

**THE MINUTES OF THE 718TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 10 JUNE 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		
Stephanie Michel (Community Organization)	X		
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		Arrived at 9:58 a.m.
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
Mary Costello, Esq., Law Department
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Celia Jailer
Meredith Ferleger, Esq.
Camilla MacKay
Joseph Perry
Matt Gindlesparger

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Eugene Desyatnik
Michael Ramos
Jay Farrell
Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association
Nissa Eisenberg
Liz Scott
Oscar Beisert
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Neil Sklaroff, Esq.
Mason Carter
Andrea Haynes, Studio Sustena
Nancy Pontone
Susan Wetherill
Dennis Carlisle
Janis Risch
Amy Lambert
Zachary Gant
David Traub
Constance Winters
Charles Richardson, Councilwoman Bass' Office
Steven Peitzman
J. M. Duffin
Ben Estepani
Deborah Gary, SPPAAA
Robert Williams
Mathew Huffman
Leonard Hill
Lauren Thomsen

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 717TH STATED MEETING, 13 MAY 2022

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:01

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 717th Stated Meeting, held 13 May 2022. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 717th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 May 2022. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 717th Meeting MOTION: Adoption of minutes MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
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, 24 MAY 2022

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:35

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 106 Bainbridge Street. 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: 106 BAINBRIDGE ST

Proposal: Reclad building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Elizabeth Ann Widdicombe

Applicant: Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 1/25/1960

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: On 4 April 2022, Historical Commission staff was informed by a neighbor that significant exterior work was occurring to the historic frame building at 106 Bainbridge Street without building permits or the Historical Commission's review. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a Stop Work Order, and violations for both interior and exterior work done without permits. This application was submitted in response to the violation for exterior work.

This application proposes to install new fiber cement lap siding over the existing exterior sheathing and weather resistive barrier, which was apparently installed overtop of the historic wood Dutch lap siding. The existing windows and doors are proposed for retention. The staff notes that the existing windows are in poor condition and will require significant restoration work. The trim around the windows and doors, which appears to have been removed during the course of the unpermitted work, will be recreated and installed over the new siding.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install fiber cement lap siding over top of existing wood siding.
- Install new trim around windows and door.

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 Wood lap siding rather than a fiber cement product should be used if approval is granted for new siding over the existing siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 3 to recommend approval, provided the new siding has a Dutch-lap profile, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 8110 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Construct ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Sons of Union Veterans

Applicant: Joseph Perry, Grand Army of the Republic Civil War Museum

History: 1805; Lewis-Pattison House

Individual Designation: 2/4/1982

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make accessibility modifications to a c. 1805 building in northeast Philadelphia as it is converted from a residential building to a Civil War museum. The application proposes to remove the existing concrete sidewalk and stoop and to install a new extended concrete stoop and switchback ADA ramp to the front entrance. It is unclear from the application materials how the existing fence would be modified. The application also proposes to slightly modify a c. 1915 rear frame addition to accommodate a new accessible restroom by decreasing the slope of the roof and infilling the rear windows. The existing side windows of the addition, which are visible from Frankford Avenue, would be retained, and new siding installed to match the existing.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install ADA ramp
- Modify rear addition to accommodate ADA restroom

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

- o The proposed ramp is set away from the historic building and could be removed in the future without causing damage if there is a change in use that no longer requires accessibility.
- *Accessibility Guideline | Recommended: Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.*
 - o While the exterior ramp would be visible from the public right-of-way, there are limited alternative locations where an accessible entrance could be provided, and the installation of the ramp does not impact the historic features of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Joseph Perry represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The application materials were updated following the Architectural Committee meeting to show a 32-inch clearance for the existing front entrance and gate.
- The walkway along the side of the building is shown on the drawings as 2'-11" in width, which is wide enough to accommodate a wheelchair. However, the applicant verbally indicated that the path narrows towards the rear and there are vent pipes and a window obstructing clear access along the path.
- A single point of entry for all visitors at the front of the building is preferable from an equal access and ADA standpoint.
- The front door, doorway, fence, and yard are character-defining features of the property, and every effort should be made to minimize the impact of the ramp to those elements.
- No additional information has been provided as to whether a sloped landscaped approach could be provided to the front door rather than a switch-back ramp.
- The ramp with wrap-around railings is currently over-designed. Railings should only be installed on the sloped portions of the ramp as required by code to minimize the visual impact of the ramp.
- The materials in which the ramp is clad should be more compatible with the historic structure. The applicant should explore stone or brick cladding along the sides that extend up to create a four-inch curb around the ramp and landings.
- Grass or other landscaping should be installed in the center of the U shape created by the ramp rather than paving.
- A slip-sheet should be installed between the existing historic stoop and new landing so that the historic materials remain in place.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The ramp as proposed visually and physically impacts character-defining features of the property, therefore failing to satisfy Standard 10 or the Accessibility Guideline.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of six to four.

ITEM: 8110 Frankford Ave					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
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	4			3

ADDRESS: 325 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Construct addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: OCF Realty

Applicant: Ben Estepani, Pace Architecture & Design

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for the removal of the existing rear ell and the construction of a rear addition with roof deck and porch at 325 S. 18th Street. The property is located at the southeast corner of S. 18th and Delancey Streets. The side elevation of the property is visible along Delancey Street. The property was constructed about 1855 as a three-story building with a three-story rear ell, like the buildings to the south. The building has been modified many times, especially at the rear ell. A mansard fourth floor was added to the main block and rear ell. A projected addition at the intersection of the main block and rear ell was constructed. Two and three-story additions on piers were constructed and later removed at the rear of the rear ell. After they were removed, the rear ell was open to the weather for years. The

rear ell was reconstructed with a new brick façade, non-historic window openings and a new second-floor bay. The building is currently sealed.

In addition to the many alterations, the building has been neglected since it was purchased by the most recent owner in 1973. That owner has allowed the building to deteriorate for decades. Taxes were not paid. Numerous violations were issued. It was listed for sheriff's sale many times but reclaimed by the owner each time. The City took the owner to court numerous times but had little success in compelling her to bring the property into compliance. About 10 years ago, the title to the building was stolen and then ultimately recovered, while the building continued to deteriorate in the meantime. In 2013, it was featured in a story in the Inquirer about neglected buildings. In 2016, the community association and near neighbors initiated an Act 135 conservatorship action. Despite the owner's numerous attempts to block the conservatorship, the community eventually prevailed, and the Philadelphia Community Development Coalition took custody of the building. The validity of the conservatorship was confirmed as recently as April 2022. Without a doubt, this property has consumed more Historical Commission, Law Department, and Department of Licenses and Inspections time on enforcement than any other historically designated property. Now that the conservator has gained control of the property, the Historical Commission should expeditiously approve a redevelopment project so that this building can be saved and returned to productive use.

Owing to its nearly 50 years of neglect, the building, which has been open and vacant, is in very poor condition. The conservator is working with a developer to restore the salvageable main block and remove the deteriorated rear ell and construct a wider rear addition with roof deck and rear porch and carport. The proposed work to the main block such as windows, doors, and masonry repair will be reviewed and approved by staff.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear ell.
- Construct new addition with roof deck.
- Construct rear metal deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize of property will be avoided.*
 - o The proposed restoration of the main block and rehabilitation of the side bay meets Standard 2.
 - o Although historic fabric may exist in specific areas of the rear ell, this section of the building has lost a lot of historic integrity from numerous alterations and long-time neglect. Owing to this, the removal of the rear ell meets Standard 2.
- *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 new addition would be compatible with the existing main block with its massing, size, and scale. For these elements, the proposed design meets Standard 9.

- o The rear ell is much altered and in very poor condition. Its removal will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The removal of the rear ell satisfies Standard 9.
- o The design of the proposed mansard-like roof surrounding the new roof deck should be further refined to be more compatible with the existing mansard roof on the main block. It should be noted that the elevation drawings show a more refined design than is illustrated in the rendering; the design intent should be clarified at the Architectural Committee meeting. The windows of the addition currently appear larger than the windows on the main block. The size of the windows should be compatible with the size of historic windows on the main block. Refining these details will enable the proposed addition to meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The area of the building that currently maintains the essential form and integrity of the historic property is the main block. The new addition maintains a clear line between the original main block and the new area of the building. In the future, this area of the building could be removed without altering the historic character of the main block, therefore the application meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the details of the design of the rear addition are refined, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the details of the design are refined as recommended, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:46:43

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Ben Estepani and developer Liz Scott represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented in support of the application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The applicant's updates to their original proposal responded directly to the Architectural Committee's comments.
- The applicant presented two options for the revised design of the new addition. At the roof level, one option showed a mansard, and a second option showed a metal railing.
- The option (Drawing A-4.2) showing the roof deck with metal railing on the new addition is preferred. A simple metal picket railing rather than a decorative railing is preferred in this location.
- The larger second floor rear deck as shown in the alternate option (Drawing A-4.1) is acceptable.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised plan with the cornice and railing and the larger balcony as shown in the alternate revised plan satisfies Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ACTION: Ms. Carney moved to approve the revised application, with the cornice and railing, not the mansard, at the rear addition, and the larger rear balcony, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 325 S 18th St					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Carney					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
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		1		1

ADDRESS: 509 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Victor Fellus

Applicant: Victor Fellus

History: 1815, Stephen Girard, developer

Individual Designation: 10/30/1962

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl, one-over-one windows installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. Six-over-six wood windows are the correct windows. In addition, the dormer window should have an arched sash. The correct windows are documented by photographs and an insurance survey. A similar application at 523 Fairmount Avenue, which included both windows and door, was reviewed by the Historical Commission in 2019 and the Commission voted to deny the legalization request. In that instance, the original brickmould was panned. In this case, the original brickmould remains intact and the new windows were inserted into the existing frame.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize windows

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 windows do not match the historic elements in design or materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:04:33

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Six-over-six wood windows were replaced with one-over-one vinyl windows.
- The original frames with brick molds remain in place.
- The replacement windows were inserted into the original window openings and are smaller than the historic windows with less glass area.
- The owner did not consult with the Historical Commission to identify the replacement or repair options for the windows. No shop drawings for the windows were submitted for review.
- The work was completed without an approved building permit.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The replacement windows do not match the historic elements in design or materials; therefore, the replacement windows do not satisfy Standard 6.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Michel seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 509 Fairmount Ave MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: McCoubrey 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	12				1

ADDRESS: 3701-15 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: CSC Co-Living

Applicant: Matthew Huffman, ALMA Architecture LLC

History: 1970; International House; Bower & Fradley, architects

Individual Designation: 12/11/2020

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to add a structure for retail use on the western section of the plaza at International House in University City. It also proposes to rehabilitate the eastern section of the plaza. The Historical Commission designated International House, a Modernist hi-rise, in December 2020. At the same meeting, the Historical Commission approved in concept the construction of a structure to house a retailer on the western section of the front plaza of the property. While the in-concept application approved in 2020 was not an explicit financial hardship application, the owner did argue that International House had several idiosyncrasies that would render its adaptive reuse expensive and difficult, and the retail structure would offset some of those expenses. The owner agreed not to oppose the designation in exchange for the Historical Commission's commitment that the retail structure as well as a rear addition would be approved. The Historical Commission indicated its commitment with the 2020 in-concept approval, when it approved in concept a retail addition, provided it was limited to the western section of the plaza, to the west of the main entranceway.

The new retail structure at the plaza is designed to stand on its own, without any support from the historic building. Its construction will require no significant alterations to the historic building, allowing for it to be removed in the future and the historic building restored to its original condition. It will incorporate the existing concrete wall that runs along Chestnut Street and

encloses the plaza. The design has been revised slightly since it was approved in concept and the structure is now slightly taller and longer. The front of the retail structure now steps down from the main roof height to the two-story glass box, to the one-story glass box, to the canopy over the entrance, referencing the terraced façade of the historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct retail structure on western section of the plaza,
- Rehabilitate eastern section of the plaza.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.
 - o The new construction will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The 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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of December 2020.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following suggested revisions:

- The entry to the store opens onto Chestnut Street, not the plaza.
- The glass section of the structure steps back slightly from the street.
- More information is provided on the green roof.
- The tone of the grey metal panels is lightened.
- More fenestration and/or other features like divisions are added to the Chestnut Street façade to reduce the mass of the façade.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:08:05

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Mathew Huffman represented the application. He explained that he revised the application to implement all of the Architectural Committee's recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, opposed the application.

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, stated this his organization did not oppose the application.
- Mason Carter commented that the proposed addition is not compatible with the historic resource.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Historical Commission approved an application in concept for the construction of a retail structure on the western end of the plaza in December 2020.
- After the May 2022 meeting of the Architectural Committee, the applicant undertook the following revisions to comply with the Committee's recommendation:
 - o The entry to the store was shifted to Chestnut Street from the plaza.
 - o The glass section of the structure was stepped back slightly from the street.
 - o The green roof was removed from the canopy at the main entrance to the historic building.
 - o The tone of the grey metal panels was lightened.
 - o More fenestration was added to the Chestnut Street façade to reduce the mass of the façade.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 9.
- The new construction will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.
- The 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, satisfying Standard 10.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application in concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Sanchez seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 3701-15 Chestnut St MOTION: Approval in concept MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Sanchez					
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	12				1

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 6740 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: The Pelham Trust Company

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Sovereign Bank

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6740 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Pelham Trust Company building satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the building stands as a distinctive example of the Colonial Revival style. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the former Pelham Trust Company building represents the economic and historical heritage of Pelham, the planned suburban residential development in the Mt. Airy neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6740 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6740 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:30:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.

- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Attorney Neil Sklaroff represented the property owner and requested that the parking lot, which sits on the deeded portion known as Parcel B, also known as 6748 Germantown Avenue, be excluded from the designation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mason Carter commented in support of the designation.
- Jim Duffin commented in support of the designation.
- Allison Weiss, representing SoLo/Germantown Civic Association, commented in support of the designation.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the designation.
- Deborah Gary commented in support of the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The tax parcel identified by the Office of Property Assessment as 6740 Germantown Avenue is composed of two deeded parcels, identified in the 15 August 2000 deed of correction as Premises A, also known as 6740 Germantown Avenue, and Premises B, also known as 6748 Germantown Avenue.
- Premises A and corresponding map registry number 083N160033 includes the historic bank building, and extends 100 feet in width along Germantown Avenue from the corner of Pelham Road.
- Premises B and corresponding map registry number 083N160040 includes the parking lot and is situated to the northwest along Germantown Avenue and extends 50 feet in width. It does not contain any historic structures.
- Premises B was not historically part of the same parcel as Premises A.
- As historically undeveloped land, Premises B has the potential to contain archaeological resources; however, the nomination does not make an argument for the inclusion of Criterion I.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The bank building represents a distinctive example of the Colonial Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The former Pelham Trust Company building represents the economic and historical heritage of the Pelham community, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that a portion of the property at 6740 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J, and to limit the designation to Premises A, also known as map registry number 083N160033, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 6740 Germantown Ave MOTION: Designate; Criteria D and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
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	12				1

ADDRESS: 224 W WASHINGTON LN

Name of Resource: Taws Cottage

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Conarroe Jawn LLC

Nominator: West Central Germantown Neighbors

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 224 W. Washington Lane and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the so-called Gardener's Cottage of the Lewis and Martha Taws Estate satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, G, and J. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the property reflects the Gothic Revival style of architecture and reflects the built environment in an era characterized by that style. Under Criterion G, the nomination contends that the property is "nestled within a distinctive nineteenth-century vignette of ancillary suburban, estate buildings and features that conform to a Romantic ideal in architecture and the Picturesque in landscape." Criterion G reads: "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." The other buildings to which this property is allegedly related are not designated as historic and do not form a park or square. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the property reflects the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the Germantown community.

A development project for the site was underway when the Historical Commission notified the property owner on 28 October 2021 that it would consider a nomination proposing to designate the property. If the development project had been implemented, it would have destroyed the character-defining features of the property and rendered it ineligible for designation. The Historical Commission postponed the review of the nomination to allow for any permits that were in place before the notice date to be implemented or expire. As of 1 June 2022, the zoning permit application (ZP-2021-004730) and two building permit applications for the project (RP-

2021-015619 and RP-2021-017667) had been withdrawn. An additional permit application (RP-2022-001144) had expired. No work was undertaken pursuant to the permits. One building permit application (RP-2022-004626) is active (submitted but not issued), but it only proposes interior work to the historic building, no exterior work. The development project that would have destroyed the character-defining features of the property has been abandoned.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 224 W. Washington Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. The staff contends that the nomination does not make a cogent argument for the satisfaction of Criterion G. That Criterion is intended to allow for the individual designation of resources associated with a park, square, or other area that might not qualify for individual designation on their own. An example of a resource that would satisfy Criterion G might be a rowhouse bordering and creating the backdrop for a city square. The assumption behind the Criterion is that the primary resource, the park or square, is designated. It is unclear what the primary resource might be in this case because nothing in the vicinity of this property is designated. There is no distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 224 W. Washington Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, with an amended period of significance from circa 1860 to 1923.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:56:03

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mason Carter commented in support of the designation.
- Jim Duffin commented in support of the designation.
- Allison Weiss commented in support of the designation.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The zoning and building permits that had been issued for the redevelopment project that would have destroyed the character-defining features of the historic building have been withdrawn and/or have expired.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property reflects the Gothic Revival style of architecture and reflects the built environment in an era characterized by that style, satisfying Criteria for Designation C and D.
- The property reflects the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the Germantown community, satisfying Criterion J.
- The nomination does not make a cogent argument for the satisfaction of Criterion G.
- The period of significance of the property is 1860 to 1923.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 224 W. Washington Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, with an amended period of significance from circa 1860 to 1923, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 224 W Walnut Ln					
MOTION: Designate; Criteria C, D, and J, with amended period of significance					
Moved BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
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	12				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:08:55

ACTION: At 11:10 a.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: Adjourn MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
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	12				1

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.