

**THE MINUTES OF THE 661ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER 2017
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D.
Mike Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
John Mattioni, Esq.
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Fred Purnell, Division of Housing & Community Development
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
H. Ahada Stanford, Commerce Department
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Jerald Goodman, Esq., Drinker Biddle & Reath
Lizbeth Marziello, Germantown Boys & Girls Club
Joseph Marziello, Germantown Boys & Girls Club
S. Moskal, Germantown Boys & Girls Club
W. Winn, Germantown Boys & Girls Club
Ariel Golding, Germantown Boys & Girls Club
John McGovern
Timothy Beaver
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Bryant Snyder, HSA
Matt Heckendorn, HAS
Loretta Witt, Historic Germantown
Shanice Pender, Germantown Boys & Girls Club
Daniel McElhatton, Esq.
J.M. Duffin
Sue Patterson, Penn Knox
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Pauline Builder, JBCI
David Parker
Andrew Miller, Esq.
Oscar Beisert, Misery Maven
Andrew Fearon, Kensington Olde Richmond Heritage

Anthony Noga, Kitchen & Associates
Dowal Woolf, Germantown Boys & Girls Club
Charlotte Caldwell, VSBA
William O'Brien, Esq.
Lenny Bazemore
Christian Jordan, PJA
Jessica Nonnenman, PJA
Tina LeCoff, Penn Knox
Elizabeth Franklin, Penn Knox
Carlos Lopez
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Clifton Hayman, Penn Knox
Meredith Johnson, University of Pennsylvania
Santiago Precindo, University of Pennsylvania
Irena Wight, University of Pennsylvania
Jacob Tornelson, University of Pennsylvania
Jungseop Park, University of Pennsylvania
Amanda Stevens, University of Pennsylvania
Jeong Eun Pae, University of Pennsylvania
Justin Lynch, University of Pennsylvania
Margaret Bach, University of Pennsylvania
Rebecca Clemente, University of Pennsylvania
Kallie Kothmann, University of Pennsylvania
Ashley Losco, University of Pennsylvania
Lillian Candela, University of Pennsylvania
David Gordon, University of Pennsylvania
Lauren Aguilar, University of Pennsylvania
Dorcas Corchado, University of Pennsylvania
Emelyn Najera, University of Pennsylvania
Yuxian Huang, University of Pennsylvania
Katie Randall, University of Pennsylvania

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Fink, Gupta, Mattioni, McCoubrey, Purnell, Royer, Schaaf, Stanford, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 660TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 660th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 August 2017. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REQUESTS TO CONTINUE NOMINATION REVIEW

Mr. Farnham presented the joint request for a 30-day continuance of the review the nomination of 23 W. Penn Street. He explained that the property owner and nominator jointly requested the continuance. It will allow additional time for both to continue to discuss the matter and hopefully reach a compromise. He reminded the Commission that the matter was heard at its May 2017 meeting, and has been continued since that time. Ms. Cooperman asked if the matter should be

continued to a special meeting, or to the Commission's regularly-scheduled monthly meeting, noting that there was lengthy discussion at the May 2017 meeting. Mr. Farnham responded that he is personally optimistic that there will be a resolution that will preclude a lengthy discussion at a subsequent meeting. He offered that it could be continued to the October 2017 meeting, and then referred to a special meeting if the situation has changed at that time. He recommended that it be continued to the Commission's October meeting, rather than a special meeting.

Mr. Thomas asked for comments from the Commissioners and the public. None were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Gupta moved to continue the review of the nomination for 23 W. Penn Street for one month, to the Historical Commission's meeting of 13 October 2017. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 AUGUST 2017

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas introduced the consent agenda, which included an application for 414-22 S. 16th Street. Ms. Royer recused from the review, owing to her employment with the property owner. Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. Mr. Thomas asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 414-22 S. 16th Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 414-22 S 16TH ST

Proposal: Install ground floor doors and windows, construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 414 S. 16th, LP

Applicant: Rachel Royer, 414 S. 16th, LP

History: 1926

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design submitted at the Architectural Committee meeting, with the following suggestions:

- The existing doorway is retained and only widened by one door width,
- That all mechanical equipment remains inconspicuous and pulled back from the edges of the building,
- The number of mullions in the storefront windows is reduced, and
- The stair overbuilds are not in the same plane as the brick façade and are clad in a neutral color and material.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert an existing garage building into a mixed-use building. In order to do so, the application proposes to install a new storefront system, retrofit or replace all existing windows, enlarge window openings on the side elevations, and construct rooftop stairtowers, elevator overrun, and roof deck.

On the primary, 16th Street elevation, storefront alterations would include the installation of glazed garage doors in place of the existing metal slat garage doors. The application also proposes to alter the configuration of the existing storefront through the removal of one historic brick panel and relocation of another for the installation a pair of doors centered within the southern storefront system. The application also proposes to alter the divisions of the existing storefront windows. The staff notes that, although the existing system may be a replacement of what was there originally, the existing proportions are in keeping with comparable historic storefronts and should be replicated.

The application also proposes to regularize the window openings on the side elevations by reopening infilled window openings and enlarging smaller openings. It also proposes to lower the sills of several first floor windows, and to install two new egress doors and a single residential entrance door with a minimal canopy.

On the roof, the application proposes to construct a combination stair tower and elevator overrun near the northeast corner, and a smaller stair tower at the southwest corner. A deck would be located at the center of the roof, set in from all sides. No materials are specified for the rooftop additions, which would be visible from the public right-of-way, and the staff suggests that they be clad in an inconspicuous, matte finish material.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 4107 MAIN ST

Proposal: Replace existing window and door with plate glass window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John and Annette McGovern

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut a rectangular storefront window from an existing double-hung window and door. Historically, this property would have had a single door and two double-hung windows, as it is part of Manayunk's residential history. Unlike many properties along Main Street that have had ground-floor alterations over the years, this property largely retains its historic residential character. Where the Commission has approved the installation of storefront windows in existing rectangular masonry openings in the past, it has required that those windows feature a two-lite transom above a plateglass window.

Following the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant revised the drawings to reflect some, but not all, of the concerns of the Committee. While the Committee asked for a high-quality storefront window, the revised drawings call for a pressure-treated wood frame window,

and provide no details on how that framing would appear or be installed. The drawings also call for new pressure treated wood framing around a new door, though the applicants have verbally indicated they do not intend to replace the existing door.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney William O'Brien and owner John McGovern represented the application.

Mr. O'Brien commented that Mr. McGovern and his wife have operated a certified public accounting firm in the adjacent building at 4109 Main Street for the last 25 years or so, and acquired this building last year. Mr. O'Brien noted that the prior retail use of the building was as an adult gift store, and that one of the reasons the McGoverns acquired it was to change the use. Mr. O'Brien explained that the change in grade from Main Street to the rear street, Station Street, is approximately nine feet. He noted that the owners have already made interior modifications and modifications to the rear, including elongating a rear deck and creating the primary entrance for the upper floor residential space on Station Street. The latter rendered the second door on the front façade unnecessary, and created a wider retail space which now has two doors and a window.

Mr. O'Brien distributed additional photographs of other properties along Main Street, which he argued had received similar modifications to the one proposed. He contended that the Architectural Committee had had three general requests: that the door and transom on the left remain; that the dimensions of the plate glass window mirror the exterior dimensions of the existing window and door; and that the storefront window be of wood rather than aluminum construction. He noted that, after the Architectural Committee meeting, the staff suggested that transom windows above the plate glass storefront window would be appropriate; he noted that such a feature is not present in many of the examples that he provided. He stated that the McGoverns are pleased to modify the application to include the transom, and asked that the Commission approve the application either with or without the transom, and then allow them to work with the staff on the details for final review.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that a new window could be approved, but not as proposed. He stated that it is very important that the staff review the details of the window framing, as the window shown in the application drawing would not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He noted that the current proposal shows a pressure treated 2x10 with some moldings slapped on the front and back. He stated that the detail needs to be developed, and the drawing needs to remove the cross section that shows a new front door being installed. He opined that a transom would be appropriate. Ms. DiPasquale asked Mr. McCoubrey and the other Commission members to suggest an appropriate storefront window system. Mr. McCoubrey responded that a wood system would be appropriate, but not a pressure treated wood system without a frame. The detail as shown would not work physically and would also not meet the Standards.

Ms. Cooperman noted that the existing northwest door does not appear to be historic. She asked if it is a steel door. Mr. O'Brien confirmed that it is. Ms. Cooperman clarified that Mr. McCoubrey is not suggesting that the existing door itself be retained, but the frame and transom. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the issue is that there are inconsistencies within the drawings, not that that particular door needs to be retained. Ms. Cooperman clarified that the historic material is the door frame and transom. Mr. O'Brien explained that some of the discrepancies in the drawings are a result of the fact that the draftsman does not speak English, and that he has to speak to him through a translator, but that the owners are on board to comply

with whatever details are specified. Mr. Thomas replied that, if there is a motion to approve, the staff will need to review the details of the storefront system for approval.

Mr. Thomas commented that the Historical Commission receives numerous requests to lower window sills and usually rejects such applications because the openings are historic. In this case, he opined, some alterations have already been made, including the insertion of a door in place of a window. He mused that a sill height of 18 to 24 inches would make a more successful and well-proportioned storefront window. Mr. McGovern responded that he thought the Commission wanted the storefront window to stay within the existing masonry openings. Mr. Thomas opined that it should stay within the opening width-wise, and asked Mr. McCoubrey's opinion. Mr. McCoubrey responded that lowering the sill slightly would be acceptable. Mr. Thomas reiterated his opinion that the proportions would be better with a lower sill, particularly with the installation of a transom. Mr. McGovern expressed his preference for no transom.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the installation of wood storefront window and transom, provided it is not pressure-treated wood, with the option of lowering the sill, with staff to review and approve details. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 4328 MAIN ST

Proposal: Construct commercial building with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bazemore Property II, LLC

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: Imminently dangerous; Demolished 2016

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story commercial building with roof deck on Main Street in the Manayunk Historic District. The historically designated building on this site was demolished in 2016, after it was declared imminently dangerous by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Main Street in Manayunk has a wide variety of architecture, and the staff suggests that the proposed building is compatible with the district in terms of massing, scale, and materials; however, the highly visible roof deck is not in keeping with the historic district and should be redesigned to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Additionally, the staff notes that the rear of this building will be a presence along the Manayunk Towpath, and therefore the first floor rear could be redesigned to look less like a service entrance.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney William O'Brien, architect Christian Jordan, and property owner Leonard Bazemore represented the application.

Ms. Chantry explained that the application has been revised since the Architectural Committee's reviews to reflect comments provided by both the Committee and staff.

Mr. O'Brien stated that it is a difficult site along the Manayunk Canal, as it is in the floodplain and requires two means of egress. He explained that the application was revised to show plantings at the deck railing, and to accurately depict the floor heights, which has raised the building height slightly on the rendering, taking the deck railing further from the street. He stated that the building height is 41 feet from the Main Street side, and 54 feet when factoring in the slope for the Manayunk Canal. He stated that the Manayunk Development Corporation's Executive Committee unanimously supports the project.

Mr. Bazemore commented that he owns two other buildings shown in the rendering, and has made a substantial personal investment in Manayunk without bank loans. He commented that he believes in the evolution of Manayunk.

Ms. Royer asked about the windows on the side wall. Mr. O'Brien responded that there will not be a lot consolidation, and Mr. Bazemore owns the one-story building adjacent to the side wall.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the penthouse and railing should be a lighter color, so that they blend with the sky.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Thomas asked about the revisions to the rear elevation. Mr. Jordan responded that the exhaust at the basement level was added. Mr. Thomas commented that the Manayunk Canal is a few years short of its 200th birthday. He stated that one of the efforts of other canal towns is to open the buildings to the canal as well as the street. He noted that other Main Street businesses have made the effort, and that this building could also open both ways. He commented that the rear elevation, while it has a lot of windows to provide views, is very much the back of a building at the ground level. Mr. O'Brien commented that the Manayunk Development Corporation has just completed a streetscape plan that includes the canal as well as Main Street, and it provided very specific recommendations that they intend to start looking to fund. He reiterated that the problem with this address is the proposed use as a restaurant and the floodplain requirements. Mr. Thomas responded that he understands floodplain requirements, but is suggesting that the rear elevation might be articulated in the treatment of the wall, and it may not have any windows, so that it does not feel like a blank wall. Mr. Jordan responded that he agrees, but the floodplain requirements necessitate the proposed design. He stated that he can articulate the rear wall with different colors of brick, or different textures, or insets, to give it some visual interest. Mr. Thomas suggested a design that "implies a massive floodwall, like pilasters and low arches." Mr. Jordan commented that the dog bakery on Main Street is also Mr. Bazemore's property and it opens to the Towpath, evidencing that they are sensitive to the concept. Mr. Thomas responded that the change of openings to the towpath will happen over time, building by building, but here is new construction, which offers a great opportunity to design it as such from the start. Mr. Bazemore commented that this is a golden opportunity to bring something substantial to Philadelphia residents. He stated that the prior building sat dilapidated for 25 years. Mr. Thomas agreed, and reiterated that these buildings do not have only one front.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the rooftop railing and penthouse are a lighter color, and the rear elevation is modified at the lower level to provide more visual interest and acknowledge the floodplain, with the staff to review details. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 236 S 21ST ST

Proposal: Legalize rooftop mechanical room and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Craig Sokolow

Applicant: 236 S 21st St Condominium

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the construction of rooftop additions. These additions house an array of solar collectors, mechanical functions and a stair. A portion of the addition features wide overhanging eaves and vinyl siding has visibility from 21st and Locust streets. The drawing, created for zoning does not accurately portray the shapes or materials of the additions. The additions could be lowered and modified to make them less visible from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Craig Sokolow represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that he had visited the site and that the owner agreed to modify the existing stairhouse to make it inconspicuous. Mr. Sokolow presented a revised drawing showing the modification described by Mr. Baron. Mr. Baron stated that, with the modification documented by the drawing, the staff supports the approval of the rooftop additions.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application to legalize the rooftop mechanical room and pilot house as documented in the drawing submitted to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 September 2017, owing to the fact that the additions will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 3701-03 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct stair tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: North Philly Works

Applicant: Maria Sourbeer, Shift Capital

History: 1927; National Bank of North Philadelphia, Beury Building; William Harold Lee, architect

Individual Designation: 11/27/1985

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the entrance as proposed, but approval of the remainder of the project, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10, with the following conditions:

- The staff reviews mock-up samples of the aluminum cladding and cast stone as well as the revised details for the entryway, transom, and sidelights for approval.
- The rooftop equipment is revised to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The louver on the stair tower is revised to have vertical proportioning.
- The stair tower should be clad in brick or brick panels to match the building.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate this building that has been vacant and neglected for many years and to construct a new stair tower addition on the north side. The proposal includes new aluminum windows to match the original wood windows and the restoration of the masonry and terra cotta elements. The window replacement will require the review of the details. The penthouse and roof will be re-clad in a metal to match the approximate the appearance of the original copper. The proposed stair tower will be visible from the north, but is placed in the least conspicuous location. The alternative materials for the roof and cladding of the penthouse should replicate the appearance of the copper color and shapes. The main doors are shown as aluminum and glass units that do not match the paneled doors shown in historic photographs. They should be revised to more accurately reflect the historic condition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Maria Sourbeer of Shift Capital, Anthony Noga of Kitchen & Associates, Jessica Clifford of JBCI Engineering, Kevin McMahon of Powers & Company and Colleen Bolden of Joseph Callahan represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the architect has revised the architectural plans to address all but two of the items mentioned in the Committee's recommendation. First, the louvers have been entirely removed from the stair tower. The mechanical units have been lowered. The entrance has been revised to more accurately reflect the historic photograph. Mr. Baron noted that the staff reviews of the mock ups have not yet occurred. Finally, the applicant would like to retain their proposal for cladding the stair tower with ground face block. Mr. Thomas congratulated the applicants for taking on this major building. He explained the importance of this building and intersection for the development of the city. He explained that he was in offices in this building in the 1960s, but that it later fell into ruin.

Mr. Noga handed out a sheet with pricing for the different material options for the stair tower. He noted four options including brick veneer, brick panels, block with a brick face, and ground face block. The ground face block is by far the least expensive. Mr. Baron pointed out the location of the stair tower on a photograph. He mentioned that the location for the new tower is against a wall with stucco facing. Mr. Thomas asked what stands between the tower and the street. Mr.

Noga responded that it is a three-story building housing a barber shop. Ms. Sourbeer explained that the new structure would be set way back from Broad Street; she added that they plan to build on the vacant lot, which would block views of the proposed stair tower. Mr. Noga showed a sample of the block proposed to clad the stair tower. He said they will try to match the color of the block with the brick on the historic building. Mr. McCoubrey said that he is in agreement with the use of the block if the color is correct. Ms. Cooperman stated that it should be inconspicuous.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the transom over the doors will be solid or glass. Mr. Noga said that they are doing further investigation once they remove the existing modern doorway. Mr. McCoubrey stressed the importance of the staff's review of the mock ups and shop drawings.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 228 RICHMOND ST

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Carlos Lopez

Nominator: Kensington & Olde Richmond Heritage, LLC

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 228 Richmond Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 228 Richmond Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. This nomination argues that the Jacob Deal frame half-gambrel house is a rare surviving example of the wooden houses associated with the early development of maritime Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Carlos Lopez represented the property. Oscar Beisert and Andrew Fearon represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert stated that he is working with the neighbors in this immediate area and that it remains one of the last intact sections of waterfront east of I-95. Much of the area, he contended, was destroyed by the construction of the highway. He noted that the owner objects to his property being individually designated and requested a continuance until the area is designated as a district. The owner, he claimed, would support the district nomination but would prefer not to have his property individually designated. Mr. Beisert then asked that the Commission honor the request and continue the matter, adding that he is in the final stages of completing the district nomination. He suggested that the Commission grant the continuance for three to six months to prevent the matter from continually appearing on Commission agendas.

Mr. Thomas explained that once a property is nominated, and the nomination has been considered correct and complete, the building is placed under the protection of the Historical Commission. Granting a continuance, he added, does not expose the building to any risk. He

further opined that when a property owner seeks to alter a nominated property prior to a determination by the Commission on whether or not to designate, the owner would need to submit a building permit application for the Commission's review. He reiterated that the owner would be amenable to the property's inclusion in a district but opposes individual designation.

Mr. Beisert interjected that the reason the district nomination has not yet been submitted is because it is being prepared by volunteers.

Mr. Fearon stated that he represents the River Wards community on preservation projects and works directly with the Fishtown Neighborhood Association, which is in full support of this effort to form a district. The district, he asserted, would protect a rare, disappearing fraction of the historic built environment that consists of the rare collection of wood-frame houses.

Mr. Farnham noted that the property owner, Carlos Lopez, is present. He expressed concern over the number of times the matter has been continued, commenting that Mr. Lopez has been incredibly patient with the designation process. Given that a district nomination is coming, he continued, and given that Mr. Lopez has been an excellent steward of his property, he questioned whether there is a reason to continue the nomination. He asked whether the nominators would consider withdrawing the nomination, adding that it has appeared over and over on the Commission's agendas and Mr. Lopez has continually traveled from his neighborhood to Center City to participate in the hearings. Without seeing a threat to the building, Mr. Farnham again asked the nominators to consider withdrawing the nomination in order to release the property owner from his frequent excursions to the meetings where he is required to wait until the end when old business is addressed. He reiterated that the owner has been an excellent steward and that the building may come under the Historical Commission's protection again in the relatively near future with the submission of the district nomination.

Mr. Beisert refused to withdraw the nomination and observed that certain matters have been continued much longer, such as the Overbrook Farms Historic District. Mr. Farnham again noted that Mr. Lopez is present at the meeting. Mr. Farnham asked Mr. Lopez to step forward and state whether he agrees with the nominators' continuance request.

Mr. Lopez answered that he prefers the path Mr. Farnham described. He commented that he has owned the property at 228 Richmond Street for 21 years and that in that time he did not sell the property, even during the 2006 real estate boom. Currently, he continued, there is another boom, though he still intends to maintain his property. He opined that there are similar properties in the neighborhood and that those properties, including that of his next door neighbor, were not included in the nomination. He stated that he does not understand why others believe he is going to demolish his property. He is not, he added, and read from page 21 of the nomination:

Perhaps the most comprehensive and representative ensemble of frame dwellings survives in Kensington. East of I-95 is a small component of the larger collection of wooden houses. With a combination of aerial imagery, field survey, and research, it is clear that nine wooden houses survived east of I-95 in 2014. Now only five of these buildings survive and the subject house and two others may soon be taken down for new development.

Mr. Lopez asked where this notion that he would demolish his home came from and again questioned why his next door neighbor, who has the same type of building, was not included in

the nomination. He again noted other buildings in the neighborhood of similar quality, including several that are older and include more original features.

Ms. Cooperman addressed Mr. Thomas and noted that the Commission has heard Mr. Lopez's testimony at past meetings. Mr. Lopez disagreed with Ms. Cooperman and asserted that the nomination falsely claims that only five of these wood-frame buildings survive.

Mr. Thomas stated that the issue in front of the Commission is whether or not to grant the continuance. Mr. Lopez responded that Mr. Farnham eloquently summarized the path he would like the Commission to take, adding that he would accept his property's designation as part of a district but that he feels targeted with the current proposed individual designation.

Mr. Gupta contended that Mr. Farnham's suggestion would be a reasonable approach in this instance. If the parties, he continued, are not willing to come to a reasonable compromise, the Commission could vote to deny the individual nomination in anticipation of a district nomination.

Ms. Cooperman suggested that the Commission, as it had done in the past, could vote to find that the property is worthy of designation but decline to designate at this time. Mr. Thomas explained that the Commission opted to make a similar decision on a matter regarding murals that were owned by the Archdiocese. In that case, he continued, there was evidence of good stewardship, and, although the Commission found that the murals were worthy of designation, they declined to designate. In this situation, he added, the Commission could designate in the future, after having already determined the property to be worthy of designation.

Mr. Mattioni urged the Commission to vote on the continuance request, suggesting that, if one is granted, the matter should be continued for a longer period of time to prevent the owner from having to return frequently for the meetings. He opined that the Commission could consider designating or declining to designate the property, but cautioned against finding the property worthy while declining to designate.

Mr. Gupta reiterated that two steps are required and the Commission will first need to vote on the continuance request. If denied, he continued, there can be a separate vote on designation.

Ms. Cooperman stated that, as chair of the Committee on Historic Designation, she concurs with the nominator's conclusion that the property is significant. If the Commission were to deny its significance now, she continued, the Commission would be in a position of having determined that the property is not significant, which could negate the cohort of buildings that will be included in a district nomination.

Mr. Thomas restated Ms. Cooperman's earlier suggestion that the Commission could find that the building is significant and meets the Criteria for Designation, but decline to designate until the district nomination is reviewed. He claimed that such a decision would allow the Commission to revisit the issue at any time and that it could choose to designate, since it would have already found the property worthy of designation.

Mr. Lopez commented that his understanding is that the district designation would be less restrictive than the current proposed individual designation. He indicated that, for that reason, he would prefer to wait for the district designation. Mr. Thomas responded that he did not believe that would be true and explained that any contributing property would be reviewed in the same manner as an individually designated property. Mr. Lopez replied that his understanding is based on conversations with Mr. Beisert. He requested clarification. Mr. Fearon clarified that in

the district nomination, he would like to define the period of significance as extending through the 1950s, which would mean that some of the twentieth-century alterations would not have to be reversed if these buildings were reviewed by the Historical Commission. Mr. Thomas questioned why the district's period of significance would extend through the 1950s. Mr. Fearon answered that he is advocating for a more flexible program that would be sensitive to owners and the process they would face. He explained that he wants to recognize the significance of this building type and to preserve it for future generations. He noted that he has outlined the significant contributors within the district and some of the alterations to those properties. The reality, he continued, is that many properties have been covered in vinyl siding and quilted stainless steel, suggesting that he is by no means asking that they be eliminated and the building be returned to its more historic appearance. Instead, he clarified, he is seeking a flexible, forward-looking program that enables minimal impact to the individuals currently living in the buildings and that the most important goal is to save the disappearing fraction of building stock.

Mr. Gupta commented that the Commission should evaluate a district nomination when it has the nomination under review. Mr. Thomas agreed, clarifying that if a property is nominated individually or as part of a district, the Commission does not compel an owner to remove features in place prior to designation, despite the period of significance.

Mr. Beisert stated that, in Fishtown and the larger Kensington area, there are some mid-twentieth-century features that are commonly seen on houses, the most notable in Fishtown being the quilted steel around windows. It adds local flavor, he contended, and he and Mr. Fearon are hoping to capture that flavor in the district nomination.

Mr. Thomas urged the Commission to determine how to move forward.

ACTION: Mr. Gupta moved to deny the continuance request. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 2. Commissioners Mattioni and Royer dissented.

Mr. Thomas explained that the continuance request has been denied and asked the Commissioners to consider taking a second action on the nomination.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination of the property at 228 Richmond Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, but that the Commission declines to designate, with the understanding that a district nomination is in process and may bring this property, along with others, before the Commission in the future. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Commissioner Mattioni dissented.

ADDRESS: 227 E ALLEN ST

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 227 E Allen, LLC

Nominator: Kensington & Olde Richmond Heritage, LLC

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 227 E. Allen Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 227 E. Allen Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. This nomination argues that the Jacob Deal frame dwelling is a rare surviving example of the wooden houses associated with the early development of maritime Philadelphia.

Prior to the nomination's April 2016 submission date, the owner had obtained a building permit for exterior alterations. The permit for this work was issued in October 2015. The work authorized under that permit may be undertaken without the Historical Commission's intervention or oversight.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorney Andrew Miller represented the property owner. Oscar Beisert and Andrew Fearon represented the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee on Historic Designation found that it needed to judge the case based on the materials before it, because no further information on the condition of the property was available.

Mr. Fearon asserted that this property is another example of the same vernacular architecture as 228 Richmond Street. In 2014, he continued, nine of this type survived between Spring Garden Street and Aramingo Avenue. He claimed that now there are only five and lamented that last month another wood-frame house was demolished on the other side of I-95, just three blocks from the nominated property. He opined that all the buildings along the waterfront in eighteenth-century Philadelphia were wood and that, by the late eighteenth century, approximately 70% are on record as being wood. That percentage, he continued, persisted into the early nineteenth century, and by the 1840s and 1850s, probably about 50 percent remained, despite ordinances trying to regulate the construction and reconstruction of wooden houses. Now, he claimed, probably less than one percent of wood-frame houses exist in the river wards, although this probably stands as a great example of that type. Mr. Fearon argued that, beyond the façade's vinyl siding is a perfectly intact wood-frame house dating to the 1830s and that it is an archetype of Fishtown and the surrounding area. He insisted these buildings are being lost on a monthly basis and that measures must be taken to preserve them or they will be lost forever.

Mr. Beisert explained that the house dates to approximately 1833 and was built by the Deal family as part of a larger development. Perhaps what is most significant about the property, he continued, is that it is a double-pile house, two rooms deep, with a central chimney. The design, he argued, is a much earlier form than that of many surviving Fishtown structures. He reiterated Mr. Fearon's statement that the building, being visible from Delaware Avenue, is part of an area where few wooden houses survive and that they represent a larger maritime context that was lost with the construction of I-95. He noted that more wooden houses exist west of I-95 but that

this small enclave of buildings represents the only intact neighborhood remaining on the waterfront that was not obliterated to allow for the highway's construction. He added that numerous examples of wooden house types were included in the nomination. Around the time of this building's construction, he commented, a law was passed in Kensington that banned people from importing wooden houses into the area, because people were moving wooden houses from Center City to the Kensington area.

Mr. Fearon showed an example of the joinery from a house that was demolished in July. He explained that it is a completely handmade joint and that he is still trying to understand some of the transitional technology that was involved. He concluded that the joinery was executed by either a carpenter or shipwright who would have been a member of the community and argued that the craftsmanship is what he is working to save.

Mr. Miller asserted that the nomination has been on the Commission's docket for quite some time, adding that an explanation of procedure is necessary. He inquired about some current photographs he had emailed to the staff and stated that he thought they would be part of the presentation. Ms. Keller responded that she did not have the digital files but that she had printed copies and would distribute them to the Commission members.

Mr. Miller proceeded to explain that on 5 October 2015, permits were granted for the erection of a three-story house at this property. The nomination, he noted, was submitted in April 2016 and, at the time, he interacted with the staff and was left with the belief that construction of those plans would proceed and the nomination would be moot. He described the work that has occurred in the interim, including substantial demolition, and that structural concerns have arisen with the existing structure. He stated that, consistent with the permitting already in place, he went back to the Department of Licenses & Inspections to amend the existing plans. He then contended that the Department would not allow changes to the existing permit, owing to the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Miller claimed he did not think any approval from the Commission was needed and that the nomination would be moot owing to the construction underway. He asserted that he had valid permits but now approval from the Commission is needed in order to return to the Department to revise the plan. Mr. Miller commented that the structural engineer is present and has rendered the opinion that the existing structure will not support the approved work. He added that the Department has the engineer's report but will not act without the Commission's approval. He asked the Commission to deny the nomination so that construction can continue. He contended that he believed he would simply report to the Commission when construction is complete, but that now he is asking for approval to modify existing plans. The plans, he argued, are not for a historic structure and that the projected photographs are misleading, because the property is in shambles.

Mr. Thomas inquired whether the owner is proceeding with construction as per approved plans and a valid permit. Mr. Miller affirmed. Mr. Thomas asked what changes were needed. Mr. Miller answered that the changes are structural and that the existing structure will not support the loads of the new structure. The original plan, he continued, envisioned utilization of the existing structural members, though he contended they cannot be used. Thomas asked if a complete replacement is necessary and whether it would require an amendment to the permit, with approval at the moment from the Historical Commission. Mr. Miller affirmed and added that the Department would have approved the amendment administratively if it had not been for this nomination. Mr. Thomas opined that the nomination of a property would cause the review by the Commission of any building permit applications and alterations, subsequent to the date notice was sent to the property owner. Mr. Miller agreed, but explained that the approved plan does not resemble the original house and is not in any way respectful of the historic concerns. Mr.

Thomas inquired whether Mr. Miller has submitted the engineer's report. Mr. Miller answered that he has not submitted the report to the Commission but that he has live testimony prepared. Mr. Thomas asked whether there are other photographs, observing that what he looked at appeared to have the same front of the building. Mr. Miller stated that it is identical.

Mr. Beisert stated that he finds Mr. Miller's explanation confusing and that he believes the property owner was approved to construct an addition. Now, he continued, the owner's representative is claiming that the plan was approved and the owner could move forward except for a structural issue. He commented that his understanding is that the only way forward is to reuse the building and add to the rear or to demolish the building to construct a new three-story building.

Mr. Fearon argued that there are usually numerous alterations to these types of properties, but the photographs show an unusual state of preservation.

Mr. Thomas referenced the Committee on Historic Designation minutes from the 14 September 2016 meeting and read the Committee's recommendation. He asked whether there has been any change at the property since that time.

Mr. Miller responded that the owner has permits to change the property and that those permits and plans have been submitted to the Commission and are currently being projected on the screen. He reiterated that if the owner were able to complete the project, there would be no historic concern with the property. He argued that the owner has that right and repeated that the problem is that the Department will not approve the amended plans to allow for the structural changes until the Historical Commission grants approval.

Mr. Thomas described Historical Commission cases when demolition or building permits were submitted prior to and following the mailing of a notice letter by the Historical Commission staff to notify the property owner of a pending nomination. He stated that, in a situation where a permit was issued prior to notice of a nomination, the nomination would be moot, because the permit would take precedence. In this specific case, he continued, the owner needs to be permitted for additional work not described in the initial permit and that the Historical Commission does have jurisdiction over that work and needs to address it.

Mr. Miller countered that he does not dispute the Commission's jurisdiction, but suggested that the Historical Commission is not designed to review with structural concerns and supplemental approvals necessary for the completion of a previously approved project. He clarified that the structural concern requires the installation of new framing members, which is work that the inspector typically reviews and approves, although the inspector will not approve the structural change owing to the fact that the Historical Commission is considering the nomination. He stated that he is suggesting that he does not believe that type of review is the intention of the statutory framework of this Commission and that it is easier for the Commission to decline to designate. He reiterated that the final project has nothing to do with the original condition of the property.

Mr. Thomas responded that the need to proceed with a change places the project in front of the Commission and that the building's material was part of the historic fabric of the building. He noted a recent financial hardship case that required the property owner to prove no feasible reuse existed and stated that Mr. Miller would need to file a similar application should the property be designated. If a property has been nominated, he continued, the Commission has a

responsibility to review permits. He contended that Mr. Miller needs to prove rather than simply state that the building is in a state of disrepair, and for that a report and plans are necessary.

Mr. Miller argued that, while he understands the example Mr. Thomas offered, the current property is subject to different circumstances and reminded the Commission that permits had already been issued. He stated that his client has a property interest in those permits and to complete the plans described. In order to complete the plans, he continued, the Department requested engineering and that engineering is completely separate from historic preservation. Instead, he contended, it has to do with safe construction. Mr. Miller again requested that the Historical Commission not micromanage an existing construction project. He asked that the Commission decline to designate, because the approved plans will be approved one way or the other and stated that he is not at the meeting to seek future approval from the Department. He reiterated that he has approval and that this is a question of how to complete the project. He again noted that the engineer is present and prepared to provide an account of the building's condition.

Ms. Cooperman responded that the Commission has designated properties in ruin. She added that what is before the Commission is the merits of the nomination.

Mr. Thomas agreed that the Commission is considering a case of designation and asked whether the nomination satisfies the Criteria. He observed that the building is standing today.

Mr. Gupta asked whether the Commission is considering designation based on the building's existence at the time of nomination or as it exists in the approved plans. He added that the building shown in the approved plans differs significantly from the building at the time of designation. Mr. Thomas summarized the owner's issue that he has approved plans but that he seems to be unable to proceed owing to a structural condition. He then opined that unless the owner can find a way to proceed with the approved plans without having to obtain an amended permit, then the matter comes before the Commission and it needs to determine whether or not to designate. He asserted that the owner's representative would need to return with a plan that represents the current condition.

Mr. Miller countered that the owner has a property interest in the completion of the existing plans. He reiterated that the Commission was never intended to micromanage the construction process and that the owner has a right to build what was permitted. The only reason he is currently before the Commission, he added, is because of the bureaucracy resulting in a checked box the Department's computer system that requires the applicant to get Historic Commission approval. What the plans permit, he reiterated, is not historic.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission has a nomination in front of it and that it is charged with determining whether the nomination of the building satisfies the Criteria for Designation. Mr. Miller reiterated that he is requesting that the Commission decline to designate the property because of the unique circumstances and that there are permits in place to construct a building that has no historical value whatsoever.

Ms. Cooperman commented that occasionally projects fall through, and what is before the Commission is the nomination's merits and the building as it exists today. The Commission, she continued, could find that the nomination satisfies the Criteria for Designation but decline to designate at this time. She added that the Commission could reach that decision, because there is no guarantee that the project will reach completion, though the property owner has the right to proceed with the project.

Mr. Miller responded that Ms. Cooperman's suggestion would work for the property owner, provided that it allows the owner to progress with the Department. He requested that the Commission decide to enable completion of the current plans pursuant to the current permits to give the owner the ability to return to the Department and allow the department to approve the structural change so the project can be completed. Ms. Cooperman countered that Mr. Miller is asking the Commission to do what he just claimed it cannot do. Mr. Miller clarified that Ms. Cooperman suggested that the permits may expire. He then stated that, if the owner were to complete construction pursuant to the permits, the Historical Commission should respectfully step aside. He suggested that the Historical Commission's resolution be that the nomination is meritorious but that it chooses not to act on the nomination and to be respectful of the owner's property interest in completion of the plans pursuant to the permits. As the Historical Commission, he continued, the Commissioners should not presume to limit the Department's discretion to permit modification of existing permits to complete an already approved project.

Mr. Thomas summarized Mr. Miller's request that the Commission would find that the nomination satisfies the Criteria for Designation but choose not to designate at this time, as it just did in the previous matter. He then stated that the Commission would monitor the site and, with property notice, could immediately designate the building because it would have been found worthy. In that scenario, he continued, the property owner would be able to proceed. Mr. Miller argued that the scenario does not benefit the property owner, because he needs the Department's inspector to approve construction. Mr. Thomas countered that the procedure he suggested means the property would no longer be under the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Miller asked whether the flag on the Department's system would be removed. Mr. Thomas affirmed.

Mr. Beisert stated that the property owner has a permit to construct an addition to the building but is now seeking to demolish the entire building. He argued that the change results in a very different project, which is not the same project. He reiterated the owner's predicament of having permits to build an addition and that he has reached an impasse because the building cannot support the load, but not, he suggested, because the building is structurally unsound. If the house were structurally unsound, he contended, the Department would have allowed the owner to demolish the building, regardless of the Historical Commission's authority.

Mr. Thomas asked that the facts be addressed and stated that the approved plans were not reviewed by the Historical Commission, because the building was not under the Commission's jurisdiction at the time. He then asked whether the plans show the demolition of the entire building. Mr. Miller answered that the plans do not, because the proposal is not for the demolition of the entire building. The plans, he continued, call for increased structural support on the side walls, because the existing side walls are insufficient to support the loads.

Mr. Thomas asked whether the building would maintain its existing appearance under the existing plans. Mr. Miller referred Mr. Thomas to the projected image being shown at the meeting and stated that it shows the approved permitted plan. Mr. Miller reiterated that the owner has the right to build what is depicted on the plans. He further reiterated that the building permitted under those plans is not historic and does not meet any of the Criteria for Designation.

James Duffin suggested that, if the Commission considers Ms. Cooperman's motion that it also includes in that motion that the decision is contingent upon the submitted and approved plans. That way, he continued, the Commission makes it clear that it understands that the building meets all the Criteria based on its present condition but that it chooses not to designate

because of the preexisting plans. If those plans should change, he added, the motion allows another opportunity for the Commission to review the nomination, although it appears that the owner intends to continue with the original permitted plans. He contended that the vote would be tied specifically to this case where there are preexisting plans approved prior to the Historical Commission sending notice to the owner.

Mr. Miller argued that the word “change” used by Mr. Duffin is problematic, because the owner has the right to complete these plans without the Commission’s intervention. However, he continued, if the permit should expire, he acknowledges that the Commission would have the opportunity to reassert its jurisdiction. He asserted that the project will be completed, but contended that he cannot constantly reappear before the Commission.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Commission regulates the exterior appearance of the building, not the interior, and that, while a structural change may require a permit revision, it is not visual. He opined that, if the Commission discovered a permit application related to a different activity other than producing the building approved for construction, then it can choose to designate. Ms. Cooperman stressed that the key element is the building’s external appearance.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor for comment from the public.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance does not have a substantive position on this particular case or the previous one, but he cautioned the Commission against the practice of finding that a building merits designation and then choosing not to designate. He added that the concept sets an unwieldy precedent and could compromise the integrity of future nominations and future recommendations by the Committee on Historic Designation. The practice, he continued, raises the possibility of the same motion occurring when no such extenuating circumstances exist. He reiterated his suggestion that the Commission exercise caution with its decision. If the building is meritorious, he added, it should be added to the Register without prejudice about what may be decided with this particular case. Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission must use its power very carefully.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. Mattioni moved that the Historical Commission reject the nomination for 227 E. Allen Street and refuse to designate the property as historic. Mr. Fink seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 5 to 6. Commissioners Cooperman, McCoubrey, Royer, Schaaf, Stanford, and Thomas dissented.

Mr. Fearon interjected that this is his neighborhood and buildings are being lost left and right. He argued that the matter should not be a question of the Commission’s jurisdiction and that it should exercise its power to decide whether these buildings need to be saved. He asked that the Commission consider that this is a real opportunity to save one of these important structures. It may not be the most glamorous building, he continued, but it is what remains and is the last of these wooden houses. Today, he added, the Commission has the power to designate the property, and he stated that he does not understand what is stopping it from doing that. Some Commissioners responded that, regardless of the Commission’s action today, this building will likely be substantially altered. Mr. Miller claimed that he does not disagree with Mr. Fearon’s statement, adding that the Commission does have the power to designate. He questioned whether that would be a meaningful act and argued that the meaning of designation matters. He then disagreed with Mr. Fearon’s claim that the Commission has the ability to save the property and contended that the property is gone because permits are already in place. He commented that the nation recognizes property rights and his client has a property right in those

permits. He then reiterated that he is not before the Commission to gain permission to alter the outward appearance but that he is present because the Department will not act.

Mr. Thomas acknowledged Mr. Miller's argument, again stating that the Commission understands the situation. He noted that at the moment, the Commission has a failed motion not to designate the property. He asked for another motion.

MOTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 227 E. Allen Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, I, and J, but that, owing to unusual circumstances, the Historical Commission declines to designate the property while noting that it is worthy of designation and should the permits expire or the project change in any substantial way, it could be nominated again for designation. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion.

Mr. Schaaf asked for clarification on the inclusion of Criterion I, stating that it was not in the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Cooperman answered that it was a strong recommendation of the Committee's archaeologist that the waterfront properties are highly likely to contain for archaeological remains.

City attorney Leonard Reuter asked whether the Commission is suggesting that it can automatically designate the property if the permitted project changes or falls through. Under such circumstances, he continued, a new nomination would need to be submitted. The current motion would still be a denial of the nomination and he asked for clarification, because it seems there is a tremendous amount of confusion. To clarify, Mr. Reuter added, any conditions the Commission places on the denial will have value in terms of how it may approach a new nomination in the future, but it would have no legal impact whatsoever.

Ms. Cooperman countered that there is a fundamental difference between finding that the property merits designation and finding that the property does not. Mr. Reuter agreed that it is important for the Historical Commission to record its findings of the present nomination and to be consistent in a future action, but he added that the Commission is not bound by any previous action. Mr. Reuter stated that no change could occur at the property within the next six years, but a new nomination could be submitted and could change the current understanding of the property. Should that happen, he contended, the Commission would not be bound by the additional language of Ms. Cooperman's motion. Ms. Cooperman asserted that without that precedent, it would be much more difficult to view a later nomination in any kind of favorable way. Mr. Reuter clarified that he wants the Commission to understand that the additional language in the motion has no legal impact. Ms. Cooperman responded that the additional language simply notes that the property is worthy of designation. She stated that she has included it for the record. Mr. Reuter replied that he wants the Commission to clearly understand that the motion is for denial and is essentially the same as the previous motion, which just failed. Ms. Cooperman argued that the motion is different, because it recognizes that this property is worthy of designation, whereas the previous motion did not recognize the property as being worthy of designation.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Cooperman to restate her motion. Ms. Cooperman began restating her motion. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance interrupted to ask that the Commission explore the implications of designation. If the Commission agrees with Mr. Miller's contention that designation will not prevent the property owner from following through on the permitted plans, then it could go ahead and designate today without stopping construction. Mr. Thomas observed that what Mr. Steinke is proposing is not in the motion that is currently on the table. Mr. Steinke concurred, but continued his argument. If a motion is offered to designate and it is

voted onto the Register, he claimed, then the history of this property will be preserved and elevated in a way that it would not otherwise be. He contended that it would be a designated building that would be lost owing to unique circumstances, but the history of that building would be preserved in the Historical Commission's records in perpetuity. Mr. Steinke argued that there is value in designating the property, even if it means acknowledging that the building will be lost, simply because it is an important part of Philadelphia's history. He noted that the Committee on Historic Designation has already recommended the property for designation, giving it the pedigree as a designated building. He asserted that designation forever enshrines the property in the city's history in a way that the current motion does not. Others disagreed and noted that the history of the property will be recorded in the Commission's archives regardless of the outcome of this review.

Ms. Cooperman stated that the Commission needs to exercise caution with the power it wields, and, if it were able to fully plan, survey, and designate all the properties it should in a timely fashion, it would be under much more ideal circumstances. Receiving nominations for buildings that already have permits for substantial alterations, she continued, is not an ideal circumstance. She further contended that the Commission is a City agency and needs to honor the City process. She opined that in a perfect world she would like to see every worthy property designated, adding that there are other circumstances at play here. She suggested that designation is not a particularly useful tool in this specific circumstance, although those circumstances may change in the future.

Mr. Farnham repeated Ms. Cooperman's motion.

ACTION: By a vote of 10 to 1, the Historical Commission adopted Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Gupta's motion to find that the property at 227 E. Allen Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, I, and J, but that, owing to unusual circumstances, the Historical Commission declines to designate the property while noting that it is worthy of designation and should the permits expire or the project change in any substantial way, it could be nominated again for designation. Mr. Mattioni dissented.

Ms. Stanford asked whether there is a mechanism to monitor the site. Mr. Thomas answered that there is no formal mechanism, but the Commission works closely with neighborhood groups and concerned citizens. He stated that he assumes this is a matter of extreme importance to people in that area and that they would continue to bring this matter to the Commission's attention.

David Traub of Save Our Sites spoke out of turn, claiming there was no opportunity for public comment during the last review, despite the fact that several members of the public spoke. Mr. Thomas replied that he requested public comment numerous times and that Mr. Traub did not respond. He allowed Mr. Traub to speak on the condition that he limited his comments. Mr. Traub commented on the two previous properties that the Commission declined to designate and stated that circumstances change. The owner of 228 Richmond Street, he observed, has been a good steward of the property for many years, but circumstances may prompt him to sell the property. That particular property, he continued, has a one-story garage next door, so there is potential for both buildings to be demolished and a developer to build a larger structure. He suggested that the Commission be vigilant and careful in these instances, because what happens in the future remains unknown.

CLG COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

HOWELL & BROTHERS PAPER MANUFACTORY, 2101 WASHINGTON AVENUE

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 2101 Washington Avenue, known as the Howell & Brothers Paper Hangings Manufactory. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

According to the nomination, the Howell & Brothers Paper Hangings Manufactory, located in Philadelphia's Graduate Hospital neighborhood, consists of seven interconnected sections constructed in stages between 1865 and 1970. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion A and notes that Howell & Brothers Paper Hangings Manufactory both contributed to wallpaper printing technology and widely distributed its products throughout the country.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.

Ms. Cooperman asked which National Register Criterion were proposed in the nomination. Ms. Keller clarified that the nomination posits that the property satisfies Criterion A.

The Commissioners discussed the National Register nomination and determined that it should be supported. Mr. Thomas commented that his firm has researched this building and determined that it remains intact. In terms of integrity, he continued, there were numerous additions over time. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Schaaf if the building was identified in the Phila2035 district plan. Mr. Schaaf answered that he was unsure whether the building was specifically called out in the plan for potential adaptive reuse, but added that the City Planning Commission has previously reviewed schemes for the building's reuse and that it would be very advantageous for the owner to receive tax credits for the property. He added that he was struck by the company's history and especially that of the 1865 mill building. He discussed the many building campaigns at the complex and longevity of the early building. Ms. Cooperman commented that the property would not qualify under Criterion C for its design significance but would qualify under Criterion A for its long history of industrial use. Mr. Schaaf added that it holds significance for its contribution to the heritage of Washington Avenue, particularly from 25th Street to Broad Street. Mr. Thomas commented that those blocks were associated with the area's industry and the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Baltimore Railroad. City attorney Leonard Reuter asserted that the property has been part of a court case for approximately two years, owing to numerous violations, though many have been resolved. He remarked that it is important for the City and for the Department of Licenses and Inspections that the building be redeveloped.

The Historical Commission recommended placing the property at 2101 Washington Avenue on the National Register of Historic Places.

FRANKFORD ARSENAL BOUNDARY DECREASE

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register boundary decrease for the Frankford Arsenal. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews nominations and district boundary changes before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination and district boundary change from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register documents. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

According to the document proposing the district boundary decrease for Frankford Arsenal, the property was listed for its significant contributions to the development of small arms and artillery munitions for the US military (Criterion A), as well as for its architectural and engineering merit (Criterion C). While the area of Frankford Arsenal to the west of Baird Street continues to convey this significance, the east side no longer retains integrity owing to the near-complete demolition of the buildings and structures associated with the Arsenal, which began in 1975 and largely concluded in 2012. Therefore, the listed boundary is being reduced to the area bounded by Bridge Street, Frankford Creek, Baird Street, and Tacony Street, extending to include the Arsenal wall along Tacony Street, from Baird Street east to the current boat launch access road, with its incorporated machine gun tower. The area west of Baird Street retains 52 resources, which represent all period of construction from the Arsenal's establishment through the Korean War/Cold War eras, and retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the Arsenal as a pioneer in munitions research and development, and for its architectural and engineering merit.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the National Register amendment to the Historical Commission. Ms. DiPasquale presented a series of questions posed to the Historical Commission in regards to the amendment.

The Commissioners discussed the National Register district amendment and determined that it should be supported. Mr. Thomas opined that the remaining buildings within the revised property boundary continue to satisfy the original criteria for the listing of the district on the National Register of Historic Places, National Register Criteria A and C. He noted that similar properties in Philadelphia that reflect similar themes or patterns include the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, where many historic military buildings have been preserved and adaptively reused.

Mr. Thomas recounted a personal story about participating in the annual bicycle ride of the Pennsylvania Environmental Council, which traveled from Bristol to Philadelphia through the Arsenal. He opined that the remaining buildings are quite beautiful and that the property within the boundary decrease retains its integrity. He opined that new development on the now-vacant land would reinforce the use of the property.

Regarding character-defining features, Mr. Thomas noted that, as with many military installations, the Arsenal was subject to multiple building campaigns, each of which is represented within the proposed boundary revision. The remaining buildings represent a mix of different architectural styles and types that convey the long history of the Arsenal. Mr. Thomas also noted that there is a wonderful green that retains its historic context.

Ms. DiPasquale explained that a small portion of the Arsenal, centered around the green, was designated in 1960, and that the Historical Commission's staff has explored the idea of expanding that boundary to include more of the buildings on the site. She also noted that that recommendation was included in the Phila2035 Riverwards District Plan. The Arsenal has been included in numerous municipal and regional plans since its closure in 1977. Most recently, in addition to the Phila2035 Riverwards District Plan, the Arsenal was included in the Lower Frankford Creek Watershed Brownfields Area Wide Plan, and the Philadelphia Trail Plan, and the portion of the Arsenal proposed for removal from the National Register boundary is being actively marketed for commercial/industrial use by the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation.

Mr. Thomas also noted that his mother graduated in Physics from Temple University in 1946 and immediately got a job designing machine guns at the Arsenal.

The Historical Commission recommended that the boundary of the Frankford Arsenal National Register designation should be amended as proposed.

EAST CENTER CITY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AMENDMENT/BOUNDARY INCREASE

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register amendment/boundary increase of the East Center City Commercial Historic District. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

The East Center City Historic District, listed in the National Register in 1984, identified an area of downtown Philadelphia characterized by its dense, heterogeneous mixture of building scales and types in styles that range from vernacular examples to multiple high-style works by prominent designers based in Philadelphia and elsewhere. While it is predominantly commercial in its buildings' uses and types, the district notably includes residential and formerly residential buildings, institutional, industrial, and government buildings. One of the characteristics of the district is the mixture of commercial building types. The period of significance was defined for the district as beginning in 1799 and ending in 1934 in accordance with the 50-year rule, although multiple buildings constructed after 1934 were listed as both significant in and contributing to the district. The purpose of this Added Information is to reevaluate buildings constructed between 1934 and 1970, and to extend the original boundary to include buildings

omitted in the earlier designation effort that are appropriately included according to the characteristics of the District as it was defined in the original nomination.

According to the statement of significance, the East Center City Commercial Historic District possesses significance under Criterion A in the area of Commerce, for its important association with the history of banking, hotels, small and large retail facilities, and other commercial uses through its concentration in this portion of the city in the 19th and 20th centuries before the Bicentennial. Additionally, the District possesses significance under Criterion C in the area of Architecture for its representative examples of styles that range from the turn of the 19th century through the 1960s. The additional documentation includes commercial buildings on the northern edge (900-1300 blocks Market Street; 900 block Ludlow Street), the eastern edge (bounded by Market Street, Independence Mall West, Chestnut Street, and 7th Street), the southern edge (Jefferson University Hospital Campus buildings), and the southwestern edge (1300 block Locust Street, 200 block S. 13th Street, 1300 block Chancellor Street). The registration form also suggests reclassifications from “intrusion” to “contributing” for sixteen buildings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas and Ms. Cooperman recused, owing to their respective firms’ work with the owner of the property. Ms. Chantry presented the National Register amendment to the Historical Commission.

Ms. Chantry noted that several of the buildings included in the amendment are listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, or are pending listing on the Philadelphia Register.

The Commissioners discussed the proposed National Register district amendment and determined that it should be supported. Ms. Turner commented that the buildings are significant under National Register Criterion A in the area of Commerce, and Criterion C in the area of Architecture. Mr. Farnham commented that there are other similar buildings, such as buildings in the Center City West Commercial Historic District. Mr. Schaaf requested an amended map of the district boundary. He commented that the City Planning Commission staff can inform an applicant if their property is located in a National Register Historic District, but a map is necessary to do so. Mr. Farnham commented that the area is not a locally designated historic district, but that some of the properties are already listed individually on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf commented that this area is mentioned in the Phila2035 District Plan for Central Philadelphia. He asked about the 16 buildings proposed to be reclassified from “intrusions” to “contributing” and noted that it is positive that these buildings are now being valued. He cited 1020 Market Street as an example of a building that was not always appreciated for its architecture.

The Historical Commission recommended that the boundary and inventory of the East Center City Commercial National Register Historic District should be amended as proposed.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 12:00 p.m., Mr. Schaaf moved to adjourn. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match

the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

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

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§ 14-1004(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

- (a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;
- (b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
- (c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- (d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
- (e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;
- (f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;
- (g) Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;
- (h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;
- (i) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or
- (j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.