about the height of the pilot houses.
 - Mr. Ohler replied that the pilot houses are 9' tall with an 8' internal clearance. He noted there is no deck on the roof to minimize pilot house height.
- Mr. Detwiler maintained that the pilot house perpendicular to S. 10th Street will be more visible.
 - Mr. Ohler agreed to consider further changes to the citing of the pilot houses.
- Mr. McCoubrey proposed a mock-up of the pilot houses prior to construction.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed concern that the view from the upper bay at the rear of the corner building would be the addition's blank north wall.
- Mr. Detwiler complimented setting back the two-story addition of the commercial building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This application proposes alterations to the rowhouse at 1000 Spruce Street, which was constructed 1872, and the expansion of a one-story mid-century commercial

- building with a two-story addition.
- The roof deck will be visible from locations along S. 10th and Spruce streets.
- The addition to the mid-block commercial building has little ornamentation.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The reopening of the storefront and the addition of inconspicuous roof decks satisfies Standard 2.
- The demolition of the non-contributing hyphen and the set-back addition to the mid-block commercial building satisfies Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the addition is revised to include a cornice and/or other restrained ornament and a mock-up ensures that the pilot houses are inconspicuous, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 1000 Spruce St					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
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	6	1			

ADDRESS: 1800 TASKER ST

Proposal: Install mural on west façade
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Dane Jensen
 Applicant: Dane Jensen, 18th and Tasker LLC
 History: 1886; Presbyterian Church of the Evangel
 Individual Designation: 10/10/2025
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, Heather.Hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The structure at 1800 Tasker Street is a historic church building currently being converted for commercial use. As part of this adaptive reuse project, the property owner proposes to install a hand-painted mural on the west facade of the building. The mural is intended to reflect the character of the surrounding neighborhood and to respond to the requests of adjacent residents who face the mural wall and who have expressed a desire for a vibrant, community-oriented artwork at this location.

The project is being managed by Trotter Cole Advisory (TCA), a public art consulting firm based in Philadelphia. TCA will lead artist selection, community engagement, and all aspects of project

management through final installation. The mural will be hand-painted directly on the wall surface by an artist selected through a structured community process.

The west wall has recently been and continues to be refinished as part of permitted masonry work undertaken by O'Neill Masonry. The mural will be directly applied to the newly restored lime plaster surface once all masonry work is complete. The proposed materials are acrylic paint and an anti-graffiti coating, both of which are vapor permeable.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install mural.

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 mural will not cover or destroy historic materials. It will be differentiated from and compatible with the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details including final paint and sealant choices pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:24:38

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Consultant Andrew Cole and owner Dane Jensen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Jensen introduced the project and explained that it emerged from the team's community engagement efforts. He noted that the large stained-glass window on the west facade was being removed to accommodate an ADA-required elevator, which will leave a substantial blank wall facing neighboring properties. Because nearby residents expressed concern about the visual impact, the team proposed installing a mural as a community benefit, an idea that received strong neighborhood support. He added that only a small portion of the mural would be visible from the public right-of-way; the majority would be seen only by the adjacent neighbors.
- Ms. Stein asked the applicant whether the mural would be applied over stucco or brick.
 - Mr. Jensen confirmed that the rear is currently stucco in poor condition and that O'Neill Masonry is working on applying a lime stucco which will be complete before the mural is painted.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the three windows in the gable end will be removed.
 - Mr. Jensen confirmed that all three will be removed. He noted that most of the stained glass is already missing from the large central window and that all other stained-glass windows elsewhere on the building will be restored apart from one that will be restored with clear glazing. He reiterated that the windows on the gable end were selected as the "sacrificial lamb" for ADA elevator placement and

- that the work was already permitted.
- Mr. Detwiler commended the applicant for his extensive preservation work and noted that the mural would be largely for neighbor benefit and not public view. He stated no objection as long as the mural materials allowed the building to breathe.
- Mr. Cluver echoed his support and asked the applicant if they had consulted with Mural Arts regarding installation technique. He noted that Mural Arts sometimes applies murals on fabric rather than directly on walls owing to past failures and suggested that the applicants review lessons learned to ensure durability.
 - Mr. Jensen explained that they initially contacted Mural Arts, but Mural Arts does not take on non-public murals. He stated that they then engaged Trotter Cole Advisory, whose staff includes former Mural Arts personnel.
 - Mr. Cole confirmed that their proposed materials and techniques match Mural Arts' best practices. He noted that his partner Elizabeth Clark previously worked closely with Mural Arts and stated that they will provide a shortlist of artists and that technical standards are already included in the submission.
- Mr. Cluver requested clarification on the expectations of durability and maintenance.
 - Mr. Cole stated that the durability aligned with Mural Arts' standards but would confirm specifics with his partner.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that Mural Arts uses both direct-paint and fabric-applied methods.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the staff is familiar with permeability requirements and mural coating perm rating requirements.
- Ms. Lukachik raised the question of whether the Architectural Committee would consider recommending approval of the entire mural area proposal or only the area that is not visible from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that he supports the full-area mural and liked that a small portion would be visible from the street.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed mural is acceptable in principle, provided it is executed in a way that does not harm the historic structure.
- The proposed mural area, both the non-public and the small publicly visible portions, is appropriate.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9, as the mural would not cover or damage historic fabric.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review final details including paint and sealant choices, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1800 Tasker St					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
SECONDED BY: Lukachik					
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: 1319-25 MARKET ST

Proposal: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Granite Penn Square LLC

Applicant: Eileen Quigley, Ballard Spahr LLP

History: 1930; Market Street National Bank; Ritter & Shay, architects

Individual Designation: 12/18/1985

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes hotel signage and lighting at the former Market Street National Bank, now Marriot Residence Inn, at 1319-25 Market Street. The fabric banner signage is proposed for three locations on the historic building. Two of the sign banners would be located at the corner of Market and Juniper Streets. A third banner sign would face Juniper Street at the corner of Commerce and Juniper Streets. The signage would be 20 feet tall by three feet wide and connected to hardware installed into mortar joints. Additional signage would be incorporated into the existing contemporary awning located above the hotel’s main entrance on Juniper Street. It would be channel letters on a black metal curved band. The existing awning was approved by the Historical Commission. Uplighting is also proposed on the awning and on the building ledge under the banner signs.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install signage and lighting.

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 fabric banner signs could be compatible with the historic building and meet Standard 9 if their size and scale were reduced. The proposed installation of the banners directly against the building could potentially trap moisture and cause

- damage to the terra cotta. To meet Standard 9, the banner must be offset from the building's façade, and the applicant must provide technical information about the fabric material's vapor transmission. Installing the signage hardware into the mortar joints would prevent damage to the terra cotta and therefore meets Standard 9. The applicant must provide hardware dimensions to ensure it will not exceed the size of the mortar joint.
- The proposed sign for the existing awning is compatible with the contemporary awning and historic building in its materials, features, size, scale, and massing, and therefore meets Standard 9. The incorporated uplighting on the awning also meets Standard 9.
 - The installation of the proposed uplighting on the terra cotta ledge below banner lighting could meet Standard 9, if the installation does not alter or harm the historic materials. Additional drawings and information should be submitted showing this part of the scope of work.
 - *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - Installing the proposed signage hardware into mortar joints would allow this change to be reversible and therefore satisfy Standard 10.

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

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Eileen Quigley and owner's representatives Jose Toro and Bill Walther represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Lukachik asked Ms. Quigley where the banner lighting would be located and how the electricity would reach the locations. She inquired how the uplighting would be anchored to the terra cotta cornice and if they have other details for this part of the application.
- Mr. McCoubrey said they would need architectural drawings for the lighting details. He said it should show the number of lights, fixture dimensions, and their size relative to the cornice projection.
 - Ms. Quigley explained that a small LED strip would be installed under each banner on the terra cotta cornice. She noted that the cornice is approximately four and a half inches deep. Ms. Quigley said they could provide the requested details prior to the Historical Commission's meeting.
- Ms. Lukachik recommended removing the existing corner signage once the new corner signage is installed. She said that terra cotta repair details must be submitted for the Historical Commission's review.
- Mr. Detwiler asserted that the terra cotta façade is a significant character-defining feature of the building, especially on the second floor with the fluted terra cotta that wraps the building's corners. He continued that the proposed signage banners have a negative impact on the historic character of this area of the building. Mr. Detwiler stated that, if lighting details are handled well, he could support this aspect of the application.

- Ms. Lukachik said she agreed with Mr. Detwiler, although she understood the applicant's need for wayfinding signage.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed banners overwhelm the terra cotta. He pointed out that this may be a situation where a small projecting banner that is perpendicular to the terra cotta would be more appropriate.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver's recommendation.
 - Ms. Quigley said the project team is aware of the concerns related to the installation and removal of signage in terra cotta. She stated that the goal would be to install the signage hardware into the mortar joints. Ms. Quigley added that the mortar joints are wide and their goal is to avoid altering or damaging the terra cotta.
- Ms. Gutterman and other Committee members asked if the applicant had considered reusing the existing flagpoles already mounted on the building for signage. The Committee noted that the flagpoles were existing but likely would need some repair.
 - Ms. Quigley stated that the flagpoles have not been considered. She explained that they originally proposed a box sign and then a sign cabinet but that the staff said they could not recommend approval for those types of signage.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed that she could not recommend approval for those types of signage.
- Mr. McCoubrey said this would be an easier review if the building was brick rather than terra cotta. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the material is sensitive to water infiltration.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed,
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested pole-mounted signage on the sidewalk as a potential option, but Ms. Gutterman commented that the sidewalks are controlled by the City of Philadelphia.
 - Ms. Quigley interjected that they would need something higher on the building to allow for pedestrian and vehicular visibility up and down the Market and Junipers Street corridors.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that signage could be projected onto the facade of the building.
 - Mr. McCoubrey added that light projection has become a powerful technology.
- Ms. Lukachik raised the concept of the perpendicular banner sign, as Mr. Cluver did earlier in the meeting. She said that hardware for this type of signage would likely have to go through the mortar to the masonry backup to have sufficient support for the anchorage. Ms. Lukachik commented that a perpendicular sign would create fewer issues for the terra cotta.
 - Ms. Quigley said that the perpendicular option was not discussed because of the potential wind load but that they could review this option.
- Mr. Walther stated that he liked the idea of the perpendicular signage and said they did something similar for an office building they own in New York City. He said that traffic coming around City Hall would immediately see their hotel with this type of signage and that is their intent. Mr. Walther said the existing signage is 25 years old and they will remove it and repair the exterior as necessary. He said they also may explore hardware that would project from the window frames or windows to avoid the terra cotta altogether. He said they would continue exploring ideas with fabric signage.
- Ms. Lukachik said they would need to see proposed details for any attachment to the building and windows.

- Ms. Quigley requested that the Architectural Committee discuss the contemporary canopy with the proposed marquee signage.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the staff's concerns about the size of the marquee's letters.
- Ms. Mehley replied that the staff recommendation for the marquee signage was approval.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the lower level of the building was granite.
 - Ms. Mehley stated that the material on the lower level was granite but noted that parts of the sign band may have been altered over time.
- Ms. Stein suggested dividing up the application. She said the marquee signage could be approved separately from the banner signage and uplighting to allow part of the project to move forward for the applicant.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed with this approach.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how the electrical service would be run to the new marquee signage.
 - Mr. Toro replied that they can use the existing electrical supply to the marquee. He pointed out that the new light marquee lighting is an LED band and does not require much additional power.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The fabric signage banners would cover a large portion of the building's character-defining terra cotta and they could cause irreversible damage to the material.
- The applicant should explore other signage options including perpendicular signage that would not directly touch the terra cotta.
- The concept of the uplighting was approvable but the application should be supplemented with installation details and specifications prior to the Historical Commission's meeting.
- The LED marquee signage could be approved as submitted.
- The application could be divided up to allow the marquee signage, and potentially the uplighting, to be approved and move forward to permitting.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The signage and lighting proposed for the marquee, satisfies Standards 9 and 10.
- The banner signage and lighting fail to satisfy Standards 9 and 10, owing to its size, scale, installation, potential negative impact to the terra cotta, and lack of submission details.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the marquee signage, with the staff to review details, and denial of the banner signage and lighting, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 1319-25 Market St					
MOTION: Approval of marquee signage; Denial of banner signage and lighting					
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: 4619-25 LONGSHORE AVE

Proposal: Construct elevator addition
 Review Requested: Review In Concept
 Owner: CDE Investments LLC
 Applicant: Andy Gray, Toner Architects
 History: 1908; Tacony Club; Clyde S. Adams, architect
 Individual Designation: 5/10/2019
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Ted Maust, Theodore.Maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes erecting an elevator tower at the rear of the building at 4619 Longshore Ave, the former Tacony Club, with a small vestibule communicating with the parking lot.

The elevator tower would expand existing window openings into doors at the first and second floors. At the third-floor level, the rear dormer would be widened to meet the tower and provide access to the upper floor.

The proposed massing and materials appear to be compatible with the historic resource and the tower is located to minimally impact the building's primary elevations.

The conceptual nature of the plans makes it difficult to fully evaluate the extent to which the project meets the Standards. Of particular note, the plans call for the removal of a portion of cornice and significant alteration of the rear dormer. An application for final approval should provide detail about these changes to character-defining elements

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story elevator tower with vestibule.

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.

- *Recommended: Constructing a new addition that results in the least possible loss of historic materials so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.*
- An application for final approval would need greater detail, particularly around the areas where historic material is being removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:16:18

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Andy Gray and Sara Pochedly of Toner Architects represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver suggested that the massing and location of the proposed elevator addition could be refined to better related to the existing building. As examples, he pointed to the way the slope of the vestibule would obscure a window opening and the proposed changes to the rear dormer.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver regarding the obscuring of the first-floor window but suggested that there was limited space to address the alignment with the windows and the dormer.
- Mr. Cluver asked if an elevator manufacturer had been selected or if the elevator would need to be custom, given its configuration with doors at 90 degrees from each other.
 - Mr. Gray responded that the applicants are soliciting cost quotes from a variety of manufacturers for the corner door configuration. He said if that is cost prohibitive, the team is considering locating the vestibule straight out toward the parking lot, which would address the concern about the obscured window opening. That change would create other challenges in the parking lot, but it is another option.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired if there are any plans to uncover or restore the cornice, which has been boxed in.
 - Ms. Pochedly responded that the current scope of exterior work is limited to the elevator addition and window replacement and that cornice restoration is not currently in the owner's budget.
 - Mr. Weiner asked whether the roof would be replaced.
 - Ms. Pochedly said it would be as the current roof is leaking.
- Mr. Cluver argued that there should be some sensitivity to the cornice so that the owner or a future owner could complete that restoration. He suggested that consideration could be given to how it interacts with the location of brackets, for instance.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that any removed brackets should be salvaged and retained in storage. He described the cornice as a character-defining feature of the building and agreed with Mr. Cluver that the elevator tower should relate to it somehow.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that a standing-seam metal roof or similar would be more appropriate than an asphalt roof on the sloped roof of the vestibule.
- Ms. Stein cited the conceptual nature of this review and voiced the opinion that the

- elevator tower would be more successful if it stepped away from the building and did not engage the cornice. She suggested a glass link which could match the height of the rear dormer.
- Mr. Gray commented that the team had considered such a scheme but that it would be more costly.
 - Mr. Cluver inquired whether the elevator could be located inside the footprint of the building.
 - Mr. Gray responded that the team had looked at it, but that there was no way to fit the elevator under the existing roof.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested that locating the elevator in the footprint of the rear dormer might streamline the elevator overrun penetrating the roof.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked about the number of units and whether any of them are proposed for low-income housing or are market-rate units.
 - Ms. Pochedly answered that the owner is in discussions with the Veterans Administration about the building for veterans' housing.
 - Ms. Lukachik asked if there is a basement or if the ground floor is the lowest floor.
 - Mr. Gray confirmed that the ground floor, which is partially below grade, is the lowest floor.
 - Ms. Lukachik speculated that the cost of underpinning, which would be required for the proposed citing of the addition, might offset some of the other costs of setting the elevator tower away from the building as Ms. Stein had suggested.
 - Mr. Cluver inquired whether it was necessary for the elevator to service all floors of the building.
 - Mr. Gray answered that the elevator is not necessary, but that it makes the apartments more desirable.
 - Mr. Weiner asked whether the submitted floor plans would meet accessibility guidelines for the Veterans Administration.
 - Ms. Pochedly clarified that discussions with the Veterans Administration are taking place through the property owner and the design team has not been made aware of any standards that the draft plans do not meet.
 - Mr. Gray commented that the larger units on upper floors would give some design flexibility to meet any standards that may come into play.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- There are spatial limitations which make it difficult for an elevator tower at the proposed location to engage the historic building with sensitivity.
- An addition in this location should consider the location of brackets or other features of the cornice, which is currently enclosed. If a portion of the cornice is removed for the elevator tower, removed brackets should be salvaged for future use.
- There may be other viable options for elevator locations, either within the building footprint or set back from the building, which should be explored further.
- An elevator that served all floors except for the top floor may be able to better meet the Standards by avoiding intersection with the rear cornice or penetration of the roof.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 4619-25 Longshore Ave					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
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: 27 DRUIM MOIR LN

Proposal: Construct dormer addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ori Feibush

Applicant: Michael Thompson, Designblendz Architecture LLP

History: 1887; Brinkwood at Druim Moir; G.W and W.D. Hewitt, architects

Individual Designation: 6/5/1980

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Josh Schroeder, Joshua.Schroeder@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a dormer addition at the third floor of the mansion at 27 Druim Moir Lane, known as Brinkwood, to accommodate the conversion of an attic into living space. The proposal includes the demolition of a portion of the roof and a small existing dormer. The new dormer would include two aluminum-clad window systems whose alignment and configuration would match those on the first and second stories below, with cedar shake siding to match the existing facade. The roof's existing asphalt shingles would be replaced with slate tiles.

In January 2023, the Architectural Committee reviewed a nearly identical proposal for 27 Druim Moir Lane. The Architectural Committee recommended denial and noted that the proposed dormer was out of proportion with the façade and that the replicated windows would diminish the visual impact of the historic windows. A revised design that proposed a shed dormer was approved by the Historical Commission in February 2023. The Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended denial for a different proposed dormer design in March 2023. The Historical Commission again approved a revised application that proposed a shed dormer in April 2023.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish dormer and portion of roof; construct dormer addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JUNE 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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 window system would not be easily differentiated from the historic windows below and its large size would diminish the prominence of the historic window features below.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval provided the dormer is reduced in size and set back from the roof edge to maintain the cornice line, and windows are differentiated from the historic windows, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:34:48

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Schroeder presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Scott Woodruff and owner Ori Feibush represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked if the gap between the stairs and the windows would allow for a smaller addition and fewer windows.
 - Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Feibush confirmed there would be a gap but preferred keeping the extra space.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the applicants were willing to follow the staff's recommendation.
 - Mr. Feibush replied that he wanted the addition to match the aesthetic for the rest of the façade and make the third floor usable. Mr. Feibush further explained that he could delineate the third floor in some other manner. He also noted he plans more substantial renovation of the mansion.
- Mr. Cluver acknowledged the need for interior space but replicating the window systems from the lower floors would disrupt the building's character. Mr. Cluver suggested two typical dormers each centered on the windows below that respected the cornice line.
 - Mr. Feibush replied that he had considered several alternatives but were not suited to his family's needs. He noted that he was also planning to undertake extensive repairs and restoration, including replacing the asphalt shingled roof with slate. He also suggested he could ensure the alterations were reversible. He further argued that the rear façade was not as architecturally significant as the front and was completely hidden from any public view.
- Ms. Lukachick suggested that aligning the windows with the external wall rather than the projecting windows below would reduce the massing at the roof and still provide space for the interior.
 - Mr. Feibush responded that he did not want the addition to be distinguishable from the rest of the building but acknowledged that that avenue does not conform with the Standards. Mr. Feibush explained that that angles and projections on the rest of the façade would make the new addition less noticeable.
- Mr. McCoubrey asserted that maintaining the cornice line and pulling the windows

back would be architecturally appropriate. He also praised Mr. Feibush's commitment to restoring the property.

- Mr. Weiner noted he was comfortable with the massing. He suggested a modern interpretation might be appropriate but preferred a different material between the window bays.
- Mr. Detwiler explained that architects G.W. and W.D. Hewitt intentionally designed multiple primary facades for this building. Mr. Detwiler asserted that the proposed dormer could be pulled back and still allow for light and room for the staircase.
- Mr. Cluver explained that features on historic buildings typically diminished in scale as they proceeded upward. This proposed addition appears top heavy because it maintains similar dimensions as below.
 - Mr. Feibush explained his need for extra space to install historic lighting fixtures from his extensive collection. He suggested imposing a requirement to return the property to its existing condition once he stopped residing in it. He further argued that the proposed changes would bring cohesion to a chaotic façade.
 - Mr. Cluver reiterated his opposition to the design but suggested removing one or two rows of panes to reduce the massing.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked if that would leave enough head space for the stairs.
 - Mr. Feibush and Mr. Woodruff stated they would consider Mr. Cluver's suggestion.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rear façade of Brinkwood at 27 Druim Moir Lane was designed as a primary façade by architects G.W. and W.D. Hewitt.
- The window bays are character defining features of Brinkwood's rear façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition's massing and scale is out of proportion to the rear façade, and thereby fail to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed new window system would not be distinguishable from the historic windows below and would diminish the historic windows' prominence, and thereby fails to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 27 Druim Moir Ln					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
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: 1523-29 WALLACE ST

Proposal: Construct four-story multi-unit residential building
 Review Requested: Review and Comment
 Owner: KPI Acquisitions LLC
 Applicant: Derek Spencer, Gnome Architects LLC
 History: vacant lot
 Individual Designation: None
 District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000
 Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, Kim.Chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story multi-unit residential structure on the surface parking lots at 1523-29 Wallace Street. It appears that the buildings that once stood on the lot were demolished circa 1966. The site consisted of several vacant lots at the time of the Spring Garden Historic District designation, with a non-historic site wall; therefore, the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction over the undeveloped site is review-and-comment only. This means that the Historical Commission and its advisory Architectural Committee may offer non-binding comments on the application at public meetings but may not approve or deny it.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story multi-unit residential building on vacant lots.

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 new building will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the surrounding historic context, satisfying Standard 9.

STAFF COMMENT: The application satisfies Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:01:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Derek Spencer represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Spencer provided an overview of the project.
- Mr. Cluver commented in support of the material choices and overall design. He stated that it fits with the character of the historic district. He observed that one design feature which feels out of place is the rounded corners of the front entry.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he appreciates the wrapping of the red brick and the quality of the chosen materials. He expressed support for the bold cornice detailing.
- Mr. McCoubrey thanked the applicant for the material selections and attention to detail. He observed that the front entrance appears a bit short.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that the fourth floor appears a bit tall, so perhaps the parapet could be brought down slightly to gain a small amount of height for the first floor and the entrance.
 - Mr. Spencer responded that they could investigate this solution.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the parapet is being used as a guard for the rooftop use.
 - Mr. Spencer responded that it is not, because the deck is held back sufficiently from the edges. He noted that there will be some rooftop mechanical equipment closer to the edges, but still not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the plan needs to be updated to reflect the recessed entry.
- Ms. Stein thanked the applicant for a good urban design in terms of height, massing, materials, and minimal parking.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Andy Biggin, an adjoining neighbor, expressed concerns related to unit density, lack of car and bike parking, and trash management in a neighborhood which is largely single-family and up to six residential units. He concluded that he would prefer a smaller building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The site consisted of several vacant lots at the time of the Spring Garden Historic District designation, with a non-historic site wall; therefore, the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over the undeveloped site is review-and-comment only.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9. The new building will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the surrounding historic context.

ADDRESS: 3500 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct building, ADA ramp, and driveway; add lighting

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Brittany Scherer, Studio Sustena

History: 1926; American Swedish Historical Museum; John A. Nyden, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: FDR Park Historic District, Significant, 8/9/2000

Staff Contact: Alex Till, Alexander.Till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an auxiliary building on the grounds of the American Swedish History Museum in FDR Park. It additionally proposes a number of exterior landscape improvements including constructing an ADA accessible ramp, adding a paved parking area, constructing pedestrian paths and a plaza, and adding exterior lighting to the building. The building was constructed in 1926 by Swedish-American architect John Nydén as part of the Sesquicentennial celebration held at FDR Park and has housed the American Swedish Historical Museum since 1928. The auxiliary building will be positioned to western the side of the building between it and Pattison Avenue and its design imitates the colors and materials of the museum building. The parking area will be situated on the eastern side of the building near Pattison Avenue and will be connected to the museum building by a series of paved pedestrian paths and a paved plaza. The ADA ramp will be constructed on the park facing south side of the building and feature a mixed metal with clear acrylic panel design. Finally, lighting will be installed, both at ground level, via poles, and via a wall sconce element on the museum building. The entire building and grounds are visible from both Pattison Avenue and FDR Park.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct new auxiliary building.
- Construct new ADA ramp.
- Construct new parking area.
- Construct new plaza and pedestrian paths.
- Add new lighting to grounds and 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 auxiliary building, ADA ramp, parking area, plaza, and paths will be compatible with the overall massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the Historic District.
 - Additional drawings showing the auxiliary building and ramp in context with the museum building should be provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:17:12

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Landscape architect Brittany Scherer, architect Al Wulff, and museum director Tracey Beck represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Scherer and Ms. Beck summarized the project as described in the application as seeking to improve visitor access and private event management for the museum.
- Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to provide more details about the proposed placement of the new auxiliary building and commented that it seems to be very close to the museum building.
 - Ms. Beck responded that the building is intended to be used for storing large, heavy items that are used for rentals that primarily take place on the park side terrace, so it needs to be relatively close to be useful. She also pointed out that the topography of the site has the museum located on the top of a hill, so the incline increases further from the museum building. Additionally, because of how the museum is sited on Pattison Avenue, moving the auxiliary building back blocks view to the side arcade.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that reviewing additional sightline studies would be helpful as it is difficult to understand the placement without them.
- Ms. Stein also inquired about the placement of the auxiliary building. She additionally pointed out the location of some mechanical equipment up against the corner of the museum building and asked if both the new building and future mechanical equipment could all be located together somewhere further away from the museum.
 - Ms. Scherer responded that there is existing mechanical equipment located in that corner and when they tried some options where it and the auxiliary building were located further away from the building, they found that it actually made those things more prominent because they stood out in an otherwise natural park landscape. Additionally, they are trying to avoid impacting nearby heritage trees.
 - Ms. Stein asked if they need to work within park boundaries as well.
 - Ms. Beck answered that they do. They do not control the parking lot in the park near the museum and all of the grounds are part of the park, which is another reason why they are looking to add a new smaller parking lot just for museum use.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested if the roof design of the auxiliary building was made less prominent, it would likely be less visible from the grounds around the museum.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed and added that the auxiliary building as is looks like it is for visitor use, so it may be better to remove some of the more decorative features and simplify the roof line to better emphasize its utilitarian nature, which would also help it recede from view more.
 - Mr. Cluver reiterated his concerns about the location of the auxiliary building. He mentioned that it would primarily be visible from Pattison Avenue and would perhaps block views of the museum building. He suggested adding some visual studies to the application for the Historical Commission's meeting to better understand the sightlines.
 - Ms. Beck answered that along with the view from Pattison Avenue, they are also considering the visibility of the auxiliary building from the park side of the museum as seen through the arcade, as that area is used by many people

throughout the year for various events. They can include their sightline studies in the next iteration of the application.

- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the fence and gates along Pattison Avenue.
 - Ms. Scherer responded that the existing fence there is being maintained or, if any replacement is needed, it will match. They will be installing two gates, one for pedestrians and one for car traffic. Access to both will be controlled by the museum and they will be closed when the museum is closed.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned if the acrylic panels for the new ADA ramp are necessary.
 - Ms. Scherer responded that the grade change is right on the edge for requiring a guard, but they thought it would be a good idea to have them regardless.
 - Mr. Wulff agreed that they are looking to add protection on the sides.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that, if you change the handrail to a 36-inch height, it could double as both railing and guard. He also argued that the acrylic panels are a questionable material choice as they will likely scratch and become unsightly rather quickly. He went on to say that the drawings seem to show a ramp that is too short based on the height.
 - Mr. Wulff responded that they will make the ramp adhere to the code requirements but that they do not want to elongate it further than necessary since a lot of its use will come during events from the opposite side of the terrace.
 - Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the ramp will need to be longer to meet the code requirements.
 - Mr. Wulff agreed to check and make sure the drawings are accurate. He went on to say that they did not want to use pickets as side guards as they thought that design looked too busy.
 - Mr. Cluver suggested they could explore a switchback ramp if they need more length. A switchback design might also help reduce the amount of guard needed.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to explain the lighting plan.
 - Ms. Scherer summarized the proposed lighting improvements. The goal is to illuminate the new parking areas and paths. Almost all the lighting will be on the ground or on poles, but one new sconce will be added to the museum building, replacing an existing emergency fixture, and they will re-use existing rails to mount new lighting for the cupolas.
 - Mr. Cluver asked for more information on the lights proposed for lighting the museum building façade on the Pattison Avenue side and the lights on the side of the new auxiliary building.
 - Ms. Scherer clarified that the façade lights are flood lights mounted on the ground and the lights for the side of the auxiliary building are mounted in the soffit and the fixtures are not visible. Additionally, the auxiliary building lights will only be used for staging during special events.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the stone veneer proposed for the new site walls and asked what type it is.
 - Ms. Scherer responded that they are looking to use a quartzite sandstone as it is more durable than the limestone on the existing walls, but it still is in keeping with the types of stone on the site currently.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked if the new stairs are being rounded like the existing ones.
 - Ms. Scherer confirmed they are proposing to use a little bit of a rounded edge.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application proposes modifications to the landscape around the Swedish American Historical Museum, a significant resource in the FDR Park Historic District.
- The proposed parking area, pedestrian paths, and lighting are appropriate alterations to the property.
- The proposed auxiliary building should be closely examined to ensure its placement and design are in keeping with the historic building on the site.
- The proposed ADA accessible ramp is an acceptable addition, but its length and the design of its acrylic panel side guards are not.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application will satisfy Standard 9 with some modifications. The auxiliary building, ADA ramp, parking area, plaza, and paths will be compatible with the overall massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic district, though the proposed acrylic side panels for the ramp do not.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the proposed ramp and acrylic panels are reexamined and the location and design of the auxiliary building are revised to be compatible with the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 3500 S Broad St					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
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: 02:47:00

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:47 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.

DRAFT