

**THE MINUTES OF THE 756TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 8 AUGUST 2025, 9:00 A.M.
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET, WITH REMOTE OPTION ON ZOOM
ZACHARY FRANKEL, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Frankel, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Zachary Frankel, Chair (Real Estate Developer)	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq., Vice Chair (Community Development Corporation)		X	
Ibriz Muhammad (Commerce Department)	X		
Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Thomas Holloman (City Council)	X		
Kyle O'Connor (Department of Public Property)	X		
John P. Lech (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair (Architect)	X		
Stephanie Michel (Community Organization)		X	
Franz Rabauer	X		
Robert Thomas, AIA (Architectural Historian)	X		
Matthew Treat (Department of Planning and Development)	X		

The meeting was held in person at 1515 Arch Street, with the option for applicants and the public to participate via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kristin Hankins, Historic Preservation Planner II
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Josh Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner I
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the meeting in person:

Angel Rodriguez, Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority
Cal Leslie

David Dean, Esq., Vintage Law
Derek Spencer, Gnome Architects
Kimberly Haas, Hidden City Philadelphia
Mark Rubin
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Dilworth Paxson
Susan Varghese, Esq., Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority
Virgis Anusauskas, Balticorp LLC

The following persons attended the meeting on Zoom:

Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown Civic Association
Aaron Moselle, WHYY
Abbey Lewis
Angel Rodriguez, Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority
Daniel Behrendt
Daniel Trubman
David Fecteau, PCPC Staff
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Jay Farrell
Julia Hayman
Justino Navarro, Spring Garden CDC
Matthew Millan, Millan Architects
Michael Bannerman
Nancy Pontone
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Patricia Freeland, Spring Garden CDC
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Reuvan Mosheyev, RM Home
Ryan Mulligan, Philadelphia Business Journal
Sam Xu
Stephanie Pennypacker
Steven Peitzman
Susan Wetherill

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 755TH STATED MEETING, 11 JULY 2025

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:42

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Frankel asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any suggested amendments to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 755th Stated Meeting, held 11 July 2025. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Frankel moved to adopt the minutes of the 755th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 July 2025. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 755th Stated Meeting of the PHC					
MOTION: Adopt minutes					
MOVED BY: Frankel					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair					X
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JULY 2025

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:15

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Frankel asked the Commissioners, staff, and public for comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 310 Spruce Street. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda					
MOTION: Adopt Architectural Committee recommendations for Consent Agenda item					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair					X
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2337-41 PENNSYLVANIA AVE

Proposal: Construct two-family semi-detached dwelling

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Reuvan Mosheyev

Applicant: Matthew Millan, Millan Architects

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a semi-detached, two-family, four-story dwelling with roof decks accessible from pilot houses. A non-contributing two-story building stood on the lot at the time the Spring Garden Historic District was designated. The building was demolished in 2022. Owing to the fact that a building stood on the lot at the time of designation, the Historical Commission has plenary or full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

The proposed building would include a central drive aisle that leads to interior garages on the ground floor. The proposed façade would feature a central recess and corner windows trimmed in cast stone to break the overall width of the building into rowhouse-like vertical massing. The cornice at the third floor would be in line with the rowhouse to the east while the overall height of the building would match the three-unit townhome complex to the west. The materials are proposed to be cast stone, red brick, and vertical metal siding in Dove Gray. The windows would have dark bronze frames and sash.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story building with roof decks on vacant lot

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work 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: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, but approval of a slightly revised design as indicated, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:06:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Matthew Millan represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Justino Navarro of the Spring Garden Civic Association commented in support of the revised application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The applicant responded to the comments and suggestions of the Architectural Committee.
- The applicant submitted two options for the treatment of the front façade. The preferred treatment includes more brick and a cast stone beltcourse that aligns with the building to the left, which is labeled as “1A” in the revised application.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Option 1A of the revised application satisfies Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application with the facade option proposing more brick, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 2337-41 Pennsylvania Ave MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Thomas					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair					X
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 148, 150, 152, 154, 156, and 158 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Demolish two buildings and construct six-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Balticorp, LLC

Applicant: Derek Spencer, Gnome Architects, LLC

History: 148: c. 1800; 150: c. 1755; 152: c. 1925

Individual Designation: 148: 12/31/1984; 150: 8/11/1982

District Designation: Old City Historic District, 148 to 152: Contributing, 154 to 158: Non-Contributing, 12/12/2003

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes constructing a six-story building across six parcels in the Old City Historic District. Two of these parcels were individually designated, a third is Contributing to the district, and the remaining three properties are Non-contributing to the district.

As proposed, the development calls for the full demolition of the Contributing structure at 152 N. 2nd Street and the Non-contributing structure at 156 N. 2nd Street as well as the rear portions of individually designated structures at 148 and 150 N. 2nd Street.

In 2017, an application was made to reclassify 152 N. 2nd Street as Non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. At that time, the Historical Commission determined that the building was constructed within the historic district's period of significance and denied the request, confirming its Contributing classification to the district.

A 2018 proposal for development of the lots from 152 N. 2nd Street north to the lot now addressed 160-64 N. 2nd Street was reviewed in-concept by the Historical Commission. That application proposed a six-story hotel building with a much taller tower set back from the street and proposed altering the building at 152 N. 2nd Street for use as an entrance lobby. The Historical Commission offered feedback on that proposal.

As part of the development, the applicant also proposes reconstructing the third floor and garret of 148 N. 2nd Street, which were demolished sometime between 1915 and 1960.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish two buildings and construct a six-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The use of brick and maximum height are compatible with the immediate surroundings within the historic district.
 - The proposed massing looms over the historic structures to be retained. Its monolithic mass could be better broken up.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the*

historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

- The proposal calls for significant demolition, including the Contributing building at 152 N. 2nd Street in its entirety and large portions of the rears of the buildings at 148 and 150 N. 2nd Street, which appear to date from at least the mid nineteenth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: As currently proposed, the application includes demolition that could not be approved by the Philadelphia Historical Commission without a finding of necessity in the public interest or that the historic resource in question could not be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. No such argument is put forward in the application. Such an argument must be made in any application for final approval.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:16:12

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Derek Spencer represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance commented in support of the revised application.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the revised application but criticized the “skin deep” treatment of the façade of 152 N. 2nd Street.
- Julia Hayman commented in opposition to the scale of the proposed development and its relation to the historic resources.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION COMMENTS:

The Historical Commission offered the following comments, but did not adopt a formal motion regarding this in-concept application:

- A setback should be introduced above a three-story base along Quarry Street to better relate to the surrounding context. The two proposed setbacks on that elevation could be consolidated into one larger setback.
- The new building remains too close to the rear of 148 and 150 N. 2nd Street and to the front of 152 N. 2nd Street. The open space between the historic buildings and new building should be increased in size.
- Further details are needed to understand how the side façade of 148 N. 2nd Street along Quarry Street will be incorporated into the proposed structure.

ADDRESS: 614 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Qian Jin Real Estate LLC

Applicant: Sam Xu, Constrecture, LLC

History: 1925

Individual Designation:

District Designation: Society Hill, Contributing, 1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing an addition on the two-story portion of the rear ell of 614 Pine Street, with a roof deck over the entire rear ell serviced by two pilot houses. Window openings on the existing three-story portion of the rear ell would be significantly altered, requiring partial removal and rebuilding of that wall using salvaged brick. Two skylights are also proposed for the rear slope of the gable roof.

The proposed addition and roof decks would not be visible from Pine Street but would be visible from the side and rear from Waverly and Addison Streets as well as a pedestrian greenway which runs from Pine Street to Addison Street.

At its July meeting, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness. Yesterday, the applicant provided new drawings which suggest that stucco could replace the metal panels on the pilot houses and revise the window design for the rear of the main block and the third floor of the ell.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct addition on two-story portion of rear ell.
- Construct roof deck with two pilot houses.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed windows on the rear of the main block and the third floor of the ell are incompatible with the historic resource.
- *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.*
 - The roof deck and pilot house would require the demolition of a small portion of the roof of the main block.
 - While the addition would not be visible from Pine Street, the rear of the property is visible from a pedestrian greenway as well as Waverly Street and Addison Street.
 - The third-story addition is very tall with a very large floor-to-ceiling height. The addition should be reduced in height by several feet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the fenestration pattern on the rear wall of the

main block and on the rear ell is revised to be more compatible with the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:37:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Sam Xu represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The application is incomplete.
- The application should include documentation of the existing building, including the fenestration pattern.
- The application should include details about the connections between the proposed addition and the existing building, including where setbacks and overhangs are proposed.
- The height of the proposed third floor is still very tall and out of scale with the existing structure. The floor-to-ceiling height is too great and results in an addition that is inappropriate for the historic building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed addition is incompatible in scale and the proposed windows are incompatible in style with the existing building. Therefore, the application does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The application is incomplete. It lacks enough information for the Historical Commission to fully evaluate it.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the revised application, owing to incompleteness. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 614 Pine St MOTION: Denial, owing to incompleteness MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair					X
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

Address: 310 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Install solar panels

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James Bannerman

Applicant: James Bannerman

History: 1980; Cypress Court; H2L2 Architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing solar panels on the street facing and rear roof slopes of a 1980 rowhouse. The height of the flush-mounted panels is 6 inches above the asphalt-shingled roof surface. The panels will be visible directly across Spruce Street, further east and west on Spruce Street, and from Bell's Court to the north. The rear roof slope is not visible from St. Peters Way, on the west side of the house, but is visible from the 300 block of Cypress Street, through the rear parking lot.

The most recent National Parks Service (NPS) guidance (2022) is that solar panels are appropriate when the building's historic character is not diminished. NPS Sustainability Guidelines recommend solar panel installation when it does not:

"...damage historic roofing material or negatively impact the building's historic character and is reversible."

The installation of street-visible solar panels will not adversely impact the Society Hill Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install solar panels on the front and rear slopes of a side 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.*
- *Roof Guideline I Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces dormers or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The solar panels will not damage historic roofing material or diminish the building's historic character.
 - The solar panels will not adversely impact the Society Hill Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the panels are placed in an orderly manner, the conduit is internal to the building, all mechanical equipment is hidden from public view, and that the roof in good condition prior to the installation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1208 SAINT JAMES ST

Proposal: Replace front entry door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sarah Brufke

Applicant: Sarah Brufke

History: c. 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the front door of 1208 Saint James Street, a building constructed about 1870 and classified as Contributing to the Washington Square West Historic District. The existing front door appears to be a non-original wood replacement. The application seeks to replace the current front door, owing to its deteriorating condition, with a six-panel fiberglass replacement and additionally proposes to repair or replace a portion of the existing door frame while preserving the existing transom. The proposed door is a stock size that may not fit the current opening without modifications. Not enough information is provided regarding the existing door, its dimensions, and how the existing frame would be modified to install the pre-hung door to be able to fully assess the application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace non-historic wood door with fiberglass six-panel door.
- Repair or replace door frame.

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 fiberglass six-panel door does not match the old in design, texture, or materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial of the proposed door replacement due to incompleteness, but potential approval of a door that closely approximates the dimensions and detailing of an appropriate historic door, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:50:26

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The application is incomplete.
- The proposed stock fiberglass door is not an appropriate replacement for the historic building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed fiberglass six-panel door does not match the old in design, texture, or materials, and therefore the application does not comply with Standard 6.
- The application does not provide any information explaining how the pre-hung door would be installed in the existing door frame and is therefore incomplete.

ACTION: Mr. Lech moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1208 Saint James St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Lech SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair					X
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 1730 WHARTON ST

Proposal: Legalize windows, with modifications

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pelican Point Investments LLC

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Dilworth Paxson

History: 1888; 18th Street Methodist Episcopal Church/Friendship Baptist Church;

J. Franklin Stuckert, architect

Individual Designation: 9/14/1988

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing aluminum windows installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit throughout the building at 1730 Wharton Street. Some of the windows and infill would be modified to better fill the masonry openings. Located at the southeast corner of Wharton Street and S. 18th Street, the former 18th Street Methodist Episcopal Church, constructed about 1888, historically featured wood windows with marbled blue glass. Between fall 2018 and summer 2019, many of the historic windows were removed without the Historical Commission's review or approval. The original frames and some of the original marbled blue glass windows remained.

At its 14 August 2020 meeting, the Historical Commission adopted the Architectural Committee's recommendation for an application proposing complete restoration of the building's exterior as part of a conversion to multi-unit residential use. The approval was conditioned on the windows being wood or aluminum-clad wood at the side elevations, including the installation of stacked double-hung windows in the double-height openings, provided the muntin patterns matched those of the historic windows, and the mullion between the windows at the new floor level was as minimal as possible; the marbled blue glass windows were retained, restored, or replicated in the front façade openings and communal spaces; and the louvers at the corner

towers were retained, with the understanding that glass or operable windows may be installed behind them. In May 2021, the Historical Commission's staff approved window shop drawings by Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation that proposed all new wood windows sufficiently replicating the historic appearance and included the character-defining marbled blue glass where appropriate. It appears that Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation went out of business, and the windows shown in the approved shop drawings were never purchased. Instead, aluminum windows with grilles between the glass and of sizes that do not fit the masonry openings were installed throughout the building in early 2025 without any approvals or permits. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the exterior work and a Stop Work Order at the request of the Historical Commission, prompting this request for legalization from the property owner/developer.

In April 2025, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application for legalization and recommended denial. The application was continued several months to allow the applicant to work on a revised proposal, which was presented to the Historical Commission at its July 2025 meeting. The Historical Commission considered the revised application, offered recommendations for additional information to be submitted, and voted to remand the application back to the Architectural Committee for review of the revised application and the details to be provided. The Architectural Committee reviewed the remanded application with additional details at its July 2025 meeting, which requested permission to retain most of the aluminum or vinyl windows but proposed modifications within the masonry openings to attempt to better fill the openings like the historic windows had, and to recess the windows and infill approximately three inches into the masonry openings. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

The application scope has been revised once more, this time to remove many of the inappropriate windows, and install new vinyl windows which better fill the masonry openings including the arched window openings.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize replacement windows or install new vinyl windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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 new windows, even with proposed modifications, 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.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:54:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Neil Sklaroff, owner/developer Cal Leslie, and architect Rich Villa represented the revised application. Mr. Sklaroff shared a photograph of a black vinyl

window with exterior muntins that is proposed. He noted that revised drawings now indicate that new vinyl windows will sufficiently fill the masonry openings.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society commented in support of the revised application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- In May 2021, the Historical Commission's staff approved window shop drawings by Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation for this former church building that proposed all new wood windows sufficiently replicating the historic appearance and included the character-defining marbled blue glass where appropriate. Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation went out of business, and the windows shown in the approved shop drawings were never purchased.
- Aluminum or vinyl windows with grilles between the glass and of sizes which do not fit the masonry openings were installed throughout the building in early 2025 without any approvals or permits.
- This revised application requests permission to remove most of the aluminum or vinyl windows and install new vinyl windows with exterior muntins that better fill the masonry openings and are recessed into the openings approximately three inches.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed vinyl windows do not match the old in color, texture, or materials, but will more closely replicate the overall design of the historic windows in general appearance than the replacement windows that were initially installed. This concession on preservation standards, which is acceptable owing to the challenges of the project, will allow this adaptive reuse project to move forward.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1730 Wharton St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair					X
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 428-34 N 4TH ST

Name of Resource: National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Mark H. Rubin

Nominator: Misha Wyllie

Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 428-34 N. 4th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The two-story commercial building was constructed in 1966-67 to serve as a union hall for the National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, which owned the property until 1990. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. The former union hall was constructed amid widespread demolition of the surrounding neighborhood as part of the Callowhill East Redevelopment Project, and thus the nomination argues that it exemplifies the economic and political heritage of the community in the era of urban renewal, meeting Criterion J. Addressing Criterion D, the nomination cites the post-war turn to Modern architecture in the United States and contends that this building reflects the built environment of that era. Finally, the nomination cites Criterion C and describes the subject property as embodying the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style—New Formalism.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 428-34 N. 4th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 428-34 N. 4th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:23:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney David Dean represented the property owner. Mr. Dean requested a continuance to the October 2025 meeting of the Historical Commission, because the property owner experienced a last-minute personal emergency.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The request for a continuance to the October 2025 meeting of the Historical Commission was justified.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 428-34 N. 4th Street to the October 2025 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 428-34 N 4th St					
MOTION: Continue to October 2025 PHC meeting					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair					X
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 16 JULY 2025

BLAKEMORE STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Multiple

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This proposed historic district, located along the 6600 block of Blakemore Street in the East Mount Airy neighborhood of Upper Northwest Philadelphia, comprises 29 properties now totaling 28 buildings, following the demolition of 6657-59 Blakemore Street. All 28 of the buildings are Tudor Revival twin apartment houses constructed in 1926 and 1927.

The nomination argues that the Blakemore Street historic district satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination contends that the buildings in the district embody distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Revival style, which was popular at the time. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the district exemplifies the cultural, economic, and social history of the Mount Airy community, as the area became densely developed during the interwar years, with commuter train lines connecting apartment dwellers with the city center. The district is located immediately across from the Stenton Station, which still serves suburban commuters.

The corner property at 6657-59 Blakemore Street, which was recently acquired by the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority (PRA) for redevelopment, suffered from years of deferred maintenance under prior ownership and was in extremely poor condition. The PRA applied for a permit for complete demolition prior to the Historical Commission mailing notice to the property owners and assuming jurisdiction over properties in the proposed district. The Historical Commission's staff has confirmed that the building was demolished with the valid permit. The Historical Commission's staff conducted a site visit after the review of the nomination by the Committee on Historic Designation and has provided photographs documenting that there is no historic resource remaining to regulate at this property on the edge of the proposed historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Blakemore Street Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, and that the boundary should be amended to remove the corner property at 6657-59 Blakemore Street, given that no historic resource remains on the site. The staff notes that the Historical Commission recently included the vacant lot at 3611 Spring Garden Street in the Gardiner-Poth Historic District when it was designated in 2021. The lot is located at the eastern edge of the linear district. The owner of the property appealed the designation. The court sustained the appeal and ordered the Historical Commission to remove the lot from the district because the district's significance was based solely on the historic buildings. This case is exactly analogous. The vacant lot is located at the edge of the linear district and the district's significance is predicated entirely on the significance of the buildings.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Blakemore Street historic district satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, with the property at 6657-59 Blakemore Street classified as Non-Contributing and the shared stairs and courtyard between it and 6655 Blakemore Street classified as Contributing.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert participated as the nominator.
- Angel Rodriguez and Susan Varghese represented the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority, the property owner of 6657-59 Blakemore Street, and opposed the inclusion of the property in the historic district because there is no building remaining on the site. Ms. Varghese distributed copies of a site survey for the block which confirmed that the property lines run through the center of the shared courtyards, which was an open question from the review by the Committee on Historic Designation. They explained that the future plan for the property is the development of affordable housing.
- Daniel Behrendt represented the property owner and occupant of 6655 Blakemore Street. Mr. Behrendt supported the nomination as written and stated that the concrete pad and steps that remain enhance the historic shared space and should be protected.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Julia Hayman stated that preservation and affordable housing can go hand in hand.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance commented in support of the nomination as articulated in the motion on the table, which would remove 6657-59 Blakemore Street from the district boundary.
- Allison Weiss stated: "Yes, hello, Alison Weiss. I would just like to say, if public agencies did their job, we would not be having this discussion now about a building that was demolished."
- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The proposed district comprises 29 properties now totaling 28 buildings, following the demolition of 6657-59 Blakemore Street. All 28 of the buildings are Tudor Revival twin apartment houses constructed in 1926 and 1927.
- The demolition permit application for the building at 6655-57 Blakemore Street was submitted to the Department of Licenses and Inspections prior to the Historical Commission's issuance of notice for the proposed historic district. The Historical Commission did not have jurisdiction to review the demolition permit application.
- The building at 6655-57 Blakemore Street had been vacant for several years and was in very poor condition when it was demolished.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The buildings in the district embody distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Revival style, which was popular at the time, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The district exemplifies the cultural, economic, and social history of the Mount Airy community, satisfying Criterion J.
- There is no historic resource remaining to regulate at 6657-59 Blakemore Street. The vacant lot is located at the edge of the linear district and the district's significance is predicated entirely on the significance of the buildings. The vacant lot should not be included in the historic district.

ACTION: Ms. Carney moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Blakemore Street Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, and that the boundary be amended to remove the corner property at 6657-59 Blakemore Street, given that no historic resource remains on the site. Mr. Lech seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 2. Ms. Cooperman and Mr. McCoubrey dissented.

ITEM: Blakemore Street historic district MOTION: Designate with amended boundary; Criteria C, D, J MOVED BY: Carney SECONDED BY: Lech					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair					X
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman		X			
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey		X			
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	9	2			2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:02:25

ACTION: At 11:18 a.m., Mr. Frankel moved to adjourn to executive session to discuss litigation matters. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment					
MOTION: Adjourn to executive session to discuss litigation matters					
Moved BY: Frankel					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair					X
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

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.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

A building, complex of buildings, structure, site, object, or district may be designated for preservation if it:

- (a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;
- (b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
- (c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- (d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
- (e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional

engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;

(f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;

(g) Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;

(h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;

(i) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or

(j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.

DRAFT