

**THE MINUTES OF THE 716TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 8 APRIL 2022, 9:00 A.M.
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Thomas, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair (Architectural Historian)	X		
Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Mark Dodds (Department of Planning and Development)		X	
Kelly Edwards, MUP (Real Estate Developer)	X		
Patrick O'Donnell (Department of Public Property)		X	
Sara Lepori (Commerce Department)	X		
John P. Lech (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
John Mattioni, Esq.	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair (Architect)	X		Left 10:58 am
Stephanie Michel (Community Organization)	X		Left 12:33 pm
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq. (Community Development Corporation)	X		

The meeting was held remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Hal Schirmer
Meredith Trego, Esq., Ballard Spahr
J M Duffin
Jason Friedland

Steven Peitzman
Justino Navarro
Jennifer Loustau
Peter Angelides, Ph.D., Econsult
George Earl Thomas, Civic Visions
Uk Jung
Chris Strom, Esq.
Plato Marinakos
Hui Ping Peng, interpreter
Dennis Carlisle
Jessica Vitali
Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Nick Kraus, Heritage Consulting Group
Jeffrey Ogren, Esq.
Simon Liu
Jay Farrell
Jafar Maleki
David Traub
Kevin Block
Madeline Maker
Matthew McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Audrey Hampton
Charles Long
Richard Wentzel
Oscar Beisert
Michael LaFlash
Janice Woodcock
Paul Pelullo
Julia Pelullo
Nancy Pontone
Celeste Morello
Dianne Pelullo

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 715TH STATED MEETING, 11 MARCH 2022

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:50

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 715th Stated Meeting, held 11 March 2022. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 715th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 March 2022. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 715th Meeting MOTION: Adoption of minutes MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

CONTINUANCE REQUEST

ADDRESS: 3101 W PASSYUNK AVE

Name of Resource: Point Breeze Gas Works

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Gas Works

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the designation of the property at 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue. The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination on 3 March 2021. The matter has been continued since that time, awaiting the outcome of litigation in a related matter regarding the authority of local land use agencies to regulate utilities. The nomination contends that the Point Breeze Gas Works satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, although some Criteria are not applied to all resources listed in the nomination. The site is inaccessible to the general public and subject to significant safety and security restrictions; therefore, aerial imagery was utilized to identify and catalog the resources. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination contends that the Point Breeze Gas Works, which expanded as the city's population grew, was one of the city's largest employers in the mid-to-late nineteenth century and is one of the oldest surviving gasworks. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that many of the structures embody characteristics of the Gothic Revival style. It also notes that later structures were designed in the Jacobean Revival style. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the earliest buildings of the Point Breeze Gas Works were built under the leadership of John Chapman Cresson, an influential figure.

The site is very large and most of the land is vacant. Most of the buildings associated with the historic gasworks have been demolished. The site is currently used by the Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW) for the storage and distribution of liquefied natural gas. Access to the site is

strictly controlled and visitors are not permitted. Persons with business at the site must be accompanied by PGW staff and wear protective gear including flame-retardant suits. The nominated buildings are primarily unused or used for storage.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, and to limit the designation to buildings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 5a, 5b, 6, 7, 8, and 9a, with a period of significance of 1855-1929. Ms. Barucco seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:08:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the continuance request.
- Attorney Chris Strom represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Strom explained the reason behind the request to continue the review of the nomination to the November 2022 meeting of the Historical Commission. He stated that he is requesting the six-month continuance because of ongoing litigation in Delaware County that remains unresolved and has a direct impact on this proceeding. He stated that the focus of the litigation is whether local authorities have the authority to regulate public utilities, or whether that power and authority lies exclusively with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC). He stated that it is unclear if there will be appeals filed following the litigation. If no appeals are filed, the matter can be resolved quickly, but if it is appealed, the litigation will be extended. He stated that the continuance allows for some flexibility given the uncertain timing.
- Mr. Thomas noted that the property would remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during any continuance period.
 - o Mr. Strom agreed that while it remains an open matter, the Historical Commission has jurisdiction. He stated that, by agreeing to this now, they are not agreeing to wave any defense or right in the future.
- Ms. Cooperman opined that, if the point of the litigation is to determine whether the property can be designated and then regulated by a local authority, then it does not matter if the Historical Commission proceeds with designating the property or not. She opined that the continuance does not mean that much, aside from creating additional work for the staff.
 - o Mr. Strom disagreed. He stated that, if the Historical Commission were to designate the property and the ongoing litigation then confirms that the Commission does not have the jurisdiction to regulate it, then the Philadelphia Gas Works will be required to go through a litigation process. He asked that the Historical Commission postpone reviewing the matter until the ongoing litigation is resolved, so that the jurisdiction issue is decided before the Commission moves forward.
- Mr. Thomas asked that the applicant provide the Historical Commission with a status update in three months.
 - o Mr. Strom agreed to this request.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, the nominator of the property, commented that the Philadelphia Gas Works should devise a plan to preserve the historic buildings during this continuance period.

ACTION: Ms. Washington moved to continue the review of the nomination of 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue to the November 2022 meeting of the Historical Commission, with a status update to be provided to the Historical Commission at its July 2022 meeting. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 3101 W. Passyunk Ave.					
MOTION: Continue to November PHC mtg, with status update at July PHC mtg					
MOVED BY: Washington					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 305 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Restore facades

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 305 Front Street Land Trust

Applicant: Ben Estepani, PACE Architecture + Design

History: 1845; Storefronts infilled; windows infilled with glass block

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003 Staff

Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The property at 305 N. Front Street is a four-story, three-bay, painted brick, vernacular building constructed ca. 1845, and is considered a contributing structure within the Old City Historic District. The rear (east) elevation faces N. Water Street and has five stories with a garage door at the first floor and three bays of glass-block-infilled windows at stories two through five.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier version of this project. After the January 2022 Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant withdrew an application. The applicant now

presents revised plans and a report from a structural engineer assessing the deteriorated conditions of the building.

The applicant proposes to remove and reconstruct the existing brick from the front and rear facades. At the N. Front Street façade, the applicant proposes to clad the first story in cast stone and clad stories two through four in a red brick veneer to match existing. The first story of the N. Water Street façade proposes a new garage door with cast-stone surround, with floors two through five clad in a red brick veneer to match existing.

The applicant now proposes a fenestration pattern at the N. Front Street façade that appears to replicate the locations of the original windows. Casement windows are proposed using a simulated divided lite pattern that attempts to approximate a six-over-six, double-hung window, the original window type. Sills and headers would be limestone.

At the N. Water Street elevation, the fenestration pattern is altered from the historic pattern. At stories two through five, balconies with double-doors are proposed at the middle bay, which are flanked by casement windows like the ones proposed for the front. A new garage door with a cast stone surround is proposed at the ground story.

A roof deck and pilot house are proposed with six-foot setbacks from both the east and west facades. The pilot house is located at the south side of the building and would be clad in siding.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove and reconstruct brick facades at front and rear;
- Construct roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The extent of the historic brick that is proposed for demolition does not satisfy Standard 9.
 - o Any historic storefront material that exists beneath the altered N. Front Street façade should be preserved and restored.
 - o The proposed reconstruction does not reflect existing physical and archival evidence of the building's historic conditions. Given the availability of such evidence, the proposed reconstruction should more closely reflect the historic facades in terms of fenestration, window type, and façade materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:19:29

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the continuance request.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to continue the review of the application for 305 N. Front Street to the May 2022 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 305 N Front St MOTION: Continue to May 2022 PHC Mtg MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

OLD BUSINESS**ADDRESS: 1533-39 N 7TH ST**

Name of Resource: Trinity Reformed Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 99 Real Estate LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1533-39 N. 7th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Trinity Reformed Church satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the church exemplifies the “inexpensive, but expressive” form of Gothic ecclesiastical architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the church was designed by influential Philadelphia architect Samuel Sloan, who included an illustration of the building in his 1868 publication of *The Architectural Review and American Builders' Journal*. The

nomination further argues that the modest but expressive design reflects the cultural, economic, and social heritage of Philadelphia's working-to-middle-class residents.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1533-39 N. 7th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that 1533-39 N. 7th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J, and that the property should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:20:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society represented the nomination.
- Owner Simon Liu represented the property and opposed designation.
- Mandarin Chinese interpreter Nina Hui Ping Huang, retained by the City of Philadelphia, translated the discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Celeste Morello supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The owner's concerns over several structural cracks do not impact the property's historical significance.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building exemplifies the architect's "inexpensive but expressive" Gothic style of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.
- Noted Philadelphia architect Samuel Sloan designed this church and several other nearly identical churches located throughout the city, satisfying Criterion E.
- The modest design reflects the evolution of the neighborhood, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 1533-39 N. 7th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Michel seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1533-39 N 7th St MOTION: Designate, Criteria D, E, and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Michel					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MARCH 2022

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:55:20

DISCUSSION:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 2036 Delancey Place. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2036 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rebecca Malcolm-Naib and Farid Naib

Applicant: Uk Jung, Studio Hada

History: 1868, Frederick Brown House; alterations, Furness & Hewitt, 1874

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

Staff Contact: Megan Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for the removal of a non-historic garage and construction of a three-story addition with garages at the rear of this corner property at S. 21st Street and Delancey Place. The proposed addition would be clad in brick and would attach to the existing building through a glass and paneled connector utilizing existing openings.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept version of the application in December 2020, recommended denial, and offered suggestions. Following the Committee's review, the applicant revised the application to respond to the suggestions. At its January 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed and endorsed the revised in-concept application. The Historical Commission concluded that the revisions made between the Committee and Commission meetings responded to the Committee's comments. The Commission suggested that an existing iron gate that was shown in the plans but not in a rendering should be retained. The Commission also indicated that details such as the design of the garage doors should be developed before a final submission. The current application for final approval is consistent with the in-concept application that the Historical Commission endorsed in 2021.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing garage
- Construct three-story addition with garages

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 proposed construction removes a non-historic element of the property. The new work is differentiated from the old and is generally compatible in massing, scale, and materials to the historic building. The application complies with Standard 9. The applicant should include historic gate in final plans as requested by Historical Commission. The applicant should confirm whether additional railings will be required by the building code around pool areas on the roof. If they are required, these railings should be incorporated into the design for the final review by the Historical Commission.
- *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 addition does not remove significant amounts of historic material and could be removed in the future without damaging the essential form and integrity of the historic property. The application complies with Standard 10.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the mechanical equipment is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way; the oval window is reconsidered; the color of the material above the garage doors is revised; and the windows in the garage doors are not arched; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Historical Commission's 2021 in-concept approval.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1601 MT VERNON ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Miguel Santiago, owner; Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, conservator

Applicant: Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio

History: 1859; Robert Purvis House

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The property at 1601 Mount Vernon Street is significant in the Spring Garden Historic District, owing to its association with Robert Purvis, a Black anti-slavery activist, writer,

and lecturer who resided at the property from c. 1875 to 1898. Over the last few decades, the property has languished and has been subject to multiple violations, Historical Commission reviews, and court hearings, culminating in the current conservatorship by the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation. A brief timeline follows:

10/11/2000	PHC designated the Spring Garden Historic District and classified 1601 Mt. Vernon Street as significant.
12/12/2003	PHC approved application for complete rehabilitation of building (main block and ell) and construction of rear addition with garage.
2006	The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) issued multiple violations for deteriorated, bulged, and fractured walls.
2/1/2007	PHC approved application for complete rehabilitation.
4/6/2009	PHC approved application for wall shoring and reconstruction.
6/24/2010	PHC approved application for new roof and windows, and to stabilize walls.
2/3/2011	PHC approved application for masonry repair and new windows.
2/24/2011	Court order to repair roof, windows, walls, and floors.
3/14/2012	PHC approved application for new windows.
11/2/2012	Court order to demolish rear ell and reconstruct it within one year.
12/2012	City demolished rear ell; rear wall of main block remained temporarily sealed for several years; owner did not reconstruct ell.
1/7/2013	PHC approved rebuilding of cornice and gable wall.
4/13/2017	Court order to make building safe by sufficiently sealing rear wall of main block.
7/14/2017	PHC approved plans to stabilize building and rebuild rear wall.
11/19/2018	Court appointed Spring Garden CDC as conservator.
5/22/2019	PHC approved application for structural and masonry repair.
3/6/2020	PHC approved application to install star bolts to stabilize main block.

Despite numerous approvals of building permit applications by the Historical Commission and its staff since 2003, the property was never restored, and the City abated an imminently dangerous condition by demolishing the rear ell in 2012. The main block was stabilized and its masonry repaired under the conservatorship. This in-concept application, submitted by a developer seeking to purchase the property, proposes to rehabilitate the main block and to construct a rear addition. Two schemes for the rear have been submitted.

Work to the main block would include removing the existing storefront, which post-dates Purvis's ownership, and restoring the building's residential appearance. A new marble base, stoop, door surround, and lintels would be installed on the front façade. A new door, windows, and a cornice would be fabricated in wood to match the historic features.

At the rear, the application proposes to construct a new ell to replace the ell that was demolished a decade ago. Scheme A proposes a two-story ell with a garage that would connect the main block to a three-story addition at the rear of the lot. The rear portion of the addition would have a garage, roof deck, and pilot house. Scheme A is similar in massing, size, and scale to plans that were approved by the Historical Commission on 12 December 2003. At the time, the historic ell remained and those plans proposed to retain and rehabilitate the ell's masonry. Scheme B proposes the same two-story rear ell with a garage but does not include the additional three-story building at the rear of the lot.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate main block; and

- Construct rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o The only remaining portion of the building, the main block, had a storefront installed c. 1920. That intervention removed the original entryway and marble base. Two large openings for storefront windows were cut into the masonry on the front façade and side wall at the first story, and a new corner entrance was constructed. Decades of neglect have also led to the loss of the cornice and have caused the masonry to deteriorate.
 - o The application proposes to rehabilitate the main block by replicating the lost features in their original materials. A marble base, stoop, door surround, and lintels would be installed to reverse the storefront alteration. A wood cornice, door, and windows would also be installed. The work complies with 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.*
 - o While neither scheme proposes to reconstruct the rear ell to its historic appearance, the construction of an addition would allow for the main block to be rehabilitated and permanently sealed, avoiding further deterioration. Both proposed additions are compatible in massing, size, and scale and comply with Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:56:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Plato Marinakos represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property has had numerous violations issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. While the Historical Commission reviewed numerous applications in the past, the property languished for decades. In 2012, the City demolished the historic rear ell, owing to public safety concerns.

- In a 2018 court order, the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation was appointed as conservator of the property. The conservator has repaired and stabilized the masonry of the main block, though the rear ell has not been reconstructed and the property has not been further redeveloped.
- This application by a developer seeking to purchase the property proposes two design schemes. Scheme A proposes to construct a rear ell and an attached three-story building. Scheme B proposes only the construction of a rear ell. The applicant is seeking approval for both schemes to allow for flexibility in the redevelopment of the property

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The garage at the proposed rear ell is inappropriate, though parking would be acceptable at the three-story portion of the proposed new construction.
- The cladding of the rear wing and addition has been revised to eliminate the siding and include only brick, which is appropriate for the property.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the in-concept application, with a suggestion to consider moving the garage from the rear ell to the wider section of the rear addition. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1601 Mt Vernon St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 16 MARCH 2022

ADDRESS: 625-33 CHRISTIAN ST

Name of Resource: St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi Catholic School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Various owners of condominium units

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 625-33 Christian Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi Catholic School satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, H and J.

Under Criteria A and J, the nomination contends that the building reflects the social, cultural, and economic development of the neighborhood when it was associated with Italian immigrants. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the property is significant owing to its association with architect Paul Henon, Jr., of Henon-Hoffman Co., a prolific firm known for its designs of Catholic churches, theaters, and movie houses. Under Criterion H, the nomination asserts that the city grid was altered for the construction of the building, which now serves as a landmark of the neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 625-33 Christian Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. The staff contends that the property does not satisfy Criterion H.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 625-33 Christian Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J, but not A and H, and that the Period of Significance run from 1927 to 1982.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:12:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.
- No one represented the owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building was designed by architect Paul Henon, Jr. of Henon-Hoffman Co. and was constructed in 1927.
- The building is an important reminder of the social, cultural, and educational contributions of Italian immigrants to this neighborhood.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Owing to its association with Paul Henon, Jr., and its role in the social, cultural, and educational development of the neighborhood, the building satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J.
- The nomination's Period of Significance should be extended from 1927 to 1982 to better reflect the building's social, cultural, and educational importance.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 625-33 Christian Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 625-33 Christian St MOTION: Designate under Criteria for Designation E and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 2301-41 S 3RD ST

Name of Resource: Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church and rectory, two buildings on a larger parcel at 2301-41 S. 3rd Street, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the church and rectory satisfy Criteria for Designation D and F. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Gothic style of architecture. Under Criterion F, the nomination argues that the church building's architectural sculpture by the Economy Concrete Company represents an anomaly for English Gothic churches.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 2301-41 S. 3rd Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D, with the

clarification that the style is Late Gothic Revival with some Tudor Revival elements and is not “Tudor Gothic.” The staff also recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property satisfies Criterion F, because no argument is offered to demonstrate that the church or rectory represents a significant innovation. Finally, because the nomination fails to include the rectory in the Statement of Significance and no arguments for its significance are made, the staff recommends that the boundary be redrawn to exclude it from this nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 2301-41 S. 3rd Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D, with the suggestion of modifying the property boundary to include only the church and masonry connector.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:17:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Celeste Morello represented the nominator.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the designation of the property.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The nomination identifies the church and rectory as contributing, though no argument for the rectory’s significance is included.
- The masonry connector between the church and rectory is identified as non-contributing in the nomination.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The boundary should be modified to exclude the rectory and only include the church and masonry connector. The rectory could be considered for designation in the future if a separate nomination is submitted.
- The masonry connector between the church and rectory contains stylistic elements related to the church building and should be considered contributing.
- The property embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Late Gothic Revival style and satisfies Criterion D.
- The nomination fails to demonstrate that the property contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which represent a significant element. The nomination does not satisfy Criterion F.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the church building and masonry connector, but not the rectory, at 2301-41 S. 3rd Street satisfy Criterion for Designation D, and to designate them as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent

ITEM: 2301-41 S 3rd St MOTION: Designate, Criterion D; amend boundary MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 32 MANHEIM ST

Name of Resource: 32 Manheim Street

Proposed Action: Reclassification in Manheim Square Historic District

Property Owner: Jennifer Fritzinger

Applicant: Historical Commission staff

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

OVERVIEW: At its December 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission designated the Manheim Square Historic District, which includes 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42 Manheim Street. The nomination included the property at 32 Manheim Street, a vacant lot, in the proposed district and classified it as non-contributing, as the nomination argued only for designation under Criterion J. The Committee on Historic Designation found that the open land in the historic district, including the property at 32 Manheim Street and the rear yards of all properties, may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, satisfying Criterion I. For this reason, the Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrated that all properties in the historic district satisfied Criteria for Designation I and J. At its December 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission found that notice provided to the property owner of the vacant lot at 32 Manheim Street listed the property as non-contributing to the historic district. The Law Department advised that new notice would need to be sent to the property owner if a classification is to be upgraded from non-contributing to contributing, which would change the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over review of building permit applications for the property. The Historical Commission concluded that the vacant lot at 32 Manheim Street shall be classified as non-contributing until such time as the classification is reconsidered. The Historical Commission directed the staff to send new notice informing the property owner of 32 Manheim Street that it will consider amending the historic district to change the classification of the property to contributing, owing to Criterion I for archaeological potential.

The historic house that stood at 32 Manheim Street was demolished by the City in 2017 owing to the poor condition of the structure. The earliest documentation provided in the nomination shows the structures at 32 and 34 Manheim Street having been constructed by 1834. Privies are clearly labeled in the rear yards, which are considered by archaeologists to have high potential for archaeological resources.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends upgrading the classification of the property at 32 Manheim Street to contributing under Criterion I, because the site may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend reclassifying the property at 32 Manheim Street as contributing under Criterion I in the Manheim Square Historic District, because the site is likely to yield information important in pre-history or history.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:24:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the reclassification request to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, supported the reclassification.
- Allison Weiss, representing SoLo Germantown Civic Association, supported the reclassification.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The historic house that stood at 32 Manheim Street was demolished by the City in 2017, owing to the poor condition of the structure.
- The earliest documentation provided in the nomination shows the structures at 32 and 34 Manheim Street having been constructed by 1834. Privies are clearly labeled in the rear yards, which are considered by archaeologists to have high potential for archaeological resources.
- Debbie Miller, the archaeologist member of the Committee on Historic Designation, recommended that the property met the threshold for designation owing to archaeological potential.
- For properties designated under Criterion I for archaeological potential, the Commission staff would review any permit applications to determine if the scope proposed significant ground disturbance. If so, the Commission staff would ask the property owner to engage an archaeologist to evaluate the work and ensure that archaeological resources remain protected in the ground undisturbed, or that any disturbed resources are documented in a manner consistent with preservation standards for archaeology before construction commenced. The cost for retaining an archaeologist would be the responsibility of the property owner, not the City.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property at 32 Manheim Street should be reclassified as contributing under Criterion I in the Manheim Square Historic District, because the site may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to reclassify the property at 32 Manheim Street as contributing under Criterion I in the Manheim Square Historic District, because the site may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 2, with 2 abstentions.

ITEM: 32 Manheim St. MOTION: Reclassify as contributing in Manheim Square Historic District MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)			X		
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					
Lepori (Commerce)			X		
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni		X			
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)		X			
Washington	X				
Total	7	2	2		

ADDRESS: 2204 WALNUT ST

Proposed Action: Classification in Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District

Property Owner: Flamingo Bay Investments

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design

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

OVERVIEW: This proposal requests that the Historical Commission reclassify the property at 2204 Walnut Street as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The property is classified as contributing in the inventory for the district, which was designated on 8 February 1995. The inventory entry reads as follows:

2204 Two, refaced townhouses for Henry Ashhurst family, c. 1870, Furness and Hewitt, architects; refaced c. 1960. --- Contributing

The inventory describes the building at 2204 Walnut Street as two townhouses designed by Furness and Hewitt for the Henry Ashhurst family, about 1870, which were refaced about 1960. Two aspects of the inventory entry are incorrect. The building was constructed as one 36-foot-wide townhouse, not two narrower townhouses. And the front façade of the building was replaced in 1938, not 1960.

Henry Ashhurst purchased the property at 2204 Walnut Street and several nearby properties in 1869 and commissioned a group of grand townhouses for the site from architects Furness and

Hewitt. Henry Ashhurst occupied the townhouse at 2210 Walnut Street; it was demolished many years before the district was created. John Ashhurst, a wealthy banker and businessman, occupied the townhouse at 2204 Walnut Street, the property in question. John Ashhurst died in 1892, leaving his property at 2204 Walnut Street to his sons. According to architectural historian George Thomas, the building was altered by architect Wilson Eyre Jr. in 1892, when Chestnut Street was widened for the new bridge over the Schuylkill River. In 1900, the building was redeveloped as the Holman School for Girls. At the time, it was reported that “the building ... has been remodeled and newly equipped with the latest and most improved furniture and apparatus to be found in this country or abroad” for the school. A garret top floor with dormers was added to the building and the front stoop was removed and the first floor was lowered to street level at some point during its use as a school, probably in 1900. In 1925, the Holman School moved to Ardmore. The property was then used as a social club called Season House. In 1938, architect George W. Neff converted the building for showroom and office space for Anthracite Industries, a promotional and lobbying arm of the coal industry. For the conversion, the front façade was removed, a new façade with storefront was installed, and the interior was converted for exhibition space on the first floor. In 1945, the coal industry group left the building, and it was converted for use by Ward & Ward, a men’s mail-order undergarment company. Ward & Ward constructed a large, rear, one-story addition for the storage of undergarments. The building was later used as the offices of 3I, a computer company specializing in information storage and retrieval; the Institute of Computer Management, a computer school, in 1965; Computer Conversions, Inc. in 1970; Temple Insurance Co. in 1976; a West Coast Video Store in 1987; a childcare facility called The King’s Kids with offices for Mark Ulrick Engineers, Inc. on the upper floors; and several other relatively short-term tenants.

In recent years, the property has been considered several times for redevelopment. The Historical Commission approved two versions of a project to redevelop the property with large rooftop and rear additions in February and July 2019. A demolition permit was issued in November 2019 to remove the rear addition and otherwise prepare the site for redevelopment, but the redevelopment project was eventually abandoned. In October 2021, the Department of Licenses and Inspections cited the building as Unsafe after an engineer reported that the front façade had separated from the remainder of the building.

The only surviving exterior portion of the Furness and Hewitt townhouse is the part of the rear wall facing Chancellor Street, a service alley, above the one-story projection added for the undergarment company and below the garret story added for the school.

The property owner is requesting that the Historical Commission reclassify the property at 2204 Walnut Street as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. Section 14-203(78) of the preservation ordinance, which is mirrored by Section 2.5 of the Historical Commission’s Rules and Regulations, defines a “Contributing Building” in a historic district as a building “within a district that reflects the historical or architectural character of the district, as defined in the Commission’s designation.” The task of the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission is to determine whether this building reflects the historical or architectural character of the district, as defined in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District nomination adopted by the Historical Commission on 8 February 1995. If it does reflect the historical or architectural character of the district, it should be classified as contributing; if it does not, it should be classified as non-contributing. The nomination for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District describes the district as follows.

"The Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential district consists of a series of residential communities representing the historical development of the region surrounding the southwest square of Penn's original planned city."

"The unifying factors [of the district] are the early and continuously residential character of the neighborhood, and the high quality of architectural design that pervades the entire area."

"The buildings of the proposed Rittenhouse Fitler residential district possess significance, however, not just as a grouping of individual landmarks, but rather as a series of streetscapes that give the area a unique sense of time and place. These streetscapes vary from the two story rowhouses of backstreets such as Addison and Smedley, through the four story rowhouses of Pine and Spruce Streets to the mixed scale rowhouses and apartment towers on Rittenhouse Square and Walnut Street."

It is important to note that the adjective "residential" is included in the name of the district, which was designed to preserve the residential sections of Center City west of Broad Street and south of Market Street. The inventory classifies some non-residential buildings as contributing; they are primarily churches, schools, and small-scale retail buildings that directly supported the residents of the area. Also, buildings that were originally residential but converted to commercial while retaining their residential features and character are also generally classified as contributing. Larger-scale retail and other commercial and office buildings are generally classified as non-contributing. The nomination does not cite, and the Historical Commission did not explicitly identify any Criteria for Designation when it designated the district in 1995. Moreover, the nomination does not propose a Period of Significance. The nomination includes 16 photographs illustrating the district. All depict residential buildings. No commercial buildings are depicted in photographs in the nomination.

The entry for 2204 Walnut Street in the inventory of National Register Rittenhouse Historic District, which was the basis for the local inventory, is not surprisingly nearly identical to the local district entry, errors and all, but it classifies the property as an intrusion, the National Register language for non-contributing.

2204 Two refaced townhouses for Henry Ashhurst family c. 1870, Furness and Hewitt, architects; refaced c. 1960. --- Intrusion.

In conclusion, the building has not served as residence since 1892. It was significantly altered about 1900 and again in 1938 for institutional and then commercial uses. Almost all traces of the original Furness and Hewitt townhouse have been removed. The building does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The building is labeled an Intrusion in the National Register district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission reclassify the property at 2204 Walnut Street as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District, pursuant to Section 14-203(78) of the preservation ordinance, which defines a contributing building as a building "within a district that reflects the historical or architectural character of the district, as defined in the Commission's designation."

The staff also suggests that the Historical Commission consider reclassifying 2202 Walnut Street as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District after additional research and proper notice to the owner.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: By a vote of 4 to 2, the Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the Historical Commission retain the classification of the property at 2204 Walnut Street as contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Laverty dissented.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:50:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the reclassification request to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Janice Woodcock represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Reuter asked Mr. Farnham to explain to the audience the implications of reclassifying the property from contributing to non-contributing in the historic district.
 - o Mr. Farnham explained that, if reclassified as non-contributing, the Historical Commission would not seek to protect the building, which could be demolished without a hardship or public interest finding, but the Commission would have full jurisdiction over any new construction on the site to ensure that it was compatible with the historic district.
- Ms. Woodcock displayed a series of images of the building and its setting. She explained that the only surviving original exterior fabric is the rear wall at the second and third stories. She discussed the buildings in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District and noted that they are primarily residential and architecturally distinguished. She stated that the property should be reclassified as non-contributing because it is a commercial structure unrelated to the residential development. The description is inaccurate in the inventory. She stated that any connection to Furness and Hewitt has been lost. She reviewed the history of the building and pointed out the errors in the inventory. She noted that the 1938 front façade had an Art Deco storefront, but it has been lost. She displayed photographs of several non-contributing houses and commercial buildings in the district. She noted that some of the non-contributing commercial buildings are architecturally distinguished but were classified as non-contributing because they are unrelated to the residential development in the area. She also displayed photographs of contributing commercial structures and noted that they were originally residential and retain their residential appearances, even though they now have commercial uses. The building in question does not retain its residential appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that the building is “very handsome” and should not be reclassified as non-contributing. He rejected the argument that the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District is a residential historic district.
- Jim Duffin stated that he represents the Historic Preservation Committee of the Center City Residents Association. He stated that his committee is opposed to the reclassification. He stated that the district is not monolithic but includes a broad range of building types and uses. He read from Historical Commission meeting minutes from 2003 and 2004, which recorded staff members stating that buildings in the district were classified as contributing if their use, scale, massing, rhythm, and materials were compatible with the district. He cited the 2006 review of the classification of the property at 316 S. 21st Street, claiming that it was the most

important case regarding classification for this district. He read from the 2006 meeting minutes, which quoted the 1987 meeting minutes at which the proposed district was discussed. He explained that the property at 316 S. 21st Street was mistakenly classified as an “Intrusion” in the inventory and was reclassified as contributing, not non-contributing, because the Historical Commission took massing and scale not solely use into account when it reconsidered the classification. He objected to the reclassification of the property at 2204 Walnut Street to non-contributing.

- o Mr. Farnham stated that he had been the staff member who administered the reclassification request for 316 S. 21st Street in 2006. He contended that Mr. Duffin failed to provide crucial information about the case. In the case of 316 S. 21st Street, the building, a typical four-story, red-brick rowhouse with mansard had been mistakenly classified as an “Intrusion” in the district inventory, a hold-over from the National Register inventory that was the basis for the local inventory. Intrusion is not a legitimate classification in local, Philadelphia historic districts. The property owner sought to take advantage of that mistake, and have it classified as non-contributing because he wanted to make major changes to the building that did not comply with the Standards. The Historical Commission instead reclassified it as contributing because it was a historic residential building that was typical of the residential rowhouses in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The Historical Commission rightly reclassified that residential building as contributing. That reclassification of 316 S. 21st Street as contributing has no bearing on the case at hand.
- Steven Peitzman stated that he supports the comments of David Traub and Jim Duffin. He stated that the building has an “appealing façade.” He stated that he objects to reclassifying this building as contributing because it is compatible with the historic district in massing and scale. He stated that the first floor appears to be vacant but might be able to house a restaurant.

FURTHER DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman stated that she disagreed with a majority of the members of the Committee on Historic Designation, who recommended maintaining the contributing classification. She stated that she had carefully reviewed the inventory for the historic district in 2016, when she was retained to the classification of a nearby building. She stated that she discovered that there are many errors and inconsistencies in the inventory while reviewing the similar case. She stated that the district has no period of significance, but there is an implied period of significance, which ends with the start of World War II. She stated that the building in question was significantly altered at the end of the inferred period of significance. She stated that, in her opinion, the building should be reclassified as non-contributing. She observed that a majority of the members of the Committee on Historic Designation offered opinions along the lines of those offered by Mr. Duffin. She added that Mr. Duffin failed to note that 2216 Walnut Street, the project with which she was involved before she joined the Historical Commission, was reclassified from contributing to non-contributing in 2016.
- Mr. Mattioni agreed with Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Farnham and stated that the building at 2204 Walnut Street seems unrelated to the historic district.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building at 2204 Walnut Street was constructed about 1870 and has not served as residence since 1892.
- The building at 2204 Walnut Street was significantly altered about 1900 for use as a school. The stoop was removed, the floor levels were changed, and a mansard was added.
- The building at 2204 Walnut Street was significantly altered again in 1938. The front façade was replaced. The building was used for commercial and office space.
- The building at 2204 Walnut Street was significantly altered again in 1945. A large rear addition was constructed at that time.
- Almost all traces of the original Furness and Hewitt townhouse have been removed.
- The property at 2204 Walnut Street is labeled an Intrusion in the National Register Historic District.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District and merits a classification of non-contributing to the historic district.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to reclassify the property at 2204 Walnut Street as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District, pursuant to Section 14-203(78) of the preservation ordinance, which defines a contributing building as a building “within a district that reflects the historical or architectural character of the district, as defined in the Commission's designation.” Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, with one abstention.

ITEM: 2204 Walnut Street reclassification MOTION: Reclassify as non-contributing MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards			X		
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9		1		3

THE CONWELL HOUSE BLOCK HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Number of properties: 7

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a historic district comprised of 7 properties on the west side of the 2000 block of Broad Street. Six of the properties are classified as contributing and one is identified as significant. The nomination argues that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C and D.

Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the district is significant for its association with the life and legacy of Reverend Russell Conwell, the founder of the college that would eventually become Temple University. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the buildings, “likely constructed at some point in the late 1880s, reflect the popularization of the Second Empire style in Gilded Age Philadelphia and the speculative development of North Broad Street...” Finally, the nomination asserts that the structures retain distinguishing characteristics of the Second Empire style, thereby satisfying Criterion D.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and D, provided the property at 2014 N. Broad Street is classified as non-contributing, owing to its extensive alterations.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and D and that the property at 2014 N. Broad Street should be classified as contributing.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:39:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nominator.
- No one represented the property owners.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The intact row of structures was built about 1876 in the Second Empire Gothic Revival style.
- Reverend Russell Conwell, the founder of the college that would eventually become Temple University, resided at 2020 N. Broad Street.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed district is significant for its association with the life and legacy of Reverend Russell Conwell, the founder of the college that would eventually become Temple University, satisfying Criterion A.

- The buildings represent Gilded Age Philadelphia and the speculative development of North Broad Street, satisfying Criterion C.
- The structures retain distinguishing characteristics of the Second Empire Gothic Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the Conwell House Block Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C and D, and that the property at 2014 N. Broad Street should be classified as contributing, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Conwell House Block Historic District MOTION: Designate under Criteria for Designation A, C, and D MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

DREXEL-GOVETT HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: University City Historical Society

Number of Properties: 95

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Drexel-Govett Historic District, a large district comprised of 95 properties on the 3900 blocks of Delancey Street, Pine Street, and Baltimore Avenue, as well as properties on the 300 and 400 blocks of S. 40th Street in the Spruce Hill neighborhood of West Philadelphia. All 95 properties are classified as contributing to the district. The nomination argues that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the district's developers, Anthony J. Drexel and Annesley R. Govett, were significant individuals in the city and helped galvanize development in the Spruce Hill neighborhood. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the buildings embody distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate, Second Empire, Neo-Grec, and Queen Anne styles of architecture. Finally, under Criterion E, the nomination contends that many of the district's buildings were designed by prominent architects such as Samuel Sloan and G.W. and W.D. Hewitt.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed historic district satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E, and that the arguments made for the satisfaction of Criterion A better apply to Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination for the proposed Drexel-Govett Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E, and to include Criterion J, owing to the significance of the district in the development of West Philadelphia.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:44:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the nominator.
- No one represented the property owners.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The district includes 95 properties, all classified as contributing.
- The district is located in West Philadelphia between 39th and 40th Streets and includes properties on Delancey, Pine, and 40th Streets, as well as Baltimore Avenue.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The district is significant, owing to Anthony J. Drexel's association as a developer and his citywide significance. The nomination satisfies Criterion A.
- The district was developed in the mid- to late-nineteenth-century in the Italianate, Second Empire, Neo-Grec, and Queen Anne styles of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.
- Several prominent Philadelphia architects, including Samuel Sloan and G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, are attributed with designing many of the buildings in the district, satisfying Criterion E.
- The district exemplifies the development of West Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the Drexel-Govett Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Drexel/Govett Historic District MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, D, E, and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 225-31 N 15TH ST

Name of Resource: Klahr Auditorium-Hahnemann Medical College 1938 Building

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: IS 245 N 15th Street, LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a portion of the property at 225-31 N. 15th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The property is part of the former Hahnemann Medical College. The area proposed for designation is limited to the Klahr Auditorium, which stands along the southern edge of the parcel at 225-31 N. 15th Street.

In 1938, architect Horace Trumbauer designed a large building for Hahnemann Medical College for the southeast corner of 15th and Vine Streets. Construction of that building began with the Klahr Auditorium, which was intended to be the southern wing or “first unit” of the larger building, in 1938. Owing to financial circumstances, the remainder of the larger Trumbauer-designed building was not constructed. Between 1966 and 1973, a large, Modern building known as the New College Building, was constructed on the site where Trumbauer’s building had been contemplated 30 years earlier. The new eight and 18-story building was internally connected to the Klahr Auditorium. In addition to the attachment to the larger building to the north, the Klahr Auditorium has been modified several times. A seventh story was added to the structure, a two-story penthouse was added, and all south-facing windows in the lightwell section were infilled.

The nomination contends that the Klahr Auditorium is significant under Criteria for Designation A and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination asserts that the building exemplifies the growth and

development of Philadelphia's medical-educational industry and culture in the first half of the twentieth century. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the building is significant as likely the last work of Horace Trumbauer, a prominent Gilded Age architect, whose designs influenced the development of Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the 1938 Klahr Auditorium, a portion of the property at 225-31 N. 15th Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Klahr Auditorium, a portion of the property at 225-31 N. 15th Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:50:46

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorneys Meredith Trego and Matt McClure, preservation consultant Nick Kraus, and developer Jason Friedland represented the property owner.
- Steven Peitzman and Oscar Beisert represented the nominator.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham explained that the staff had recommended to the Committee that the Klahr Auditorium satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E. The staff has since learned that the structure is not a stand-alone building but a dependent wing of a larger building. He noted that the staff has some concerns about designating a portion of a building that is not self-sufficient.
- Mr. Peitzman stated that he recently learned that the building is owned by Iron Stone, a real estate development company with which he is familiar. He stated that he is acquainted with other Iron Stone adaptive reuse projects, which have been very successful. He stated that Iron Stone is adept at reusing medical facilities. He stated that, in light of his faith in Iron Stone, the Keeping Society does not oppose the compromise designation plan that Iron Stone's consult will present. He stated that they agree to designating only the western volume of the building as defined by the first four southern bays of windows. He stated that he disagrees with the owner's consultant, who will claim that the lack of visibility of the south façade at the time of construction is a reason not to designate it or consider it significant. He stated that he also disagrees that the sealing of the windows on the south façade reduces the historic value of the building. Finally, he stated that the building is not important for the auditorium itself, but for the many medical school facilities that the building housed.
- Mr. Beisert stated that he also supports the compromise of limiting the designation to the front volume of the building and thanked the property owner for seeking a compromise rather than opposing the designation outright.
- Mr. McClure stated that his client, Iron Stone, acquired the property on 9 July 2021. The Historical Commission sent notice letters to the prior owner on 30 July 2021. He noted that the OPA records were not updated promptly, and his client did not receive notice or attend the Committee on Historic Designation meeting. He stated that the structure nominated today is not a complete building. It is a wing of a building. It was connected to a new building constructed in the 1970s and does not have its own

stairs or elevators. It does not have its own HVAC and other systems. It is part of a larger building. Mr. McClure stated that his client would prefer that the structure is not designated but will not object to the compromise. He reported that the character-defining features of the building, which has been modified many times, are limited to the front façade and the corner. He assured the Historical Commission that the windows in the lightwell area have been eliminated; they no longer exist.

- Ms. Trego asked several questions of Mr. Kraus, the historic preservation consultant.
 - o Mr. Kraus stated that he prepared a report on the building and nomination. He stated that the structure in question is part of a larger building. The south façade has been significantly modified and was not visible to the public when it was constructed. The historically significant features of the building are at the west façade and the designation should be limited to that part of the building. He confirmed that the windows on the south façade have been covered on the inside and out. He also noted that a two-story addition was constructed on the roof of the structure. He showed a map of the entire former Hahnemann Hospital campus and pointed out the various buildings. The area to the south of the Klahr Auditorium was built up, but much of it has since been cleared for surface parking and loading. He summarized the many changes to the structure in question. He showed photographs of the interior, noting that the historic lobby has been removed and the auditorium itself has been replaced.
- Mr. McClure stated that the compromise proposal will allow for the historically significant section of the building to be preserved.
- Mr. Beisert stated that, although “maybe this isn’t an independently operating building but I do still believe this is a building that was built at the time that it was built and it has been adaptively reused because it was gutted and redone and even if the other building next to it is one day not there this building could be adaptively reused once again.”
- Ms. Edwards reminded the Historical Commission that it had designated a portion of Esslinger’s Brewery a few years ago.
- Mr. Peitzman stated that the structure in question stood as an independent building for many years.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the structure was an independent building when it was erected. Whether the south wall could be seen from the street or not is not relevant.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The so-called Klahr Auditorium structure has been altered many times.
- The character-defining features of the structure are limited to the front or west section of the building, facing N. 15th Street.
- The Historical Commission has designated parts and portions of properties and buildings in the past.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the property at 225-31 N. 15th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 225-31 N. 15th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E, and to designate the western or front volume of the so-called Klahr Auditorium building, bounded by the front façade and the first four bays of the side or south façade, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 225-31 N. 15th Street designation MOTION: Designate with conditions MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

ADDRESS: 1206 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Philadelphia Federal Credit Union
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: 1206 Chestnut LLC
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1206 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that building, constructed in 1922 and re-clad in 1963, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the property represents the development of Center City, Philadelphia from residential to commercial in the late-nineteenth through mid-twentieth centuries. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the front façade of the building, installed in 1963, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Mid-Century Modern style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1206 Chestnut Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D, and that the arguments made for Criterion A better reflect Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1206 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:32:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi and Janice Woodcock represented the nominator.
- Attorney Jeffrey Ogren, architect Richard Wentzel, historic preservation consultant George Thomas, and economics consultant Peter Angelides represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Chantry noted that this matter was continued from the Historical Commission's February 2022 meeting, to allow time for the nominator and property owner's representatives to meet.
- Mr. Grossi summarized the findings of the letter prepared by the Preservation Alliance and provided to the Historical Commission and public. He stated that the Preservation Alliance met with the owner's representatives at the request of the Historical Commission. He stated that the objective was to consider a viable redevelopment program that would preserve the unique modernist façade but afford the opportunity to take advantage of the site's permissive zoning. Mr. Grossi outlined several ideas, including simply reusing the building as a commercial property, and introducing lightwells. He stated that the approach that seems to meet the objectives of both sides is a designation of the property with the understanding that the 1963 façade is the primary character-defining feature, and that the remainder of the building may be demolished in part or in full. The scope of demolition would allow for construction of a taller new structure behind the façade. The façade itself could be removed and stored off-site with the intention of reincorporating it, or a new façade could be designed which would replicate the appearance of the 1963 façade but with alternative materials. The front spaces could be programmed for amenities as they would be more dimly lit. He stated that architect and Preservation Alliance board member Janice Woodcock developed a zoning study which was provided to the Commission and made available to the public. He concluded that the Preservation Alliance stands by its assertion that 1206 Chestnut Street merits listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
- Ms. Woodcock introduced the zoning study she prepared to go along with Mr. Grossi's description of the proposed scope.
 - o Ms. Cooperman interjected that the Commission is reviewing a matter of designation, not new construction.
 - o Ms. Woodcock explained that she prepared the zoning study in response to the Commission's recent request that both sides investigate potential building reuse options. She explained that lower floors can be amenity space and a new building above can be apartments. She read from the deed which described two ways of exiting the building.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that he is still not clear on the status of the life safety issues described during the Historical Commission's prior review.
- Mr. Ogren introduced architect Richard Wentzel, historian and preservation consultant George Thomas, and economist Peter Angelides. He stated that they met with the Preservation Alliance and considered their drawings seriously. He stated that, after careful consideration by the consultant team, they maintain that a designation of the property would result in a dead building, because no one would

spend the money to develop it, and there would be no ability to recoup the money in rent. He stated that there has been interest in purchasing the property, until prospective buyers learn there are no windows. He stated that *Hustler* magazine considered putting in a sex toy shop but decided against it once they learned of the pending historic designation.

- Mr. Wentzel described the constraints of the property. He noted that the building has no legal windows on the front, back, or side. He referenced a slide showing the numerous prohibited uses for the property and stated that the biggest issue is the lack of egress.
- Mr. Thomas described additional site constraints. He stated that new adjacent construction will completely block the illegal side windows. He questioned if an interesting façade is a reason to create a completely unusable building.
- Commissioner Thomas asked about solutions. He asked if a solution has been reached between both parties.
 - o Mr. Ogren responded that he wanted to ensure the Commission first understood the problem. He stated that no solution was reached. He stated that the Preservation Alliance's suggestion that it simply remain a commercial property is not a solution based on prior testimony from the consultants. He stated that an owner will never recover the initial investment and taxes based on the rent. He stated that the Preservation Alliance's other suggestion to remove the façade, store it off-site, demolish the remainder of the building, build an entirely new building, and reinstall the façade is not a viable solution.
 - o Mr. Wentzel added that only 2,000 square feet of the first floor can be used per zoning, and some of that space would need to be carved up to get an exit to Chestnut Street.
- Mr. Angelides discussed the economics related to reuse of the property: He stated that there is a limited number of usable square feet on the ground floor, and it is not configured well for modern retail. He stated that the rent potential with the existing structure is low. He stated that the suggestion by the Preservation Alliance to demolish and build new with the façade reinstalled would still result in unrentable space being covered in dark material, and then the rentable space would be set back from the street before rising up. The loss of rentable space on the lower level and the limited building envelope results in a low number of rentable square feet. He calculated that it would only be approximately 55% rentable space based on the Preservation Alliance's proposal, rendering it an incredibly inefficient building. He summarized that one would have to build a lot of dead space just to build rentable space, and therefore the proposal does not work economically. He noted that if the adjacent lots get built up, the setback of this building creates much less desirable rentable units.
- Mr. Thomas discussed the logistics of removal of the 1963 façade. He stated that it is highly risky, and the stone panels are cracking and have been drilled for the metal ornaments. He asked if a facadectomy that removes all original material and replaces it with something else, and which also changes the use, meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. He used the National Products Building and Rittenhouse Coffee Shop as examples.
- Mr. Ogren concluded his presentation by stating that designating the building as it stands is not good for the city, or the neighborhood, or the economy. He stated that no one is going to take the chance on developing this property if it cannot make financial sense, which would be the case if the property were designated as historic. He noted that the Historical Commission has, in the past, required documentation of

historically designated buildings before they are to be demolished. He stated that this can be done here, but he asked that the Historical Commission vote to decline to designate the property. He stated that a designation will result in a return to the Historical Commission with a financial hardship application, which brings additional costs and expenses.

- Commissioner Thomas agreed that the Historical Commission has, in the past, determined that a property satisfies Criteria for Designation but has declined to designate for any number of reasons. He asked how one could go about preserving this façade and still have a building that is usable. He agreed that the Historical Commission could consider financial hardship concerns as it deliberates a designation of a property.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Madeline Maker asked questions about the restrictions that come with historic designation, opining that a designation is appropriate because the owner can then submit an application to the Historical Commission to build a tower on top of the building, which she suggested is economical.
- Jim Duffin commented in support of the designation. He commented that he is concerned about the process to date being more of a discussion about financial hardship rather than the merits of the nomination. He stated that this is allowed in some cases but not others, creating an equity issue. He noted that the Historical Commission has an advisory Committee on Financial Hardship. He observed that Mr. McCoubrey is no longer in attendance.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented in support of the designation. He opined that the Alliance gets itself in trouble by nominating mid-century modern landmarks. He referenced Penn Fruit and Robinson's as examples where a designation did not result in protection of the buildings. He referenced Ott Camera as an example where the designation remains. He questioned the future of the Roundhouse. He commented that this discussion has turned into a financial hardship review, rather than a review of whether this property satisfies Criteria for Designation. He noted that the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over a building's use. He referenced Inga Saffron's description of the building as "a modernist gem with almost pop art sensibility."
- Oscar Beisert commented in support of the designation. He objected to the hardship argument. He claimed that the owner bought the property property sight unseen. He claimed that this is a disingenuous approach. He asserted that the building meets the Criteria and therefore should be designated. The owner can submit a hardship application if needed.
- Hal Schirmer commented in support of the designation. He commented that the Historical Commission should only consider whether the property satisfies Criteria for Designation, and should not concern itself with anything else. He stated that the question of hardship should be considered separately.

FURTHER DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham observed that some of the public comment inaccurately portrays the Historical Commission's purview and authority when considering a nomination, and he asked that staff attorney Leonard Reuter to provide clarifications, given that some of the comments were essentially legal advice.
- Mr. Reuter addressed the question of whether the Historical Commission is obligated to designate if it finds that a property meets one or more Criteria for Designation, to

which he stated that the Historical Commission is in no way obligated to designate. He observed that the historic preservation ordinance states that a property “may” be designated “if” it meets one or more Criteria for Designation, which is intentional because the Historical Commission is meant to determine if public policy is best served by designating a property as historic. He referenced a prior review by the Historical Commission in which it declined to designate a property owing to the financial burden a designation would have placed on the owner, which was a small church congregation. He summarized that the Historical Commission should take into consideration the public benefits of designation and the potential harm caused by designation in every case.

- Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission should be consistent in the types of information it allows to be introduced when considering a designation, but that it can hear any sort of evidence it wants, including evidence about whether a designation would satisfy the City’s larger public policy goals. The Historical Commission may consider financial information. It is not obligated to designate and then convene a financial hardship hearing.
- Mr. Reuter added that the advisory Committee on Historic Designation can and should take a narrower approach in its review of nominations, focusing on whether a nomination demonstrates that a property meets one or more Criteria for Designation. He stated that those who are under the impression that the Historical Commission can only take this narrower approach in its review are mistaken.
- Mr. Mattioni brought the discussion back to the life safety issues discussed during the prior Historical Commission review of this nomination and mentioned briefly during this review. He stated that the life safety issue has not been adequately addressed. He stated that it is a serious question to take into account if the building does not have an adequate means of egress. He opined that the financial issues raised during this discussion are not as persuasive as the life safety issues.
- Ms. Cooperman expressed concern that the Historical Commission has not received neutral third-party information. She observed that the information received has come from either the property owner’s representatives or the nominator, both of which are advocating for their position regarding designation. She expressed concern that the Commission is giving weight to information presented by the property owner’s representatives because the owner has the financial means to develop and present this information.
- Commissioner Thomas stated that he is torn, because the building satisfies Criteria for Designation, but is windowless in addition to having other constraints such as egress. He questioned if the Historical Commission should designate the property and then evaluate it further through the financial hardship application which would inevitably be submitted.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building at 1206 Chestnut Street was constructed in 1922 and re-clad in 1963. The 1963 façade is the character-defining feature of the mid-century modern building, but has no windows.
- The fire tower façade blocks the entire rear of the building.
- The west side has illegal windows that would be blocked by any new construction at the adjacent property.

- The building as it stands fails to meet the code requirements for natural light, ventilation, and egress, which presents significant life safety issues for a reuse of the building as it currently stands or could be reasonably adapted.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building as it stands has no legal windows and therefore reuse of the building is incredibly limited. The value in the site can only be realized if a new building meeting current code and zoning requirements can be built.
- The Historical Commission cannot compel a property owner to construct a tall tower on top of an existing building as a means of making a reuse of a property viable.
- A designation of this property would not satisfy the City's historic preservation public policy and purposes as outlined in Chapter 14-1000 of the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to decline to designate the property at 1206 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 3. Commissioners Cooperman, Lech, and Thomas dissented.

ITEM: 1206 Chestnut St. MOTION: Decline to designate MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair		X			
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman		X			
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)		X			
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	6	3			4

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:34:28

ACTION: At 1:36 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: Adjourned MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

- (a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;
- (b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
- (c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- (d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
- (e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;
- (f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;
- (g) Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;

- (h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;
- (i) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or
- (j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.