

**THE MINUTES OF THE 760TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 DECEMBER 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 9:07 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		
Kareema Abu Saab (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
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Josh Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner I
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the meeting on Zoom:

Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown
Aaron Moselle, WHYY
Anthony Mascieri

Benjamin Estepani, Pace Architecture + Design
David Fecteau, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
David Traub, Save Our Sites
David Whipple, Assimilation Design Lab
Dennis Carlisle
Emily Cooperman
Haleh Kadkhoda
Ian D'Elia
Jane Ahn
Jason Morris
Jay Farrell
Jingyi Luo
John Walsh
Judy Robinson, Continuum Architecture and Design, PC
Justino Navarro, Spring Garden Civic Association
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co., Inc.
Kimberly Haas
Lea Litvin, Lo Design
Michael Silver
Nic Tanji, Pace Architecture + Design
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Patricia Freeland, Spring Garden Civic Association
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Stephanie Pennypacker
Steven Peitzman
Yoav Shiffman

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 759TH STATED MEETING, 14 NOVEMBER 2025

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:25

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Frankel asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any suggested additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 759th Stated Meeting, held 14 November 2025. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Frankel moved to adopt the minutes of the 759th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 November 2025. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 759th Stated Meeting of the PHC					
MOTION: Adopt minutes					
MOVED BY: Frankel					
SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (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	10				3

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 NOVEMBER 2025

ADDRESS: 1924 and 1940 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Construct three-story mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Yoav Shiffman/Rite Aid of Pennsylvania

Applicant: David Whipple, Assimilation Design Lab

History: 1990

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolishing a one-story commercial building at 1924 Fairmount Ave and constructing a three-story mixed-use building across that property and the adjacent parking lot at 1940 Fairmount Avenue. The two properties sit at the southeast corner of Fairmount Avenue and N. 20th Street and extend south to North Street. A 1940 stone building sat on the site of 1924 Fairmount Avenue and was gradually rebuilt with cement block between 1971 and 1985. It is non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District.

The proposed three-story building would include ground-floor commercial spaces and 28 residential units on upper floors. It would include a roof deck for residential use. Much of the street-facing elevations would be constructed in red brick, with some areas clad in a dark grey cement-board siding. The application includes aluminum-clad windows in a black color, with doors, flashing, and railings to match.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing one-story commercial building.
- Construct three-story mixed-use building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The scale of the proposed building is appropriate for the surrounding district, which is characterized by three-story brick rowhouses.
 - The design of the proposed differentiates itself from nearby historic buildings through its more contemporary design but, in the opinion of the staff, departs too much from the rhythms of the surrounding district. The first-floor storefronts and the brick band between the storefronts and second-floor windows establish strong horizontal lines, which make the building appear low and monolithic in contrast with the neighboring rowhouses, which are vertically oriented and have a rhythm that repeats every 15 or 20 feet. Breaking up the Fairmount Avenue elevation through the introduction of more vertical elements and perhaps material variation would make the new building more compatible with the historic district.
 - The setback areas with the dark cladding at the second and third floors break the street wall that is emphatically maintained throughout the historic district. While the setback areas do establish rowhouse-width modules, the shadowy open areas with balconies are unlike anything in the historic district. The setbacks should be

- eliminated and the street wall maintained.
- Cornices at the top of the façade and above storefronts are characteristic features of the surrounding architecture. Incorporating cornice elements at the top of the building and above the storefronts may help the new building respond to the historic context.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:40

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect David Whipple represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the application.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia commented in support of the application but suggested that it could use a more developed cornice and architectural detailing.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application positively responds to the comments of the Architectural Committee.
- The first floor could be better aligned with the upper floors to give the sense of three-story massing rather than upper floors on a pedestal.
- The North Street elevation could respond better to the residential context.
- The rear courtyard could be better defined and articulated to make it an attractive and useful space.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed building is compatible in scale and material with the surrounding historic district and satisfies Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the storefront systems on Fairmount Avenue and the first-floor facades along North Street are further considered and the rear courtyard is landscaped, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1924 and 1940 Fairmount Ave MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Thomas					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (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	10				3

ADDRESS: 1907 GREEN ST

Proposal: Demolish rear addition; construct rear addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1907 Green St LLC

Applicant: Benjamin Estepani, Pace Architecture & Design

History: 1859; stucco, 1986

Individual Designation: 4/25/1974

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a rear ell and rear wall at 1907 Green Street and built a larger rear ell. The building at 1907 Green Street is an 1859 three-story, five-bay structure with a shorter three-story, two-bay addition at the rear. The Historical Commission's staff asserts that the addition is original to the house, although significantly altered over time. As the building stands, the floors of the main block and rear ell do not align, and the proposed addition would remedy that as well as add one additional living unit to the building. The application also proposes a roof deck. The addition and roof deck would not be visible from Green Street, and the property is landlocked in the rear.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish three-story rear ell and rear wall and construct larger three-story rear ell with roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the*

property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

- The rear ell has been significantly altered over time and does not characterize the property. The proposed rear ell and roof deck will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:21:31

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Benjamin Estepani represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The applicant adequately addressed prior concerns regarding excessive demolition of the rear wall of the main block by revising the plans to retain a significant portion of the existing masonry and added an engineer's report.
- Revisions to the rear addition's exterior cladding material were made in response to Architectural Committee's recommendations.
- There may be structural and fire safety conditions common to this row of houses, including party or interior bearing walls that may not extend above the ceiling and these conditions should be addressed by the applicant as part of construction documentation.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application proposes to keep more of the historic rear wall, which will help maintain structural integrity, and thereby satisfies Standard 9.
- The new building material that is proposed will be compatible with yet differentiated from the historic structure, satisfying Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the suggestion that the party walls are extended up to the roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1907 Green St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (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	10				3

ADDRESS: 257 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Remove addition; construct wall and garage; add windows and doors

Review Requested: Final approval

Owner: M Dwell Two, LLC

Applicant: Judith Robinson and Jane Ahn

History: 1810; three-story rear addition in 1981

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic three-story rear addition on a Federal rowhouse that is both individually designated and listed as a significant resource in the Society Hill Historic District. The newly exposed western wall will feature three large openings set with a combination of windows and French doors and Juliett balconies on the upper stories. It also proposes to construct a brick wall and live-roof garage structure on the rear yard of the property. Additionally, it proposes to add one skylight to the rear slope of the roof, add one window and one set of French doors with guardrail to the exposed north side façade of the house and add windows and doors to a small historic rear ell. The building was constructed c. 1810 and is three-and-a-half stories tall with a gable roof and brick façade. The three-story addition proposed for removal is located behind the main block of the building and dates to 1981. The current front façade, north façade, and roof were reconstructed to their current forms in 1963. Prior to 1963, the front façade had a first-floor storefront, and the north wall of the building was covered by a neighboring garage. Upon removal of that garage, the owner, in consultation with the Historical Commission and Redevelopment Authority, reconstructed that façade with a new brick veneer, added the current windows with shutters, and rebuilt the chimneys and side roofline to match the rest of the row. The newly exposed rear wall, rear roof, and north side will all be at least partially visible from some surrounding public pedestrian walkways including S. 4th Street, St. James Place and St. Joseph's Way.

The applicants presented a similar design but with an added roof deck for an in-concept review to the Architectural Committee in April 2025. At that time, the Committee was receptive to all of the changes other than the roof deck.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove a three-story non-historic rear addition; add windows and doors to rear wall;
- Construct a brick wall and a live-roof garage structure around the rear yard; and,
- Add a window and French door to the north façade; add windows and doors to rear ell.

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 live roof and garage structure for the rear yard satisfies Standard 9. It does not affect any historic materials and is compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building.
 - The proposed addition of a window to the north wall is compatible with Standard 9. While an end wall like this one would likely not have had any windows in it if it were original, the wall as it currently stands with existing windows was reconstructed in 1963 with the approval of the Historical Commission. The addition of one more window does not further impair the architectural features of this property. However, the proposed addition of the French doors with guardrail to the north wall does not meet Standard 9 as it is too specific and distinctive a feature to be compatible with the historic design of the building.
 - The proposed addition of new windows and doors to the rear wall and rear ell may satisfy Standard 9. New openings in general are compatible with the historic features of the building, but the proposed arrangements and extent of new windows and doors may alter the appearance to too large an extent to be compatible with the historic design features of the building.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The removal of the 1981 rear addition satisfies Standard 10. It is a non-historic addition that was reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission in 1981. Its removal will not impair the essential form or integrity of the historic building.
- *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 proposed new skylight satisfies the Roofs Guideline. It will be small and minimally visible from surrounding public rights-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the new windows on the north wall include shutters and the fourth-floor opening is changed from French doors to a window that is appropriately scaled and aligned, that the openings proposed for the rear east wall are reduced in scale, that a stronger relationship be made between all existing and proposed openings, and the windows proposed

for the ell be double-hung units instead of casements, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:32:10

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Judith Robinson and owner Jane Ahn represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revisions to the application reflect the changes requested by the Architectural Committee.
- The proposed removal of a 1981 rear addition, the concept of adding windows to the north wall, rear ell, and rear wall and modifications to the rear garden and garage structure are all acceptable.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The removal of the 1981 rear addition satisfies Standard 10. It is a non-historic addition that was reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission in 1981. Its removal will not impair the essential form or integrity of the historic building.
- The proposed addition of several windows to the north wall is compatible with Standard 9. While an end wall like this one would likely not have had any windows in it if it were original, the wall as it currently stands with existing windows was reconstructed in 1963 with the approval of the Historical Commission. The addition of more windows does not further impair the architectural features of this property.
- The proposed live roof and garage structure for the rear yard satisfies Standard 9. It does not affect any historic materials and is compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building.
- The proposed skylight satisfies the Roofs Guideline. It will be small and minimally visible from surrounding public rights-of-way.
- The proposed addition of windows and doors to the rear wall and rear ell as shown in the revised drawings satisfies Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 257 S 4th St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Thomas					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (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	10				3

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 413 S 3RD ST

Proposal: Demolish rear one-story addition; construct two-story addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Gail and Michael Silver

Applicant: Lea Litvin, Lo Design

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to remove a one-story, non-historic conservatory addition and construct a two-story addition along the rear ell at this rowhouse at the northeast corner of S. 3rd and Stamper Streets. The building at 413 S. 3rd Street was constructed in the early nineteenth century as part of a row of speculative houses. In 1989, a small rear addition was demolished and the side-yard conservatory addition with glass roof and clerestory windows was constructed along Stamper Street using an existing garden wall. The proposed two-story addition will be constructed on the existing footprint of the conservatory addition and will include a small roof deck. Owing to its location along Stamper Street, the addition will be highly visible from the public right-of-way. Although it is a narrow, alley street, some houses face Stamper Street. The application also proposes a deck on the addition at the second floor, a new screening railing for existing mechanical equipment at the third floor, and a new railing for an existing flat roof section at the fourth floor.

After the October Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant supplemented their application with additional context photographs. The design was not revised.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish existing one-story addition.
- Construct two-story addition.
- Replace screening for mechanical equipment.
- Add railing at the fourth floor.

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.*
 - This building and the adjacent row have a documented history of rear additions and alterations over time. The proposed scale, proportion, and massing could meet Standard 9 if the proposed addition was set in slightly from the outer corner of the main block of the building.
 - Although a contemporary-style addition can be appropriate for a historic building, in this specific location, the design should be more visually compatible with the historic building and environment to meet Standard 9. Owing to the visibility of the addition and its location directly across from the front of residences along Stamper Street, the design should employ historically compatible materials and features to meet Standard 9. The massing of the proposed addition is appropriate, but the windows and doors visible from the street should be reduced in size to be more in keeping with the existing punched openings. The cladding of the addition should be compatible with the historic building and environment.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed demolition of non-historic materials meets Standard 10.
 - The proposed new addition may meet Standard 10 if the existing window openings in the main block and rear ell are repurposed as doorways on the interior of the new addition. This will allow for the restoration of the window openings in the future if the addition is removed, therefore meeting Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, 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.*
 - Additional information about the proposed fourth-floor roof deck including the means of access should be provided.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the massing of the addition and the screening and railings, but not the fenestration, cladding, or other design features, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:36:33

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.

- Architect Lea Litvin represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The scale and massing of the proposed addition are appropriate for the historic building and neighborhood context.
- The fenestration and materials should be further developed and compatible with the neighborhood context.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed massing and configuration satisfy Standard 9. The design's fenestration and materials should be more visually compatible with the historic building and environment to satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed demolition of non-historic materials satisfies Standard 10. The proposed addition may satisfy Standard 10 if the demolition of the rear wall and existing window openings on main block walls are minimized.
- The proposed mechanical screening on the third-floor roof and railing on the fourth-floor roof deck should be further developed for a final review in order to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the massing and configuration of the addition in concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 413 S 3rd St MOTION: Approval in concept MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Thomas					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (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	10				3

ADDRESS: 2017 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Legalize windows and doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Margaret Szumski

Applicant: Jason Morris

History: 1885

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing windows and doors installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit on the front and rear facades at 2017 Sansom Street, a former stable and carriage house that was used for auto repair in later years. The existing windows and doors on the front façade were non-historic. In 2000, the Historical Commission approved one-over-one double-hung windows for the front façade. In 2024 and 2025, the Commission's staff responded to several inquiries about staff-level approvals for replacement windows and doors at this property. The staff responded that, despite the owner's desire to install casement windows, there was no historic documentation of casements in the window openings, and the staff was limited to approving double-hung windows for the front façade. Several months later, despite the guidance, the Commission's staff observed that new casement windows were installed on the front façade, with the lintel of the first-floor glass block-infilled opening lowered to be in line with the lintel above the doorway. A new garage door and entry door had been installed as well. The new entry door fills the entire height of the opening, which required the removal of the transom. At the rear, which had multi-light windows and doors in very deteriorated condition, new casement windows were installed. The existing doors were refurbished, with new glass without muntins. No building permits were obtained for the work. The Commission's staff requested that the Department of Licenses and Inspections issue a violation for the unpermitted work. The violation was issued on 3 April 2025. The property was listed for sale on 1 October 2025. Soon thereafter, the applicant was made aware of the violations on the property, prompting this request for legalization.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize windows and doors installed without permits.

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 new casement windows do not match the old windows in design. The transom was removed for installation of the new front entry door. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:42:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Developer and commercial realtor Jason Morris represented the application and the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The applicant relied on a window subcontractor to obtain building permits, which was not done, and windows and doors were installed without permits. Additionally, a mason altered a masonry opening and lintel on the front facade without a permit. Had permits been applied for, the Historical Commission's review process would have been triggered for the windows, doors, and masonry scope.
- The applicant claimed that he conferred with civil rights disability attorneys who informed him the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Housing Equality Center of Pennsylvania require that the Historical Commission provide for reasonable accommodations and allow reasonable modifications. The casement windows permit the property owner's equal enjoyment of fresh air. The property owner is a petite 75-year-old female who broke her wrists at separate times in the recent past. She cannot open double-hung windows. She did not plan on selling the property but her financial situation has changed and now it is for sale.
- The applicant claimed that he learned of the violation for the work without permits once the property was listed for sale, at which time he contacted the Historical Commission's staff.
- The applicant's claims about casement windows are not accurate. Double-hung windows that are properly balanced can be opened and closed with little effort, making them easier to operate than casement windows with cranks.
- The Historical Commission has approved casement windows that look like double-hung windows. If installing casement windows was necessary for ventilation, casements that look like double-hung windows and would have replicated the historic appearance should have been installed.
- The applicant requested but did not receive a quote for double-hung windows from a local window supplier. A different window contractor was used for the casement windows.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The exterior changes to windows, doors, and a masonry opening as well as some interior work required building permits, which would have triggered the Historical Commission's involvement in the review of the proposed work.
- The new casement windows do not match the old windows in design. The transom was removed for installation of the new front entry door. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ITEM: 2017 Sansom St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Thomas					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (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	10				3

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

ADDRESS: 1801 E HUNTINGDON ST

Resource: Textile National Bank

Owner: 1801 E Huntingdon LLC

Nominator: Kevin McMahon, Powers & Company, Inc.

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

The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 1801 E Huntingdon Street located in the Kensington neighborhood of Philadelphia and historically known as the Textile National Bank. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

The Textile National Bank is significant under Criterion A in the area of commerce as the first, and for many years the only, bank in the United States established specifically to serve the banking needs of textile manufacturers. Located in the heart of Philadelphia's Kensington district, the Textile National Bank was founded in 1904 and helped to fund the operation and growth of the textile industry in Philadelphia through the end of the 1920s, when the bank merged with the Industrial Trust Company of Philadelphia. The Textile National Bank is also

significant under Criterion C in the area of architecture as a major, high-quality example of early-twentieth century, Classical Revival bank design by Philadelphia-based architect Herman Miller. Completed in 1909, the Textile National Bank exemplifies architectural trends that strongly favored the Classical Revival style for bank buildings between about 1900 and 1930. The period of significance is 1909-1929, beginning with the year the bank was completed and ending with the year the bank merged with the Industrial Trust Company. This property was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 2017.

The significance of the Textile National Bank should be evaluated within the historical context established by the Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF), "Industrial and Commercial Buildings Related to the Textile Industry in the Kensington Neighborhood of Philadelphia." The building is situated in the north-central portion of the boundary of the MPDF, which includes the Textile National Bank as one of five banks, the MPDF's primary commercial building type. Notably, the MPDF calls the Textile National Bank "the most prominent" of the financial institutions that served Kensington's textile industry.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:58:05

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Frankel described the nomination as a "very interesting one."

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to support the nomination of 1801 E. Huntingdon Street, under Criteria A and C, and recommend that the property should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1801 E Huntington St MOTION: Support listing on National Register of Historic Places MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (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	10				3

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:01:46

ACTION: At 10:07 a.m., Mr. McCoubrey moved to adjourn to executive session to discuss legislation, litigation, and personnel matters. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: Adjourn MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Thomas					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (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	10				3

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.