

**THE MINUTES OF THE 707TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 9 JULY 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 (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair	X		
Mark Dodds (Department of Planning & 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		
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
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:

Claire Nevin-Field
Oleg Sokolov
Sally Nista
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Paul Toner, Esq.
Barbara Richman
John Toates
Matt Semola
David Traub
David Ade
Bridgette Byrnes
Scott Ritchie
Hal Schirmer, Esq.
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Jay Farrell
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Audrey Hampton
Nancy Pontone
Barbara Cunningham
Christina Santos
Max Matthews
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Rebecca Glyn
Beverly Cardwell
Charles Kerr
P. Patrick
Deborah Gary
Ben Apple
Allison Weiss, SoLo
Steven Peitzman
Matt Wysong, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Amadi Lewis, Plato Studio
Allan Nadav
Megan Strenski
Bradley Maule
Nina Curlett, E. Mt Airy Neighbors
Ed Poletti
Ben Waxman
Jeffrey Scafaria
Carolyn Campbell
Alan Delfiner
Sean Whalen, Esq., Vintage Law
Judy Robinson
David Fellner
Ken Weinstein
P. Justin Detwiler
Adrian Trevisan
Ian Hegarty, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
J M Duffin
Dennis Carlisle

Janice Woodcock
Celeste Morello

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 706TH STATED MEETING, 11 JUNE 2021

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:05

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 706th Stated Meeting, held 11 June 2021. No corrections were offered.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the minutes of the 706th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 June 2021. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 706th Meeting					
MOTION: Adoption of minutes					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JUNE 2021

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:45

DISCUSSION:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the application for 527-37 W. Girard Avenue. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 59 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct addition and light wells; replace windows and storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PHL 59N2ST LLC

Applicant: Oleg Sokolov, RS Law Group

History: 1885

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to add an additional story to this four-story building located in the Old City Historic District. The new fifth story would have a roof deck with access via stair and elevator pilot houses, and span the full length of the existing building, which runs from N. 2nd Street through to N. Mascher Street at the rear. The application also proposes to insert two light wells into the building, and install a new storefront system at the front façade and new windows in the front and rear facades. The staff can work with the applicant on the appropriate storefront and window details.

The application mentions evidence of an original fifth story, but the staff has found nothing to support that suggestion, and notes that the rear elevation on N. Mascher Street has five floors of fenestration so that may have contributed to confusion surrounding a fifth floor on the building historically.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct fifth floor addition.
- Insert two light wells.
- Install new storefront at front façade.
- Install new windows at front and rear facades.

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.*
 - The proposed addition is not compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportions, and massing of the historic property and therefore the application fails to satisfy Standard 9.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The proposed addition is highly visible from the public right-of-way and therefore the application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Oleg Sokolov and architect Charles Kerr represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The proposed addition shown in Scheme 2 of the revised application is set back five feet from the front cornice, has a vertical front wall, and matches the tan color of the building's stucco party wall.
- A massing study shows that visibility of the addition will be further minimized if the adjacent one-story building becomes a four-story building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed addition shown in Scheme 2 of the revised application is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportions, and massing of the historic property, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed addition shown in Scheme 2 of the revised application has been set back from the front façade, reducing visibility from the public right-of-way, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve Scheme 2 of the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 59 N 2nd St					
MOTION: Approval of revised application with conditions					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

ADDRESS: 400-36 S 3RD ST, AKA 301-17 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct parish hall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. Peter's Church

Applicant: David Ade, SMP Architects

History: 1758; St. Peter's Church and Yard

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The property in question, 400-36 S. 3rd Street, is a large parcel that occupies much of the block bounded by Pine, S. 3rd, Lombard, and S. 4th Streets. St. Peter's Church stands at the northeast corner of the site. St. Peter's Cemetery occupies much of the northern half of the site. The southwest corner of the site, a surface parking lot, is being subdivided from 400-36 S. 3rd Street as 301-17 Lombard Street. St. Peter's Church proposes to build a parish hall on the site. The overall property, 400-36 S. 3rd Street, was individually designated in 1957 and was

included in the Society Hill Historic District as a Significant resource in 1999. Although part of the larger tax parcel at 400-36 S. 3rd Street at the time of designation, the surface parking lot at 301-17 Lombard Street is separately classified as Contributing for its archaeological potential, but not for any aboveground resources.

The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a design for the parish hall in 2019, with the requirement that the property owner conduct an archaeological investigation. Since that time, the archaeological investigation has been completed and a new architect has taken over and revised the design of the parish hall. The underground parking has been eliminated from the project. The exterior materials and design details of the parish hall design have changed slightly, but the overall siting and massing of the building are very similar to the project approved in 2019.

In May 2021, the Architectural Committee reviewed a new parish design. Following that review, the applicants withdrew the application, and have since submitted updated materials, including additional context photos. Revisions to the design include replacing the previously-proposed striated brick with a darker, rough brick; setting back the two-story portion of the building four inches from the Lombard Street elevation; and adding pedestrian scale windows with wood screening below the ribbon windows to the west of the Lombard Street entrance.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a parish hall

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.*
 - The archaeological investigation has been completed and the final report submitted with the application.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The revised design is similar to that approved in 2019. The proposed building would be differentiated from the old and would be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee failed to offer a recommendation. Ms. Stein moved to recommend approval of the application, with the suggestion to replace the metal spandrels with brick at the north elevation. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 2 to 2. Mr. Detwiler and Mr. D'Alessandro dissented.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:29:47

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- The Reverend Claire Nevin-Field and architect David Ade represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert asked if the parking lot site was cleared during the Redevelopment Era to allow views to the historic church.
 - It was noted that the archaeological report details development on the site, which was cleared long before the redevelopment era.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Based on the archaeological reports, there is no potential for significant archaeological remains within the footprint of the proposed building.
- The proposed massing and materials are compatible with the historic district.
- Improvements have been made since the original Architectural Committee review to the Lombard Street elevation in terms of the brick, set back of the two-story portion of the building, and addition of windows. The applicants chose not to modify the north elevation per the Architectural Committee's split opinion owing to programmatic and philosophical reasons.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Archaeological investigations determined is no potential for significant archaeological remains in the footprint of the proposed footprint, therefore archaeological remains on the site will be protected, satisfying Standard 8.
- The proposed building is compatible in massing, size, and general materials with the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 400-36 S 3rd St aka 301-17 Lombard St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

ADDRESS: 527-37 W GIRARD AVE

Proposal: Construct addition; rehabilitate building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 527 W Girard, LLC

Applicant: Judy Robinson, Continuum Architecture

History: 1886; N. 6th Street Farmers' Market House & Hall

Individual Designation: 8/14/2020

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Located at the northeast corner of W. Girard Avenue and N. 6th Street, the former North Sixth Street Farmers' Market is composed of several interconnecting masses constructed between 1886 and 1887, including a prominent headhouse fronting on Girard Avenue (identified in the application as Building A); a two-story hall to the north along N. 6th Street (Building B); and two one-story market sheds with monitor roofs, Building C, which runs along N. 6th Street and connects Buildings A and B; and Building D, which occupies the interior northeast quadrant of the lot and is not visible from the public right-of-way.

In August 2020, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for the property and concluded that the Historical Commission should exercise flexibility in approving alterations to Building D and that a new addition on Building D should be restricted to approximately six stories in height so as not to overwhelm the existing building.

This application proposes to remove Building D and to construct a four-story building with a roof deck. The new building would be largely independent from the remaining historic buildings, with attachments limited to pilot houses at the northeast corners of Buildings A and B. The addition would be clad in dark grey corrugated metal siding with black composite windows and feature a series of wrap-around walkways.

The application also proposes to rehabilitate the existing historic buildings A, B, and C. Since no clear historic photographs have been located of the property, and only a few historic windows remain on the buildings, the application proposes simple one-over-one aluminum-clad and conventional storefront windows for most of the openings. The contents feels that the proposed window and doors are mostly acceptable, but encourages the use of clerestory-type windows in the monitor of Building C, and the use of glazed transoms in lieu of Azek panels in all locations. At a minimum, the staff recommends that glazed transoms with a vertical mullion be installed in the arched transoms to approximate the general historic appearance. The application also proposes to repaint the façade.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove Building D
- Construct four-story building
- Rehabilitate existing buildings
- Alter openings
- Install new windows and doors
- Repaint facade

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - While the configuration of many of the windows and doors on this property are not known, existing transoms on both floors indicate that there were split, arched fanlight transoms in the large arched openings. The staff recommends that these be replicated or approximated in the remaining openings.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed removal does not destroy materials that characterize the property, and the new construction is largely free-standing from the remaining historic buildings. The new building is limited to four stories, and while taller than the existing buildings, does not overwhelm the historic buildings.
- *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.*
 - If removed in the future, the proposed building would leave the form and integrity of the historic buildings intact.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the removal of Building D and construction of a four-story building, and approval of the rehabilitation of Buildings A, B, and C, provided the window and door configuration matches or more closely approximates the historic building, with the staff to

review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Historical Commission's August 2020 in-concept approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the top of the stair towers is lightened, and the window and door configuration matches or more closely approximates the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Historical Commission's August 2020 in-concept approval.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1250 E PALMER ST

Proposal: Construct additions

Review Requested: Review In-Concept

Owner: Barbara Cunningham

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design

History: Joseph Paxson Frame Store & Dwelling

Individual Designation: 11/10/2017

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to add additions at the side and rear of this two-and-a-half-story individually designated building. The one-story addition at the side of the house would include a roof deck. The additions would be clad in Hardie Plank Lap Siding and the proposed roofing is grey architectural shingles.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct additions at the side and rear of house.
- Replace existing bay windows at ground floor.

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.*
 - Although the addition that is proposed at the rear leaves the dormer intact, the house's original roofline would be destroyed in order to accommodate the new construction. The staff considers the shape of the roof to be a character-defining feature of the house and therefore contends that the rear addition as proposed does not satisfy Standard 9.
 - The staff finds the use of Hardie Plank siding and asphalt dimensional shingles to be appropriate materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:47:00

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Thomas recused from the review, owing to his business involvement with the applicant.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Property owner Barbara Cunningham and architect Janice Woodcock represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert spoke in support of the property owner's enthusiasm for the designated building.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION COMMENTS:

The Historical Commission commented that:

- The historic volume and mass of the house is still intact and would be negatively impacted by the proposed design.
- The definition of the main volume of the rear would be completely lost by the present design.
- Lowering the cornice of the addition to meet the cornice of the historic house would help the design.
- Section drawings would help the review of this application in order to better understand ceiling heights.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The applicant should consider exploring different roof forms that would encroach less on the main gable of the historic house.
- The applicant should explore a more defined transition point between the second floor of the historic house and the addition as a way to make the addition appear less massive.
- The applicant should return with alternate roof forms and section drawings.

The Historical Commission took no official action on the in-concept application, which requested comments only.

ADDRESS: 1106 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Legalize removal of glass and metal panels and repair brick façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Nadav

Applicant: Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio

History: Front façade for John Davis Co., Furrier, George W. Neff, architect, 1939

Individual Designation: 4/30/1986

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 1106 Chestnut Street was individually designated in 1986 for its unique Art Deco façade that featured polished glass and pressed metal panels above its commercial storefront. In April 2014, the Department of Licenses and Inspections inspected the building, deemed the front façade unsafe, and issued a violation to the property owner. The violation notice specified that only the unsafe and loose panels of the façade were to be removed and that Historical Commission approval would be necessary prior to replacement. To correct the violation, the owner removed all the panels from the façade prior to June 2014 without seeking approval from the Historical Commission. In 2016 and 2017 the staff of the Historical Commission approved two permit applications. The scope of work on both applications included the removal of the glass and metal cladding, repointing and repair of the brick façade, and the installation of new and salvaged glass and metal panels. The staff placed a condition on the application that work would be completed within 12 months. In its present condition, the brick wall and wood parapet remain exposed, and the metal straps that once held the glass and metal panels remain in place. The proposed work would result in the long-term exposure of the brick back-up wall, the removal of the original metal fasteners, and the removal of the wood parapet. The character-defining glass and metal panels would not be reinstalled.

A similar application was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its 28 July 2020 meeting. However, following the discussion, the property owner withdrew the application, and no recommendation was made. During the discussion, the Committee requested that the owner submit engineers' reports detailing the condition of the brick backup wall. This application provides those reports, as well as an estimate for a new veneer wall system that would replicate the appearance of the glass and metal panels; however, such a system is not being proposed as part of this application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize removal of metal and glass façade panels;
- Restore exposed brick wall;
- Remove wood parapet; and
- Modify storefront for new entrance.

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.*

- This application has been submitted in response to a long-standing violation related to the removal of character-defining polished glass and pressed metal panels that once adorned the building's Art Deco façade. The application proposes to legalize the removal of those features and to retain only the support brick that now comprises the front façade. The still-extant metal fasteners that once held the panels would be removed, as would the wood parapet. The proposed work would leave the façade highly altered and would eliminate the features that contributed to the building's architectural significance and for which it was designated. The work does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:02:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Property owner Allan Nadav and architects Amadi Lewis and Bridgette Byrnes represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Nadav argued that the panels were not removed illegally from the entire façade, adding that the panels all came down on the same Friday afternoon. He stated that he contacted William Proud Masonry to remove them under the supervision of an inspector from the Department of Licenses and Inspections. He contended that the Department's inspector requested that all panels be removed. The violation notice specified that only the unsafe and loose panels of the façade were to be removed and that Historical Commission approval would be necessary prior to replacement. He explained that the glass was glued onto the brick wall with mastic. Contractors engaged to complete the permitted and approved work to restore the façade, he continued, stated that the panels only have a certain lifespan and would need to be reinstalled on a new structural system. He remarked that he hired Plato Studio to design a new façade system to replicate the historic façade and, after obtaining approval, he could not find a contractor to do the work. He contended that no one wanted to install the glass system on the existing brick backup wall without an engineer's approval. The engineers, he continued, concluded that the backup wall could not support the load of the glass panels or a new, lighter glass curtain wall system. He argued that the engineers who evaluated the wall suggested that the existing backup wall would need to be demolished and a new structural wall that could support the load of the curtain wall system would need to be built. He explained that to construct a new structural wall and install the curtain wall would be complicated and prohibitively expensive. He asked that instead of rebuilding a new structural wall and curtain wall system that he get approval to repair the exposed masonry façade. In this plan, he continued, the entire structure would remain. He noted that to make the second through fourth stories usable, he would need to add a means of egress at the Chestnut Street storefront. He explained that the existing interior stair extends from the second story to the window display and then exits in

the vestibule. He asked to retain the roll-down gate but to shorten it so it remains over the commercial storefront.

- Mr. Thomas inquired whether the storefront was original.
 - Ms. Byrnes responded that she believed, based on the Architectural Committee's discussion, that the two storefront display windows are original and have historic value. She explained that this application proposes to shorten the gate and convert the western display window into the entrance to the upper stories.
- Mr. Thomas questioned whether the applicant should be directed to the Committee on Financial Hardship.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the basis for the design was an economic hardship and recommended that the applicant submit a financial hardship application. He asked that the application include the cost of various options for the façade. He noted that the entire masonry façade is carried on a beam that spans party wall to party wall and questioned whether there is an option to demolish the brick wall and construct a significantly lighter curtain wall system using the existing beam, though he acknowledged such a system could be costly.
 - Mr. Nadav responded that engineers have explained that the beam supporting the brick wall is an unknown factor and that once the brick wall is demolished, there is movement in the building that would expose the beam. He added that the beam and posts that extend to the foundation would need to be inspected following demolition. He argued that it would be an open-ended process and would be highly concerning to undertake as a property owner. He claimed that he has been trying to restore the glass and metal panels for years, but that it has come to a point where they need some type of relief and to remove the violations from the property. He noted that he will be in court in a few months.
- Mr. Farnham agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that the question before the Commission is whether the Art Deco façade can be restored, noting that the property was designated solely for the façade. The façade, he continued, was removed several years ago, though the circumstances are unclear. He commented that Mr. Nadav offered his impression of those circumstances, and the staff offered a slightly different perspective. He stated that the Commission needs to determine whether the façade can be restored, adding that the brick backup wall and storefront are secondary to the discussion. The second question, he continued, is whether the property should continue to be designated. He clarified that the feasibility of restoring the façade could best be determined through a financial hardship application, adding that the property owner could submit a hardship application that shows how much it would cost to restore or replicate the façade, and demonstrate whether the building could produce the revenue to support that work. He noted that it is the owner's opinion that it would not, but that no numbers have proven that claim. He then asked that the issue be resolved, since it has been a problem for both the property owner and Historical Commission for many years. The other option, he continued, is to submit an application requesting the rescission of the designation with the claim that the qualities that caused the designation have been lost. Through a review by the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission, he added, the Commission could determine whether or not the façade was legally or legitimately lost due to safety concerns or through the direction of the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Mr. Farnham concluded that the Commission does not have the information it needs before it today and that to approve the application as proposed, the Historical Commission would, in essence, legalize the removal of the façade.

- Ms. Cooperman responded that if the building had its current appearance of exposed brick, it would be highly likely that it would be designated, because there are many similar designated nineteenth-century rowhouses in this part of the city. She acknowledged that the current designation is specific to the former façade, but asked that the Commission consider that it may be eligible for its significance prior to the Art Deco façade as well.
- Mr. Thomas stated that more information is necessary and that he cannot just assume this would be a hardship case without understanding what other options are available. He suggested that the applicant provide more information to demonstrate that suggestions by preservation professionals and the Historical Commission members have been explored. Rescinding the property's designation, he continued, would not be preferable and there is not enough information provided. He opined that the owner could pursue a hardship case separately, though he asked the applicant to consider other options. He further explained that the Commission would need to consider structural conditions created by alterations, such as the removal of first-story brick and insertion of the structural beam and the bowing of the upper façade caused by the glass panels.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the 1986 Committee on Historic Designation meeting minutes record that the property was designated as "an outstanding example of a glass commercial façade rendered in the Art Deco style. . . . [and] as a rare surviving example of a full façade glass shopfront and as a fine representation of its materials and style." There is an argument to be made, he continued, that the building behind it has historical significance and merits preservation, though that may require an amendment to the designation. At this point, he added, the Commission's obligation is to protect the glass façade that was lost, to understand the circumstances of its loss, and the finances in recreating or restoring it. He explained that the application before the Commission does not address those issues and the Commission would not be satisfying its responsibility to protect the façade if it approved the application. He suggested that there are opportunities to reevaluate the significance of the building and consider whether the late eighteenth-century or early nineteenth-century building also has historic merit, though that cannot be done today. He opined that the Commission is bound to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation.
 - Mr. Thomas agreed, adding that if the decision is to deny the application, the Commission can recommend how the owner should proceed. He suggested potentially amending the designation's period of significance to allow the owner the option to restore the glass façade or repair the brick façade.
- Mr. Reuter stated that the only issue before the Commission is the application that was reviewed by the Architectural Committee. He added that presently it would be difficult for the Commission to approve the application, because they would be approving the loss of the feature for which the property was designated. If the owner chose to amend the designation to recognize the significance of the eighteenth- or nineteenth-century façade, he continued, then restoration of the Art Deco façade would not be possible. He commented that the issue did not need to be addressed now. He also noted that this matter remains in court. The violation, he continued, was issued in 2015, and there was no appeal of the violation. He stated that the case will be heard in December and asked that the Historical Commission reach some resolution before that time.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that he concurs with the Architectural Committee's recommendation that this issue is a hardship matter. He commented that the building's façade was unique in Center City and its loss is a real loss to the city's architectural history. He remarked that the violation notice in 2014 stated that only the unsafe and loose panels were to be removed, though in the field all the panels were removed. He contended that it was not necessary to remove them all. He acknowledged the owner's commitment to the building and city. He noted that Ms. Dowdell wrote a letter and questioned the quantity and condition of the glass and metal panels that are stored off site. Mr. Steinke encouraged the Commission to learn more about the panels. He then noted that he has attempted to reach out to the property owner through his architect to suggest that the Preservation Alliance has preservation architects, structural engineers specializing in historic preservation, and experts in historic materials, who could come together to help find a solution that would restore the panels or produce an acceptable facsimile, should the owner want that assistance.
- Oscar Beisert stated that if restoration of the glass panels is ultimately determined to be cost prohibitive, it would be preferable to avoid the hardship process by submitting a proof of cost to mitigate the loss through the preservation of the rowhouse façade.
- Jim Duffin agreed with Mr. Beisert's comments and suggested that, if the Art Deco façade cannot be restored, the façade be returned to its original early-nineteenth-century appearance.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property was designated in 1986 for its significant Art Deco glass and metal panel façade.
- The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the unsafe condition of the building's front façade in 2014. At the time, some glass panels had fallen from the façade, and the violation requested that only loose panels were to be removed. The owner subsequently removed all glass and metal panels.
- The Historical Commission staff approved applications to restore the glass and metal Art Deco façade in 2016 and 2017, but the work was never undertaken.
- The owner contacted several engineers to assess the possibility of reinstalling the glass and metal panel system, and two reports were included in the application. One report concluded that the brick backup wall cannot support the load of the panels. The other report recommended replacing the spacers and anchors per the new glass façade manufacturer.
- The matter remains in court and will be heard in December 2021.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Historical Commission is tasked with ensuring the preservation of the Art Deco glass and metal panel façade for which the building was designated.
- The removal of the glass and metal panels and exposure of the brick backup wall resulted in the loss of the building's character-defining façade. The work did not comply with Standard 9. The façade should be reinstalled if financially feasible.
- While the owner may have a hardship claim, owing to the cost of restoring the glass and metal panel system, a financial hardship application would need to be submitted and reviewed through the financial hardship process.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1106 Chestnut St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Lippert					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 2 JUNE 2021

ADDRESS: 1016-18 SOUTH ST

Name of Resource: Engine 11 Firehouse

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Waters Memorial AME Church

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1016-18 South Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the building has significant value as part of the heritage of the City, being the home of Engine Company 11, which from 1919 to 1952 was one of only two African American fire companies in the segregated Philadelphia Fire Department. Under Criterion B, the nomination contends that the building is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, being the desegregation of the Philadelphia Fire Department in 1953. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the building, constructed in 1902, is significant for its architect, Philip H. Johnson, who designed numerous public buildings for the City.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1016-18 South Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and E.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:01:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jim Duffin supported the designation.
- Celeste Morello supported the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building housed Engine Company 11 from 1919 to 1952.
- The current property owner, Waters Memorial AME Church, reportedly supports the designation.
- The nomination does not explicitly make an argument for significance related to the Isaiah Zagar mosaic, but consideration of it at a later time is not foreclosed.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building has significant value as part of the heritage of the City, being the home of Engine Company 11, which from 1919 to 1952 was one of only two African American fire companies in the segregated Philadelphia Fire Department, satisfying Criterion A.
- The building is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, being the desegregation of the Philadelphia Fire Department in 1953, satisfying Criterion B.
- The building is significant for its architect, Philip H. Johnson, who designed numerous public buildings for the City, satisfying Criterion E.

ACTION: Mr. Lippert moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1016-18 South Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and E, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1016-18 South St MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, B, and E MOVED BY: Lippert SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

ADDRESS: 6625 LINCOLN DR

Name of Resource: Nichols-Goehring House

Proposed Action: Amend boundary of individual designation

Property Owner: 6625 Lincoln Dr LLC

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to amend the boundary of the designated property at 6625 Lincoln Drive to exclude the subdivided parcels at 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive. The Historical Commission would retain jurisdiction over the smaller subdivided property at 6625 Lincoln Drive, where the Nichols-Goehring House is located. The Historical Commission designated the Nichols-Goehring House property at 6625 Lincoln Drive on 11 January 2019. The designated parcel is shown on a site plan in the nomination. The property owner subdivided the property that was known as 6625 Lincoln Drive into the five parcels with a deed that is dated 9 January 2019 and recorded on 11 January 2019, the very same day that the property was designated. A zoning permit for the subdivision had been issued on 17 September 2018, prior to the issuance of the Historical Commission's notice. The Historical Commission notified the property owner that it would consider designating the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive on 12 November 2018, thereby initiating its jurisdiction over the entirety of the property originally known as 6625 Lincoln Drive, which was later subdivided into five properties.

In May 2020, the Historical Commission was notified that three houses were under construction at 6625 Lincoln Drive, presumably without permits. The staff visited the site and photographed three houses under construction as well as one foundation being excavated. The staff contacted the Department of Licenses & Inspections about the construction that was underway without the Historical Commission's review or approval. The Department responded that the houses had been permitted under the addresses 6619, 6621, and 6623 Lincoln Drive. The permits had been applied for on 26 April 2019 and issued on 10 September 2019. A Google Streetview photograph shows that site work and the construction of the foundations was underway in November 2019. The Department of Licenses & Inspections did not refer the new construction

permit applications to the Historical Commission because they had been issued under 6619, 6621, and 6623 Lincoln Drive, addresses that did not exist at the time of designation; only 6625 Lincoln Drive was identified as historic. The permit referral system was designed to catch subdivisions and carry the historic designation marker from the parent to the child property, but it did not in this case. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declined to revoke the permits because the mistake had been made within the City system and revoking the permits would open the City to liability.

The fourth house contemplated for the site was not permitted with the other three in 2019. The new house was planned for the subdivided parcel at 6627 Lincoln Drive, situated in front of the historic house. The property owner submitted an application for new construction for review by the Historical Commission at its 9 April 2021 meeting. The Historical Commission approved the new construction application, which proposed to locate the house to the side of the subdivided lot to maximize views of the Nichols-Goehring House.

The property owner contends that the subdivision of 6625 Lincoln Drive into five parcels had already been initiated prior to the date the Historical Commission staff sent notice of the nomination and that the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the properties at 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive.

At the time of designation, the Historical Commission found that the property satisfied Criteria for Designation C and D, both of which relate to architectural style. The Historical Commission made no findings about the significance of the grounds. The designation was predicated on the architectural style of the house itself and not on landscaping, archaeology, or other features or aspects of the site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends amending the boundary of the individual designation of the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive to exclude the subdivided parcels at 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 002:09:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Sean Whalen represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Historical Commission designated the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive, the Nichols-Goehring House, on 11 January 2019. At the same time, but preceding the mailing of notice of the nomination, the owner formally subdivided the property into five parcels. The historic building remains on the parcel identified as 6625 Lincoln Drive.
- The nomination identified the boundary of 6625 Lincoln Drive in its former state prior to subdivision, and the Historical Commission designated the property according to the boundary, because the Office of Property Assessment's records did not indicate that a subdivision had occurred until after the property was designated.

- Four additional properties were created and include 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive.
- New construction was legally permitted and is nearly completed at 6619, 6621, and 6623 Lincoln Drive.
- The Historical Commission reviewed and approved an application for new construction at 6627 Lincoln Drive at its 9 April 2021 meeting.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The parcel on which the historic resource is located is 6625 Lincoln Drive; however, the boundary as designated by the Historical Commission did not reflect the actual boundary of the property at the time of designation.
- Because the subdivision predates the mailing of notice of the nomination, the boundary should be amended to reflect the actual boundary of the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive. The subdivided parcels at 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive should be excluded from the designated boundary.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to amend the boundary of the designation for 6625 Lincoln Drive as proposed. Mr. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 6625 Lincoln Drive MOTION: Amend boundary MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

ADDRESS: 1716 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Wall and Ochs Building

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Tuscan Realty of PA, LLC

Nominator: Center City Residents Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1716 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the subject property is a “notable example of a Renaissance Revival-

style commercial building of the turn of the twentieth century.” Under Criterion E the nomination argues that the 1716 Chestnut Street was designed “by the architectural firm of Addison Hutton, a designer that greatly influenced the City of Philadelphia and the larger region in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.” Under Criterion J, the nomination suggests that the subject property is significant because it was constructed for and housed opticians Wall & Ochs, whose business was representative of “the economic, social, and historical heritage of optometry in Philadelphia, as the field and industry evolved in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to become a recognized health care profession nationwide.”

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1716 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:15:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Jim Duffin of the Center City Residents Association represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building was designed by the firm of noted architect Addison Hutton in 1898.
- The building was constructed for the use of opticians Wall & Ochs.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building is a fine example of the Renaissance Revival-style commercial building, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building was designed by the firm of Addison Hutton, an architect who greatly influenced Philadelphia’s built environment, satisfying Criterion E.
- The building was purpose built for Wall & Ochs, opticians who helped professionalize their field, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1716 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1716 Chestnut Street MOTION: Designate, D, E and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Lippert					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

ADDRESS: 721 W GRANGE AVE

Name of Resource: Fox Motor Car Company/Thomas M. Royal & Co.

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Edmund M. Dunn

Nominator: Adrian Trevisan

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 721 W. Grange Avenue, located in the Olney neighborhood of Philadelphia, as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Historically known as the Fox Motor Car Company, the building completed construction in 1921. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that it is valuable as a rare surviving automotive manufacturing plant in Philadelphia that dates to the early years of the United States' automotive industry. The nomination further contends that the building qualifies under Criterion D, as the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen, C.A.P. Turner's flat-slab, or, as it was better known, the "mushroom system" factory building, which combining poured concrete with steel reinforcement to produce well-lit, fireproof buildings with abundant floor space. Finally, the nomination asserts that the building is significant under Criterion J because it exemplifies the changing industrial character of the city during the twentieth century.

The staff notes that the nomination is unclear regarding whether the building was constructed with C.A.P. Turner's reinforced concrete system specifically, or with a system akin to Turner's. Turner obtained a patent for his system in 1908, but the patent was invalidated a few years before this building was constructed in 1921. The nominator should clarify whether Turner was directly involved in the construction of this building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 721 W. Grange Ave, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Additional information is needed regarding Criterion D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 721 W. Grange Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J. The Committee found the argument for Criterion D in the nomination related to C.A.P Turner's mushroom system was not sufficient, but they agreed that Criterion D is met because it is representative of "red and white" architecture, a factory building with red brick infill and concrete trim, satisfying Criterion D.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:21:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Adrian Treviso represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The nomination is well researched and informative about the early years of the automotive industry in Philadelphia.
- The property is in an area of the city that has a limited number of historically designated properties.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property is valuable as a rare surviving automotive manufacturing plant in Philadelphia that dates to the early years of the United States' automotive industry, satisfying Criterion A.
- The building is representative of "red and white" architecture, a factory building with red brick infill and concrete trim, satisfying Criterion D.
- The property exemplifies the changing industrial character of the city during the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Mr. Lippert moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 721 W Grange Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 721 W Grange Avenue MOTION: Designation, Criteria A, D, and J MOVED BY: Lippert SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

ADDRESS: 3568 FRANKFORD AVE

Name of Resource: St. Joan of Arc Roman Catholic School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3568 Frankford Avenue in Harrowgate as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former St. Joan of Arc Roman Catholic School, designed by George Audsley and constructed in 1921 and originally used as both a church and school, is significant under Criterion for Designation A because it is associated with the lives of persons significant in the past, St. Joan of Arc and Monsignor Edward F. Hawks, the founding pastor and supervisor of the design and construction. After serving as a Captain and Chaplain in the English army during World War I, Monsignor Hawks' first assignment as a pastor was at St. Joan of Arc in Harrowgate. He named the new parish one week after Joan was canonized and began the parish tradition of the "military mass" in honor of St. Joan, the soldier, to preserve her historical role. Hawks, who converted from Anglican Church to Roman Catholicism, was appointed by Pope Pius XI as a Domestic Prelate and sent as a Vatican Observer to witness and report on the Spanish Civil War. He wrote extensively and gained attention for writings and speeches in converting people to Catholicism. The nomination asserts that the combination church and school was the first church in the United States dedicated to St. Joan of Arc after her canonization in 1920.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3568 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criterion A for its association with Monsignor Edward F. Hawks, but not St. Joan of Arc. The life of Joan of Arc, who was born about 1412 and reportedly burned at the stake in 1431, is not associated with this property in Philadelphia. This property does represent the modern interest in the story of Joan of Arc that resulted in her

canonization in 1920 and therefore may satisfy Criterion J by exemplifying the heritage of the community, but it is not associated with the life of Joan of Arc, which occurred 500 years before this building was constructed.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:28:00

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The former St. Joan of Arc School was constructed in 1921 as a combination church and school building.
- The combination church and school was the first church in the United States dedicated to St. Joan of Arc after her canonization in 1920.
- The significance of the property is not tied to the life of St. Joan of Arc herself, but to the timing of her appearance in the public's imagination and in the Catholic faith.
- Monsignor Edward F. Hawks was a Captain and Chaplain in the English army during World War I, after which he was assigned as a pastor at St. Joan of Arc church, which he named as such one week after her canonization. He received numerous honors and commendations from Pope Pious XI and gained attention for his writings and speeches in converting others to Catholicism.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- St. Joan of Arc was a person significant in the past, but naming the parish after her does not create a significant association between her and the building.
- Monsignor Edward F. Hawks, the founding pastor and supervisor of the design and construction, was a person significant in the past, satisfying Criterion A.

ACTION: Mr. Lippert moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3568 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 3568 Frankford Ave MOTION: Designate; Criterion A MOVED BY: Lippert SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

ADDRESS: 3558 FRANKFORD AVE

Name of Resource: St. Joan of Arc Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3558 Frankford Avenue in Harrowgate as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the St. Joan of Arc Roman Catholic Church, constructed in 1946, when the congregation outgrew the church in the school building, on a design by architect Frank J. Ricker, is significant under Criteria for Designation A and D. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the church is significant for its association with St. Joan of Arc and Monsignor Edward F. Hawks. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the church embodies distinguishing characteristics of Early Christian revival style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3558 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criterion D for its architecture and Criterion A for its association with Monsignor Edward F. Hawks, but not St. Joan of Arc. The life of Joan of Arc, who was born about 1412 and reportedly burned at the stake in 1431, is not associated with this property in Philadelphia. This property does represent the modern interest in the story of Joan of Arc that resulted in her canonization in 1920 and therefore may satisfy Criterion J by exemplifying the heritage of the community, but it is not associated with the life of Joan of Arc, which occurred 500 years before this building was constructed.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:38:17

PRESENTERS:

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

- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- St. Joan of Arc church was constructed in 1946 during a period of population growth and time in which many churches were constructed in the Romanesque Revival style.
- Monsignor Edward F. Hawks was a Captain and Chaplain in the English army during World War I, after which he was assigned as a pastor at St. Joan of Arc church, which he named as such one week after her canonization. He received numerous honors and commendations from Pope Pious XI and gained attention for his writings and speeches in converting others to Catholicism.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- St. Joan of Arc was a person significant in the past, but naming the parish after her does not create a significant association between her and the building.
- Monsignor Edward F. Hawks, the founding pastor and supervisor of the design and construction, was a person significant in the past, satisfying Criterion A.
- The church embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Romanesque Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3558 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 3558 Frankford Ave MOTION: Designate; Criteria A and D MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Lippert					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

CARNEGIE LIBRARY THEMATIC HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Number of properties: 20

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a thematic historic district composed of the remaining 20 of the original 25 Carnegie branch libraries constructed throughout Philadelphia between 1905 and 1930. Of those properties, 16 remain branch libraries, and 11 are already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the district has significant interest or value as part of the City's development, the history of public libraries in the United States and its association with Pittsburgh industrialist Andrew Carnegie. The branch libraries, constructed between 1905 and 1930, were the first purpose-built public libraries in the city of Philadelphia. While each of the libraries is unique, they all embody distinguishing characteristics common of Carnegie-funded libraries, satisfying Criterion D, and were designed by a veritable "who's who" of renowned local architects, including Cope & Stewardson, Frank Miles Day & Brother, John T. Windrim, David Knickerbacker Boyd, Hewitt & Hewitt, and Philip H. Johnson, satisfying Criterion E.

The nomination also contends that one property, the McPherson Square Branch library, is additionally significant under Criteria for Designation G and I for its historic and current relationship to McPherson Square, which has never been developed and holds archaeological potential as the early homestead of the Webster family.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Carnegie Libraries Thematic Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E, and that the McPherson Square branch at 601 E. Indiana Avenue additionally satisfies Criteria G and I.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that Carnegie Library Thematic Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E, and that the McPherson Square branch at 601 E. Indiana Avenue additionally satisfies Criteria G and I, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:44:26

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub supported the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Twenty of the original 25 Carnegie libraries constructed in Philadelphia between 1905 and 1930 still exist, 11 of which are already designated as historic, and 16 of which remain branch libraries.
- The libraries were the first purpose-built public libraries in the City of Philadelphia.
- The construction of Carnegie libraries was one of the greatest acts of philanthropy in United States' history, with libraries constructed throughout the city allowing equal access to good books and good architecture to people of all economic and social statuses.
- The buildings are architecturally significant and also representative of the works of significant architects.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The district is significant under Criterion A for its significant interest or value as part of the city's development, the history of public libraries in the United States, and its association with Pittsburgh industrialist Andrew Carnegie.
- While each of the libraries is unique, they all embody distinguishing characteristics common of Carnegie-funded libraries, satisfying Criterion D.
- The libraries were designed by a veritable "who's who" of renowned local architects, including Cope & Stewardson, Frank Miles Day & Brother, John T. Windrim, David Knickerbacker Boyd, Hewitt & Hewitt, and Philip H. Johnson, satisfying Criterion E.
- The McPherson Square Branch library at 601 E Indiana Avenue is additionally significant for its historic and current relationship to McPherson Square, which has never been developed and holds archaeological potential as an early homestead, satisfying Criteria G and I.

ACTION: Mr. Lippert moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Carnegie Libraries Thematic Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E, and that the McPherson Square branch at 601 E. Indiana Avenue additionally satisfies Criteria G and I, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Carnegie Library Thematic Historic District MOTION: Designate; Criteria A, D, E, and additionally G and I for McPherson branch MOVED BY: Lippert SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

CENTRAL MT. AIRY COMMERCIAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Philadelphia City Planning Commission

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

OVERVIEW: This proposed historic district, located along the 7100 and 7200 blocks of Germantown Avenue in Northwest Philadelphia, is comprised of 47 properties, largely constructed between 1885 and 1933. Five properties are classified as significant, 38 properties are considered contributing, and 4 properties are classified as non-contributing. An additional two properties are already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The proposed Central Mt. Airy Historic District extends just past Nippon Street at the north and is bounded by Mt. Pleasant Avenue at the south. The west boundary is defined by properties fronting Germantown Avenue, with one additional property on W. Durham Street. The east boundary is similarly bounded by properties fronting Germantown Avenue, with several additional properties on E. Mt. Airy Avenue.

The nomination argues that the Central Mt. Airy Historic District evolved from an area sparsely populated by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century buildings to a dense commercial corridor by the early twentieth century, accelerated by wholesale commercial development in the 1920s. The nomination contends that, owing to the scale and presence of those early twentieth-century buildings, their Art Deco style defines the district, with colonial buildings interspersed throughout. The nomination further argues that the buildings within the district have undergone little change since the corridor was modernized nearly 100 years ago.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J. However, the staff recommends that some properties be further evaluated to determine whether they merit full jurisdiction by the Historical Commission.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Central Mt. Airy Commercial Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J with the following amendments:

- the rear portion of 7111-13 Germantown Avenue should be classified as non-contributing, with the sanctuary fronting Germantown Avenue to remain contributing;
- the entire property at 7151 Germantown Avenue as identified in the nomination's boundary should remain classified as non-contributing;
- the rear auditorium box of the Sedgwick Theatre at 7133-43 Germantown Avenue should remain classified as non-contributing;
- the parking lot at the rear of 7165 Germantown Avenue should be classified as non-contributing; and
- the parking lot at the rear of 7167-69 Germantown Avenue should be classified as non-contributing.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:50:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Ian Hegarty of the City Planning Commission represented the nomination.
- Ken Weinstein and David Fellner represented their ownership interests.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Weinstein requested that the rear of his property at 7111-13 Germantown Avenue either be excluded from the district boundary or be classified as non-contributing. He argued that the nomination does not describe the rear of the building and that it falls outside the Period of Significance, having been constructed after 1933. He noted that the building was recently converted into condominiums and has been highly altered. He agreed that the church building should remain classified as contributing.
- Mr. Fellner requested that several amendments be made to the boundary to exclude portions of four properties, including 7133-43, 7151, 7165, and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue.
 - At 7133-43 Germantown Avenue, the Sedgwick Theatre, Mr. Fellner noted that the rear is identified as non-contributing in the nomination. He described it as a blank box that has been highly altered and that has no visibility from the public right-of-way. He asked that it be excluded from the district boundary.
 - At 7151 Germantown Avenue, Mr. Fellner noted that the entire property is classified in the nomination as non-contributing, adding that the lot is very deep and consists of a parking lot. He asked that the structure remain within the boundary as a non-contributing structure but that the large rear parking lot be excluded.
 - At 7165 and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue, Mr. Fellner stated that the rears are parking lots and asked that the rear portion be excluded, owing to the lack of historical significance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination.
- Brad Maule, a resident and representative of the Mt. Airy CDC, supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Philadelphia City Planning Commission nominated the district as part of Commission's Germantown Avenue Growth & Preservation initiative.
- The district includes 47 properties, with four of those properties considered non-contributing.
- The purpose of the district is to regulate properties fronting Germantown Avenue.
- Several property owners have requested amendments to the district boundaries and property classifications. Those properties include 7111-13, 7133-43, 7151, 7165, and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue.
- The property at 7111-13 Germantown Avenue has been redeveloped with condominium units at the rear building on the property. The property owner is requesting to either remove or classify as non-contributing the rear building on the property.
- The property at 7133-43 Germantown Avenue, the Sedgwick Theatre, is considered significant in the district; however, the nomination identifies the rear auditorium box, which has been greatly altered, as non-contributing. The property owner is requesting to remove the rear auditorium box from the district.
- The property at 7151 Germantown Avenue is considered non-contributing in the nomination. The boundary is based on a deed and does not include the entire tax parcel. The property owner is requesting to remove the rear parking area from the district.
- The properties at 7165 and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue include historic buildings fronting Germantown Avenue with parking lots behind. The property at 7167-69 Germantown Avenue is located on the corner of Germantown and E. Mt. Airy Avenues. Properties fronting on Mt. Airy Avenue are not located within the proposed historic district. The property owner is requesting to remove the rear parking lots from the district.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The district developed from an area sparsely populated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to a dense commercial corridor in the early twentieth century, with wholesale commercial development in the 1920s, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- Owing to the scale and presence of the early twentieth-century buildings, their Art Deco style defines the district, satisfying Criteria D.
- The rear of the church property at 7111-13 Germantown Avenue should be classified as non-contributing. The nomination does not describe the rear building or assign any significance to it. The rear building was constructed after the Period of Significance listed in the nomination. The rear building was recently altered significantly. The church building fronting Germantown Avenue should remain classified as contributing.

- The rear of the Sedgwick Theatre at 7133-43 Germantown Avenue has been highly altered and should remain classified as non-contributing in the district. The front portion of the building fronting Germantown Avenue should remain classified as significant.
- The rear parking lot of the non-contributing property at 7151 Germantown Avenue should be excluded from the district, leaving the non-contributing structure within the boundary.
- Parking lots and vacant land at 7165 and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue should be classified as non-contributing.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Central Mt. Airy Commercial Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the following amendments:

- the rear portion of 7111-13 Germantown Avenue is classified as non-contributing, with the sanctuary fronting Germantown Avenue to remain contributing;
- the rear auditorium box of the Sedgwick Theatre at 7133-43 Germantown Avenue is classified as non-contributing;
- the rear parking lot at 7151 Germantown Avenue is excluded from the district's boundary, and the structure fronting Germantown Avenue is classified as non-contributing;
- the parking lot at the rear of 7165 Germantown Avenue is classified as non-contributing; and
- the parking lot at the rear of 7167-69 Germantown Avenue is classified as non-contributing.

Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Central Mt. Airy Commercial Historic District MOTION: Designate, with amendments MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

Commissioner Mark Dodds excused himself from the meeting.

AUTOMOBILE ROW THEMATIC HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Kevin McMahon and Logan Ferguson, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Number of properties: 29

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. North Broad Street was an early center for the automobile trade in Philadelphia, with numerous small and large showrooms, assembly and distribution plants, and parts and accessories stores on what was known as “Automobile Row” as early as 1906. The thematic district covers an approximately 2.8-mile-long stretch between Cherry Street (at the south end) and Lehigh Avenue (at the north end) and includes 29 properties that are known to have been built by or for the automobile industry between 1909 and 1930.

Under Criteria A and J, the nomination contends that the district is representative of the burgeoning automobile industry in Philadelphia between 1909 and 1930. Automobile Row was an outgrowth of the general commercial and industrial activity that had flourished on North Philadelphia’s “Main Street” for more than half a century. The large number of automobile industry-related businesses that opened on North Broad Street during this period reflect Philadelphia’s major role in the early automobile industry. Virtually every major national brand – Buick, Cadillac, Ford, Oldsmobile, Studebaker, among many others – was represented. Not confined to the selling of cars, many of Automobile Row’s facilities operated as major assembly plants and/or distribution centers, serving networks of dealerships in Philadelphia and throughout the region. Under Criteria C, D, and E, the nomination asserts that the district includes major works of Beaux-Arts, Classical Revival, and Commercial Style buildings by many of Philadelphia’s and some of the country’s best-known architects of the early twentieth century. Many of the buildings are faced in glazed white architectural terra cotta, comprising one of the finest collections of this popular and highly adaptable building material in the city.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that Automobile Row Thematic Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:57:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.
- Max Matthews, director of operations for Freire Schools, represented the ownership interest for 2221 N. Broad Street.
- Ed Poletti, facilities manager for the Pennsylvania Academy for Fine Arts (PAFA), represented ownership interests for 130-40 N. Broad Street.
- No other owners were present.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Matthews requested that 2221 N. Broad Street be excluded from the historic district designation and said that their non-profit charter school organization is focused on serving students who are most in need of a high-quality high school education. Mr. Matthews said they should be putting the maximum of their resources toward the students' education rather than overhead costs. He asked the Commissioners to prioritize the use of public education funding for the students rather than the building.
- Mr. Poletti requested that 130-40 N. Broad be excluded from the historic district designation. He stated he is familiar with the Commission's project and permit review process through his work on 118-26 N. Broad Street, a nearby designated property. Mr. Poletti stated that his organization is concerned about added costs related to historic designation.
- Ms. Washington said there needs to be a balance between the Commission protecting buildings and working with small non-profits who are set up to serve underserved communities such as in the case with Freire Schools. She continued that the Commission cannot do that unless it designates. Ms. Washington pointed out that there are provisions for the Commission to work with non-profits who have economic limitations or special circumstances for consideration. She expressed concern about failing to designate a building and then losing it to demolition later. Ms. Washington concluded that it would be better to designate when given the opportunity and then work with non-profit organizations on any future changes to their building with consideration given to their circumstances.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert supported the historic district designation. He encouraged Commissioners to designate all buildings in the nomination including the two properties whose owner representatives asked for their removal from the historic district.
- Celeste Morello spoke in opposition of removing the two properties from the historic district and encouraged the Commission to designate all properties listed in the inventory.
- Hal Schirmer pointed out that the Commission has designated properties with special instructions or conditions in the past. He suggested that the two properties requesting removal from the historic district could be handled with special conditions or instructions that could be revisited at a later date.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Although the Commission recognized that non-profit organizations may have some financial limitations for ongoing building maintenance, it is not a compelling reason to exclude properties from being designated as part of the historic district. The Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations allow, under specific circumstances, for leniency when reviewing permit applications.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed Automobile Row Historic District represents the burgeoning automobile industry in Philadelphia between 1909 and 1930, thereby satisfying Criteria A and J.

- The historic district includes major works of Beaux-Arts, Classical Revival, and Commercial Style buildings by many of Philadelphia's and some of the country's best known architects of the early twentieth century, thereby satisfying Criteria C, D, and E.
- All properties in the proposed district inventory merit historic designation.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Automobile Row Thematic Historic District MOTION: Designation MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				3

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:23:00

ACTION: At 1:12 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: Adjourn MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)					
Washington					
Total	9				3

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.