

**THE MINUTES OF THE 702ND STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 2021
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	X		
Donna Carney (Department of Planning & Development)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair		X	Joined 12:21 p.m.
Mark Dodds (Division of Housing & Community Development)		X	
Kelly Edwards, MUP	X		
Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property)	X		
Sara Lepori (Commerce Department)	X		
Josh Lippert (Department of Licenses & Inspections)		X	
John Mattioni, Esq.	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair	X		
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		
Betty Turner, MA, Vice Chair	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq.	X		

Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, all Commissioners, staff, applicants, and public attendees participated in the meeting remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I
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:

Ben Leech
Elizabeth Okakpu
Michael Phillips
Greg Paulmier
Joe McQuillan
J M Duffin
Kristin Haskins Simms
Dolores Curtis
Ken Weinstein, Philly Office Retail
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Sarah Reeves
Keith Brooks
Jay Farrell
Jaime Rodriguez, Philly Office Retail
Jen Furniss
Martha Agate
Sam Newhouse
Garth Herrick
Joe Gray
Eileen O'Brien
Jody Greenblatt
Maureen Flanagan
Karen West
Rob Mandeville
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Kate Schoener, Philly Office Retail
John Kahler
John Dulik
Richard Stokes
Shana Goldin-Perschbacher
Robert Mueller
Leah Silverstein
Scott Baldasare
Doug Mooney
Carol Fitzgerald
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Devon Beverly
Richard Pavoni
Lance Saunders
Loretta Witt
John O'Toole
J. Bono, Blue Grotto Technologies, Inc.
Eileen Javers
Allison Weiss, So/Lo Germantown RCO
Steven Peitzman
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Cecil Baker
Ben Derby

Mike Simone
Kevin Block
Sue Patterson
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Timothy Kerner
Steve Fillmore
Ian Toner, Toner Architects
Kathy Willetts
Randy Baron
J. Dellaquila
Nick Kraus, Heritage Consulting Group
Jim Hammond
Andrew Cohen
Allison Lukachik
Kelly Chaido
Libbie Hawes
Valerie Pearce
Nancy Pontone
Nathan Farris, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Kristen Clark
Hewson Baltzell
Catherine Myers
Malik Gray
Courtney Disston
Jonathan Freedman
Chelsea Hengstler
Martha Spanninger
Linda Baldwin
Margaret Manzer
Stephen Marando-Blanck
Keshara Senanayake
Kirsti Bracali
Jonathan Morse
Eric Leighton
Thomas Queenan
Jeffrey Gelles
Steve Bertil, Esq., Klehr Harrison
John Dulik
Catharine Lowery
Alexis & Gian Vergnetti
Justin Detwiler
Dierdre McKee
Jennifer Feden
Pinchas Lando
Sergio Coscia AIA
Virginia Baltzell
Alex Canady, Philly Office Retail
Adrienne Fernandez, Swampoodle Neighborhood Parcels Association RCO
Karis Stephen
A.A. Levinson
Ann Peters

Suzanna Barucco
 Cassidy Glatz
 Doug Seiler
 Alex Warren
 Maggie Sawin
 Mary McGettigan
 Dana Fedeli
 Richard M. Heiberger
 Falak Shahid
 Robert Couzin
 Kyle Meiser, Philly Office Retail
 Sandra Folzer
 Celeste Morello

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 701ST STATED MEETING, 8 JANUARY 2021

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:20

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 701st Stated Meeting, held 8 January 2021. No corrections were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 701st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 January 2021. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 701st Meeting MOTION: Adoption of minutes MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

APPOINTMENT OF ALLISON L. LUKACHIK, PE TO THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:06:30

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners for any comments regarding the appointment of Ms. Lukachik to the Architectural Committee. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee is looking forward to having Ms. Lukachik as a member of the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to appoint Allison L. Lukachik, PE to the Architectural Committee. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Appointment of Allison L. Lukachik, PE					
MOTION: Appointment					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES

ADDRESS: 1106-14 SPRING GARDEN ST

Name of Resource: Woodward-Wanger Company

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Stella and Nga Wong, Mapleville, LLC

Nominator: Callowhill Neighborhood Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate as historic the property at 1106-1114 Spring Garden Street. The Historical Commission previously designated the property in March 2018. In 2020, the property owners asked the Historical Commission to rescind the designation of the property and then remand the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation for an entirely new review because they had not been notified of the consideration of the nomination that led to the designation in 2018 and, therefore, did not have an opportunity to participate in

the Committee on Historic Designation's and Historical Commission's reviews of it. At its December 2020 meeting, the Historical Commission granted the rescission and reconsideration request, rescinding the designation and directing the Committee on Historic Designation to review the nomination at its January 2021 meeting with adequate notice to the property owners. The property remains under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the new review of the nomination.

The property at 1106-1114 Spring Garden Street includes a remnant of a building that stands along Spring Garden Street and vacant land at the rear. Several redevelopment projects have been contemplated for the site in the last decade and one was initiated but then abandoned. Numerous zoning permits as well as building and demolition permits for redevelopment were issued from 2013 to 2017. In 2015 or 2016, the rear half of the building was demolished, but work then stopped and the permits expired. The remaining portion of the building is a shell. It is open but boarded at the rear, where the back half was demolished. It has no interior partitions or finishes.

The nomination argues that the surviving section of the former Woodward-Wanger Co. or Lawsonia Building, constructed in 1929 as a warehouse and office building, is significant under Criterion for Designation D as a distinctive example of the Colonial Revival Style. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the surviving section of the building reflects the environment of commercial and light industrial buildings in the Colonial Revival style. The Colonial Revival features are limited to the Spring Garden or front façade.

The nomination proposes to designate the entirety of the property, but then attempts to limit the scope of the designation by defining a second boundary. Using a dashed line on an aerial photograph to outline the surviving section of the building (page 2), the nomination provides "more specific boundary related to the significant portion of the proposed designation." The second boundary presumably indicates that, if designated, the Historical Commission would treat the surviving building remnant as contributing and the vacant land as non-contributing. During its reviews in 2018, neither the Committee nor the Commission addressed the boundary ambiguity and the entire property was ultimately designated without any identification of significant and insignificant sections.

To ensure that it operates within the bounds of constitutionality, the Historical Commission should only designate properties that have uses in their current forms or may be reasonably adapted for new uses, where a property with a "use" is one that has the capacity to produce a reasonable rate of return. The property in question does not appear to have a use in its current form, but may be able to be adapted for a new use. Given that it is a remnant, a shell, it will have to undergo a significant redevelopment before it can be used in a way that produces a reasonable rate of return. If the Historical Commission decides to designate the property, it should designate it in such a way that allows for a reasonable adaptation for a new use. Given that the front façade is the character-defining feature of the property, limiting the designation to the front façade with a sufficient return at the roof line to ensure the preservation of the two-story volume when viewed from Spring Garden Street would be an equitable approach.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1106-14 Spring Garden Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D and that the front façade to a depth of five feet is the character-defining feature of the resource and the remainder of the property does not contribute to its historical significance.

ACTION: See below

ADDRESS: 1615 WALNUT ST

Name of Resource: The Clarke & Sarah Merchant House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Honey Nuts LLC

Nominator: Center City Residents' Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1615 Walnut Street, located in Center City, as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Historically known as the Clarke and Sarah Merchant House, it was constructed in 1832 with substantial alterations completed in 1892 and 1911.

Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the building is associated with the life of Clarke Merchant, whose career as a manufacturer and merchant of metal and tin-plate architectural and building materials made a significant impact on the built environment of Philadelphia and beyond. The nomination further contends that the building qualifies under Criterion E, owing to the alterations and addition completed in 1892 by prominent Philadelphia architect Addison Hutton. Finally, the nomination asserts that the building is significant under Criterion J because it is a rare surviving urban mansion on a principal street that was once home to expensive residences but is now lined with purpose-built commercial structures.

The period of significance begins in 1892, when the Merchant family purchased the property and engaged architect Addison Hutton, and ends in 1931, when the building was sold out of the Merchant family.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1615 Walnut Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

ACTION: See below

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: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@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.

ACTION: See below

ADDRESS: 156 W SCHOOL HOUSE LN

Name of Resource: Boxwood

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Teen Challenge Training Center Inc.

Nominator: Penn Knox Neighborhood Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 156 W. School House Lane and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that Boxwood reflects the Colonial Revival style of architecture as applied to upper-class suburban residences in late nineteenth-century Philadelphia. The nomination further argues that the “cottage-stable” at the rear of the property represents Gothic Revival cottage motifs popularized by Andrew Jackson Downing in the late 1840s and early 1850s. Under Criterion D, the nomination asserts that Boxwood was designed by Mantle Fielding, a prolific and significant architect who influenced the built environment in Northwest Philadelphia at the turn of the twentieth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 156 W. School House Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. However, the staff asserts that the so-called “cottage-stable” at the rear of the property does not reflect the Gothic Revival style and, therefore, does not satisfy Criteria C and D as presented in the nomination. While the building has a cross gable, a typical feature of the Gothic Revival, it does not have any other features characteristic of the style. The building may have served as a barn, potentially for an earlier residence predating Boxwood, and was later updated with a cross gable. The staff recommends that the so-called “cottage-stable” contributes to the site’s historical significance but does not exhibit sufficient character-defining features to be considered reflective of or exemplary of the Gothic Revival style.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:07:35

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Thomas presented the continuance requests to the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to grant the continuances of the reviews of the nominations for 1106-14 Spring Garden Street and 1615 Walnut Street to the March 2021 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation; for 1206 Chestnut Street to the April 2021 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation; and for 156 W. School House Lane to the March 2021 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Continuance of reviews of designation matters MOTION: Adoption MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2021

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:08:50

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and public for comments on the Consent Agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 8419 Germantown Avenue, 2035 S. College Avenue, and 11 Queen Street for the Consent Agenda. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 20 JANUARY 2021

ADDRESS: 5151 WISSAHICKON AVE

Name of Resource: Robeson Lea Perot House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: American Legion, North City Post

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the building at 5151 Wissahickon Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criterion for Designation D. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the house, designed by owner and architect Robeson Lea Perot in 1905, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Revival style of architecture.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 5151 Wissahickon Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5151 Wissahickon Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and H. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:11:25

PRESENTERS:

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

- Nominator Steven Peitzman represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Dana Fedeli supported the nomination.
- Allison Weiss of SoLo/Germantown Civic Association supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Revival style of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building is prominently located atop a hill on the corner of Wissahickon Avenue and Hansberry Street and is an established and familiar visual feature within the neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to find that the property at 5151 Wissahickon Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and H, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 5151 Wissahickon Ave MOTION: Designate; Criteria D, H MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

ADDRESS: 121 PLEASANT ST

Name of Resource: Joseph Meehan House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: CDPHI LLC

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 121 Pleasant Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property

satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the property is significant owing to its association with the life and work of Joseph Meehan, “a prominent editor, horticulturalist, landscape gardener, nurseryman, writer and veteran of the Civil War.” Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the property is significant as a representation of the “commercial and cultural legacy of the larger Meehan family in Mt. Airy, Germantown, and Philadelphia.” Joseph Meehan was the brother of famous botanist, author, and publisher Thomas Meehan, who ran Meehan & Sons Nursery in the Mt. Airy section of Philadelphia.

The nomination implies that the yard to the west of the house is historically significant because Meehan “no doubt began planting on the grounds” when he purchased the property in 1880. However, the nomination does not identify any specific features including plants that might convey that significance. The nomination states that “the feeling of a bygone era is further amplified by the ample landscape of matured trees and plantings that occupy the large undeveloped lots on both sides of the dwelling.” The yard to the west was historically associated with the Meehan house. Houses stood on the parcels to the east until after 1962. The parcels were not historically associated with the subject property and are currently owned by the City.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 121 Pleasant Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Barucco moved to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 121 Pleasant Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, I, and J. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:16:28

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner.
- Jim Duffin of the Keeping Society represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Allison Weiss spoke in support of the nomination, including the vacant land to the west of the house.
- Dana Fedelli spoke in support of the nomination.
- Ann Peters spoke in support of the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman spoke in support of the nomination.
- Suzanna Barucco, a member of the Committee on Historic Designation, spoke in support of designation under Criterion for Designation I in addition to Criteria for Designation A and J.
- Doug Mooney, a member of the Committee on Historic Designation, explained why the Committee recommended in favor of the addition of Criterion I.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building at 121 Pleasant Street, constructed about 1886 in the Mt. Airy section of Philadelphia, served as the private residence and garden of Joseph Meehan, an important nurseryman a member of the Meehan family, known for their contributions

to the field of horticulture as well as for their success in the commercial nursery industry.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property is significant owing to its association with the life and work of Joseph Meehan, an important horticulturalist, landscape gardener and nurseryman, satisfying Criterion A.
- The property is significant as a representation of the commercial and cultural legacy of the Meehan family who contributed to Philadelphia's role as a national leader in the nursery industry, satisfying Criterion J.
- The nomination did not support evidence that merited designating the property under Criterion I.
- The boundary proposed by the nominator included vacant parcels that did not help to further the public's understanding of the nominated house, and therefore did not need to be included in the designation.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to exclude Criterion I from the designation. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 121 Pleasant Street MOTION: Exclude Criterion I MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 121 Pleasant Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, to designate the property with a reduced boundary measuring the width of thirty-five feet one and a half inches along Pleasant Street and the full depth of the lot, excluding the vacant land to the west of the house, and to list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1.

ITEM: 121 Pleasant Street MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, J MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey		X			
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9	1			3

ADDRESS: 2038-48 E CUMBERLAND ST

Name of Resource: Cumberland Street Methodist Episcopal Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Urban Worship Center Inc.

Nominator: East Kensington Neighbors Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2038-48 E. Cumberland Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the former Cumberland Street Methodist Episcopal Church building reflects the environment of the country, state, and city in the third and early fourth quarters of the nineteenth century, when the architecture of church edifices was characterized by the Italianate style. The nomination further argues that the design of the building is based on a ubiquitous urban “preaching box” church type of red brick construction with a distinctive Italianate treatment.

Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style, prevalent in American architecture between 1840 and 1885 and seen in a wide variety of building forms.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2038-48 E. Cumberland Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2038-48 E Cumberland Street satisfies Criteria

for Designation C and D. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:44:34

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Jim Duffin of the Keeping Society represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites spoke in support of the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The church at 2038-48 E. Cumberland Street was first constructed in 1872 and later reconstructed in 1875.
- Though the architectural features of the building had elements of the Italianate style, the building could not be summed up so simply, and was more nuanced than just that label.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The former Cumberland Street Methodist Episcopal Church building reflects the environment of the country, state, and city in the third and early fourth quarters of the nineteenth century, when the architecture of church edifices was characterized by nuanced interpretations of the Italianate style, satisfying Criterion C.
- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style, prevalent in American architecture between 1840 and 1885 and seen in a wide variety of building forms, satisfying Criterion D.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2038-48 E. Cumberland Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 2038-48 E Cumberland Ave MOTION: Thomas MOVED BY: Turner SECONDED BY:					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

ADDRESS: 2006 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: The Durham & Co. Radio Showroom/Philadelphia W3XM Radio Station

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: AGAS Holdings LLC

Nominator: Center City Residents' Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2006 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Durham & Co.'s Radio Showroom and Philadelphia W3XM Radio Station building, constructed in 1928, satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. Under Criterion D, the nomination explains that the property embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Art Deco style as applied to modest commercial buildings in Philadelphia. The nomination further contends that the building represents an era distinguished by low-rise commercial buildings in the Art Deco style that defined business districts across the country, satisfying Criterion C.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2006 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Lavery moved to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2006 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:48:00

PRESENTERS:

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

- No one represented the property owner.
- Tim Kerner of the Center City Residents Association represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building at 2006 Chestnut Street was constructed in 1928 in the Art Deco style.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building at 2006 Chestnut Street embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Art Deco style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building represents an era distinguished by low-rise commercial buildings in the Art Deco style, satisfying Criterion C.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2006 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 2006 Chestnut St MOTION: Designate; Criteria C & D MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

ADDRESS: 4412 E THOMPSON ST

Name of Resource: St. John Cantius Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the church building at 4412 E. Thompson Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the St. John Cantius Roman Catholic Church, constructed in 1898, satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Gothic style of architecture. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the church represents the Polish cultural and historical heritage of the Bridesburg community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the St. John Cantius Roman Catholic Church building at 4412 E. Thompson Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Barucco moved to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 4412 E. Thompson Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:52:35

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- St. John Cantius Roman Catholic Church was constructed in 1898 in the Gothic style.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Gothic style of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.
- The church represents the Polish cultural and historical heritage of the Bridesburg community, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to find that the church building at 4412 E. Thompson Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 4412 E THOMPSON ST MOTION: Designate; Criteria D and J MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	9				4

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 3 DECEMBER 2020

ADDRESS: 208-10 REX AVE

Name of Resource: Hirst-Duhring House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Virginia, William H. & Hewson Baltzell

Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 208-10 Rex Avenue in Chestnut Hill and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the house, constructed about 1857-60, with alterations around 1893 and a substantial rear addition in 1927, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the property has significant character as one of the early prominent suburban villas constructed in the first period of the development of the suburban character of the Chestnut Hill section of the city after the extension of the first railroad to the area. The nomination also argues that the building is significant under Criterion A for its association with architect H. Louis Duhring, who owned and lived in the house between 1919 and 1946, and under Criterion E as a representative example of Duhring's influential architectural work. The nomination also contends that the property is significant under Criterion C as reflecting the environment of both the period of its original Italianate construction and its Arts and Crafts addition.

The property currently known as 208-10 Rex Avenue is a single tax parcel composed of two deeded parcels (map registry numbers 128-N-11-50 and 128-N-11-22; 208 and 210 Rex Avenue, respectively). At the Committee on Historic Designation meeting, the attorney for the current property owner suggested that the 60-foot wide deeded parcel known as 210 Rex Avenue was not part of the historic property and should be excluded from the designation. The

staff agreed to undertake deed research to determine the extent of the property during the period of significance of 1857 to 1946. Through this research, the staff determined that the current tax parcel boundary is consistent with that of the historic property. Historically, the entire parcel (Map Registry number 128-N-11-4) was known as 208 Rex Avenue and contained 238 feet 8 inches in width along Rex Avenue. In 1946, after the period of significance, ownership of the property passed to Duhring's nephew, Jean P.J. Baltzell, who subdivided the property into four parcels (map registry numbers 128-N-11-50 (208 Rex Ave), -22 (210 Rex Ave), -25 (located in the right of way of Crefeld St), and -40 (now part of 122 Hilltop Rd).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 208-10 Rex Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and E.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 208-10 Rex Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and E.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:07:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Carl Primavera and owners Virginia and Hewson Baltzell represented the property owner. Mr. Primavera explained that the property features a large structure on a large parcel and presents complicated issues related to hardship and architectural review over potential new structures. Mr. Primavera opposed the designation in full but noted that his clients would find it less objectionable if the deeded lot at 210 Rex Avenue was excluded from the designation.
- Lori Salganicoff of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy represented the nomination and argued that the full property should be designated as historic. She noted that the Conservancy supports appropriate new construction on the property, but asked that the designation be finalized prior to the review of any consideration of the redevelopment of the property.
- Mr. Reuter explained that boundaries of the historic property are consistent with those of the nominated property.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Attorney Michael Sklaroff, representing the Rex Avenue Neighbors' Association, supported the designation and requested that consideration of the designation be separate from and prior to the review of the in-concept application for the redevelopment of the property. He argued that the entire property as delineated in the nomination has historical significance and should be designated, as the boundaries match those of the historic parcel, and the large yard around the mansion is part of its character is an "urban villa" that developed throughout Chestnut Hill after the introduction of the railroad.
- Thomas Queenan, neighbor and member of Rex Avenue Neighbors' Association, supported the nomination, and supported some new construction on the property, provided it is consistent with the zoning and historic character of the property, and is of a scale and density that is harmonious with the character of the neighborhood and does not detract from the property's expansive yard and does not block views of the historic building.

- Neighbor Bob Mueller opined that the large yard and historic house are integral to the historic property and recommended that the Historical Commission retain jurisdiction over the entire parcel.
- Sergio Coscia, an architectural consultant for the Rex Avenue Neighbors' Association, supported the nomination and noted the property's significance as an urban villa estate that developed in Chestnut Hill after the introduction of the railroad.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The original building was constructed in the mid-nineteenth century in the Italianate style popular with architects like J.C. Sidney, John Riddell, and Samuel Sloan.
- A sensitive Arts and Crafts/Craftsman addition was constructed in the early twentieth century by architect and owner H. Louis Duhring, Jr., who was a significant architect and member of the Chestnut Hill community.
- The Chestnut Hill Railroad line behind the property opened in 1884, and is therefore part of the area's history and is critical to understanding the significance of Chestnut Hill and the development of "urban villas" such as this property.
- The expansive yard and semi-circular driveway are character-defining features of the property.
- The coal yard was on an adjacent property, not the property at 208-10 Rex Avenue, which was historically called 208 Rex Avenue.
- The deeded lot at 210 Rex Avenue was part of the historic property during the period of significance of 1857-1946 and was not subdivided and reconsolidated until after H. Louis Duhring's ownership.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- No portion of the property will be excluded from the designation. The designation will cover the entire parcel of 208-10 Rex Avenue.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property at 208-10 Rex Avenue has significant character as one of the early prominent suburban villas constructed in the first period of the railroad suburb development of Chestnut Hill, satisfying Criterion A.
- The nomination demonstrates that the building is also significant under Criterion A for its association with architect H. Louis Duhring, who owned and lived in the house between 1919 and 1946, and under Criterion E as a representative example of Duhring's influential architectural work.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property is significant under Criterion C as reflecting the environment of both the period of its original Italianate construction and its Arts and Crafts addition.
- The Historical Commission enjoys full jurisdiction over any future development on the property.

ACTION: Ms. Carney moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 208-10 Rex Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and E, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 208-10 Rex Avenue MOTION: Designate; Criteria A, C, & E MOVED BY: Carney SECONDED BY:					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	9				4

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2021

ADDRESS: 8419 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Demolish rear addition; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chestnut Hill Community Center

Applicant: Christopher Miller, John Milner Architects, Inc.

History: 1803; Charles Redheffer House; remodeled c. 1854

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The early-nineteenth-century stone Federal-style building at 8419 Germantown Avenue, historically known as the Charles Redheffer House, has functioned as the Woodward Community Centre since 1917 when it was established by Gertrude Woodward. The three-story structure has had several exterior alterations since its construction, most notably the 1918 addition of a two-story rear porch, originally intended to be temporary, and the removal of the front porch to allow for the construction of two large bay windows in 1925.

This application proposes to demolish the existing two-story rear addition and to construct a larger three-story addition to support the functions of the Chestnut Hill Community Centre Corporation, which operates out of the building. The addition would be three stories where it connects to the historic structure and would step down to two stories toward the rear of the property. It would include a stone water table, two-over-two double-hung sash windows, a standing seam metal roof, stuccoed walls, and an elevator penthouse. No alterations to the front or side facades of the historic structure are proposed.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-original rear addition;
- Construct three-story addition with elevator penthouse;

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 addition would require the demolition of a non-original two-story rear porch constructed as a temporary structure in 1918. The original Federal-style building would remain intact.
 - o While the addition is large, the step down of the addition from three to two stories, the alignment of the floors with the historic structure, and the architectural detailing make the building compatible in massing, size, and scale.
 - o The proposed materials, fenestration patterns, and architectural features, such as cornices and columns, are compatible with the historic building and surrounding context.
- *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 addition would replace a non-original two-story porch and would only impact the rear wall of the historic building. The future removal of the addition would have limited impact on the historic structure and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, noting that the west elevation reflected on drawing A2.5 is preferred over the alternate elevation reflected on drawing A2.5a.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 341 S 25TH ST

Proposal: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Brooks Tanner and Penelope Carter

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: c. 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to add a third story with no setback on a two-story contributing building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The front façade would be

clad in brick, and the sides and rear would be clad in composite lap siding. The existing cornice would be salvaged and reinstalled at the new roofline.

While there are few precedents for similar additions, the Historical Commission has approved several full-story additions typically designed as mansards on carriage houses. In considering the current application, the Committee might comment on the appropriateness of a mansard or other addition at this property.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct third-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o Double rowlock brick coursing would differentiate the proposed addition from the original building; however, as proposed, the massing, size, and scale of the addition would not be compatible with the historic building. An addition of a different design or set back from the front façade may be more appropriate.

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: 03:04:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Catharine Lowery represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Randall Baron opposed the application, stating the addition would be highly visible.
- Steven Peitzman agreed with Mr. Baron's comments.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION COMMENTS ON THE IN-CONCEPT APPLICATION:

The Historical Commission commented that:

- The application originally proposes a third-story addition that would occupy the entire footprint of the building.
- The Architectural Committee found that an addition may be appropriate if it is set back from the front façade.
- The revised application addresses the Architectural Committee's concerns and proposes an addition set back 5-feet from the front façade. The cladding material would be fiber cement clapboard siding.
- Aluminum clad windows would be appropriate for the addition

- The setback addition seems compatible in size, scale, massing, and material. The corner building is three stories in height, and the proposed addition would remain lower.

ADDRESS: 2035 S COLLEGE AVE

Proposal: Install mechanical equipment; modify openings; provide ADA accessibility

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Trustees of the Estate of Stephen Girard

Applicant: Doug Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architecture

History: 1833; Founder's Hall, Girard College; Thomas U. Walter, architect

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to make a series of upgrades to Founder's Hall, in part so Girard College can return the building to its original use as an educational facility and also be used as an event space. Founder's Hall has long been used to host events, many of which generate income for the school. The proposed work addresses current issues the building has with heating and cooling, ventilation, and interior space configuration. The application also addresses ADA accessibility.

The Architectural Committee reviewed this same scope of work at its last meeting of 15 December 2020, where it provided several comments and recommendations about the proposal. The main concern of the Architectural Committee was the lack of detail in the presentation, given the local and national significance of the building. While reviewing the nine proposed modifications, a member of the Architectural Committee commented that due to the lack of detail, the proposal should be considered as an In-Concept application rather than a Final Review and suggested that the applicant return the following month with more detailed plans. The minutes from this meeting have been included as part of this overview.

The application moved on to the Historical Commission's meeting of 8 January 2021 where it was reviewed as In-Concept. The applicant presented an updated set of drawings that reflected the recommendations made at the Architectural Committee's December meeting. The application was received with enthusiasm and the Historical Commission agreed that it would benefit from further review by the Architectural Committee. The current application is for Final Approval of the revised plans.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install mechanical equipment.
- Modify openings.
- Provide ADA accessibility.
- Remove existing ceiling panels and replace with louvers.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.*
 - o The proposed changes are motivated, in part, by Girard College's decision to return Founder's Hall to its original use as an educational facility, as well as to address issues that currently negatively impact the interior spaces used for events, including heating, cooling and ventilation.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work 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 application proposes to pin back the front doors at the north and south entrances to create interior vestibules with frameless glass doors. The revised application includes the requested details (modifications #3 and #5).
 - o The application proposes to convert two windows into doors by removing and storing the existing windows and stone spandrels and installing doors in the openings. The proposed door configuration and landings have been revised to reflect the comments from the Architectural Committee and the requested details have been provided. Several exterior door alternatives are also presented for consideration (modification #6).
 - o Rather than removing an existing window to accommodate a new louver, the applicant updated the plan to install the louver behind the existing sash, and details have been provided, per the Architectural Committee's recommendation (modification #7).
 - o The revised application includes the requested details regarding the new ADA ramps proposed for the north and south entrances (modifications #2 and #4).
 - o The ADA lift proposed at the east side of the building has been relocated closer to the column to protect the spacious views of the building between the columns (modification #1).
 - o The revised application includes the requested details regarding the new equipment ramp proposed at the west side of the building (modification #8).
 - o The application includes a future scope of work that proposes to remove six original cast iron ceiling panels at the north side of the building and install louvers as required for the new HVAC system. The revised application provides the requested details, including mechanical drawings (modification #9).
- *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 If all removed elements like windows, stone sills and panels, and ceiling panels are securely stored on site, the proposed alterations could be reversed in the future, and the essential form and integrity of the building would be unimpaired.
- *Accessibility Guidelines: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the user while preserving significant historic features. Finding solutions to meet accessibility requirements that minimize the impact of any necessary alteration on the historic building, its site, and setting, such as compatible ramps, paths, and lifts.*
 - o The proposed ramps would provide barrier-free access while preserving significant historic features. The proposed ramps would provide accessibility while minimizing the impact on the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the conditions outlined above, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 9, and 10 and the Accessibility Guidelines.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Owing to the reversibility of the interventions, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with the conditions suggested by the staff as well as with the following conditions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 9, 10 and the Accessibility Guidelines:

- the lift in Scope #1 be placed closer to the column and when possible aligned with the stairs' joints;
- for Scope #6, a centered door that does not require a motorized operator and a smaller landing that does not project out as far as specified;
- the louver in Scope #7 is placed approximately six to eight inches behind the muntin with a shadow box; and,
- bronze is used for the lift.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2417 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Legalize partially constructed deck; relocate mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jonathan Freedman

Applicant: Daniel Bowen, Precision Decks and Remodeling

History: 1963, Walter Weissman, architect

Individual Designation:

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to legalize a partially constructed deck and relocated mechanical equipment at 2417 Delancey Place, a non-contributing building in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. In the beginning of November 2020, the Historical Commission received an application for a roof deck at this property in the Department of Licenses & Inspections' online application website called eCLIPSE. The staff reached out to the applicant for clarification about the proposal including the reason why the deck was to be raised so high above the flat roof, the location of the mechanical equipment, and the placement of the railing. At the time this correspondence began, staff was unaware that there was an open violation for the construction of a roof deck.

When the staff received the requested additional information, photographs showed lumber already on the roof. It was at this point that the staff started to research whether the work on the roof deck had already started without a permit and discovered that a violation had been issued in September 2020 for an "outdoor deck." Upon further discussions with the applicant, staff learned that the mechanical equipment had already been relocated in an effort to prepare for the roof deck.

The property is classified as non-contributing in the historic district. Therefore, the Historical Commission is not charged with protecting the historic character of this building. However, the Historical Commission is charged with protecting the historic character of the district. The

question for the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission is whether the proposed deck and mechanical equipment would have an adverse effect on the district.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Legalize partially constructed roof deck.
- Legalize mechanical equipment that was relocated without a permit.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work 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 proposed roof deck does not destroy any historic materials, features, or spatial relationships associated with the building, as there are none.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The proposed railing and mechanical equipment should be set back from the façade of the building so that they are less conspicuous from the public right-of-way, thereby reducing the impact of the deck and mechanical equipment on the district.
 - o The deck is currently shown to sit a minimum of three feet two inches off the roof. This should be minimized to make the roof deck less conspicuous from the public right-of-way, thereby reducing the impact of the deck and mechanical equipment on the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval if the railing and mechanical equipment are set back from the front façade, and the height of the deck above the roof is reduced, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, provided:

- the deck is pulled back from the parapet wall by at least five feet;
- it is accessed through a pilot house, not the spiral stairs;
- the deck is lowered to sit closer to the flat roof; and,
- the mechanical equipment and railings are relocated so as to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:17:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Property owner Jonathan Freedman represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the recommendation of the Architectural Committee.
- Jim Duffin commented that a spiral stair to access a roof deck would be a better solution than a pilot house.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The proposed revisions addressed the concerns expressed by the Architectural Committee.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed roof deck does not destroy any historic materials, features, or spatial relationships associated with the building, as there are none, satisfying Standard 9.
- A spiral stair painted white would be less conspicuous than a pilot house and would therefore have less of an adverse impact on the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.
- If the deck, railing and mechanical equipment are pulled back from the parapet wall, they could be made less conspicuous, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.
- If the height of the deck is lowered to sit closer to the flat roof, it could make it less conspicuous from the public right-of-way, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: Ms. Edwards moved to approve the application, provided the deck is pulled back by at least five feet and is lowered to sit closer to the roof; and the mechanical equipment and railings are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 2417 Delancey PI MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Edwards SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman					X
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				

ADDRESS: 1718 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Scott Baldasare

Applicant: Richard Stokes, Stokes Architecture

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, multiple classifications, 2/8/1995

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a two- and three-story addition at the rear of the property at 1718 Delancey Street, facing Panama Street. The new addition would incorporate an existing non-historic addition and an existing parking area, which are located on lots identified in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District inventory as 1717 and 1719 Panama Street and classified as non-contributing. Panama Street dead-ends at this property, but is not a service alley. Several three-story rowhouses front on the block.

The proposed addition would connect to the historic house through a second-floor connector on top of an existing one-story connector. An overhead garage door with a wood-like appearance would provide access to the addition. A roof deck would be located on the two-story portion of the addition. The original design was entirely clad in stucco, with two projecting bays. Following the Architectural Committee review, the applicants revised the design to lower the height of the addition by 18 inches to 36 feet 6 inches; remove one of the bumpouts and create a more traditional bay window with wood paneling and windows on three sides; add a clerestory over the garage; and replace the stucco on the upper floors with painted brick.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct addition facing Panama Street

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the building. The new work is differentiated from the old, and its general massing, size and scale are appropriate to the historic property and the district, but that the fenestration and materials do not correspond with the character of the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, which, while diverse, is characterized by more traditional/Classical forms, proportions and detailing, regularized fenestration, and masonry materials of brick and stone. Bays are common on rears and sides of buildings in the district, but are typically differentiated from the masonry facade materials. The application partially complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the features and fenestration are revised to be more consistent with the character of the historic district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the projecting bays, detailing, and starkness of the design in relationship to Panama Street and the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:33:51

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Property owner Scott Baldasare and architects Richard Stokes and Jeffrey Dellaquilla represented the application.
- Mr. Farnham noted that the Historical Commission has approved bay windows on rears of similar properties in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Neighbor Kelly Chaido objected to the modern design, bay window projection, iron railing, and elimination of visible sky.
- Neighbor Jim Hammond supported the overall concept and change in materials but objected to the projecting bay window and window design.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The design has been modified to use brick instead of stucco, which is more consistent with materials in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District.
- The simpler, paneled bay with additional fenestration is more typical of bay windows found in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District.
- The modern design is compatible with but differentiated from the old, and is located at the end of a dead-end street and next door to a large blank wall of the rear of the Plays & Players Theater.
- The revised application addressed the concerns of the Architectural Committee.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised design does not destroy historic materials or spatial relationships that characterize the property, and the new work will be differentiated from the old but compatible with the historic materials, size, scale, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1718 Delancey St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington					X
Total	9				4

ADDRESS: 11 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Raymond J. Evers

Applicant: Laurits Schless, LHS Residential Design

History: 1775

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish a non-historic two-story rear addition, and construct a three-story rear addition on a slightly larger footprint, and also construct a stair hall with deck on the existing two-story sloped rear addition. Visibility of the rear of the property is limited to the side when looking east on Queen Street. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviewed a similar application in August and September 2020. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission determined that the massing, roof overhang, and overall architectural embellishments of the addition were not in keeping with the historic character, and the application was denied. The applicant and property owner did not participate in the reviews owing to the emails from the Historical Commission staff being routed to the applicant's spam folder. The applicant subsequently reviewed the meeting minutes and meeting recording and has submitted a new application based on the comments from the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. This design narrows the rear addition by an additional one-foot three-inches on the visible west side, simplifies the roof cornice, and simplifies the overall architectural embellishments of the addition.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish two-story rear addition; construct three-story rear addition.

- Construct stair hall with deck on existing rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work 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 proposed rear addition and stair hall with deck have been redesigned to be more compatible with the historic building's features, size, scale, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, but approval, with the staff to review details, with the following revisions:

- The third-floor roof is at least one foot below the height of the gambrel roof;
- The third-floor deck is reduced in size or eliminated;
- The third-floor balcony is eliminated and proposed door becomes a window;
- The bump-up at third-floor rear door/window opening is eliminated;
- The design of new windows at first-floor side of existing building is reconsidered.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2021

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP, 27 JANUARY 2021

ADDRESS: 113-29 BERKLEY ST

Proposal: Demolish building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Wayne Junction Properties

Applicant: Angie Williamson, Philly Office Retail

History: 1884; Keystone Dry Plate & Film Works; Moore Push Pin

Individual Designation: 12/12/2014

District Designation: Wayne Junction Historic District, Contributing, 7/13/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish the former industrial building at 113-29 Berkley Street in the Germantown section of the city. It claims that the building cannot be feasibly reused, that requiring its preservation would impose a financial hardship on the property owner. The financial hardship application will be reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship as well as the Historical Commission.

The building at 113-29 Berkley Street is a two-story plus basement former light-manufacturing building constructed in 1884 for the Keystone Dry Plate & Film Works. It is 13,320 square feet in

size. The property was purchased by Wayne Junction Properties in 2018. Its last use was by Recovery King, an addiction treatment center. The Historical Commission individually designated the property as historic in 2014, and again in 2018 as a contributing building to the Wayne Junction Historic District. Both nominations were authored by Historical Commission staff. The nominations argued that the building was significant under Criteria for Designation A, G, and J. Satisfying Criterion A, John Carbutt, founder of the Keystone Dry Plate & Film Works, was a pioneer of mass-market dry plates for photography, and produced the first commercial x-ray plates in the world in his Wayne Junction factory. Edwin Moore, who operated out of the factory beginning in 1912, was the inventor of push-pins. He went on to patent picture hangers and map tacks, also manufactured out of the Wayne Junction factory. Satisfying Criteria G and J, Wayne Junction Station was the locus of mills and factories that capitalized on rail transportation to move in raw goods and send out finished products. Other industries soon followed the lead of John Carbutt, and Berkley Street between Germantown Avenue and Wayne Avenue became an industrial headquarters.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance prohibits the Historical Commission from approving the complete demolition of a historic building unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted in order to justify a demolition, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed. This application claims that the condition of the building and the cost to repair it prohibit a sale or reuse of the building.

Philly Office Retail, LLC is the management company of Wayne Junction Properties, with Ken Weinstein as the owner of both. The application includes a cover letter from Mr. Weinstein that explains that he is seeking a finding of financial hardship owing to four main reasons: 1) the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is, or may be, reasonably adapted, owing to years of deferred maintenance under prior ownership which requires immediate and costly repairs of critical elements; 2) the building cannot provide a reasonable rate of return as is, and cannot be renovated to provide a reasonable rate of return; 3) the inability to obtain state and/or federal tax credits further increases the projected losses of a renovation; and 4) the blighted property negatively impacts ongoing redevelopment efforts in the Wayne Junction area. The cover letter concludes that:

“the rehabilitation of 113 Berkley Street is impractical and infeasible due to the significant cost of necessary repairs compared to the after renovated value of the property. This creates a financial hardship for the owner which would result in a substantial financial loss both in terms of overall value and ongoing cash flow. We respectfully request that the Philadelphia Historical Commission grant this application for financial hardship.”

The application includes an affidavit from Mr. Weinstein, and multiple exhibits. Exhibit “A” provides a financial expense report for 2019 and 2020 for the property. In those two years, Philly Office Retail spent \$544,518 on the property. Of that, \$290,000 was for removing accessory structures, site clearing and environmental remediation, and \$78,000 was for architectural and engineering costs associated with the planned redevelopment of the remaining structure. Exhibit “B” provides an appraisal for the property. The cost of buying and renovating the property is \$2.147 million more than the as-completed appraised market value, \$3.9 million versus \$1.8 million. Exhibit “C” provides a structural engineering report. The report concludes

that the preservation of the building may not be economically feasible owing to its structural condition and the significant work required to stabilize and upgrade it to meet code requirements. Exhibit "D" shows the original plans for adaptive reuse. The Historical Commission staff confirms that iterations of these plans were reviewed and approved over the past two years. Exhibit "E" provides financial projections including proposed renovation budgets, pro formas, and projected rent rolls. Even with anticipated rents for all three floors, the analysis predicts a negative cash flow through its first decade with a net present value of negative \$349,189. Incorporating historic tax credits results in negative cash flows every year and a net present value of negative \$437,292. The analysis adjusting for a light-industrial tenant predicts negative cash flows every year and a net present value of negative \$2,274,642. The owner acknowledges that Philly Office Retail has been willing to take a loss on initial value of historic properties in the past, but states that this loss is more than can be reasonably absorbed. Exhibit "F" includes letters of support for the application from immediate neighboring businesses. Exhibit "G" provides interior and exterior photographs of the subject building. The application concludes with meeting minutes from the designation of the property, and a copy of the Wayne Junction Historic District nomination.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that:

- The complete demolition of the designated resource triggers the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. For the Historical Commission to approve the complete demolition, the applicant must demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The construction cost estimate relative to the appraised value indicates that it is unlikely the building can be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The construction cost estimate relative to the appraised value indicates that it is likely that a sale of the building for reuse purposes is impracticable without a substantial financial loss.
- The financial analysis demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The Historical Commission may approve the application, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial by a vote of 3 to 2.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Financial Hardship voted to recommend approval of the application because the building at 113-29 Berkley Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; the sale of the property is impracticable; rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return; and other potential uses of the property are foreclosed; pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:54:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Property owner Ken Weinstein, and Kyle Meiser, Jaime Rodriguez, and Kate Schoener from Philly Office Retail represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented that the Alliance retained an independent structural engineer, and has decided to offer non-opposition to the application.
- Loretta Witt, a real estate broker and nearby resident, supported the application.
- Allison Weiss, representing SoLo/Germantown Civic Association, opposed the application.
- Joseph Gray, a nearby resident, supported the application.
- Kristin Haskins Simms, a nearby resident and business owner, supported the application.
- Adrienne Fernandez, representing the Swampoodle RCO, opposed the application.
- Malik Gray, a social worker and graduate of the Jumpstart Germantown program, supported the application.
- Jim Duffin commented that, should the application be approved, the property should remain listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, and the Commission can require documentation prior to demolition.
- John Kahler, a Mount Airy resident and former Communications Director for the Lutheran Seminary, supported the application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The complete demolition of the designated resource triggers the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. For the Historical Commission to approve the complete demolition, the applicant must demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The construction cost estimate relative to the appraised value indicates that it is unlikely the building can be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The construction cost estimate relative to the appraised value indicates that it is likely that a sale of the building for reuse purposes is impracticable without a substantial financial loss.
- The financial analysis demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- Any future development on the site will require review and approval from the Historical Commission of a building permit application.
- The Committee on Financial Hardship conducted a thorough review of the application and all public comment received, both written and offered over Zoom during the public meeting on 27 January 2021.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building at 113-29 Berkley Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; the sale of the property is impracticable; rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return; and other potential uses of the property are foreclosed; pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.
- In cases where the Historical Commission agrees to the demolition of a historic building, the Historical Commission may require that the historic building be recorded, at the owner's expense, according to the documentation standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey and the Historic American Engineering Record

(HABS/HAER) for deposit with the Historical Commission, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(c) of the Philadelphia Code.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to find that the building at 113-29 Berkley Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; the sale of the property is impracticable; rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return; and other potential uses of the property are foreclosed; and to approve the application; provided the building is recorded, pursuant to Sections 14-1005(6)(c and d) of the Philadelphia Code. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 0.

ITEM: 113-29 BERKLEY ST					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Mattioni					
SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington					X
Total	9				4

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2021

ADDRESS: 208-10 REX AVE

Proposal: Construct 4 twins; rehabilitate building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Hewson and Virginia Baltzel

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 1857; William L. Hirst/Louis I. Duhring House; additions 1893, 1927 by Louis Duhring

Individual Designation: 1/1/3000

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application seeks guidance from the Historical Commission about potential redevelopment of a property currently under consideration for designation. The existing property at 208-10 Rex Avenue features a large Italianate villa with an Arts and Crafts addition, designed by H. Louis Duhring, who was also the owner of the property from 1919 to 1946. The historic property is surrounded by a large yard and has featured a semi-circular driveway since at least

1876. This application proposes to construct four sets of 11,000+ square foot twins and to create condominium units within the existing historic building. The new buildings would be accessed by a wide driveway. The semi-circular driveway would be replaced by a wide driveway for the new townhouses and a front-yard parking lot for the condominiums in the historic house.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert existing house into condominiums
- Create paved driveway and parking lot
- Construct eight townhouses

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed project does not destroy historic materials that characterize the historic building, but does alter the spatial relationships that characterize the property. The NPS guidelines explain that any new additions should be subordinate to the historic building, and should be scaled and located far enough away from the historic building to maintain its character and that of the site and setting.
 - o The proposed construction is overly large, obstructs views of the historic house, and includes an excessive amount of paving that alters the sense of the expansive lawn.
 - o While residential in use, the proposed buildings have an institutional rather than residential appearance, and are incompatible with the residential property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9, but approval of some new construction on the site, provided it is of a residential character, is reduced in scale, does not obstruct views of the historic house, retains the sense of the curved drive, and the overall amount of paving is reduced.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9, but approval of some new construction on the site, provided it is of a residential character, is reduced in scale, does not obstruct views of the historic house, retains the sense of the curved drive, and the overall amount of paving is reduced.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:56:36

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Carl Primavera and architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Eileen Javers, board chair for the Chestnut Hill Conservancy, noted that the Conservancy's primary interest is in preserving the historic mansion and its

viewshed. She encouraged any new development to be consistent with the character of the site and the area. She explained that, as a preservation advocacy non-profit, the Conservancy works to preserve buildings, but also the green urban village character of Chestnut Hill. She opined that any new construction should harmonize with the context. She noted that there are many ways to erect appropriate new buildings in the side and rear yard of the historic property, but the proposed design is inappropriate in size, scale, and siting. She argued that the current proposal does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She also contended that, since the main premise of the in-concept application is essentially that of financial hardship, the application should not proceed without a Committee on Financial Hardship review.

- Sergio Coscia, architectural consultant for the Rex Avenue Neighbors' Association, reiterated his comments from the Architectural Committee meeting, noting that the proposal lacks dimensions, setbacks, and relative scale, making it difficult to truly evaluate the proposal. He noted that the design is very vertical, but that the section drawing lacks detail, and does not show the fourth set of twins or how they relate to the historic building. He noted that it is not clear whether the proposed houses have pilot houses, and that, he estimates that the rear building is about 56 feet above the road. He opined that it would be easy to show more detailed elevation marks and give actual heights. He argued that the fact that the property is intact going back to the 1800s says something about the importance of this house and grounds to the neighborhood. He opined that the townhouses seem out of character and scale with the historic property and its context. He noted that the nomination talks about the property being an example of the suburban villa. He noted that, while there are some townhouses in Chestnut Hill, they are not prevalent on this type of property.
- Neighbor Bob Mueller opined that the issue that has not been focused on enough is the amount of blacktop and the fact that the three to four-bedroom units would suggest two to four cars per house and would create a need for street parking that does not exist.
- Neighbor Kathleen Willets questioned how hard the Baltzells tried to market the property, noting that she was personally interested and reached out several times but was never able to see the property. She opined that the proposed buildings are lot-aggressive and not suitable for the area.
- Attorney Michael Sklaroff, representing the Rex Avenue Neighbors' Association, noted that approximately one year ago Mr. Baker presented a proposal that is nearly identical to that presented today. He noted that, at that meeting, Mr. Baker agreed to develop a different design that was sensitive to the concerns of the community, and that the neighbors responded that they would be open to a redesign. He noted that they heard nothing until this proposal was submitted. He noted that stakeholder members of the community and near neighbors would love to see Mr. Baker do what he promised to do, which is to address the community's concerns.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Primavera noted that the owner has tried to market the property and had interested builders who wanted to demolish the historic house and to build multiple buildings on the property. He explained that the owners are now trying to find a hybrid solution that saves the historic house, converts it into condominiums, with additional construction on the parcel that is hopefully consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, which is primarily composed of twins and single-family properties. He

noted that they want to proceed by consensus but have received sometimes inconsistent opinions from the various interested parties.

- Mr. Baker explained that they are trying to create a project that makes economic sense but is also friendly to the neighbors. He noted that this application is the first attempt. He explained that he has heard that the retention of the crescent drive is important, and that the twins should be pulled back and the primary elevation of the twin facing Rex Avenue should face the street rather than the driveway. He argued that each residence should have one enclosed garage. He noted that they cannot eliminate the large cul-de-sac at the top of the wide driveway because it is necessary for fire trucks. He agreed that the design of the twins could be more responsive to the neighborhood context.
- Mr. McCoubrey reiterated the Architectural Committee recommendation, noting that, while there were some different suggestions, there was general concern with the institutional rather than residential scale of the proposed twins in relationship to the historic house and neighborhood; and concern over the side-facing buildings, especially the front twin occupying the front yard. He noted that the Architectural Committee was concerned that the first twin severely impacts the site, and suggested building more at the rear rather than the front of the site. He noted that the Architectural Committee suggested preserving more of the front landscape and agreed with the staff that there is too much paving. He explained that the position of the house in an expansive yard with a semi-circular drive are critical to the site.
- Ms. Cooperman explained that while there are many twins on Rex Avenue closer to Germantown Avenue, this property is at a transition point where the lot sizes change as one moves down towards the Wissahickon. For this particular property, the experience from the street is the house sitting in a landscaped setting and the viewsheds of the house from the street are a major aspect of its significance and public benefit. She argued that new construction should preserve the sense of a free-standing house and its important viewsheds from public rights of way. She explained that any new construction should give the house room to breathe and should be deferential to the jewel set in the landscape.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the twins on Rex Avenue are small in scale, two to three-stories, while the proposed twins are four stories with large footprints of a completely different scale. Ms. Cooperman agreed.
- Mr. Thomas noted that there are typically sidewalks in this community, which also impact how people experience and see properties in the area. He noted that in the design of the Cherokee Apartments, the developers avoided huge parking areas. He agreed with the recommendation to preserve the curvilinear driveway at 208-10 Rex Avenue with pullouts for parking. He suggested that, if paving is necessary for the fire trucks, an alternative paving material be used. He noted that fences and landscaping are also important in the neighborhood. He noted that although the size of the proposed homes may be primarily dictated by the market, it would be appropriate to have different scales of buildings on the site. He agreed that a building closer to Rex Avenue should face Rex Avenue, but noted that he would find it acceptable for houses to be side-facing further back on the property.
- Mr. Primavera reiterated that that they are looking for guidance, because they have not had fruitful discussions over the last few years. He noted that the Baltzells are not developers. They own inherited real estate with an oversized building on an oversized lot. He opined that the building is not of interest for single-family use, and Hill House looms in the background. He noted that Ms. Baltzell is a broker, and argued that the problem is how to attract a developer.

- Mr. Thomas suggested that the applicants look to other developments in the neighborhood, providing an example of the Woodward homes in Chestnut Hill that worked in beautiful buildings. He questioned whether the proposed construction would require a zoning variance, noting that something that is historically sensitive might require a zoning variance.
- Ms. Cooperman agreed with the Architectural Committee recommendation. She explained that there is not opposition to some redevelopment of the property, just this redevelopment. She explained that there is an avenue for reworking of this site, and noted that concerns over paving and scale have come up repeatedly. She noted that H. Louis Duhring and Edmund Gilcrest were good at managing the scale of their developments. They broke up the elevations of the groups of buildings with courtyards, varied rooflines, and manipulation of scale. She noted that those developments might be a useful model, but that the proposed design does not conform to that.
- Mr. Thomas noted that the proposed homes are each approximately 11,000 square feet. He explained that some of the Woodward homes are large, but they do not have the feeling of that size. He suggested that the applicants need to reduce the size of the proposed buildings, and break them down in scale so they fit in. He noted that the design is overly vehicle-centered, and suggested the design be made more pedestrian friendly. He suggested that the height of the buildings could be greater towards the back of the site. He suggested that the Hill House apartments on the other side of the railroad are not a problem.
- Mr. Mattioni lamented the coldness of the proposed design. He argued that the neighboring properties have more character, and that the proposed buildings lack character and look like four boxes thrown down on the site. He noted that the design does not take advantage of the landscape or the site, and suggested that they be more user-friendly.
- Mr. Thomas suggested the applicants look at the developments of Allens Lane Station and French Village, which are friendly and walkable but also dense. He noted that the materials and size of the buildings in those developments are more appropriate to the area. He noted that there are also quad houses on Mount Airy Avenue, south of the station, which accommodate cars, but are not vehicle-centric.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION COMMENTS ON THE IN-CONCEPT APPLICATION:

The Historical Commission commented that:

- Some additional construction on the site would be acceptable, but the proposed construction is overly large, obstructs views of the historic house, and includes an excessive amount of paving that alters the sense of the expansive lawn and the property's significance as an "urban villa" in the garden suburb of Chestnut Hill.
- The amount of paving should be reduced, and alternative paving materials explored for areas in which the paving must remain.
- Viewsheds of the historic mansion from the public rights-of-way should be preserved.
- The curvilinear driveway should be retained.
- While residential in use, the proposed buildings have a cold, institutional feel and appearance rather than residential appearance.
- The scale of the buildings should be reduced and visually broken down.
- Development should be pushed back on the site and away from the historic house.

EMERGENCY MATTER

ADDRESS: 2048 UPLAND WAY

Proposal: Demolish buildings owing to Imminently Dangerous conditions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Talmudic Yeshiva of Philadelphia

Applicant: Steve R. Bertil, Esq., Klehr Harrison

History: 1893

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Contributing, 11/8/2019

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

BACKGROUND: The application requests the approval of the demolition of the house and garage at 2048 Upland Way in the Overbrook Farms Historic District. The application is being reviewed on an emergency basis, without referral to the Architectural Committee. The Department of Licenses & Inspections inspected the house and garage on January 8, 2021 and cited them as Imminently Dangerous on January 9. The property was previously cited as Unsafe. On January 21, Steven Gallagher, the director of Emergency Services at the Department of Licenses & Inspections, speaking on behalf of Ralph DiPietro, the acting Commissioner, informed the Historical Commission that the property is Imminently Dangerous and that the “demolition of the property is necessary to protect the safety of the public.”

The current owner, a nearby private school, purchased the property from the former owner on February 18, 2020 after it was listed for sheriff's sale in January 2020. The school purchased the property to eliminate a blight on its doorstep. An attorney working on behalf of the school has applied to the Historical Commission to demolish the buildings. The application includes an engineer's report, which concludes that “It is our professional opinion the buildings represent a hazardous condition to anyone passing near the buildings and removal is the only feasible option to address L&I citations and make the property safe.” In addition to the engineer's report, the application includes photographs of the current conditions at the property, a copy of the imminently dangerous violation, and letters of support for the demolition from the community organization and near neighbors.

The former owner of 2048 Upland Way purchased the property at sheriff's sale in 1974 and had neglected it for decades until it was put up for sheriff's sale in 2020. Violations for the property during that ownership date back to at least August 2, 1978, when he was cited for an illegal junk yard at 2048 Upland Way. On December 12, 1978, he was cited for operating an automotive repair and storage shop in violation of the zoning code. In 1980, Court of Common Pleas ordered the former owner to cease and desist maintaining the property at 2048 Upland Way in a manner inconsistent with the City code and to bring the property into full compliance with the fire, electrical, and housing codes by June 2, 1980. The City sued the former owner over the condition of the property in 1997 and prevailed at Common Pleas Court, but the decision was vacated by the Commonwealth Court in 1999. The City sued the former owner over the condition of the property again in 2000. In 2001, the former owner sued the City, Department of Licenses & Inspections, Municipal Court, Court of Common Pleas, and the Tax Review Board. The City sued the former owner over the condition of the property yet again in 2006. In this case, the Court ordered the owner to bring the property into compliance with the various codes and issued a \$150,000 conditional fine. At that time, the former owner removed the front porch, which was failing. Between 2007, when the City began posting violation information online, and 2021, the Department issued 55 violations to the property, an astonishing number for a single-family dwelling. The violations include citations for rubbish, structural repair, exterior repair,

abandoned automobiles, maintenance, extermination, wall repair, ceiling repair, floor repair, rodents, water/heating, roof drainage, windows, plumbing, exterior drainage, dangerous trees, unsafe conditions, unsafe structures, roof deficiencies, exterior walls, weeds, exterior sanitation, demolition by neglect under the preservation ordinance, and imminently dangerous conditions. In 2008, the former owner appealed a zoning violation, but the appeal was sustained by the Board of License & Inspection Review. For decades, the City sought to compel the former owner to maintain the property in compliance with the City's property maintenance, building, and zoning codes. While those efforts were successful at times, the property continued to deteriorate. City records show that other properties owned by the same person followed similar paths of neglect, violation, enforcement, foreclosure, sheriff's sale, and demolition. Throughout four decades of enforcement actions, the property at 2048 Upland Way continued to deteriorate and has reached the point that the buildings must be demolished.

The Historical Commission designated the Historic District on November 8, 2019. The property is classified as contributing in the district. Had the Historical Commission been aware of the condition of the property, it might have classified it as non-contributing. If the application is approved and the buildings are demolished, the property will remain designated and within the historic district; any new construction will be subject to plenary review by the Historical Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The property was neglected for more than four decades by the former owner, despite the City's enforcement efforts. The property was in very poor condition at the time of designation in 2019. The current owner played no role in the neglect and purchased the property to alleviate the blight. The Department of Licenses & Inspections has determined that the buildings must be demolished to protect public safety. The property will remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction and any new construction will be subject to its review. The staff recommends that the Historical Commission approve the demolition of the house and garage at 2048 Upland Way as necessary in the public interest to abate the imminently dangerous condition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Steve Bertil represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Department of Licenses & Inspections has cited the house and garage at 2048 Upland Way as Imminently Dangerous and determined that the buildings must be demolished to protect public safety.
- The property was neglected for more than four decades by the former owner, despite the City's enforcement efforts.
- The property was in very poor condition at the time of designation in 2019.
- The current owner played no role in the neglect and purchased the property to alleviate the blight.

- The property will remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction and any new construction will be subject to its review.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The demolition of the house and garage at 2048 Upland Way is necessary in the public interest to abate the imminently dangerous condition.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the demolition of the house and garage at 2048 Upland Way as necessary in the public interest to abate the imminently dangerous condition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 2048 Upland Way MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington					X
Total	9				4

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 06:00:55

ACTION: At 3:01 p.m., Mr. McCoubrey moved to adjourn. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: Adjourn MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (DPD)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair					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.