

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

**TUESDAY, 28 JULY 2026  
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM  
NAN GUTTERMAN, ACTING CHAIR**

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

The Acting Chair called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

| <b>Committee Member</b>                  | <b>Present</b> | <b>Absent</b> | <b>Comment</b> |
|------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair |                | X             |                |
| 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  
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:

Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown Civic Association  
Arielle Harris, RePoint Philadelphia  
Ben She  
Cleivi Prophete, FH Demolition  
David Traub, Save Our Sites  
Elliot Rodger  
Evan Litvin, Lo Design  
Greg Barnaby  
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance  
Jake Blumgart  
James Pearlstein, Pearl Properties  
Jay Farrell  
Jay Rockafellow, DAS Architects

Julia Hayman  
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy  
Matt Masterpasqua, Mass Architecture Studio LLC  
Nancy Pontone  
Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties  
Roy Aharonovich  
Sam Xu, Constrecture LLC  
Samantha Chui  
Stephanie M. Pennypacker  
Susan Wetherill

DRAFT

## **AGENDA**

### **ADDRESS: 1018 WINTER ST**

Proposal: Demolish and reconstruct upper floors with roof deck

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 main front block, roof, and a portion of the rear ell of 1018 Winter Street and reconstructing the main block with an additional floor and new roof with dormer. Construction of a new second and third story and roof deck are proposed at the rear. 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 includes a parking area, the back of the building is not visible from the public right-of-way.

This project was first presented at the 24 February 2026 meeting of the Architectural Committee and the 24 April 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission. It proposed substantial demolition of the front of the building. The Architectural Committee recommended denial. The applicant presented a significantly revised application to the Historical Commission that maintained the historic front wall, roof, and main block and focused the new construction to the rear of the building. The Historical Commission commended that applicant and said the revised application was moving the project in the right direction. The Commission asked the applicant to continue to develop the revised proposal and provide a structural engineer's report on the building, owing to its poor condition. The Commission did not approve or deny the application but instead remanded the application back to the Architectural Committee for an additional review because of the magnitude of the revisions between the Committee and Commission meetings.

The application submitted for this meeting includes the requested structural report and a revised scope of work. The application is substantially different than the version presented at the 10 April 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission.

### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish the front main block of the building including the front wall and roof with dormers, as well as a one-story portion of the rear ell.
- Rehabilitate a portion of the rear ell, construct an extension at the first floor, and construct second and third stories.
- Construct roof deck.

### **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
  - The application proposes a significant amount of demolition to the front of the

- building; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 2.
  - If the front wall and roof must be replaced, as recommended in the structural report, they should be replaced in-kind and not include an additional floor level.
- *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 do not meet Standard 9 in terms of 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 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 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, 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:** 00:04:37

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sam Xu represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee had reviewed the application and that she would like Mr. Xu to focus on the structural engineer's report. She noted that the report states that the building needs to be demolished.
  - Mr. Xu responded and said the engineer identified many problems. He said that their goal was to keep parts of the building that are in good condition and incorporate them into the new construction. Mr. Xu pointed out that the engineer's report did not recommend total demolition of the building.
  - Ms. Lukachik agreed with Mr. Xu's statement and stated that the report indicates that most of the wood framing could either be replaced or sistered to address the structural deficiencies. She continued that the rear masonry wall could be retained with repairs, but the roof framing needed to be addressed. Ms. Lukachik said that the report's most significant recommendation was that the front wall needed to be taken down and rebuilt. She explained that, if the front wall needed to be replaced, it would need to be an in-kind replacement, salvaging as much material as possible. Ms. Lukachik said that, without removing the interior plaster,

it is difficult to tell what the true condition of the front wall is but it may be possible to save it. She observed that there has clearly been water and moisture infiltration over the years but that it could potentially be saved through repair. If it cannot be repaired, it would need to be reconstructed in kind.

- Mr. Weiner said that the front wall cannot be pulled back to plumb, but it can be stabilized and prevented from moving further. He said the wall is probably in perfectly good condition to be stabilized. Mr. Weiner noted that, although he has not seen the wall in person, his observation is based on his experience with this type of repair.
- Ms. Lukachik said she agreed with Mr. Weiner's comment. She said the existing deficient framing could be sistered and reinforced. She continued that, once this was done, any further movement could be arrested with additional starbolts or other measures to stitch it back together. Ms. Lukachik noted that the maximum dimension of forward movement shown in the report was one and one-eighth inches. She stated that it is likely that the Architectural Committee members have saved building facades that have moved more than that. She concluded that she is not seeing anything that says it cannot be saved, but conceded she has not surveyed the building, and recognizes that the documentation is a report signed by a structural engineer.
- Mr. Detwiler remarked that the goal of changing the building from a one-family building to a three-family building may be asking it to do too much. He said that while he agrees with the City's goal of increasing density, trying to create three units in a small-scale building such as this may not be feasible.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he did not agree with the proposal to add a third floor to the front of the building. He pointed out that the building at 1018 Winter Street is individually designated and that a certain level of historical significance would be lost with this proposal. He said that, even if the front needs to be reconstructed, it should maintain its current appearance and not be reconstructed as a larger building.
- Ms. Mehley pointed out that the proposal presented by the applicant at the April 2026 Historical Commission meeting included a scheme that added density to the rear of the building which is not visible from the public right-of-way. She said that the staff and Historical Commission felt that that revision showing additional space at the rear moved the project in the right direction. Ms. Mehley asked the Architectural Committee to comment on how density could be added to the rear of the property.
  - Mr. Detwiler agreed and said the rear of the property is where the project density should happen. He explained that the current scale of the front of the building is the most important thing to preserve. Mr. Detwiler stated the back of the building can be developed as a separate piece. He said the April 2026 submission was overall the better proposal and approach to this project.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Ben She spoke in support of the application, asserting that the city needs more housing.

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

The Architectural Committee found that:

- To satisfy the Standards, the proposal should be revised to maintain the front façade and roof of the building and locate the new construction with additional square footage at the rear of the building.
- The applicant and structural engineer should determine if the front wall and gable

roof can be repaired rather than replaced. If replacement is necessary, the replacement must match the existing in material, form, scale, and detail.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2, owing to the significant demolition proposed to the front of the building. If the front wall and roof must be replaced, as recommended in the structural report, they should be replaced in-kind and not include an additional floor level.
- The proposed alterations to the front façade do not meet Standard 9 in terms of scale and proportion.
- 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.

| <b>ITEM: 1018 Winter St<br/>MOTION: Denial<br/>MOVED BY: Lukachik<br/>SECONDED BY: Stein</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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                                                                                        | 5   |    |         |        | 2      |

**ADDRESS: 124 AND 126 S 7TH ST**

Proposal: Alter rears of buildings; restore storefronts

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: JR Sansom Partners LLC

Applicant: Reed J. Slogoff, Pearl Properties

History: 1876, Collins & Authenrieth, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Jewelers' Row Historic District, pending

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

**OVERVIEW:** The one-story commercial buildings at 124 and 126 S. 7<sup>th</sup> Street are very small; each is about 13 feet wide and 18 feet deep. They have flat roofs. They were constructed as one-room retail shops in 1876. This application proposes to incorporate them into the residential high-rise development that will be constructed to the south and west of them on the lot at 708 Sansom Street. The Historical Commission reviewed and commented on the high-rise development in April 2024.

The small buildings would be used as entrances to the interior motor court of the high-rise building. Sections of the side and rear walls, roofs, and the interior party wall would be removed

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2026**

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

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

to incorporate the buildings into the larger project. The front facades of the buildings would be restored to their historic appearances, with the exception that the single step below each storefront door would be removed for accessibility reasons. The restoration can be guided by insurance surveys and historic photographs.

Historically, only the front facades of the buildings were visible from the street. The side and rear walls were party walls shared with adjacent properties but have been exposed with recent demolitions. The flat roofs of the one-story buildings are hidden behind bulking storefront cornices. Therefore, the storefronts were the only parts of the buildings visible from the public right-of-way historically and are therefore the only character-defining features of the buildings. The historic preservation ordinance defines demolition at Section 14-203(88) of the Philadelphia Code as “the razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building.” With the removal of the rear walls, part of the side wall of one building, and parts of the roofs, one could claim that the work proposed in this application constitutes a demolition in the legal sense. However, the removals of the proposed sections of the buildings would not result in a “razing or destruction ... in significant part” because the historic characters of the buildings would survive intact after the parts are removed. The removals would not satisfy the definition of a demolition in the legal sense. Moreover, categorizing these reviews as demolition reviews would have an inherent risk. These very small buildings (less than 200 sf each), which are not accessible and neither have nor have room for adequate restroom facilities, could not be reasonably adapted for any purpose and therefore would undoubtedly qualify for complete demolition under Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance. Integrating them into the new development is likely their only option for retention and restoration.

#### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Alter rears of buildings
- Restore storefronts

#### **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
  - The historic character of the properties will be retained and preserved. No distinctive materials features, spaces, or spatial relationships will be altered or removed. The application satisfies Standard 2, provided the storefront restoration details are reviewed and approved by the staff.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
  - Deteriorated features of the storefronts will be repaired and lost features will be replaced in kind based on documentary and physical evidence. The application satisfies Standard 6, provided the storefront restoration details are reviewed and approved by the staff.
- *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 storefronts are the only character-defining features of the buildings. The proposed work will restore all features that characterize the properties. No character-defining features will be inappropriately altered or removed. The application satisfies Standard 9, provided the storefront restoration details are reviewed and approved by the staff.

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:26:10

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Reed Slogoff and architect Jay Rockafellow represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Slogoff explained that the dilapidated properties are under consideration for designation as part of the Jewelers Row historic district. He stated that they met with the Preservation Alliance as well as the Washington Square West Civic Association and the Society Hill Civic Association to review the plans and no one opposed them.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if passersby would see the motor court of the new residential tower through the storefront windows, or if the glass would be frosted.
  - Mr. Slogoff confirmed that the motor court will be behind these storefronts and noted that the details of the glass could be worked out with the staff.
  - Mr. Rockafellow explained that there will be a roof over the first three to four feet to create a gateway to the motor court, and the intent at this time is for the glass to be clear, to get as much light into the space as possible.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the drawings contain very few dimensions. He asked the applicants to add more information to the architectural drawings before the application is reviewed by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the intention is to recreate the storefronts as they are shown in a historic photograph, or to rehabilitate the storefronts that exist currently.
  - Ms. Chantry responded that the staff's understanding is that the applicant is seeking approval to replicate the current appearance.
  - Mr. Rockafellow confirmed Ms. Chantry's assertion to be true.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the width of the existing and proposed doors.
  - Mr. Rockafellow responded that the doors are three-foot doors and that the step up would be eliminated to make the entrances ADA-complaint, resulting in slightly taller doors than what is there now.
- Ms. Lukachik asked about the stability of the buildings after the alterations.
  - Mr. Rockafellow responded that a steel frame will be added and will tie back into the existing structure.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that the south wall should be perceived as the wall of a building and not a screen. He recommended the retention of at least six feet of the side, former party wall.
  - Ms. Stein noted that the dimension appears to be eight or nine feet in the plan.
  - Mr. Rockafellow confirmed that the south wall is eight or nine feet, with a mosaic tiled screen wall that caps the building.



- Ms. Lukachik commented in support of the side wall design.
- Ms. Stein asked about protection of the historic buildings during the construction of the high-rise building. She was concerned that the historic buildings might be damaged during the construction of the tower and recommended covering the historic buildings with scaffolding.
  - Mr. Slogoff responded that the project will be permitted by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. The permit review will include confirmation that the project can be constructed safely.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the storefronts should be brought back to their earlier historic appearance rather than reconstructed to the current appearance, including the double doors seen in the photograph from 1959.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented that this project will result in the loss of two retail spaces. He suggested that the new south wall should be as long as the current width of the building, and that the storefronts should be restored to their current or historic appearance.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Historically, only the front facades of the buildings were visible from the street. The side and rear walls were party walls shared with adjacent properties but have been exposed with recent demolitions. Therefore, the storefronts were the only parts of the buildings visible from the public right-of-way historically and are therefore the only character-defining features of the buildings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The historic character of the properties will be retained and preserved. No distinctive materials features, spaces, or spatial relationships will be altered or removed. The application satisfies Standard 2, provided the storefront restoration details are reviewed and approved by the staff.
- Deteriorated features of the storefronts will be repaired and lost features will be replaced in kind based on documentary and physical evidence. The application satisfies Standard 6, provided the storefront restoration details are reviewed and approved by the staff.
- The storefronts are the only character-defining features of the buildings. The proposed work will restore all features that characterize the properties. No character-defining features will be inappropriately altered or removed. The application satisfies Standard 9, provided the storefront restoration details are reviewed and approved by the staff.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the south wall is a minimum of nine feet in length, the storefront details replicate those seen in the 1959 photograph, and the historic buildings are protected during construction, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

| <b>ITEM: 124 and 126 S 7<sup>th</sup> St</b><br><b>MOTION: Approval with conditions</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Detwiler</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Weiner</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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                                                                                                                                              | 5   |    |         |        | 2      |

**ADDRESS: 1504 PINE ST**

Proposal: Stucco front facade; replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1504 Pine St LLC

Applicant: Matt Masterpasqua, Mass Architecture Studio LLC

History: 1851; Union Place, 18 rowhouses; Thomas U. Walter, architect

Individual Designation: 9/28/1971

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes applying a stucco finish over the brownstone façade of 1504 Pine Street. The property is part of a row of 18 Italianate brownstone rowhouses designed by prominent architect Thomas U. Walter and built in 1851. Prior to the row's designation in 1971, a rusticated stucco coating was applied over the first two floors of the building at 1504 Pine Street. The brownstone on the upper floors exhibits some delamination and damage. Windows at the basement and fourth floor were replaced without Historical Commission approval in 2009 and a legalization application for that work was denied in 2010. The illegal windows remain in place.

The applicants, new owners of the property, propose removing the older stucco and applying a thin layer of stucco over the entire façade, tooled with a simulated join pattern. They cite the stuccoed façade at 1514 Pine Street as a similar scope of work. The stucco work at 1514 and 1506 Pine Street pre-date the designation of this row. It is unclear exactly how thick the stucco coating would be. The proposed scope of work would likely result in removal of detail in the trim elements around the window openings in addition to the more elaborate ornament on the first and second floors, which is currently covered by the rusticated stucco.

The application also proposes replacing the windows on the front elevation. Elevation drawings suggest that the proposed replacements replicate the historic windows, with a thicker central muntin, but no section drawings have yet been submitted.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Rehabilitate front façade.
- Apply stucco to front façade.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2026**

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

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

- Replace windows.

#### **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
- *Masonry Guidelines:*
  - *Not recommended:*
    - *Applying paint or other coatings (such as stucco) to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated to create a new appearance.*
    - *Removing a masonry feature that is unrepairable and not replacing it, or replacing it with a new feature that does not match.*
    - *Using substitute material for the replacement that does not convey the same appearance of the surviving components of the masonry feature.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6 and the Masonry Guidelines.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:49:55

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Matt Masterpasqua of Mass Architecture and property owners Greg Barnaby and Roy Aharonovich represented the application.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Aharonovich commented that they are not sure what lies behind the existing stucco. He noted an interest in restoring the entire brownstone façade but indicated that it was not financially feasible.
  - Mr. Weiner replied that brownstone is behind the existing stucco.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that EIFS (Exterior Insulation and Finish System) should not be used because it can trap moisture in the walls.
  - Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Mr. Barnaby asked if the Architectural Committee had suggestions about how the upper floors could be restored.
  - Ms. Gutterman answered that there are a variety of available materials, including composite patches and cast stone details, which might be used to sensitively restore the brownstone. She explained that many of the issues with brownstone stem from the position of the stone's bedding plane with respect to the surface of the wall. Delamination is caused by a bedding plane parallel to the exterior surface. Ms. Gutterman reiterated her personal opinion that coating masonry elevations with stucco is not a treatment that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- Mr. Detwiler cited Ms. Gutterman's extensive experience in working with brownstone and asked her to expand on what materials work best in a project of this scope.

- Ms. Gutterman suggested that the existing brownstone should be sounded to remove delaminated areas and then patched with a composite product. She emphasized that it is important to understand how deep the brownstone units are to ensure that compromised material can be removed while still preserving a water-tight elevation. Ms. Gutterman also commented that brownstone units could also be replaced with cast stone or with real brownstone installed with the bedding plane rotated to prevent future deterioration.
- Mr. Weiner asked if the applicants had priced EIFS compared to brownstone for façade repairs.
  - Mr. Barnaby responded that they had not yet, but that contractors have given them the sense that the cost would be three or four times the cost of stucco.
- Mr. Weiner asked Ms. Gutterman for clarification of the product names that might be appropriate for patching.
  - Ms. Gutterman listed Jahn, Prosoco, and Edison among others.
- Ms. Gutterman observed that using an EIFS system, which covers rigid boards with a coating, would result in loss of the trim details around the upper windows.
  - Mr. Masterpasqua responded that they had considered using traditional stucco for that reason.
  - Ms. Gutterman expressed doubt about the suitability of applying traditional stucco onto the brownstone without a layer of lath but noted that using lath would also likely result in a loss of detail.
- Mr. Masterpasqua spoke to the loss of detail in many of the upper-floor trim elements along the block and explained that the plan was to very simply wrap the surviving material in stucco similar to several treatments completed before designation. He also asked Ms. Gutterman about the use of cast stone and whether it could be used to replace missing or damaged units.
  - Ms. Gutterman confirmed that she has used cast stone in that manner to repair brownstone.
- Mr. Masterpasqua inquired about the process of securing approval for exploratory work to remove some of the existing stucco and investigate the condition of the stone underneath.
  - Mr. Maust responded that the staff could approve exploratory work in a sample area.
- Mr. Weiner suggested that using EIFS on the currently stuccoed floors and restoring the upper floors might be a reasonable compromise.
  - Ms. Gutterman expressed a preference for conventional stucco over EIFS.
  - Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Lukachik agreed with Ms. Gutterman.
- Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. Weiner that she could support removing the existing stucco and re-covering the first two floors in a conventional stucco treatment with scored joint lines and better-replicated window trim. She emphasized that she would want to see product specifications and that the staff should review a mock-up of the stucco details on plywood to evaluate the scoring and the trim treatment.
- Mr. Weiner turned back to the upper floors and suggested that the historic trim details could be replicated through patching or unit replacement by a skilled mason.
  - The property owners responded that they are open to such a compromise.
- Mr. Detwiler recommended that the stucco be tinted to match the brownstone above for a cohesive whole.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- EIFS can trap moisture inside the wall, which would be deleterious for the brownstone.
- A skilled mason could restore the upper floors through the use of composite patch products designed for use with brownstone or the use of cast stone to create replacement units.
- Restoring the upper floors while re-covering the lower floors with a more compatible stucco treatment could be an acceptable compromise.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Covering the brownstone on the upper floors with stucco or EIFS fails to satisfy Standards 5 and 6.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6 and the Masonry Guidelines.

| <b>ITEM: 1504 Pine St</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Detwiler</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Lukachik</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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                                                                                                           | 5   |    |         |        | 2      |

**ADDRESS: 1601 MOUNT VERNON ST**

Proposal: Amend approval of façade materials

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mt. Vernon Commons LLC

Applicant: Naché Patior

History: 1859; Robert Purvis House; storefront, 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This application calls for amending the Historical Commission's July 2023 approval for the rehabilitation of the Robert Purvis house. The developer seeks approval to substitute cast stone for marble on the front façade's stoop and door surround, owing to the high cost of marble. The applicant is determining the viability of cast stone for the water table.

The property at 1601 Mount Vernon Street is significant in the Spring Garden Historic District,

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2026**

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

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

owing to its association with Robert Purvis, a Black anti-slavery activist, writer, and lecturer who resided at the property for the final years of his life—ca. 1875 to 1898. Over the last few decades, the property languished and was subject to multiple violations, proposed but unimplemented projects, and court orders, culminating in an Act 135 conservatorship. The City demolished the rear ell to abate a dangerous condition in 2012. After years of deterioration and legal proceedings, the property is being rehabilitated.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Amend approval of façade materials

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
  - The only remaining portion of the original building, the main block, had a storefront installed c. 1920. That intervention removed the original entryway and marble stoop. Two large openings for storefront windows were cut into the masonry on the front façade and side wall at the first story, and a new corner entrance was constructed.
  - The application proposes to substitute the approved marble of the stoop and door surround with cast stone, owing to the high cost of the marble. They are unsure if they will propose cast stone or brick at the water table. While suboptimal, the staff sees the use of cast stone as the best solution to complete construction of the residential front. If cast stone is used for all marble elements on the front façade, the work complies with Standard 6.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, if the water table, as well as the surround and stoop are built with cast stone, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 1:12:22

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Stein asked if the marble water table would extend along the 16<sup>th</sup> Street facade of the building.
  - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff noted that the original approval called for the water table to extend the length of the 16<sup>th</sup> Street facade. However, at the request of the developer, the staff removed this requirement because there are many examples of contributing corner buildings in the Spring Garden Historic District without water tables extending along the side street facades.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed support for the change from marble to cast stone but also expressed concern regarding the lack of details for installation of the cast stone.
  - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff agreed.
- Mr. Weiner expressed concern regarding the method of construction for the cast stone elements.

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff stated that the method of construction had not been discussed, only the substitute material for the marble.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the cast stone would match the color of the marble.
  - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff intoned that the goal is to match the color of marble as closely as possible.
- Mr. Weiner objected to the staff recommendation that was support for the change from marble to cast stone.
- Mr. Gutterman asked if more than one bid was sought for the marble.
  - Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff observed that the staff's goal is to move the project forward to completion, even if the marble door surround, stoop and water table will be executed in cast stone.
- Ms. Gutterman asked for the quote to be submitted on the letterhead of the company providing the stone.
- Mr. Weiner opined that the quoted cost for the marble was consistent with his experience.
- Mr. Detwiler added that the cost for material and labor should be accounted for separately.
- Mr. Detwiler said the profile of the cast stone at the corner must be properly detailed.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Julia Hayman expressed support for marble on the stoop, door surround, and water table.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 1601 Mount Vernon Street is significant in the Spring Garden Historic District, owing to its association with Robert Purvis, a Black anti-slavery activist.
- The Historical Commission approved plans for the building's rehabilitation at its July 2023 meeting.
- The developer is proposing cast stone instead of marble for the stoop, door surround, and possibly the water table.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6, owing to incomplete information regarding to construction details and the water table material.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness of the application and pursuant to Standard 6.

| <b>ITEM: 1601 Mount Vernon St</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Detwiler</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Weiner</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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                                                                                                                 | 5   |    |         |        | 2      |

**ADDRESS: 4275 VIOLA ST**

Proposal: Completely demolish building; stucco party wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Haverford Square Viola LLC

Applicant: Francis Henriquez, FH Demolition

History: 1897, Henry E. Flower, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Contributing, 12/11/2009

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

**OVERVIEW:** The property with a three-story rowhouse at 4275 Viola Street is classified as contributing in the Parkside Historic District. The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) cited the property as Imminently Dangerous on June 25, 2026. In response to the violation, a demolition contractor working for the property owner submitted an application requesting approval of the complete demolition of the building.

The property at 4275 Viola Street has been neglected for many years. The current owner, Haverford Square Properties, purchased the property in May 2023. L&I issued Imminently Dangerous violations for the property in December 2021, January 2023, May 2025, and the current violation in June 2026. Last year, in 2025, L&I issued a make-safe building permit to the current owner to address the deterioration and repair the rear ell to comply the violations, but no work was ever undertaken and the permit for the repair work expired.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the City of Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance enumerates restrictions on demolition and stipulates that: "No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted." The application does not attempt to demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be reasonably adapted and therefore fails to justify the complete demolition as required by the preservation ordinance.

After the submission of the application, the Historical Commission's staff conferred with the head of the unit at L&I that administers ID violations and he indicated that the violation can be

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2026**

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

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



complied with a make safe permit allowing the applicant to partially demolish the rear section of the building under the direction of a registered architect or engineer. On 28 July 2026, early on the morning of the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant submitted an engineer's report on the condition of the building. The report indicates that the rear ell of the building must be demolished, owing to its condition, but that the main, front block can be repaired, albeit with difficulty. The report claims that the front facade may need to be braced in the street while the rear is demolished and the front is stabilized.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Completely demolish building
- Stucco party wall

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the City of Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance enumerates restrictions on demolition and stipulates that:

- No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
  - The application does not attempt to demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be reasonably adapted and therefore fails to justify the complete demolition under Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. The building should be repaired as proposed in the make-safe building permit RP-2025-006366 issued in 2025. If the repair cannot be safely accomplished because of additional deterioration, the rear ell should be demolished and the front, main block stabilized and sealed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:28:39

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Demolition contractor Cleivi Prophete represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Prophete introduced herself and stated that she was surprised that she needs the Historical Commission's approval before she can obtain the demolition permit, even though the Department of Licenses and Inspections sent a violation notice stating that the property owner must immediately repair or demolish the building. She stated that she visited the property, which is in very bad shape, with the structural engineer. She stated that her firm recommended to the property owner that he demolish the entire building because removing just the back would compromise the front; retaining the front block of the building would be dangerous and cost a lot of money. She stated that the engineer determined that bracing the front would be costly and difficult. Ms. Prophete stated that the building has suffered severe damage, in part owing to a fire. Many floor joists are missing. The front façade is in poor condition.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the violations that were issued as far back as 2021. He asked if the building was repaired in response to those violations.

- Mr. Farnham stated that it is his understanding that the building was never repaired. A permit was issued to repair the building in 2025, but the work was never undertaken and the permit expired.
- Ms. Lukachik, the structural engineer on the Architectural Committee, stated that the front block of the building could be braced without blocking the street. She stated that an interior frame could be constructed a few feet above each floor to create a new box and stabilize the front of the building. There are ways to brace the front portion to allow it to be safe so that the damaged interior framing can be removed and replaced. Ms. Lukachik agreed that the back section of the building could be demolished.
  - Ms. Prophete again stated that the building is in very poor condition and does not merit expensive stabilization and repair.
  - Ms. Lukachik stated that the interior framing could be replaced and tied back into the structure. She asserted that the front of the building can be saved.
  - Mr. Weiner, the contractor on the Architectural Committee, and Mr. Detweiler agreed with Ms. Lukachik.
- Ms. Stein stated that it is a character-defining building, and it would be tremendously sad to lose a building like this that has such a presence on the street. She agreed with her colleagues that the front block of the building should be retained and repaired.
  - Mr. Detweiler agreed with Ms. Stein and noted that the front bay window is important for the house and the block. He stated that the front should be saved for the sake of the streetscape.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance stated that she agrees with the Architectural Committee members' comments. She stated that property is extremely significant to the Parkside Historic District. She contended that the front block of the building should not be demolished.
- Evan Litvin reported that he is a registered architect and one of the largest commercial property owners in the Parkside neighborhood. He stated that he agrees with the comments made by the Architectural Committee and contended that the building and block are both very important and should be protected. He asserted that the front part of the building should not be demolished.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that the building is important and should be saved.
- Arielle Harris of RePoint Philadelphia stated that she hopes that the house can be retained, not demolished. She objected to the late submission of the engineer's report. She suggested that the newer and better photographs should have been included in the application. She stated that she objects to the demolition of the rear of the building but would accept the demolition of the rear to save the front.

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

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property with a three-story rowhouse at 4275 Viola Street is classified as contributing to the Parkside Historic District.
- The Department of Licenses and Inspections cited the property at 4275 Viola Street as Imminently Dangerous on June 25, 2026.
- The head of the unit that administers ID violations at the Department of Licenses and Inspections indicated that the violation can be complied with a make safe permit

allowing the applicant to partially demolish the rear section of the building under the direction of a registered architect or engineer.

- The applicant submitted an engineer's report on the condition of the building that indicates that the rear ell of the building must be demolished, owing to its condition, but that the main, front block can be repaired.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not attempt to demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be reasonably adapted and therefore fails to justify the complete demolition under Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

|                                                                                                                  |     |    |         |        |        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>ITEM: 4275 Viola St</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Lukachik</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| 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                                                                                                            | 5   |    |         |        | 2      |

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:45:51

**ACTION:** The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:49 a.m.

### **PLEASE NOTE:**

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its advisory Committees are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, [www.phila.gov/historical](http://www.phila.gov/historical).