REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 27 OCTOBER 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
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:
Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown
Amy Blumenthal
Amy Lambert
Chris Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture LLC
Christopher Blakelock, Blakelock Architects
Dan Addis, Onion Flats Architecture
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Joe Serratore, Jos. A. Serratore & Co., Architects
Julia Hayman
Kara Haggerty Wilson, Onion Flats Architecture
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design

Lindsey Rosenberg, Mural Arts
Nancy Pontone
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Rhonda Babb
Stephanie M. Pennypacker
Stephanie Magagna, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Todd Bressi, Mural Arts
Tom Familetti
Trevor Cordivari, Lauren Thomsen Design
Zachary Winters, 3rd Story Philly
Zamir Garcia, M Architects

DRAFT

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2201 PANAMA ST

Proposal: Construct fourth floor and roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Amy and Alexander Blumenthal
Applicant: Amy Blumenthal
History: 1963; Goldberg & Nauta, architects
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse-Fitler residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a fourth-floor addition with a mansard roof and roof deck on a rowhouse at 2201 Panama Street, built in 1963 and classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The Historical Commission approved fourth-floor additions and roof decks at 2211-13 Panama Street in 2025, 2225 Panama Street in 2019, and 2227 Panama Street in 2021. This application is for a corner property. The other houses were mid-block.

The Roofs Guideline is the standard typically invoked when reviewing rooftop additions and decks; it requires that the addition is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way to ensure that the addition does not adversely impact the public's perception of the historic building. However, in this case, the building is non-contributing, so the Historical Commission is charged with protecting the historic district but not the building itself.

An in-concept application was reviewed at the August 2026 Architectural Committee meeting. The Committee recommended denial and suggested many changes to ensure compatibility with the surrounding historic district. That application was withdrawn prior to review by the Historical Commission. A new in-concept application was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its September 2026 meeting which incorporated comments from the prior review. The Architectural Committee responded positively to the new in-concept application, making only minor suggestions for changes.

At its October 2026 meeting, the Historical Commission acknowledged that the applicant had addressed the comments of the Architectural Committee, except for the cornice. This application for final approval includes a composite bracketed cornice to replicate a wood cornice. In total, the following changes have been made from the initial in-concept application to ensure compatibility with the historic district:

- The third-floor mansard roof has been eliminated.
- The façade will be painted a red brick color.
- The faux slate mansard roof will be grey.
- The three adjoining windows on the third-floor front facade have been replaced with two windows that have been enlarged to reduce the amount of brick between the top of the windows and the cornice.
- The bracketed cornice design eliminates the expanse of brick above the third-floor windows.
- The roof deck is now set in seven feet from the front, side, and rear of the building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a fourth-story addition and roof deck.

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work 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 building is not historic, so no historic materials would be destroyed with the construction of the addition and deck. Changes to the proposal have increased compatibility with the historic context. The proposal calls for painting the façade red to blend with the nearby contributing red brick buildings. The low height of the existing house, choice of faux slate grey shingles and addition of the bracketed cornice allows for the addition of the fourth-floor mansard roof without adversely impacting the visual continuity of this area of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.
- *Roofs Guideline I Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
    - The Roofs Guideline does not apply to this application because the building in question is non-contributing; there are no character-defining features at the building.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:29

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Contractor Zachary Winters and property owner Amy Blumenthal represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver inquired if a section drawing of the proposed cornice was included in the drawings.
    - Mr. Winters replied that the application did not include a section drawing of the cornice, but such a drawing could be added.
- Mr. Cluver and Mr. Detwiler opined that a single rear gutter would be insufficient to manage water runoff.
- Mr. Cluver wondered if any of the third-story windows were being enlarged in the proposal.
    - Mr. Winters said the front windows on the third story would be enlarged.
- Mr. Cluver suggested noting the increase in the windows sizes on the architectural drawings.
    - Mr. Winters confirmed that he would make that change.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the gable-roofed dormers that were in the original plans have been changed to shed-roof dormers in the current plans.
- Ms. Blumenthal reported that a street tree has been planted where the drawing shows wild vegetation growing.

- Mr. Cluver asked if new rooftop mechanical equipment will be installed.
  - Mr. Winters said an additional mechanical unit will be installed on the roof deck to service the fourth-story addition.
- Mr. Cluver urged the applicant to place the mechanical unit on the rear portion of the roof as far from the building facades as possible.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The property at 2201 Panama Street is classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.
- At its October 2026 meeting, the Historical Commission acknowledged that the applicant had addressed the earlier comments of the Architectural Committee, except for the cornice.
- The applicant submitted a revised proposal with a bracketed cornice.
- The Architectural Committee requested that the applicant indicate additional downspouts on the architectural plans.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed design is compatible with nearby contributing buildings in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, satisfying Standard 9.
- The railing setback of seven feet from all facades and the discreet location of mechanical equipment ensures that the roof deck and equipment will not adversely impact the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 2201 Panama 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: 240 S 7TH ST
Proposal: Construct rear dormer addition with deck and solar canopy
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Anthony DiBlasio
Applicant: Kara Haggerty Wilson, Onion Flats Architecture
History: 1796; John Hutchinson, carpenter
Individual Designation: 4/30/1957
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Significant, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, dan.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes extensive alterations to the eighteenth-century rowhouse at 240 S. 7th Street. It proposes minor alterations and additions at the first and second-floor rear as well as masonry and stucco repair and door and window replacement. More significantly, the application proposes to remove the rear slope of the roof of the main block including a dormer, construct a full-width dormer addition in its place, and modify an existing roof deck. An open, pergola-like structure called a "canopy" would be added to the deck and solar panels would be added to the canopy and dormer roof.

The gable roof on the main block of the building is a character-defining feature. Removing the rear slope of the gable would destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, violating Standard 9. The Roofs Guideline requires that additions be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, ensuring that the addition does not adversely alter the public's perception of the historic building. The building at 240 S. 7th Street is situated in the middle of the block between Spruce and Manning Streets. However, the south façade, including the gable on the main block, is visible from S. 7th Street, owing to a gap formed by the rear of yard of 701 Spruce Street. The roof deck and canopy would also be visible from Manning Street, although it will be somewhat obscured by the rear ell of 738 S. 7th Street. The new dormer and canopy would not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

The Historical Commission approved the fourth-story roof deck and other changes in 2014. At that time, the rear dormer was converted to a door to access the deck, but the original dormer configuration was otherwise maintained. The existing fourth-story roof deck is minimally visible from S. 7th Street and Manning Street but satisfies the inconspicuous standard.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Construct rear dormer addition with deck and solar canopy.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work 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 addition would eliminate the rear gable roof, an historic, character-defining feature.
- *Roofs Guideline I Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*

- The addition and canopy would be conspicuously visible from both S. 7th and Manning Streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:14:58

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Kara Haggerty Wilson represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked the staff to explain the basis of the designation of the property to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
  - Mr. Shacher-Krasnoff replied that the building was individually designated along with the two attached rowhouses in the mid-to-late 1950's.
- Mr. Cluver described the proposal as a very aggressive intervention, exceeding in scope other projects that the Architectural Committee opposed. Furthermore, he opined that it would be difficult to recommend approval, even if the proposal was revised.
  - Ms. Haggerty Wilson suggested increasing the reveal to diminish the impact of the addition, although that would require amending its interior layout.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the eighteenth-century rowhouse is categorized as Significant within the historic district and, therefore, increasing the reveal would be insufficient.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that the fourth story was a garret space that was not meant for much more than housing a single person. He noted that he might support a modest expansion of the dormer, but no loss of original material.
- Ms. Gutterman observed that the addition is merely creating access to the roof deck, not livable space. She expressed opposition to any addition at the rear gable of the fourth story.
- Ms. Gutterman suggested relocating the solar array to the rear third-story deck instead of the fourth-story deck.
- Mr. Detwiler contended the proposed pergola has a strong presence that would be detrimental to the building's historical integrity. He suggested reducing the size of the dormer addition and placing the solar panels on the roof, not the pergola.
- Ms. Lukachik objected to the proposal, owing to the extent of demolition.
- Ms. Stein noted that the proposal amounts to the construction of an additional story.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed that removal of the rear roof is inappropriate. He further stated that the rear ell has previously been widened and the deck added, but that he would not support further expansion of the building envelope. He noted that the Historical Commission has already approved the maximum amount of alteration to this rooftop area.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to explain proposed alteration of the front windows.
  - Ms. Haggerty Wilson said an additional sheet of laminated plastic would be included on the new windows for security.
  - Mr. Detwiler encouraged maintaining the narrow dimension of the meeting rails.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired how the number of solar panels was determined.
  - Ms. Haggerty Wilson responded that the proposal includes the maximum number of panels that could be constructed on the pergola.

- Mr. McCoubrey replied that the number of panels should, instead, be determined by the house's energy needs.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:
The Architectural Committee found that:
- The property at 240 S. 7th Street was individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places on 30 April 1957 and is also classified as Significant in the Society Hill Historic District.
- The application proposes to remove the rear slope of the roof of the main block including a dormer, a character-defining feature, and construct a full-width dormer addition in its place.
- An open, pergola-like structure with solar panels called a "canopy" would be added to the fourth-story roof deck.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:
- The demolition of the rear gable roof removes a character-defining feature and fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- The highly visible full-width dormer addition alters the gable-roof configuration and fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- The addition and canopy would be conspicuously visible from both S. 7th and Manning Streets, failing to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

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

ITEM: 240 S 7th St **MOTION: Denial** **MOVED BY: Cluver** **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: 2102 GREEN ST
Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct rear addition with roof deck and pilot house
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: John C. and Margaret T. Caramanico
Applicant: Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
History: 1854
Individual Designation: 11/2/1972
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000, Contributing
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes alterations to the 1854 Italianate rowhouse at 2102 Green Street. The project received conceptual approval with some modifications when reviewed by the Historical Commission at its October 2026 meeting. An insurance survey from the time of construction describes a three-story brick dwelling house with three-story brick back building and two-story frame kitchen. Historic maps confirm the three-story rear ell. Presently, the rear ell is two stories in height.

The rear of the property is on Wilcox Street, a service alley lined with garages, decks, and rear additions of various sizes.

In 1980, the Historical Commission approved the replacement of the front façade, owing to its structural condition. At that time, the owner was asked to restore the façade using scored stucco to simulate brownstone, utilizing 2104 or 2106 Green Street as an example for projecting sills and lintels. In 1984, the Historical Commission approved the scored stucco sample. In 1993, the Historical Commission approved a deck over the rear parking area. That deck is now in disrepair and is proposed to be reconstructed as part of this application.

This application for final approval has been revised and supplemented based on feedback for the in-concept application. The proposed rear addition is now set in at the third floor, the design has been reworked to be less modern in appearance, and the pilot house has been reduced in size, and its roof is now sloped. Additionally, the application has been supplemented to show that the first bay of the main block rear wall is CMU, and the remainder is wood infill. Photographs are also included to confirm that the recently altered rear addition at 2104 Green Street is primarily a blank wall facing the rear addition of 2102 Green Street, with just two windows and a door.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Demolish rear ell.
- Construct three-story rear addition.
- Construct roof deck with pilot house.
- Reconstruct deck over rear parking area.
- Construct egress window well at front façade.
- Restore front façade features.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
    - The proposed alterations will be in keeping with the varied massing, scale and

materials on Wilcox Street, and the front façade alterations are in keeping with the design of the adjacent property at 2104 Green Street.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:39:17

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked about the location of the new rear wall compared to the existing rear wall, and if the floor structure is being maintained.
  - Ms. Thomsen responded that the locations are very close, but not exact, and the new wall location is being determined by the stair. She explained that the new wall only goes to the second floor. She confirmed that the floor structure is being maintained in the entirety of the main block.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about access to the roof of the main block, and if there will be mechanical equipment on that roof or if a railing will be required. She asked if the footprint of the pilot house on the main block can be reduced.
  - Ms. Thomsen responded that the access is only for maintenance, and there is no mechanical equipment proposed at this time and a railing is not required. She offered to provide an additional section drawing to document how the pilot house has already been minimized.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the section drawing needs to be updated to reflect the revised design. He suggested that the section drawing show a section through the pilot house and stair.
- Mr. Detwiler commented on the roof cricket and suggested that it may solve some problems if the pilot house door is moved to the side.
  - Ms. Thomsen responded favorably to this suggestion.
- Mr. Detwiler thanked the applicant for first applying in-concept and then adjusting the design based on comments from the Architectural Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This application for final approval has been revised and supplemented based on feedback for the in-concept application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed alterations will be in keeping with the varied massing, scale and materials on Wilcox Street, and the front façade alterations are in keeping with the design of the adjacent property at 2104 Green Street, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the pilot house is reduced as much as possible and the door location for roof access is reconsidered, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2102 Green St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Detwiler 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				

ADDRESS: 4370-74 MAIN ST
Proposal: Construct two-story addition
Review: Final Approval
Owner: Brazilian Wax and Spa by Claudia Pennsylvania Corp
Applicant: Joseph Serratore, Joseph Serratore & Company Architects.
History: 1900, 4370 Main Street, Oliver S. Keely & Co.; 1930, 4372-74 Main Street
Individual Designation: None.
District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, 12/14/1983
Staff Contact: Josh Schroeder, joshua.schroeder@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application is seeking final approval to construct a two-story addition with five residential units above an existing one-story commercial property at 4370-74 Main Street. Now a single property and building, the 4370 Main Street portion is classified as contributing to the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District while 4372-74 portions are classified as “intrusions” in the district.

The current proposal includes a three-bay, two-story addition above the contributing portion at 4370 Main Street and features a two-foot, six-inch setback from the large front parapet above the storefront as well as a reveal between the contributing and non-contributing portions. Except for a new sign in place of the existing, no alterations are proposed for the contributing storefront. The two-story addition above the non-contributing portion at 4372-4374 Main Street will include a brick veneer and two projecting bays on the second floor. The double door entrance at 4374 Main Street will be replaced with two separate entrance doors while the front of 4372 Main Street will be altered to match the adjacent 4374 Main Street storefront’s appearance.

The building’s rear faces the Schuylkill River Trail with substantial public visibility. The proposed addition’s rear façade has a more uniform appearance than the front, with recessed and Juliet balconies, and projections beyond the original exterior below.

A previous version of this proposal was reviewed in-concept by the Architectural Committee in November 2025. The Committee denied the proposal, owing to incompleteness, but found that the proposed setback of the addition on 4370 was insufficient to respect the historic character of the historic storefront and the proposed rear alterations needed revision. In January 2026, the

Historical Commission approved a revised in-concept proposal similar to the current proposal but denied the proposed two-foot setback as likely insufficient to avoid overwhelming the historic character of the storefront and parapet at 4370 Main Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct two-story addition on top of 4370-74 Main Street and alter front and rear façades.

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.*
- *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.*
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
    - This application does not propose any alterations to the contributing storefront. The proposed setback of the addition above the historic storefront, though small, and the differentiation of materials and colors between the proposed addition and existing front façade are sufficient to preserve the front parapet's prominence. The application does not propose any alterations to the existing rear façade.

The Main Street Manayunk review criteria as restated in the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations include:

- *Section 6.9.b.4: Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.*
- *Section 6.9.b.5: Design: Additions, alterations and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.*
    - The application proposes no changes to the storefront on the contributing portion of the building. Three-story, mixed-use buildings, and second-floor bays on the front are common in Main Street Manayunk.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, and Main Street Manayunk review criteria.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:54:50

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the applicant was present.

    - Mr. Schroeder responded that the applicant was not among the attendees.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Mr. Schroeder about the Historical Commission's discussion of the setback.
    - Mr. Schroeder explained that the Commission rejected the proposed setback as insufficient but only noted that a larger setback was preferred and warranted further discussion.
    - Ms. Lukachik and Mr. Detwiler explained why a greater setback was preferred to maintain the front parapet's prominence. Ms. Lukachik noted that the two-foot, six-inch (30 inches) setback noted in the drawings was actually closer to two feet, as that figure included the parapet width. She explained she would prefer a 30-inch minimum gap. Mr. Detwiler stated he did not think 30 inches was sufficient and that the gap would trap water and debris.
- The Architectural Committee members discussed the façade materials for the overbuild at 4370 Main Street and noted that the colors and patterns should be accurately conveyed.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the lintels should extend about six inches beyond the window edges, but the rendering's depiction was unclear.
- Mr. Cluver also noted apparent discrepancies between the rendering and drawings. Mr. Cluver suggested that future applications indicate whether drawings or renderings take precedence and asserted that this rendering should be updated before the Historical Commission's meeting.
    - Mr. Weiner stated that the architectural drawings should always be considered preeminent.
    - Mr. Detwiler agreed, but still believed the renderings should be accurate.
- Ms. Stein stated she believed the massing and scale of the proposed addition was appropriate for the district and that the historic character of the storefront could be maintained with the proposed setback. She further explained the building's footprint could not realistically accommodate a larger setback without a full redesign.
- Mr. Cluver suggested installing a roof plane beneath the second-floor front windows sills to make maintenance easier.
- Mr. Cluver and Mr. McCoubrey discussed that the reveal proposed for the front façade did not appear in the same location on each floor plan or elevations.
    - Mr. McCoubrey noted that that the reveal was intended to keep the front parapet independent. He did not believe the current setback was sufficient but did not know if increasing it by one foot would make an appreciable difference. He also agreed with Ms. Stein that the proposed addition is compatible with the historic district.
- Mr. Cluver noted that a roof plan was needed to see if there was a roof access structure.
    - Mr. Detwiler and Ms. Gutterman wondered where the mechanical equipment might go.
    - Ms. Stein stated that mechanical equipment would have to go on the roof as there was little space in the property's rear.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the basement entry and steps shown on the elevations exist or are being proposed, because they were not included in the rendering.
    - Mr. Schroeder noted that they exist and can be seen in the photographs.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:
The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application's materials contain some discrepancies, conflicting details, and lacked a roof plan.
- The proposed addition's massing and scale is appropriate for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District.
- Increasing the addition's setback from the front parapet is not feasible owing to the property's size limitations.
- The gap created by the setback would present drainage and maintenance challenges.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed addition does not directly alter any character-defining features and takes reasonable measures to preserve the front parapet's prominence, satisfying Standards 2, 9, and 10.
- The application maintains the appearance and features of the existing historic storefront, satisfying Section 6.9.b.4 of the Main Street Manayunk review criteria.
- The proposed addition is compatible in size and design with the historic district, satisfying Section 6.9.b.5 of the Main Street Manayunk review criteria.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a roof plan is submitted and suggestions are integrated in the application for the Historical Commission's review, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, and Main Street Manayunk review criteria.

ITEM: 4370-74 Main St **MOTION: Approval** **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				

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 8226 GERMANTOWN AVE
Proposal: Construct multi-unit residential building
Review Requested: Approval
Owner: Vich Properties LLC and VP 8226 Germantown LLC
Applicant: Roy Aharonovich, VP 8226 Germantown LLC
History: 1760; Detweiler House; new façade, 1800
Individual Designation: 5/28/1957
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Josh Schroeder, joshua.schroeder@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for the construction of a four-story mixed-use building and parking spaces at 8226 Germantown Avenue. The new building will occupy the northeastern portion of the lot with new parking at the property's rear. The Detweiler House, an eighteenth-century stone house situated on the lot's southeastern corner, will not be altered by the new construction nor is any work to the Detweiler House included in the scope of this application. The new building's exterior is largely clad in stucco and will have an artificial slate mansard roof with dormers. A storefront will be featured on the ground floor facing Germantown Avenue. Portions of the ground floor façade will feature Wissahickon Schist similar in appearance to the Detweiler House.

The proposed new construction has undergone several rounds of in-concept review. The current proposal for the new construction is largely unchanged from the in-concept proposal approved by the Historical Commission at its March 2026 meeting.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Construct four-story building with parking.

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:14:44

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Schroeder presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Stephanie Boggs Magagna and architect Zamir Garcia represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Schroeder noted that the applicants sent in revisions the evening prior to the Architectural Committee meeting, which were included in the presentation but provided yet to the Committee members.
  - Ms. Magagna and Mr. Garcia explained the revisions, which included reductions in the heights of the dormer cornice, increased fourth-floor door heights, and design changes to the roof cornice.
- Mr. Detwiler noted his appreciation for efforts to reduce the dormer massing on the mansard but explained that the dormers should not extend to the roofline and the trim should be thinner. He also approved extending the trim of front façade's tripartite windows to the roof.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked why the fourth-floor ceiling height was greater than the floors below.
  - Mr. Garcia replied that the height was dictated by agreements with community groups to keep the top of the third story in line with the adjacent building.
  - Mr. Cluver and Mr. McCoubrey noted that the floor-to-ceiling heights of the second and third story were over one foot shorter than the fourth story.
  - Mr. McCoubrey noted reducing the top-floor ceiling height might would mitigate the mansard's top-heavy appearance.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that there should be three panels below the tripartite window systems instead of two, and they should follow the rhythm of the windows.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the fourth-floor hairpin railing was an inappropriate design for a roof deck.
  - Mr. Zamir responded that they were matching the railing in the front yard of the Detwiler House.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the slope of the mansard roof was the same on all sides.
  - Mr. Garcia confirmed that the slope was uniform on all sides.
- Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Detwiler praised the applicants' responsiveness to the stakeholder feedback.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The fourth floor's height and features are out of proportion to the rest of the building.
- The Detwiler House is an individually-designated eighteenth century house located on the property.
- The proposed new construction's design respects the historic context of the property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new construction does not alter or connect to the historic Detwiler House and therefore satisfies Standards 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the floor-to-ceiling height of the fourth floor is reduced, the mansard doors' height is reduced to seven feet, the trim over the dormers is reduced, and the tripartite window systems have three panels, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

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

ADDRESS: 5914 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Construct three-story multi-unit residential building on subdivided parcel
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Nyzio Baker Real Estate LLC
Applicant: Christopher Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture LLC
History: 1901; subdivided from historic property 2025
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018
Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application seeks approval for the construction of a three-story building at 5914 Ridge Avenue. An early twentieth-century historic stone building stands at 5912 Ridge Avenue, from which the subject parcel was subdivided in 2025. This application proposes to construct a three-story, multi-unit residential building on the newly created lot beside the historic building. No part of the historic building will be demolished or significantly altered as part of the new construction. The new building will share a three-story, four-bay design with similar architectural features and massing as the historic and will have a Wissahickon Schist veneer on the front and part of the side facades. It will also feature a long rear ell clad with dark gray fiber cement siding. The landscape will be slightly altered to accommodate the new building, but the existing driveway and stone front wall will be preserved. The front and sides of the new building will be visible from Ridge Avenue.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story multi-unit building.

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The proposed new construction meets Standard 9. It does not alter or connect with the historic building. The proposed architectural features, massing, size and scale are in keeping with the historic building.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
  - The proposed new construction does not affect the historic building and could be removed from the site in the future, leaving the historic resource intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:35:59

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chris Carickhoff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Carickhoff commented that they have been working with the local Registered Community Organization on the design of this project and are aiming for something that fits well within the neighborhood. They are aiming to match the massing and some of the details of the historic building on site while differentiating the new one through color and materials.
- Mr. Cluver commented that he would like to see elevation drawings showing the historic building as well as the new one so that the details can be compared easier side by side. He emphasized that comparable proportions are important to be able to see but it is difficult to tell exactly what matches and what differentiates the two buildings. He went on to add that he questions whether the design is too close to the historic budling and too much of a copy. Since it will be new and made with newer materials, it may stand out even more when set so close to the historic example.
  - Mr. Detwiler responded by suggesting that the design fits in well with the overall streetscape and, as long as the details differ enough, he thinks the proposed plan is a good idea. He agreed that it will be important to make sure the detailing, materials, and colors are different enough when compared to the historic building. He also pointed out that the renderings included only show the buildings from one angle and adding renderings that show the other angle would be helpful as the amount they are wrapping the stone around the sides differs and there is less on the side not shown. He suggested adding more stone so that the stone wrapped both sides evenly. He also questioned whether adding the stone quoining detail around the side door was necessary.
  - Mr. Carickhoff replied that their intention is to use the details to differentiate the

two buildings and not to make an exact replica. The porch columns, for example, will be squared and different and some of the materials they use will naturally be different as well. He also explained that the side entry was detailed in that manner because it is the main entrance for the apartments on the upper floors of the building; the detailing highlights it.
    - Mr. Detwiler suggested adding a hood above the side door to create a small porch area.
- Ms. Stein commented that she is highly supportive of the proposed project. She called attention to the existing historic building and pointed out that its stone front is also only limited to that front facade and does not continue along the sides, which are brick instead.
    - Mr. Detwiler responded that he had missed that detail, and he retracted his earlier comment about adding more stone to the side façade of the new building.
    - Mr. Carickhoff pointed out that budget is certainly a factor with the amount of stone used as well.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the heights of the top floor windows do not align on the sides and front and asked if that was intentional.
    - Mr. Carickhoff responded that it was not intentional, and he will clean up the drawings for the final review.
    - Mr. Detwiler commented that raising the height of the first-floor windows on the porch would likely look better as well and that the porch roof height could be raised to accommodate that.
    - Mr. McCoubrey clarified that he was highlighting the third-floor windows with his comment and the position of the tops of their lintels.
    - Mr. Detwiler agreed about the third-floor windows but reiterated that the first-floor windows on the porch also would look better if they were raised up and that sloping the porch ceiling would accommodate that.
    - Mr. McCoubrey further suggested altering the current design of the porch details so that it differs even more from the historic building. He also asked if the color of the porch and the cornice could be made the same.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if one of the units only has a garage entrance.
    - Mr. Carickhoff responded that it does and that unit is designed to be accessible and the only place they could locate the entrance at grade was through the garage.
    - Mr. McCoubrey suggested also adding an entrance door though the interior hallway.
    - Mr. Carickhoff replied that they could do that, but it would require adding some stairs as the hallway sits higher than the accessible unit.
    - Mr. Cluver commented that the layout of the bathroom and laundry in the accessible unit does not appear to be accessible.
    - Mr. Carickhoff replied that they still need to redesign those layout details.
- Mr. Cluver pointed out that the previously mentioned inconsistent window heights for the third floor appear to be a drawing error where the cornice line is set higher on the side elevations than the front. He suggested that the current side elevations are correct and that it would be unusual to have a band of stone set between the top of the windows and the cornice.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the object at the end of the driveway.
    - Mr. Carickhoff responded that that will be a dumpster.
    - Mr. McCoubrey asked if it would be screened.
    - Mr. Carickhoff responded that they will use a wood or composite type fence to

screen it.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society commented in support of the application and praised the design for fitting in well with the neighborhood.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The lot at 5914 Ridge Avenue is a new parcel that was subdivided from a historically designated parcel at 5912 Ridge Avenue.
- The design of the proposed building will take inspiration from the design and proportions existing historic building at 5912 Ridge Avenue and will use detailing to differentiate it.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9. The new construction does not alter or connect with the historic building. The proposed architectural features, massing, size and scale are in keeping with the historic building
- The application satisfies Standard 10. The proposed new construction does not affect the historic building and could be removed from the site in the future, leaving the historic resource intact.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 5914 Ridge Ave **MOTION: Approval** **MOVED BY: Detwiler** **SECONDED BY: Stein**					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 2215 MADISON SQ
Proposal: Construct rear addition
Review Requested: Review In Concept
Owner: Matthew and Julie Matysik
Applicant: Christopher Blakelock, Blakelock Architects
History: 1872; Madison Square; Charles Leslie, developer
Individual Designation: 9/28/1971
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a small second-floor rear addition at 2215 Madison Square. The rear of the property faces Kauffman Street, a service alley. The houses on Madison Square have unusual original configurations. The houses consist of a main block at the front that spans the full width of the property and a shallow rear ell that spans about half the width of the property, leaving a light court at the rear along the alley between adjacent properties. Within the light courts, small frame, not masonry, rooms project off the houses at the second-floor level only. The projections are held aloft by posts at the outer corner. Many of the projecting frame structures have been altered over the years to add interior square footage. At 2215 Madison Square, the first floor under the frame structure was enclosed prior to the historic designation in 1971. This proposal would extend the original frame structure at the second floor out to the property line in the middle of the light court.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Construct second-floor rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
    - The proposed addition will only be viewed from Kauffman Street, which is a service alley on this block. The design, materials, and massing will be in keeping with the surrounding context.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:57:19

PRESENTERS:
- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Christopher Blakelock represented the application.

DISCUSSION:
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were precedents on the block of Madison Square for additions to the rear ells.
    - Mr. Blakelock referred to his submitted context photographs, including one of 2202 Madison Square, which has been extended into the light court.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired about what size is being considered for the support post.
    - Mr. Blakelock answered that at this conceptual stage they were considering

various options including a “lolly column” or something “beefier” like an 8” x 8” post.

- Mr. McCoubrey commented that this proposal is incorporating a “cutout” on the first floor which evokes the original configuration of the rear ell. He suggested that the applicant could investigate the historic appearance of the original posts.
  - Mr. Detwiler responded that the posts were likely originally round cast-iron columns, possibly with a small ornament at the top. He pointed to the existing column at 2207 Madison Square as being a good model in terms of dimensions and location.
  - Mr. Cluver agreed that 2207 Madison Square offered the best model to follow among the photographs that were submitted.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the small size of the parcels on this block and expressed no objection to an addition of this type.
  - Mr. Cluver agreed that there is precedent for this proposal.
  - Mr. McCoubrey further opined that, if other neighbors completed similar projects, they would not have adverse effects on the block but noted that the open first floor and support column are characteristics that should be maintained.
  - Mr. Detwiler agreed.
- Ms. Stein commented that, from the submitted context photographs, it seems that previous additions to the rear ells on the block have had difficulty with water management and suggested that the matter should get some consideration in the final proposal.
  - Mr. Blakelock answered that he will study the matter further. He said he has been planning to tie into an existing downspout on the rear.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether the addition would continue the existing cornice system.
  - Mr. Blakelock responded in the affirmative.
- Mr. Detwiler recommended surveying the existing support columns in the neighborhood to see if there are surviving historic examples or examples that might serve as models. He suggested that it should be round.
  - Mr. McCoubrey agreed that a simple metal tubular column is best.
  - Mr. Detwiler emphasized that it should not be too small or set in too far from the corner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The massing of the proposed addition is compatible with the historic building and surrounding block.
- Creating an overhanging volume supported by a corner column is an appropriate design given that it is a historic feature of the rear ells of this block.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9. The addition 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.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2215 Madison Sq **MOTION: Approval in concept** **MOVED BY: Cluver** **SECONDED BY: Detwiler**					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 1724 ARCH ST
Proposal: Install mural
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Arch Street Presbyterian Church
Applicant: Lindsey Rosenberg, Mural Arts
History: 1855; Arch Street Presbyterian Rectory
Individual Designation: 9/26/1961
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing a mural on the west façade of the building at 1724 Arch Street. The building was constructed in 1855 to serve as the church's rectory. The stucco wall appears as a party wall but was never attached to another building. The planned mural will be painted on cloth and installed on the west façade. Prior to this installation, the stucco wall will be painted with an acrylic primer to prepare for the mural application. After installation, the mural areas will be coated with an acrylic varnish coating and sealer.

SCOPE OF WORK
- Install a mural on the west façade

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines and the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations 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 alteration of the stucco wall with a mural would not destroy the historic character of the property.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the*

historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
    - If the proposed mural were removed in the future, the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. Any damage to the stucco wall could be repaired.
- *Section 6.15.a. of PHC Rules & Regulations:*
    - *Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.*
    - *Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.*
    - *The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees, and staff shall not consider a mural's content as part of its review of any application for a building permit, but may consider size, scale, and relationship to the historic context.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2 and 10, and Section 6.15.a. of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:07:01

PRESENTERS:
- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Lindsey Rosenberg and Todd Bressi of Mural Arts represented the application.

DISCUSSION:
- Ms. Rosenberg stated that their team has been working closely with the Arch Street Presbyterian Church for approximately five years on this mural and said the congregation and the clergy are excited about the project. Ms. Rosenberg pointed out that specifications for all mural materials were included in the submission documentation. She stated that the size of the mural would be approximately 40 feet by 33 feet and that it would not fill the entirety of the wall.
- Ms. Stein commented that the building's façade is highly articulated and that the sophisticated mural that the artist has designed is very articulated as well. She asked if the mural could be set back slightly from the front façade to create visual separation and relief between the front of the building and the mural.
    - Ms. Rosenberg replied that a separation was planned. She explained that the mural would be centered on the side wall and there would be a four-and-a-half-foot separation between the front façade and the left side of the mural. Ms. Rosenberg also said that the mural would be about 40 feet in height and that there would be open area below the mural as well. She added that the mural would be a perfect rectangular in shape.
- Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Detwiler inquired about the edge of the mural and whether the entire wall would be covered.
    - Ms. Rosenberg explained that the mural ends where the parachute cloth ends. She added that, since the mural would be smaller than the side wall, the wall areas outside of the mural would not be altered and would remain as it currently exists. Ms. Rosenberg stated that attaching the parachute cloth, with the mural painted or applied on it, to the wall with adhesive is the method that Mural Arts has been using predominantly for the last two decades.
- Mr. Cluver inquired about the breathability of the building's wall surface under the mural.
    - Ms. Rosenberg confirmed that the products being used on the mural exceeded requirements to allow the wall to remain vapor permeable, and therefore allowing the wall to breathe. She pointed out that all the product information and the vapor permeable ratings were included with the submission.

    - Mr. Cluver thanked the applicant for paying attention to permeability. He then inquired about the placement of the mural on the wall. He observed that the placement shown in the current application did not match their description at the meeting.
    - Mr. Cluver and Mr. McCoubrey requested that the applicant provide an updated rendering for the Historical Commission's meeting.
    - Ms. Rosenberg confirmed to the Architectural Committee that they would send a copy of the updated rendering prior to the November meeting of the Historical Commission.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that the location is a great place for a mural.
- Ms. Rosenberg agreed and said that their team and the church are excited about all the foot traffic around this site and its proximity to the Comcast building. She noted that many will be able to appreciate the time that has gone into this project.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The mural will cover most of the stucco party wall. The stucco areas not covered by the mural will remain visible and unaltered.
- The mural will be centered on the wall and set back from the front façade, providing a four-and-a-half-foot visual break in between the front façade and the mural.
- The mural will be painted on parachute cloth and then applied to the wall. All products used meet water vapor permeability requirements and will not damage the historic wall or building.
- The applicant will provide a revised mockup and rendering of the correct placement of the mural on the building's wall prior to the November meeting of the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 2. The addition of a mural on the stucco wall will not destroy the historic character of the property.
- The application satisfies Standard 10. The addition of a mural on the stucco wall will not destroy the historic character of the property. If the proposed mural were removed in the future, the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. Any damage to the stucco wall could be repaired.
- The application satisfies Section 6.15.a. of Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations:
    - The mural will not be placed directly on historic fabric.
    - The mural will not obscure historic fabric and will be set back from front façade.
    - The mural is compatible in size and scale in relationship to the historic context.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 2 and 10 and Section 6.15(a) of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations.

ITEM: 1724 Arch St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Detwiler 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: 02:21:04

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:38 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