

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

**TUESDAY, 24 MARCH 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 9:02 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
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
Joshua Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner I
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

Andy Marsden, NPDP Apartments
Elizabeth Anderson
Hal Schirmer, Esq.
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Hassan Qureshi
James Adducci
Jay Farrell
Kate Woodson
Kathy Dowdell
Kenny Grono
Mackenzie Lee
Michael Bucci
Nancy Pontone
Paul Small, NPDP Apartments

Ryan Crocetto, NPDF Apartments
Sarah Banh, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Stephanie Sultanov Graham
Steven Peitzman
Susan Wetherill
Tim Lee

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2027 AND 2029 BRANDYWINE ST

Proposal: Demolish roof and rear of building; construct four-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James Adducci and Elizabeth Andersen

Applicant: Kenny Grono, Buckminster Green

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the flat roofs and rears of two adjoining rowhouses at 2027 and 2029 Brandywine Street and construct an addition with a gable roof spanning across the two buildings. The adjacent buildings are being converted into one single-family home. The rear of the buildings are visible from 20th Street across several properties, and the proposed additions would be visible. The fronts of the buildings are not being altered. The buildings on this block of Brandywine are three stories in height with flat roofs. The proposed gable roofs would break from the three-story flat rooflines that are consistent on both sides of the street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish flat roofs and rears and construct additions with a gable roof.

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.*
 - Removal of the flat roofs and the addition of a steep gable roof is not compatible with the historic scale, proportion, or massing of the structures and of the row.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed alterations are not reversible.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:59

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Kenny Grono property owners James Adducci and Elizabeth Andersen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Grono introduced the project and explained that he is proposing to combine two rowhouses while preserving street-facing facades and doors. He noted constraints

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MARCH 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

such as a six-inch floor height difference affecting window alignment. He argued that both rear portions of the buildings have already been significantly altered and are not original. He asserted that preserving the rear ell structures is not feasible, owing to prior alterations and construction limitations.

- Mr. Cluver questioned the visibility analysis of the proposed roof slope and lack of comprehensive view studies. He noted that the buildings on the block have flat roofs and expressed concern about introducing a pitched roof.
 - Mr. Grono stated that the submitted views represented the worst-case visibility scenarios. He maintained that the roof addition would not be visible from Brandywine Street.
- Mr. McCoubrey highlighted the visibility of the proposed roof from the rear and raised concerns about the extent of the proposed demolition, particularly the removal of the rear wall of the main structure. He emphasized the importance of preserving the main block of the building.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed that the level of demolition is too extensive and does not meet preservation standards, noting that there were similar projects reviewed by the Architectural Committee that preserved more structural elements.
 - Mr. Adducci questioned whether the concerns about demolition were related to safety or to preservation standards.
 - Mr. Detwiler clarified that the concerns were based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.
- Mr. Detwiler opined that too much historic material was proposed to be removed. He stated that a building is more than its facade and that the proposal compromises its integrity.
- Ms. Stein noted the lack of clarity and completeness in the submitted drawings, indicating that it was difficult to understand the full scope of structural changes. She characterized the proposal as a "facadectomy" and expressed concern about the potential visibility of the roofline. She suggested exploring a fourth-floor addition over the rear ell instead of the main block.
- Mr. Detwiler stressed the importance of preserving the roof structure and rear wall of the main block and suggested that there would be more flexibility for a rear addition than for altering the main structure.
 - Mr. Adducci argued that the rear walls were already non-original and heavily altered and explained a need for reconstruction, owing to water damage and structural issues. He emphasized his investment as a homeowner, his long-term commitment to the neighborhood, and intent to remain in the neighborhood.
- Ms. Lukachik sought clarification on which walls were proposed to be altered.
 - Mr. Grono distinguished between different rear wall locations and asserted that the rear walls had undergone substantial alterations. He argued that the project was not a "facadectomy," owing to the retained structural elements and interior programming.
- Mr. Weiner agreed that replacing interior structural elements is common in renovations and suggested that the primary issue was the proposed roof design rather than the amount of demolition.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the interior work was outside the Historical Commission's purview and emphasized that the roofline change was the main concern because it broke from the precedent of the block and violated preservation standards.
 - Mr. Weiner and Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the roofline, particularly the gable form, is the primary issue and that the rear modifications were generally less concerning.

- Mr. Adducci acknowledged the feedback and expressed willingness to modify design to reduce the roof's visibility. He noted the constraints and compromises they had already made.
- Mr. Detweiler emphasized that the objection was not solely about visibility but also loss of historic structural integrity. He opined that removing the entire roof structure was unacceptable under preservation standards.
 - Ms. Anderson asked about roof deck precedents on nearby properties.
 - The Architectural Committee members responded that the roof decks may predate the properties' historic designations and/or may be unpermitted and that each roof deck application is evaluated independently.
- Mr. Cluver cautioned that approval of this application could set a precedent and alter the character of the block.
- Mr. McCoubrey emphasized the importance of reversibility and retaining historic fabric where possible.
- Mr. Adducci challenged the rear visibility concerns and argued that the rear visibility exists owing to neighboring non-historic structures.
- Mr. Cluver concluded that the Architectural Committee was bound by preservation standards and encouraged the applicant to revise and strengthen the submission for the review by the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. Grono sought the Committee's guidance on acceptable approaches, particularly regarding a fourth-floor addition.
 - Mr. Cluver and Mr. Detwiler clarified that they could not redesign the project and suggested reducing the amount of demolition and avoiding an overbuild of the main roof. They indicated that more flexibility exists at the rear.
- Ms. Anderson asked if a flat roof would be more acceptable.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that the flat roof is a defining feature of the block and should be preserved. Every building on the block is three stories in height with a flat roof.
- Ms. Anderson reaffirmed their long-term commitment to the neighborhood and their desire to make the project work.
 - Mr. McCoubrey acknowledged and appreciated the applicants' commitment.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Steven Peitzman commented in opposition to the application, citing concerns about the integrity that would be lost with the addition of a gabled roof.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed gable roof breaks from the standard roofline along the block and does not satisfy historic preservation standards. The existing flat roof form of the main block should be retained.
- The extent of the proposed demolition exceeds preservation standards. More historic fabric should be retained. The structural integrity of the buildings should be ensured. A revised proposal should preserve more of the main block.
- The application materials lack clarity, particularly regarding the extent of demolition and structural changes. The application should be revised to include clearer documentation about the existing conditions, visibility from multiple viewpoints, and the extent of proposed demolition and structural changes.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, as the proposed removal of the flat roofs and the addition of a steep gable roofs are not compatible with the historic scale, proportion, or massing of the structures or of the row.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 10, as the proposed alterations are not reversible.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 2027 and 2029 Brandywine St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Allison Lukachik	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Sam Weiner	X				
Total	7				

ADDRESS: 406 S CAMAC ST

Proposal: Cut window opening on side wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mackenzie Lee

Applicant: Mackenzie Lee

History: 1829

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut a new window opening on the north (side) wall of the corner trinity house at 406 S. Camac Street. The property owner has submitted several options for the type of window. The primary goal is to get light into the space. All existing windows and front entry door date to a 2020 replacement. The small second floor window opening on the side elevation and the overbuild at the rear dates to a 2000 approval by the Historical Commission. The new property owner recently replaced the front brick steps with appropriate marble steps. The brick steps, done by the prior owner without a building permit, had been in violation for several years but have now been corrected.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Cut new window opening(s) into side wall; install window(s).

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MARCH 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *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 of one or two new windows on the side elevation that match the first-floor front window will not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships which characterize the property, and will be compatible with the historic features of the building, satisfying Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of one or two new windows that match the first-floor front window in size, design, and alignment, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:48:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Property owner Mackenzie Lee and her father Timothy Lee represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked Ms. Lee which design option she preferred.
 - Ms. Lee responded that the two-window option is her preference.
 - Ms. Lukachik commented that the two-window option is her preference as well.
- Ms. Stein commented in support of one or two new windows but noted that there may not be enough width for two windows with shutters. She agreed with the staff recommendation that the new window or windows replicate the first-floor front window.
- Mr. Detwiler advocated for the one-window option rather than the two-window option, referencing the photograph of the one side window at 401 S. Iseminger Street.
- Mr. Weiner asked about the details for the new sill and header.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that those details should match the front window.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that these details should be provided as part of the application for review by the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. Lee responded that he would include the requested details but first wanted to see if the application was able to be approved before taking on the expense.
- Mr. Detwiler concluded that two windows with shutters would appear too crowded, and so one single window with shutters is preferred.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the addition of two windows on the side could potentially flip the primary facade from the front to the side, which is not desirable. He agreed with the addition of one window.
 - Ms. Lee agreed that the addition of two windows could make it appear crowded from the outside. She agreed that one window is preferable.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing first-floor living area could benefit greatly from the addition of light and air through the introduction of a new window in the side wall.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MARCH 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The addition of one new window on the side elevation that matches the first-floor front window will not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships which characterize the property, and will be compatible with the historic features of the building, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of one new window that matches the first-floor front window in size, design, and alignment, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 406 S Camac St					
MOTION: Approval of one window					
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: 408 S 22ND ST

Proposal: Alter front door and front steps

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Timothy McMillin and Kaitlin Woodson

Applicant: Michael Bucci, g_space LLC

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Josh Schroeder, joshua.schroeder@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to raise the front door at the rowhouse at 408 S. 22nd Street. The application proposes adding marble front steps and replacing the existing paneled double-leaf door with a single leaf door featuring sidelights in the existing doorway. The panel above the existing door would be removed to make way for the new door, but existing arched transom and crown molding would remain.

All seven houses from 400 to 412 S. 22nd Street were constructed simultaneously about 1869. As the application contends, the existing entrances at 408 and 410 S. 22nd Street have fewer steps and lower doors than the adjacent houses, though the heights of the doorways are consistent across all seven houses. The staff was unable to locate any record of alterations to the front entrances, but the buildings at 408 and 410 share similar features that distinguish the pair from the adjacent houses. By the early twentieth century, both had mansards. Zoning documents indicate that until about 1963, the building at 408 S. 22nd Street had a single large window on the first-floor front, similar to that at 410 S. 22nd Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MARCH 2026

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The staff contends that the proposed steps and elevated door would be a historically appropriate design but suggest a single-leaf door that otherwise matches the existing door in appearance.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Alter front door and front steps.

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 proposed new steps and raised doorway are historically appropriate for this block of S. 22nd Street.
- *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 existing door is a historic feature of the houses on this block. The design of the proposed replacement deviates from the historic design and is therefore not appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the proposed steps and door placement, but denial of the door design, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:04:04

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Schroeder presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Michael Bucci and property owner Kate Woodson represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked if the interior vestibule was being removed and if a handrail was being installed.
 - Mr. Schroeder responded that no handrail was proposed and the applicants were keeping the vestibule but wanted the exterior entrance to better correspond with the interior.
- Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed door would look out of place on the block and a single door leading to two interior vestibule doors would still be a difficult entrance to negotiate.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed but acknowledged the difficulties posed by double doors. He opposed the proposed design as inappropriate while complimenting the applicants for their sensitivity to the existing transom and frame.
 - Mr. Bucci explained they had considered other door designs beside the current proposal of a 36-inch-wide door. He stated that a single door made from combining the double doors would be over four feet in width and too large to operate in the vestibule. A 44-inch door would require larger trim to fill the doorway, but the in-swing worked.

- Mr. Cluver asked why the applicants wanted a single exterior door while retaining the two doors inside the vestibule.
 - Ms. Woodson responded that exterior double doors offered poor security against break-ins and that the interior doors were usually left open and therefore simple to navigate with the enlarged exterior door.
- Ms. Lukachik stated her preference for a larger door with larger trim that matched the other doors on the block.
 - Mr. Bucci noted he had developed plans for a larger door without sidelights.
 - Ms. Lukachik advised that they could be reviewed by the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing double-leaf door design, crown molding, and arched transom contribute to the historic character of the building and surrounding neighborhood.
- A door larger than the 24-inch door proposed with wider trim rather than sidelights to fill the opening would be compatible with the neighborhood's historic character.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed steps and door placement are historically appropriate; therefore, the application satisfies Standards 2 and 9.
- The proposed single door with sidelights is not compatible with the property's historic character, therefore the application fails to satisfy Standard 2 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed steps and door placement provided a handrail is included, but denial of the door design as proposed, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ITEM: 408 S 22nd St					
MOTION: Approval of steps and door placement; denial of door design.					
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: 4225 PINE ST

Proposal: Legalize replacement of slate on mansard with charcoal asphalt-fiberglass shingles

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Neighborhood Preservation and Development Fund LP

Applicant: Ryan Crocetto, Altman Management Company LLC

History: 1900

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District, Contributing, 7/12/2024

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing the removal of slate roofing and its replacement with GAF Timberline Ultra High Definition asphalt-fiberglass shingles in a charcoal color on the mansard at 4225 Pine Street. This property is part of a larger development row on the 4200 block of Pine Street, all of which historically featured slate mansard roofs. The properties on the block were listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in July 2024 as part of the Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District, meaning that any slate mansard replacement prior to written notice being sent to property owners was not reviewed by the Historical Commission.

In October and December 2025, and again in January 2026, a community member contacted the Department of Licenses and Inspections to inform it of the recent replacement of the slate with asphalt-fiberglass shingles at this property. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the roofing work without a building permit in January 2026, prompting this request for legalization from the property owner.

According to the National Park Service's Preservation Brief #29, slate roofs have a lifespan of 60 to 125 years. Section 6.10.c.4 of the Commission Rules & Regulations states that "the staff shall review and may approve without referral to the Architectural Committee and the Commission permit applications proposing the replacement of slate roofing materials, with the exception of mansards, turrets, and other character-defining features, provided the severity of deterioration requires replacement and the substitute materials closely approximate the color and shape of the historic slate roofing materials." The Historical Commission's staff acknowledges that the slate on the mansard reached the end of its lifespan, but it would have been unable to administratively approve a black asphalt-fiberglass shingle in this shape as a replacement, had this application been submitted as a building permit application for review in advance of the work commencing.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize replacement of slate on mansard with charcoal asphalt-fiberglass shingles.

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.*
 - The black GAF Timberline asphalt-fiberglass shingles do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:14:55

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Ryan Crocetto and Andy Marsden represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein asked whether the slate still existed below the shingles or had been entirely removed.
 - Mr. Marsden responded that the slate had been removed.
- Mr. Cluver pointed to the photograph of the installation in progress and expressed reservations about the quality of the unpermitted work, citing the use of a variety of materials including tarpaper and building wrap.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. Cluver.
 - Mr. Weiner also expressed concern about the installation, noting that there appears to be flashing on top of shingles in some spots.
- Mr. Cluver explained that, while slate has a high initial cost, it lasts for a long time and might be a good investment on a property such as this one. He indicated that it would likely add value to future sales and that many past property owners benefitted from the initial cost of the historic slate roof. He urged the owners to consider slate a value rather than simply an expense. Mr. Cluver summarized his thoughts by indicating that the Architectural Committee could not recommend legalizing the unpermitted work.
 - Mr. Marsden asked whether asphalt shingles which replicated the appearance of slate would be acceptable, offering GAF Slateline as an example product. He noted that because these products can be installed with a nail gun, the installation cost is significantly reduced from real slate.
 - Mr. Cluver asked if the applicant had solicited estimated costs of slate replacement.
 - Mr. Marsden indicated that the applicants had not done so.
- Mr. Detwiler cited his own recent projects and contended that slate is not as expensive as it is often perceived to be. He noted that cedar shakes are currently more expensive than slate. He agreed with Mr. Cluver that the Committee could not recommend legalization but that the Historical Commission had more discretion and could consider the application.
- Mr. McCoubrey referred to the photographs of the unpermitted work and described the hip ridge as having been “mangled.”
 - Mr. Marsden indicated that the original hip ridge had been retained but acknowledged that it looked somewhat battered.
- Mr. Marsden asked whether a composite slate product, which could be installed with a nailgun, would meet preservation standards. He reiterated that installing slate is a very labor-intensive and therefore very expensive process.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested that it might be useful to present price estimates for slate replacement as well as compromise roofing materials to the Historical Commission in advance of its 10 April 2026 meeting, so that the tradeoffs could be considered in specific terms.
 - Mr. Marsden asked for further information about the Historical Commission meeting.

- Mr. Farnham provided information about the relationship between the Historical Commission and Architectural Committee as well as the upcoming meeting's logistics.
- Mr. Maust indicated that he would follow up with the applicants to provide more details after the current meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Slate roofs require a significant upfront cost but last longer than most other roofing materials and offer long-term value.
- From the limited evidence of the photographs taken during and after the unpermitted work, there is some doubt that the work was done to a professional standard.
- Estimates of the cost of replacement slate and alternate materials would be useful for the Historical Commission when considering the application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6, as the installed shingles do not match the historic slate roofing in material, design, color, texture, and other qualities.

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

ITEM: 4225 Pine St MOTION: Denial 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				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:29:01

ACTION: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:50 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.