

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

**TUESDAY, 17 DECEMBER 2024
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		
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
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Danny McGoldrick
Eric Dvotsky
German Yakubov, Haverford Square Properties
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Jay Farrell
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Mary Kistler
Rachael Gordon
Samuel Gordon, Samuel Gordon Architects
Sam Katovitch, Toner Architects
William Klotz
William Rider

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 322 S SMEDLEY ST

Proposal: Construct addition with pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rachel Rose Gordon

Applicant: Samuel Gordon, Samuel Gordon Architects

History: 1845

Individual Designation: 5/27/1969

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a one-story rear addition at 322 S. Smedley Street and to construct a three-story addition in its place. The application also proposes a roof deck above the rear ell to be accessed by a pilot house, which will pierce the front slope of the roof.

The proposed addition and roof deck would not be visible from public right-of-way, and, given the narrowness of Smedley Street, the pilot house may be minimally visible. The roof deck and pilot house would require the demolition of the rear slope of the roof and a portion of the front slope.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish one-story rear frame addition.
- Construct three-story rear addition.
- Construct roof deck and pilot house.

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.*
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The roof deck and pilot house would require the demolition of significant portions of the roof, which appears to be historic in form, given that it corresponds with most of the properties to the south along Smedley Street. Although there is precedent for additions of this size on the subject block of S. Smedley Street, the undertaking this particular design would require the demolition of most of the roof, including a portion of the front slope.
 - o The application would satisfy Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline if the stair to the roof deck was relocated behind the peak of the roof or if the roof deck was eliminated altogether.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sam Gordon and property owners Rachael Gordon and Will Rider represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Gordon contended that the rear addition, roof deck, and pilot house would not be visible from the public right-of-way and indicated willingness to slope the roof of the pilot house to further reduce visibility from neighboring buildings. He further noted that the existing stairs in the building are narrow and uneven, and the stair tower addresses that condition.
- Mr. Cluver noted that the Architectural Committee's primary concern is the pilot house extending through the front slope and peak of the roof. He asked if there were any images from the street level to assess visibility from longer views.
 - o Mr. Gordon said that he had taken photographs but not included them in the application. He attested to the fact that there would be no visibility even from the ends of the street.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that it would be possible to create roof access without the demolition of the front slope of the roof, by ending the proposed stair tower at the third floor and locating a stair to the roof elsewhere, possibly in the rear study on that floor.
- Mr. Detwiler acknowledged that visibility is a significant concern to the Architectural Committee, but that maintaining historic fabric is also important, including the roof, even when not visible to the public. He further emphasized that the Architectural Committee has repeatedly suggested that pilot houses on historic structures be located behind the ridge of the roof or at the rear. He echoed Mr. D'Alessandro's comment that there may be another way to achieve the desired result.
 - o Ms. Gutterman noted that the Architectural Committee has asked other applicants proposing roof decks to locate them on rear ells.
 - o Mr. Gordon described the study as 11' by 12' and said that adding a stair in that room would make it unusable. He indicated willingness to explore reducing the front portion of the pilot house but noted that that would still come into the ridge of the roof and would result in a more "jagged" and less simple pilot house. He further commented that in proposing to slope the pilot house from the front to back, he was already working with minimal headroom.
- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that a circular stair might be an option and suggested that the degree of demolition of the roof was unnecessary.
- Ms. Gutterman argued that the application as proposed requested significant modifications to an 1845 house merely for access to a roof deck.
 - o Mr. Gordon agreed that the roof deck was a "desire" rather than a need but pointed to neighboring structures which he suggested had been modified at the rear portion.
- Ms. Stein pointed to the submitted aerial view of the property and commented that it appeared likely to her that the ridge of the roof was the original rear wall of the property and that a pilot house behind that point would be acceptable.
 - o Mr. Gordon asked the Architectural Committee to clarify whether a pilot house behind the ridge of the roof would be acceptable.

- o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Architectural Committee is asking to preserve the rear slope, or at least part of the rear slope, if possible, but acknowledged that this project presents some constraints in terms of the size. He reiterated that the Architectural Committee has often asked for pilot houses to be located behind the main block of the house, but that it has approved roof alterations, including wide dormers, behind the ridge of the roof.
- Ms. Stein asked for clarification about where the original rear wall was located.
 - o Mr. Gordon pointed to the location of the chimney and the neighbor to the right suggesting that the rear may be original.
 - o Mr. Cluver pointed to the two properties to the left of this property, which have rear ells with side-sloped roofs, and the fact that the roof ridge appears to match up with the interior walls, all suggesting that the rear slope may have been a later modification.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the argument could be made, though it is not known for sure, that the original form of the house was a half-gable roof. With that understanding, a pilot house on the rear slope would be acceptable.
- Mr. Detwiler asked that any pilot house be as “petite” as possible, as they can become bulky. He also asked that future submissions include a side elevation of the addition and pilot house.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Roof decks and pilot houses should, whenever possible, be located behind the historic block of a historic structure. Roof penetrations, including dormers, should be located behind the roof ridge.
- There are likely other ways to create roof deck access, which could be located behind the front block or at least the front slope and which would require less demolition of the roof.
- Given the constraints of the project, a pilot house behind the ridge of the roof would be acceptable.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, as the addition of the pilot house would necessitate significant demolition of the roof structure and would impact the front slope of the roof, a character-defining feature of the property.

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

ITEM: 322 S Smedley St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
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: 510 E WILDEY ST

Proposal: Legalize work to front facade
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: GLY Investments LLC
Applicant: German Yakubov, Haverford Sq GC LLC
History: 1840
Individual Designation: 2/28/1967
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize work to the front façade of 510 E. Wildey Street that does not comply with plans for a rear addition and selective front façade work approved by the Historical Commission in 2020 and 2023, or an electrical permit approved in 2024. The approved plans called for wood six-over-six double-hung windows in existing openings, the existing (non-historic) front door to remain, and no exterior electrical work. The completed work includes vinyl windows with grilles between the glass in openings which appear slightly larger than the former openings, a new front door that is not based on historic documentation, and the electric meter and associated conduit installed on the front façade. The residential building permit included the following “PHC Staff Review” conditions, none of which were met:

This permit is subject to the following conditions.

CONDITIONS

Homeowner assumes all liability for any work they perform. If a contractor is not named compliance with codes is the sole responsibility of the homeowner performing the work.

PHC Staff Review of railings required for final approval.

PHC Staff Review of siding required for final approval.

PHC Staff Review of door assembly 'shop' drawings required for final approval.

PHC Staff Review of window assembly 'shop' drawings required for final approval.

The approved plans called for Hardie Plank siding to bring the front façade closer to the original wood clapboard appearance, and it appears that this product was indeed used although a sample was not provided to the staff for review. The Department of Licenses and Inspections

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 17 DECEMBER 2024

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

issued a violation for the exterior work at the request of the Historical Commission's staff, prompting this request for legalization from the property owner/developer.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize work to front façade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - o The vinyl windows and entrance door do not match the old in design or materials. The Historical Commission's staff routinely approves electrical permit applications where the meter is located on the interior or an otherwise inconspicuous location. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:27:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner and developer German Yakubov represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Yakubov stated that the other houses in this row have vinyl windows which have been in place for many years. He stated that he enlarged the door opening a bit because the original size was impractical. He stated that the building had suffered from years of water infiltration, which resulted in higher construction costs to renovate it, making the project go significantly over budget. He described issues with the property owners on either side of his property. He stated that he has already reduced the asking price and will be underwater regardless of the sale price because of the cost of pouring a new foundation and essentially rebuilding the house.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that, while the Architectural Committee sympathizes with challenging building projects, it does not explain why Mr. Yakubov did not meet the Historical Commission's permit condition requirements. He stated that the permit requirements must be met in order to obtain a Certificate of Occupancy. He stated that it does not help to go against the rules and regulations for a tight project, and that the Historical Commission's staff could have been accommodating with alternative materials if they had been contacted.
 - o Mr. Yakubov responded that it was an oversight to not send a siding sample to the Historical Commission's staff. He stated that the vinyl windows were a fraction of the cost of appropriate wood windows.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the original siding size and detail.
 - o Ms. Chantry responded that the staff does not have a photograph showing the original wood clapboards on any of these four houses, as they were already clad in alternative materials in the earliest known photograph, from 1958.

- Mr. Detwiler asked if the window locations had been changed.
 - o Mr. Yakubov responded that the locations were not changed, but the openings were made a bit wider.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the cornice was altered.
 - o Mr. Yakubov responded that the cornice was not changed.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the electric meter and conduit on the facade.
 - o Mr. Yakubov responded that PECO refused to place the meter on the interior of a single-family house and added that the conduit cannot be on the interior either.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Historical Commission's staff has experience in working with PECO to obtain permission to have meters located on the interior.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the new door, new windows, trim or lack thereof around the windows, and the exposure of the siding results in there no longer being a sense of this as a historic structure. He noted that there would have been some sort of casing around the windows historically. He observed that this is a very simple facade.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that there was a complete disregard for the historic nature of the building.
- Ms. Gutterman noted that the windowsills were covered by siding as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The approved plans from 2020 and 2023 called for wood six-over-six double-hung windows in existing openings, the existing, non-historic front door to remain, and no exterior electrical work. The completed work includes vinyl windows with grilles between the glass in openings which appear slightly larger than the former openings, a new front door that is not based on historic documentation, and the electric meter and associated conduit installed on the front façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The vinyl windows, window casing, entrance door, and siding exposure do not match the old in design or materials. The Historical Commission's staff routinely approves electrical permit applications where the meter is located on the interior or an otherwise inconspicuous location. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ITEM: 510 E Wildey St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
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: 613 S HANCOCK ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark and Sally Forester

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1765; John Fullerton House

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a highly altered rear ell and construct a rear addition that encloses a portion of the rear of the main block at 613 S. Hancock Street. No work is proposed to the front façade.

The rear ell of the building at 613 S. Hancock Street faces S. Howard Street, a short, dead-end alley used primarily for parking. Three non-historic buildings with first-floor garages stand on the east side of S. Howard Street, across from the rear of 613 S. Hancock Street. The rears of the buildings facing the west side of S. Howard Street have been significantly altered. There is a history of demolition on the 600 block of S. Howard Street that has diminished its historic character. The 1917 Sanborn map shows a now-demolished five-story building that previously obscured the view of the rear of 613 S. Hancock Street.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept version of the application in May 2024 and recommended denial. That design featured a side-gable roof with skylights and facades clad in cementitious panels with one-over-one windows clad in aluminum. The addition would not be visible from Hancock Street. The Architectural Committee objected to the design of the roof, which would drain onto the historic building, as well as the cladding and windows. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a revised in-concept application in June 2024. The revised design featured a flat roof instead of a side gable roof and an alteration to the slope the rear gable of the historic building to shed water to the front downspout. An internal roof drain in the addition will manage all water runoff from the addition internally without impacting the historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear ell.
- Construct 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.*
 - o No work is proposed to the historic front façade and street visible gable roof. The rear of 600 S. Hancock Street, including the ell, is highly altered and lacks character defining features.
- *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.*
 - o The scale of the proposed addition is large, but it does not diminish the view of the designated property from S. Hancock Street; there is no historic fabric on S. Howard Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 0:44:10

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sam Katovitch represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler questioned if a shed roof would simplify the management of water runoff. He stated that rear ell roofs typically slope to one side, and the proposal would cause significant water runoff to the gutter of the historic building.
 - o Mr. Katovitch responded that the proposed shed roof slopes to the alley and is curved at the edge to contain and shed runoff. He stated that the downspout would be able to handle the water runoff.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that a five-inch downspout is incompatible in scale with the historic building.
 - o Mr. Katovitch responded that the proposal calls for a four-inch downspout. He continued that he will consult with an MEP engineer regarding the building's water management.
- Mr. McCoubrey recommended that a notch be taken out of the height of the addition's roof where it abuts the historic house. He stated that nearly all of the addition's ceiling heights could remain as proposed.
 - o Mr. Katovitch expressed concern with building code compliance if the notch was taken out.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the ceiling heights in the addition.
 - o Mr. Katovitch responded that the proposed third-floor ceiling height is 9 feet 4 inches.

- Ms. Stein stated that the Architectural Committee has never received a proposal where the height of the addition necessitates that all water runoff at an historic house is directed to the front gutter. She questioned if a gutter path could be created at the five-foot wide gap between the addition and the house to the north.
 - o Mr. Katovitch replied that this idea was discussed at the Architectural Committee review of the in-concept application, but the Committee decided at that time that it did not want a cricket used to manage the water.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the project design has a commercial feel. He stated that a cricket and a reduced roof height where the addition meets the historic house is preferred.
- Mr. Cluver observed, based upon the section drawing, that the height of the addition could not be reduced to below the rear eave of the original house. However, the addition could be at the same height as the eave.
 - o Mr. Katovitch replied that the client was not happy with the solution suggested by Mr. Cluver. He expressed concern that incorporating these suggestions would require additional time for reconsideration by the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the suggested changes could be executed for consideration by the Historical Commission at its next meeting, and the project would not have to return to the Architectural Committee.
 - o Mr. Katovitch inquired if the staff could approve the application with the suggested changes.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey responded that the project requires review at a public meeting of the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rear ell of the building at 613 S. Hancock Street faces S. Howard Street, a short, dead-end alley used primarily for parking.
- The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a revised in-concept application in June 2024.
- As designed, all water runoff from the roof of the historic house is directed to the front gutter.
- The roof of the addition sits higher than the rear slope of the historic house's roof.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Owing to the addition's height where it abuts the historic house and the transfer of all water to the front gutter of the historic house, the application fails to satisfy Standards 2 and 9.
- The roof of the addition should be lowered so that it meets the back slope of the existing roof at the eave in order to satisfy the Standards.

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

ITEM: 613 S Hancock St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
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: 1108 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Legalize rear addition with reduction in height and revision of cladding

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: DML Worldwide LLC

Applicant: William Klotz, Restoration Development Group

History: 1800

Individual Designation: 3/30/1965

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize a rear addition built without the Historical Commission's review at 1108 S. Front Street. The as-built addition is presently three-stories in height and clad in vinyl siding. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviewed three previous versions of this application, and ultimately denied them. Feedback during the reviews has focused on the scale of the rear addition and its use of bright white vinyl cladding, which make it very visible from Manton Street and incompatible with the neighboring historic properties. Previous applications have included proposals for the front façade, but the applicants have agreed to work with the Historical Commission's staff on the restoration of that elevation.

The revised application, which was presented to the Historical Commission on 13 December 2024 and referred back to the Architectural Committee, addresses those key concerns. The submitted plans show the full removal of the third-floor roof deck, pilot house, and a large section of the third floor. The vinyl siding will be removed and replaced with a synthetic stucco finish above the first floor, which is of masonry construction. A roof deck above the second floor is also proposed, with a black metal picket railing. The revised scope shows a proposed rear addition that is more compatible in terms of historic materials, features, size, and massing with the historic property and neighboring buildings.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize unpermitted rear addition after changes to massing and cladding.

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.*
 - o The extant rear addition, as built, is very large in comparison to the historic structure. Removing the pilot house, roof deck, and rear portion of the third floor of the addition will bring the massing of the rear addition into compliance with Standard 9.
 - o The bright white siding of the rear addition is out of keeping with the neighboring masonry structures. Replacing the white vinyl with a synthetic stucco will make the addition more compatible with the surrounding historic resources and will bring the cladding of the rear addition into compliance with Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:05:25

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Danny McGoldrick and Bill Klotz of Restoration Development Group Inc. represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked for confirmation that the applicants understand what it will entail to work with the Historical Commission's staff on a restoration of the front facade.
 - o Mr. McGoldrick answered in the affirmative.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the wall at the third floor of the historic structure was still constructed of masonry or had been modified.
 - o Mr. Klotz answered that the wall at the third floor is the same as when the project began.
- Ms. Gutterman sought clarification about the extent to which the third floor is original.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is unfortunate to lose the historic form of the half gambrel roof, but that extending it into more usable space may protect the front of the gambrel.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the framing in the front roof portion and the dormer.
 - o Mr. Klotz answered that there had been sistering, but that the original framing is there.
- Ms. Stein thanked the applicants for bringing the rear addition to a more appropriate scale.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed and posited that if the Architectural Committee had reviewed this application at the outset, it may have been approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The application is much improved by the reduction in scale and revision in cladding materials.
- Losing the half-gambrel form of the roof is unfortunate.
- The applicants have committed to working with the Historical Commission's staff on the front facade details, including windows, doors, cornice, and masonry repair and restoration.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9 by responding to the historic materials of the subject buildings and its neighbors in the selection of synthetic stucco for the frame addition and the historic scale by stepping down at the rear, which is visible from the public right-of-way.

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

ITEM: 1108 S Front St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
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: 01:14:56

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:15 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.