

**THE MINUTES OF THE 761<sup>ST</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 9 JANUARY 2026, 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 9:03 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

| <b>Commissioner</b>                                                         | <b>Present</b> | <b>Absent</b> | <b>Comment</b> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| 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  
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III  
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 in person:

Charles Elison  
Eric Giusini  
Joseph Horan, Kimmel Architecture  
Louis Thomas

Todd Reeves, Overbrook School for the Blind

The following persons attended the meeting on Zoom:

Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown  
Ben Schurhamer  
Brian Wise  
Chris Dean  
Connor Burke  
David Fecteau, Philadelphia City Planning Commission  
David Traub, Save Our Sites  
Geoffrey Klein  
Gina Maria Ross  
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance  
Jay Farrell  
Jeremy [no last name given]  
Jingyi Luo  
John Walsh  
Joseph Serratore  
Julia Hayman  
Kimberly Haas, Hidden City  
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy  
Laura Mark  
L. Gamble  
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department  
Linda Strauch  
Mandy Targoff  
Margaret Kalalian  
Mark Cartella  
Mark Faulkner, PAU  
Matt Masterpasqua  
Megan McGaffigan  
Nicole Brunet  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance  
Richard Thom  
Sara Pochedly, Toner Architects  
Stephanie Pennypacker  
Steve Gonzalez  
Sue Patrone  
Tamarra Cannon  
Tylin Colston, PHFA  
Wendy Sumida  
William M. Scott

## **ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 760<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING, 12 DECEMBER 2025**

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:03:04

**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 760<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting, held 12 December 2025. No comments were offered.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 760<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 December 2025. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| <b>ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 760<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the PHC</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>MOTION: Adopt minutes</b>                                                           |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOVED BY: Thomas</b>                                                                |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>SECONDED BY: McCoubrey</b>                                                          |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>VOTE</b>                                                                            |     |    |         |        |        |
| 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, 16 DECEMBER 2025**

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:37**

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Frankel asked for a motion on the Consent Agenda.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- At the end of the Historical Commission's meeting, Jay Farrell requested that the Historical Commission reopen the record for the consent agenda so that he could make a comment. He claimed that the Historical Commission had declined to take public comment during the consideration of the consent agenda at the start of the meeting.
  - Mr. Frankel reopened the record for the consent agenda to allow Mr. Farrell to offer comments on the application for 1301-25 Chestnut Street.
  - Mr. Farrell stated that he did not have a comment on the application itself but wanted to ensure that he was given an opportunity to comment on the consent agenda. He stated that he had no further comments.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 1301-25 Chestnut Street. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

|                                                                                     |     |    |         |        |        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>ITEM: Consent Agenda</b>                                                         |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOTION: Adopt Architectural Committee recommendation for Consent Agenda item</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOVED BY: Thomas</b>                                                             |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>SECONDED BY: McCoubrey</b>                                                       |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>VOTE</b>                                                                         |     |    |         |        |        |
| 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      |

## **AGENDA**

### **ADDRESS: 1301-25 CHESTNUT ST**

Proposal: Install signage; add doorways; install interior partitions; construct rooftop additions with pool and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: TF Cornerstone

Applicant: Jonathan Alan Broh, JKR Partners

History: 1910, John Wanamaker Department Store, Daniel H. Burnham & Co., architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes several changes to the Wanamaker building as it transitions from a department store with offices to a mixed-use retail and residential building. The building and the Grand Court portion of the interior are individually designated and the Eagle statue in the Grand Court is designated as an object.

At the ground floor, the application proposes dividing the department store retail space into several smaller retail spaces. Bronze and glass storefront partitions would be added in arched openings in the Grand Court to create retail spaces. New entrances to retail spaces in the north and south sections of the building would be inserted into existing window openings at all four exterior facades on Market, Juniper, Chestnut, and 13<sup>th</sup> Streets. The designs for the new doorways would be based on the building's historic doorways. Standardized tenant signage is proposed for the exterior.

At the rooftop, the application proposes two small, one-story additions, roof deck, and pool. The rooftop additions would not be visible from the street.

### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Install signage.
- Add doorways.
- Install interior partitions.
- Construct rooftop additions with pool and 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 alterations and additions will not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships. They 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, satisfying Standard 9.
- *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 alterations and additions are reversible, satisfying Standard 10.
- *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 rooftop additions including the deck with railings and pool will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the banner sign mounts do not damage the masonry, the paint scheme for the Grand Court is guided by the paint analysis but does not need to replicate the historic color scheme, and the metal bands on the Grand Court storefronts better relate to the imposts of the arched openings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda.

**ADDRESS: 1601 S 13TH ST**

Proposal: Convert church to apartments; remove stained-glass windows; alter openings; install doors, windows, window wells, roofing, and dormers

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Annex Investments II

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1892; St. John's Baptist Church; Samuel Hall Day and Charles E. Oelschlager, architects

Individual Designation: 6/12/2020

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application proposes to convert the former St. John's Baptist Church in South Philadelphia to residential use. The church, which is currently vacant, was designed in 1892 as the Church of the Reconciliation, and the attached chapel and school building was designed in 1899, both in the Romanesque Revival architectural style. The application proposes to renovate the building and insert additional floor levels inside to convert it to use as a 26-unit apartment building. It proposes to install a series of new "doghouse shaped" dormers clad with fiber cement siding along both sides of the steeply pitched main church roof and to replace all the existing stained-glass windows with aluminum framed clear glass windows. It further proposes to infill several existing doors and convert them to windows, replace the entry doors, insert window wells at existing basement window locations and enlarge the associated windows, install several new windows and skylights, and replace the current slate roof with new asphalt shingles with a rectangular slate-like appearance.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Install new roof dormers
- Replace all existing windows
- Replace doors
- Alter openings
- Install window wells
- Replace roofing

**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 or pictorial evidence.*
  - While some of the existing windows are later replacements, many are original stained glass. Details for the proposed windows are not clear but could be appropriate if they accurately approximate the visual qualities of the historic windows. The new windows could potentially satisfy Standard 6.
  - The existing doors are likely not original, but the proposed replacement doors appear too contemporary in design and do not match the historic character of the originals. The new doors do not satisfy Standard 6.
  - The existing rectangular gray slate roofing has reached the end of its useful life and the proposed replacement with a slate-like asphalt shingle satisfies Standard 6.
- *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 new dormers are too large, too numerous, and are not compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property. They do not satisfy Standard 9 but potentially could if they were redesigned to be less intrusive.
  - The proposed alteration of some existing door openings to windows and installation of basement level window wells will satisfy Standard 9 if the new windows approximate the visual qualities of the historic windows.
- *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 dormers are too large, too numerous, and conspicuous. They do not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:28**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Till presented the in-concept application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Sara Pochedly represented the in-concept application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Lou Thomas, a neighbor, commented in support of the application.
- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia commented in support of the application.
- Julia Hayman commented in support of the application. She encouraged the use of

slate or slate alternative for the roof and suggested the gable dormers were more in keeping with the character of the building.

- Ben Schurhamer, a resident of the block, commented with some concerns about the application. He was worried about the impact that the additional units will have on the block.
- Jeremy [no last name given] commented in support of the application.
- Laura Mark, a neighbor, commented on the proposed dormers and roof materials. She suggested looking at arched dormers. She also expressed concern for what look to be proposed basement apartments and their access to light, air, and egress.

#### **HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- Alternate dormer designs should be explored to find a solution that best fits the building before a final application is submitted.
- Slate and slate alternative roofing options should be explored more thoroughly.
- Retention of a few of the existing stained-glass windows should be explored.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Details for the proposed windows and doors are not clear, but they could be appropriate if they accurately approximate the visual qualities of the historic windows. The new windows could potentially satisfy Standard 6.
- The existing rectangular gray slate roofing has reached the end of its useful life and a proposed replacement with slate, a slate-like alternative, or an asphalt-fiberglass shingle that replicates the size and shape of slate could satisfy Standard 6
- The proposed dormers are not compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property. They do not satisfy Standard 9 or the Roofs Guideline but potentially could if they were redesigned to be less intrusive.

**ACTION:** Mr. Lech moved to approve the application in concept, provided the suggestions offered by the Historical Commission are accounted for in the application for final approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| <b>ITEM: 1601 S 13<sup>th</sup> St</b><br><b>MOTION: Approval in concept</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Lech</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Thomas</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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: 2224 AND 2226 W TIOGA ST**

Proposal: Construct rear additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Wise Holding Group, LLC

Applicant: Matthew Masterpasqua, Mass Architecture Studio

History: 1898; Conkling-Armstrong Houses; Edgar V. Seelers, architect

Individual Designation: 3/8/2019

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, Theodore.Maust@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application proposes constructing a three-story addition at the rear of 2224 and 2226 W. Tioga Street, the Conkling-Armstrong Houses. The development of the site to create 12 apartments will enable the restoration of the elaborate front and side facades of the historic twin buildings, which have sat vacant for several years.

In 2021 and 2023, the Historical Commission's staff reviewed and approved a make-safe application, which required the interior demolition of the building so that it could be shored up. The third-floor mansard roof and dormers on the rear ell were demolished with the condition that they would be reconstructed. This proposal includes that reconstruction work. The applicants have also submitted a thorough masonry restoration plan, which can be reviewed at the staff level.

The application also proposes the creation of basement egress in the historic structures by creating wells and lengthening existing basement windows on the side elevations.

The proposed addition would face Estaugh Street but be set back from the street across a small parking lot. The proposed addition would also be visible from N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and minimally visible from W. Tioga Street.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct three-story addition at rear of property.
- Restore historic structure.
- Create basement egress.

**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 addition would read as a separate building to the Conkling-Armstrong houses and not negatively impact the view of the resource from W. Tioga Street.
  - The building is taller than neighboring buildings on Estaugh Street but does not overwhelm any designated historic resources.
  - The proposed addition is compatible in material with the historic building and surrounding context, with its masonry construction and architectural detailing including a cornice, water table, and sills and lintels around window openings.
- *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.*

- An application for final approval will need to include details about how the proposed addition intersects with the historic houses. Given the heavily altered rear wall, however, this intersection may be done in a way which is largely reversible.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:22:10**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Matthew Masterpasqua and developer Brian Wise represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance commented in support of the application.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the application and urged more study of the cornice of the proposed addition.
- Julia Hayman commented in support of the application and also asked for a greater relationship between the rooflines of historic buildings and the addition.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The connection point between the rear of the historic buildings and the addition should be carefully studied for the final application.
- The reconstruction of the mansard roof on the rear ells could be done in a simplified fashion if that enables the restoration of the more elaborate elements of the historic buildings.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed addition is appropriate in scale and material with the historic buildings, and the in-concept application satisfies Standard 9.
- Careful design of the intersection between the historic buildings and the addition would satisfy Standard 10.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application in concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| <b>ITEM: 2224 and 2226 W Tioga St</b><br><b>MOTION: Approval in concept</b><br><b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Thomas</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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: 4221 PINE ST**

Proposal: Legalize replacement of slate mansard with brown asphalt shingles

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gina and Thomas Ross

Applicant: Gina Ross

History: 1900; William Kimball, developer

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes legalizing the removal of slate and replacement with GAF Timberline HDZ fiberglass asphalt shingles in a brown color on the mansard at 4221 Pine Street. This twin 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 November 2025, a community member contacted the Historical Commission to inform it of the recent replacement of slate with brown fiberglass asphalt shingles at this property. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the roofing work without a building permit, 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 staff acknowledges that the slate on the mansard reached the end of its lifespan, but it would have been unable to administratively approve a brown fiberglass asphalt shingle 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 brown asphalt shingles.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Property owner Gina Ross represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- This twin property is part of a larger row of matching buildings on the 4200 block of Pine Street, all of which historically featured slate mansard roofs. The original slate on this mansard roof was recently removed without a building permit or the Historical Commission’s approval and was replaced with an inappropriate roofing material.
- The project appears incomplete. Elements are missing including the ridge and hip caps, and downspouts.
- The owner could investigate options for re-coloring the existing shingles in place.
- Asphalt-fiberglass shingles may be acceptable if the other details are correct.
- The owner has indicated a willingness to bring the building back into compliance and should work with the Historical Commission’s staff on next steps.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

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

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

| <b>ITEM: 4221 Pine St</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Carney</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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: 423 AND 425 VINE ST**

Proposal: Demolish part of ell; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Charles Elison and Alina Mateo

Applicant: Wendy Sumida, Via Laulima

History: 1799

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application seeks final approval to demolish a section of the rear ell of the rowhouse at 423 Vine Street and construct a wider ell in its place. The building at 423 Vine Street was constructed in 1799 and is classified as a significant resource in the Old City Historic District. The property at 423 Vine Street is now combined with the property at 425 Vine Street as a single-family residence. The house that once stood at 425 Vine Street was demolished in the 1940s and the land is used for parking, open space, and a roof deck. The rear ell has two sections, a stucco-clad section closer to the main block and a brick-clad section at the rear. The stucco-clad section is proposed for demolition. The brick-clad section would be retained. Based on historic maps and current photographs, the area proposed for full demolition appears to be original. It is likely that the ell's original exterior was brick but is now covered with stucco. A porch was added to the stucco section of the ell and the historic windows were replaced at some point with one-over-one windows. The stucco section of the ell was originally three stories but the third floor has been removed in the interior. The new infill construction is proposed to be a similar height but with a wider footprint. Brick veneer cladding and Fibrex windows are proposed for the exterior. The staff recognizes that, although the stucco section of the ell is likely original and therefore significant, this area at the rear of the main block is not visible from the public right-of-way.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish rear ell
- Construct new two-story infill addition

**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 application proposes the demolition of the section of the rear ell that likely dates to 1799; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 9.
  - The proposed design of the infill construction is more contemporary in its features and fenestration. The red brick cladding material is compatible with the historic building. If the fenestration, proportions, and details of the proposed façade facing the courtyard were revised, the new construction could meet Standard 9.
- *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 will be unimpaired.*
  - The proposed demolition permanently removes historic materials; therefore, this application does not meet Standard 10.
  - If the demolition is approved, the rear ell should be documented to HABS (Historic American Buildings Survey) standards. Creation of this documentation would allow the application to better meet Standard 10.

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:37:54

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Property owner Charles Elison and architect Wendy Sumida represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property is classified as significant in the Old City Historic District.
- The section of the rear ell in question may date to the construction of the main block in 1799.
- The proposed new construction would not be visible from the public right-of-way.
- Historic elements of the rear ell could be removed prior to demolition and reused in the new construction.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Since the area of demolition and new construction will not be visible from the public right-of-way, the public's view of this historic resource will be protected and preserved.

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

| <b>ITEM: 423 and 425 Vine St</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>MOTION: Approval</b>          |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>       |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>SECONDED BY: Carney</b>       |     |    |         |        |        |
| 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: 6333 MALVERN AVE**

Proposal: Demolish non-historic buildings; construct dining hall, guard house, and drop-off area

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Overbrook School for the Blind

Applicant: Joseph Horan, Kimmel Architecture

History: 1900; PA Institute for the Instruction of the Blind; Cope & Stewardson, architects

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application seeks final approval to construct a dining hall and vehicular drop off area at the Overbrook School for the Blind. The original school was designed by the renowned firm Cope & Stewardson between 1897 and 1900. Today, the school's campus includes approximately 17 buildings constructed between 1897 and 2008. The proposed scope includes the full demolition of Wynnewood Hall (1960) and the Garage (1960) and partial demolition of the Food Services Building (1975) and Lions Hall (1954). Modifications to the facades of these

buildings are intended to facilitate connections to the new dining hall building. In addition, the project includes the construction of a new guard house near the northeast vehicular gate to better control traffic flow into the campus and the widening of the east pedestrian gate into a vehicular gate to improve traffic flow. Owing to the historic wall that surrounds the Overbrook School for the Blind campus, there will be limited visibility of these changes from the public right-of-way. The new dining hall and gate house will be clad in stucco with a standing seam metal roof. The proposed colors of the exterior materials will be similar to the historic Main Building.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish two non-contributing buildings and existing parking area.
- Partially demolish two non-contributing buildings.
- Construct one-story dining hall building and “connector” to Main Building.
- Widen historic perimeter wall and construct guard house.
- Construct vehicular drop off loop and parking 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 shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - o The majority of the proposed changes impact non-historic buildings constructed between 1954 and 1975. The proposed demolition of Wynnewood Hall, the garage, food service building, and Lions Hall do not alter the historic integrity of the property’s historic buildings; and therefore, meets Standard 9.
  - o The proposed construction of a new parking area, guard house, and vehicular loop does not alter the historic integrity of the property and its environment; and therefore, meets Standard 9.
  - o The proposed new construction of the dining hall is compatible in massing, size, scale, and materials with the historic buildings on campus; and therefore, meets Standard 9.
- *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 will be unimpaired.*
  - o The proposed alterations to the Main Building’s east elevation include changes to existing openings. If the school decides in the future to remove the connection between the new dining hall building and the historic Main Building, the exterior wall could be successfully restored to its historic appearance; therefore, this application could meet Standard 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the issues raised by the Architectural Committee are addressed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:00:19

**PRESENTERS:**

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

- Architect Joseph Horan and Todd Reeves, the executive director of the Overbrook School for the Blind, represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the application.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The proposed dining hall and drop-off area defer in terms of scale, detail, and materials to the historic building.
- The evolving needs of the student population necessitate the construction of a safe drop-off area and expanded parking lot.
- The connection between the new dining hall and the historic Main Building will be limited and require minimal demolition.
- The revised application successfully incorporated the Architectural Committee's comments including developed designs for the guardhouse and elevator tower. It also included an overall floorplan showing how the new building, Lyons Hall, and the Main Building operate together.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The majority of the proposed demolition and new construction does not alter the historic integrity of the property and its environment. The proposed new construction of the dining hall is compatible in massing, size, scale, and materials with the historic buildings on campus; and therefore, this application meets Standard 9.
- The proposed alterations to the Main Building's east elevation include changes to existing openings. If the school decides in the future to remove the connection between the new dining hall building and the historic Main Building, the exterior wall could be successfully restored to its historic appearance; therefore, this application meets Standard 10.

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

| <b>ITEM: 6333 Malvern Ave</b><br><b>MOTION: Approval</b><br><b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Carney</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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: 4370-74 MAIN ST**

Proposal: Construct two-story addition

Review: In Concept

Owner: Laurel Holdings Group

Applicant: Joseph Serratore, Joseph Serratore & Company Architects.

History: 1900, 4370 Main Street, Oliver S. Keely & Co.; 1930, 4372-74 Main Street

Individual Designation: None.

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, 12/14/1983

Staff Contact: Josh Schroeder, [joshua.schroeder@phila.gov](mailto:joshua.schroeder@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a two-story addition, to add five residential units, to 4370-74 Main Street above the existing one-story commercial property. Now a single property and building, the 4370 Main Street portion is classified as contributing to the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District while 4372-74 are classified as "intrusions" in the district.

The current version of the proposal includes a three-bay, two-story addition above the contributing portion at 4370 Main St and features a two-foot setback from the large front parapet above the storefront as well as a reveal between the contributing and non-contributing portions. No alterations are proposed for the contributing storefront. The two-story addition above the non-contributing portion at 4372-4374 Main St will include a brick veneer and two projecting bays on the second floor. The double door entrance at 4374 Main St will be replaced with two separate doors while the brick façade and two small windows at 4372 Main St will be altered to match the adjacent 4374 Main St storefront's appearance.

The building's rear faces the Schuylkill River Trail with substantial public visibility. The proposal generally retains the existing basement and first floor rear exterior's appearance, with new stucco parge over the existing masonry and new windows. The second and third floor rear

additions overhang the original exterior below and project over the river trail.

The Architectural Committee performed an in-concept review at its November 2025 meeting. The current revised application responds to several of the suggestions made by committee members.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct two-story addition on top of 4370-74 Main Street and alter front and rear façades.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
- *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.*
- *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 Main Street Manayunk review criteria restated in the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations include:

- *Section 6.9.b.4: Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.*
- *Section 6.9.b.5: Design: Additions, alterations and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.*

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:17:06

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Schroeder presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Joseph Serratore represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The setback from the addition to the front facade at 4370 Main Street presents maintenance and drainage issues that need to be addressed.

- The proper depth of the setback will require further consideration during final review.
- The revised rear elevations responded satisfactorily to the Architectural Committee's suggestions.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The two-foot setback may not be sufficient to respect the historic character of the 4370 Main Street front facade, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, and Manayunk Review Criterion 5.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve most of the application in concept, but to deny the proposed setback of the addition from the plane of the front facade of the building at 4740 Main Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10 and the Main Street Manayunk Review Criteria. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| <b>ITEM: 4370-74 Main St</b><br><b>MOTION: Approval in concept except denial of the setback of the addition</b><br><b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Cooperman</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| 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: 01:32:06**

**ACTION:** At 10:35 a.m., Mr. Frankel moved to adjourn. Mr. Lech seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

|                          |     |    |         |        |        |
|--------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>ITEM: Adjournment</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOTION: Adjourn</b>   |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOVED BY: Frankel</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>SECONDED BY: Lech</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>VOTE</b>              |     |    |         |        |        |
| 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](http://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.