

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

**TUESDAY, 25 FEBRUARY 2025  
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM  
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

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

<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		
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Allison Lukachik	X		
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

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

The following staff members were present:

- Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Candice Player
- Eszter Kutas, Philadelphia Holocaust Remembrance Foundation
- Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
- Lindsey Rosenberg, Mural Arts Philadelphia
- Logan Dry, KDA Design Associates
- Meredith Ferleger
- Michael Ramos
- David McShane, Mural Arts Philadelphia
- Todd Bressi
- Deepan Patel

## **AGENDA**

### **ADDRESS: 1631-37 ARCH ST**

Proposal: Install mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Verizon Communications Inc.

Applicant: Lindsey Rosenberg, Mural Arts Philadelphia

History: 1915; Bell Telephone Building; John Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 12/12/2008

District Designation: None

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

**Background:** This application proposes installing a mural on the one-story east façade of the building at 1631-37 Arch Street, historically known as the Bell Telephone Parkway Building. This wall faces the Horwitz-Wasserman Holocaust Memorial Plaza, the site of the first public Holocaust monument (1964) in the United States. The proposed mural would be the nation's first large scale mural dedicated to Holocaust remembrance and education in a public space.

The limestone wall facing Memorial Plaza is not original to the 1915 Bell Telephone Building. Until the early 1960s, the east wall of 1631-37 Arch Street functioned as a party wall. After the adjacent buildings were demolished in the 1960s, the brick party wall was exposed and later finished with limestone panels. The planned mural will be painted on cloth and installed into recessed panels of the east façade. Prior to this installation, the limestone 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.

### **SCOPE OF WORK**

- Install a mural on the east façade

### **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 alteration of the limestone wall with a mural would not destroy the historic character of the property. The area being impacted is not part of the original design or historic fabric.
- *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 non-historic wall could be repaired or replaced.
- *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:** 00:03:00

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Lindsey Rosenberg and David McShane of Mural Arts Philadelphia and Eszter Kutas of the Philadelphia Holocaust Remembrance Foundation represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Kutas provided background on the initiative and explained that the Foundation started a conversation with Mural Arts in 2021 about installing a mural on the Verizon building to add to the narrative of the Holocaust Memorial Plaza. She stated that a finalist was selected out of 54 artist applicants, and the finalist met with the general public over the winter, where the public was welcome to get to know the artist and understand the project goals in terms of Holocaust remembrance and education with the mural at the site. She stated that the artist is currently working on the design of the mural, and the expectation is that she will be ready with her final design by May 2025. She concluded that they look forward to adding more storytelling and visual narrative to the site that considers the Holocaust primarily but also considers other forms of discrimination.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the acrylic primer proposed for use on the limestone.
  - Mr. McShane responded that the purpose of the primer is to soak into the substrate to allow for a good root system to which topcoats can adhere. He stated that the glue is thick and so the primer is needed to absorb into the limestone first.
  - Mr. Cluver noted that the limestone panels are not historic material, but that this would be non-reversible and therefore would be an issue if the material was historic.
  - Ms. Gutterman disagreed, stating that the wall still needs to breathe.
  - Mr. McShane explained that the mural is not covering the entire wall, and the paint chemist that he has met with refers to the acrylic paint as breathable. He stated that he has been with Mural Arts for 30 years and has not witnessed a failure where this product has been used.
  - Ms. Gutterman stated that the applicant should provide product data from the manufacturer listing the perm rating.
  - Others questioned why the Committee would be concerned with potential damage to a non-historic wall that could be repaired or replaced at a later date.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that he approves of a mural in this location, provided it is done in a way which preserves the building and mural long-term.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the glue being applied on top of the primer.
  - Mr. McShane responded that the entire process is acrylic.
  - Ms. Gutterman requested that he submit the product data to Ms. Mehley.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the applicants submit an existing-conditions report on the limestone to the Historical Commission's staff.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if repairs to the limestone were planned prior to installation of the mural.
  - Ms. Kutas responded that the entire building was repointed within the last six

- months, and the wall is in extraordinarily good condition. She noted that the mural is only being placed in panels between exposed limestone.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern about the ability of the limestone to breathe. He suggested redesigning the mural so that air can get behind it.
  - Mr. Detwiler agreed that allowing air behind the mural is one way to address moisture concerns.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the existing trees on the plaza.
  - Ms. Rosenberg responded that the mural was designed with the trees in mind.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- A mural in this location is acceptable.
- The primary concern for a mural as proposed is the permeability of the paint adhesives.
- Product data showing permeability should be provided to the Historical Commission.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The alteration of the limestone wall with a mural would not destroy the historic character of the property. The area being impacted is not part of the original design of the building and is not historic fabric, satisfying Standard 2.
- It is unknown if the mural could be removed in the future without impact on the historic property, owing to a lack of information about the permeability of the proposed materials. This aspect of the application fails to satisfy Standard 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 10.

<b>ITEM: 1631-37 Arch St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

**ADDRESS: 1322 PINE ST**

Proposal: Replace door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Candice and Betty Player

Applicant: Candice Player

History: 1852

Individual Designation: 3/28/1961

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace the front door of 1322 Pine Street. The building was constructed in 1852, and the property was designated as historic in 1961. The current front door appears to be the original front door, which was modified with the replacement of the upper wood panels with glass panels. The property owner would like to replace the front door with a custom mahogany door made by Tague Lumber that would have no glazing and three broad panels of varying sizes. The door would be stained and not painted. The proposed door does not replicate the design of the original door. The door would fill the entire opening, and the panel profile would match that of the shutters on the building.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Replace historic door with new mahogany door.

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends denial of the proposed door replacement, but approval of a door that closely approximates the historic door, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:24:47

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Candice Player, the property owner, represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Stein asked the applicant if she would be willing to change the proposed panels to match the profile of the historic door configuration.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if there was something wrong with the current door.
  - Ms. Player responded that the current door was not her preferred door. She noted that she believed it was not a particularly secure door, that it was thin and

- drafty, and that the door looked worn in her opinion.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if her security concerns stemmed from the glass in the front door.
  - Ms. Player responded in the affirmative, stating that the door with the glass was not secure.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if she knew the thickness of the door and the thickness of the proposed door.
  - Ms. Player responded that she did not but could provide that information to the Historical Commission.
- Mr. D'Alessandro opined that, if there was nothing wrong with the door, he did not think it should be changed but that it could be repaired with some carpentry work.
  - Ms. Player responded that as a homeowner she would like to upgrade her property and in her opinion the door was not in good condition. She opined that just because the door functioned did not mean she would not wish to replace it.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the door-panel details were character-defining elements of the residential buildings in this neighborhood and that the original doors date the building to a specific date.
- Ms. Player highlighted the fact that the presentation showed only houses with the original door design, but that there were other houses on the block that were not shown that had differently designed doors.
  - Mr. Detwiler explained that it was possible those doors were replaced before the Washington Square West Historic District was designated and the Historical Commission had review authority.
- Mr. Cluver noted that it would be possible to change the hardware of the door for door security.
  - Ms. Player opined that keeping the glass panels would be unacceptable for her, owing to safety concerns. On the subject of the door thickness, she noted that the weight of her current door seemed thinner and less substantial to the mahogany door that she viewed and tested at the Tague showroom. She noted that, in the same way that the Architectural Committee might allow for her to change out the glass and hardware on the door, she hoped it would allow her to replace the door with a more substantial door if she believed that would be best to secure her home.
  - Mr. Detwiler noted that he agreed with her points, but that where they disagreed was in the design of the door.
- Ms. Gutterman added that the door jamb would need to be measured to determine what thickness of door could be installed in the historic frame. She noted that she would like to see the existing door remain and explained to the applicant that if she were to reinforce the door from the inside, she would not need to seek approval from the Historical Commission as they had no jurisdiction over the interior.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the wood available today would not be of the same quality as the old-growth wood most likely found in the historic door.
- Mr. Cluver commented that in his opinion there were two paths forward. One path was to fortify the existing door, and the other path was to get a new door made with the same panel detailing as the historic door.
  - Ms. Player stated that the second option was more appealing to her.
- Mr. Detwiler noted the importance of door hardware for security.
- Mr. Cluver noted that if the applicant were to get approval to replace the door, he would strongly recommend that the historic door be salvaged and not disposed of.
- The applicant questioned the Architectural Committee about Standard 6 and how the

Committee defined the term “historic features.” She pointed out that the historic doors that had been discussed were those found on the 1300 block of Pine Street and wondered if it were possible that on other blocks there were other styles of doors that would have been common in the 1850s. The applicant asked the Committee why they were defining this historic door in terms of the 1300 block of Pine Street.

- Mr. Detwiler clarified that Washington Square West Historic District has many styles but that each row, each side of the street, typically would have been built at the same time by a developer and the doors for each row would have been unique to that row.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Many original historic entry doors survive on the 1300 block of Pine, including the door at 1322 Pine.
- If the door were to be replaced, it should maintain the historic panel composition and profile.
- If the door were to be replaced, the historic door should be salvaged.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6, as the historic door could be repaired and reinstalled rather than replaced.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, as the proposed door is not compatible with the existing historic doors on the 1300 block of Pine.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed door pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

<b>ITEM: 1322 Pine St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: D’Alessandro</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

**ADDRESS: 1304 SPRUCE ST**

Proposal: Replace front entry door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Multiple Condominium Unit Owners

Applicant: Deepan Patel

History: 1840

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace the front door of 1304 Spruce Street, a property built circa 1840 and classified as Contributing to the Washington Square West Historic District. The existing front door appears to be the original front door. The applicant contacted the Historical Commission to inquire about replacement of the front door, owing to its deteriorated condition, and the Historical Commission's staff responded that it is limited to approval of a new front door that is wood and sufficiently replicates the appearance of the historic door. The applicant obtained quotes from two suppliers, which the applicant asserts are cost prohibitive. These quotes are included in the application materials. The applicant has also included two quotes for doors from Home Depot, for which he would like approval, either a steel six-panel door or a wood six-panel pre-hung door.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Replace historic door with steel or wood six-panel door.

**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 proposed steel or wood six-panel doors do not match the old in design, texture, or materials in the case of the steel option.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends denial of the proposed door replacement, but approval of a door that closely approximates the detailing of the historic door, pursuant to Standard 6.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:47:40

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Condominium unit owner Deepan Patel represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Patel suggested that the proposed six-panel door could be installed upside down, and the kickplate installed over the smallest two panels, resulting in the appearance of a four-panel door.
  - Ms. Gutterman responded that flipping a six-panel door would not result in a four-panel door with the correct proportions or panel profiles. She stated that neither



- of the designs proposed in the application match the existing door.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is amazing to have the original door intact and that it is a character-defining feature of the building. He stated that the application does not provide documentation that the existing door cannot be repaired rather than replaced.
  - Mr. Detwiler stated that a preservation-minded carpenter would repair the door slab and improve the hardware, which should be less expensive than full replacement.
  - Mr. Patel asked about the requirement to get approval and what would happen if the door was replaced without the approval of the Historical Commission. He stated that he is not against historic designation but feels that there is price gouging by historic preservation contractors because they know that the property owners do not have a choice.
    - Mr. Farnham explained that the Philadelphia Historical Commission is part of City government, and the City's historic preservation ordinance is a City law that requires all owners of historic properties to obtain Historical Commission's approval before undertaking any exterior alterations. He stated that the Department of Licenses and Inspections may issue violations to owners of properties who do not follow the law. If the violations are not corrected, the City can pursue enforcement actions including fines and taking the owners to court.
  - Mr. Cluver observed that Quote 1 includes replacement of the frame and transom as well as the door slab, and that there is no need to replace everything within the masonry opening, which is resulting in a higher quote. He observed that Quote 2 is from a company that will provide an incredibly high-quality door that will last a very long time.
    - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the Architectural Committee does not need to concern itself with costs.
    - Ms. Gutterman countered that the Architectural Committee needs to be aware of costs and how they may factor into an application.
  - Mr. Patel stated that he contacted numerous contractors and fabricators, and the prices they have provided for new historically accurate doors feel like price gouging, owing to the historic designation of the property.
    - Mr. McCoubrey responded that the quotes provided in the application are for a high-quality door that will last a long time, which will undoubtedly be more expensive than a door from Home Depot.
    - Mr. Detwiler agreed that the quotes provided are in line with the going rates for doors of a certain quality.
  - Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the door frame rather than the door itself may be the issue, and that Mr. Patel could look at relocating the hinges, or using a dutchman where the hinges are so that the screws stay in place.
  - Mr. Detwiler recommended reaching out to preservation-minded carpenters who could repair the existing door and frame for less money than replacement. He suggested that Mr. Patel reach out to the local civic association and the Preservation Alliance for recommendations of carpenters.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Michael Ramos commented in support of restoration of the existing door, noting that it is old-growth lumber and therefore of better quality than the wood used today to make a new door.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing four-panel front door appears to be original to the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed steel or wood six-panel doors do not match the old in design, texture, or materials in the case of the steel option. The application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed door or transom replacement, but approval of a door that closely approximates the detailing of the historic door, provided the existing door cannot be repaired, pursuant to Standard 6.

<b>ITEM: 1304 Spruce St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Gutterman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

**ADDRESS: 449 LOCUST AVE**

Proposal: Rehabilitate designated house and construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: KJB Solutions, LLC

Applicant: Logan Dry, KDA Design Associates

History: 1861; Edwin T. Chase House

Individual Designation: 12/13/2024

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to convert the Edwin T. Chase House to a multi-unit residential building. The proposal calls for restoration of the primary (east) façade and rehabilitation of the north and south facades of the main block and secondary block located behind. An altered one-story enclosure at the rear of the building will be demolished. Fire escapes on the north and south facades of the main block will be removed. Much of the original fenestration pattern will be restored on the first and second stories of the north and south facades of the main block. The third story of the main block’s north and south facades have two small, double arched windows that were partially altered by the construction of the fire escapes. The proposal would restore the top portions of the arched windows but lengthen them by adding lower sashes. An elevator overrun will be removed from the main block. The roof height of the secondary block will be raised to align with the rear addition, diminishing the original difference

in height between the main block and the secondary block.

The three-story addition will be clad in cementitious siding with two-over-two windows similar to those in the original building. A hipped roof will cover most of the addition with a flat-roofed hyphen where the addition will adjoin the secondary block of the original building. Juliet balconies with minimal railings will break up the massing of the addition.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Restore/rehabilitate the main block of the original building.
- Raise the roof height of the secondary block of the main building.
- Demolish the altered one-story block at the rear of the original building.
- Construct a three-story rear addition.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
  - The primary façade of the main block will be restored to its original appearance.
  - The top sash of the paired, arched windows on the third story of the main block's north and south facades will be restored but lower sash will be added to lengthen these windows.
  - The roof of the secondary block will be raised to be the same height as the third story of the addition.
  - An original, altered one-story room at the rear of the house will be demolished.
  - The addition is shorter than the main block, but its roof is slightly taller than the secondary block of the original building.
- *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 addition allows for retention of the cornice and roof line of the north and south facades of the secondary block.
  - Cladding in cementitious clapboard siding differentiates the addition from the historic structure.
  - The addition is deferential to the historic building and the topography of the site reduces its visual impact.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with reconsideration of the lengthening of the third-story arched windows of the main block, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 1:08:55

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Logan Dry and attorney Meredith Ferleger represented the application.

## **DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Dry to respond to the staff's comments on his design.
  - Mr. Dry indicated that the building code requires an egress compliant window on the third floor of the main block. Therefore, the side facade windows are lowered with the front facade windows maintained in their original configuration.
  - Mr. Dry continued that he amended the addition's roof configuration to shed water from the historically designated building.
- Mr. Detwiler complained that the drawings lack appropriate details for a final approval. The walls of the historically designated building and the addition do not align on sheet SK3.
- Mr. Detwiler continued that the addition should be set back 12" to 18" from the original building. Also, the flat roof of the addition should be lowered where it adjoins the historically designated building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro argued for replacing the addition's sliding doors with single doors.
- Mr. Detwiler declared that details such as roofing materials are undefined.
  - Mr. Dry stated that the original building's roof condition has not been evaluated. Should the roof require replacement, a staff-approved architectural shingle would be employed on the main roof of the historically designated building with a metal roof for the porch. He stated that he reviewed the nomination for the property before preparing the drawings.
- Mr. Cluver wondered if the arched windows on the north and south facades of the main block's third story could be two casement windows separated by a removable mullion
  - Mr. Dry replied that the clear height and width dimensions were too small to comply with the building code. He stated that he would take a second look at the problem.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested the window could appear as double hung but actually be a casement.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the addition could be simplified.
- Mr. Detwiler urged the applicant to set back the addition from the corner of the historically designated building, lower the addition's roof exposing brackets on the rear of the historic designated building, align all windows and doors on the addition, and darken its cladding.
- Mr. Cluver mentioned that the addition's downspouts could be realigned, creating a stronger relationship with downspouts on the original historically designated building.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested a plane break in the middle of the addition to reinforce its verticality, just as the historically designated building emphasizes verticality.
- Mr. Cluver wondered why the paired double-hung window at the west end of the south facade's third story does not match its counterpart, a lone double-hung window on its north facade.
  - Mr. Dry responded that the egress stair is at the west end of the south facade while there is an apartment at the west end of the north facade.
- Mr. Detwiler argued for amending the addition's design to harmonize the fenestration, color, and downspouts.
- Mr. Cluver pondered the front porch lighting.
  - Mr. Dry opined offered the installation of ceiling mounted lanterns, wall sconces, or recessed lights.
- Mr. Cluver suggested using only one pendant light on the front porch.
- Mr. Detwiler opposed recessed lighting in favor of an historically appropriate, understated solution.

- Mr. Cluver declared that the lighting of the cupula should be warm and not starkly white.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired if the wrought iron fence at the sidewalk would be maintained.
  - Mr. Dry confirmed that the fence would be salvaged, and the circular driveway will be constructed. He continued that retention of the gates would be impractical although they could be permanently affixed to the fence in an open position.
  - Mr. Detwiler encouraged retention of the gates in an open position.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Michael Ramos applauded the restoration of the house but objected to the scale of the addition.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Rehabilitation of the historically designated building is proposed.
- Details of the rehabilitation are not properly defined.
- The transition between the historically designated building and the addition is lacking.
- The addition’s fenestration is disorganized.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2 because details are unclear and the altered third-story egress windows are too large.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 because the addition is insufficiently deferential to the historically designated building where they adjoin, and the fenestration of the addition is disorganized.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing the lack of details regarding rehabilitation of the historically designated building, the size of its third-story egress windows, the need for a setback on the addition’s north façade, and the design of the addition’s fenestration, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

<b>ITEM: 449 Locust Ave</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cluver</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Detwiler</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D’Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	7				

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:44:10**

**ACTION:** The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:44 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).

DRAFT