

**THE MINUTES OF THE 721ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

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

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

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

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Supervisor
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Supervisor
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Callan Devery
Sophie Zionts
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Jane Nasta
Allison Weiss, SoLo
John Athanasiadis

Priyanka Gorasia
Elizabeth Donison
Doug Thomas
Steven Peitzman
Logan Ferguson
Matt Skolnik
Edward Brittingham
Joy Gordon
Mike Kitsios
Jeff Wyant
Rich Villa
Dustin Dove
Dan Alampay
Laurie Wexler
Chuck Long
Terry McNally
Devon Beverly
Anusha Khansaheb
Ali Volpe
Alyson Rock
Nick Kraus, Heritage Consulting Group
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Nancy Pontone
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Colin Cohan
Madelyn Koch
Justino Navarro
Yevgeny Desyatnik
Jay Farrell
Alex Balloon
Matt Taylor
David Berch
Richard Camitta
Anusha Khansaheb
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Matthew McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Calvin Nguyen
Meagan Kearney
Leechen Zhu
Celia Jailer, Hidden City
Anusha Khansaheb
Kathleen Conlon
Joe Lombardi
Susan Thomas
David Hollenberg
Patricia Freeland
Sergio Coscia
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.

Meredith Trego, Esq., Ballard Spahr

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 720TH STATED MEETING, 12 AUGUST 2022

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:40

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 720th Stated Meeting, held 12 August 2022. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 720th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 August 2022. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 720th Meeting					
MOTION: Adoption of minutes					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 AUGUST 2022

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:10

DISCUSSION:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 539-41 N. 22nd Street. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda MOTION: Approval of Consent Agenda MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

AGENDA**ADDRESS: 1915 SPRUCE ST**

Proposal: Add front gate, rear addition with garage, and roof deck with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jennifer and Paul McLean

Applicant: Jeffrey Wyant, Wyant Architecture

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for alterations to the front and rear elevations and the addition of a roof deck with pilot house at 1915 Spruce Street. The property is contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The original building was constructed circa 1870 in the Italianate Style. In 1925, the front facade was reconstructed in the Colonial Revival Style. The historic district inventory recognizes the 1925 facade as a contributing element to the property's design.

The proposed changes to the front façade include the addition of a front metal gate within the entryway area. The application proposes replacing the second and third-story windows with two-over-two windows and installing new iron balconies in place of the existing ones. Photographs from 1947 and 1950 provide visual evidence that the front balconies were likely installed as part of the 1925 façade alteration. The photographs show that six-over-six windows were in place in the 1940s which would have been historically compatible with the Colonial Revival facade.

At the rear of the property along Manning Street, the application proposes to remove a number of non-historic, later additions including a fire escape, garage, section of building facing Manning Street, and a one-story breezeway structure. A new addition with garage is proposed for the areas of demolition. A new roof deck and pilot house would be added to the building's rear ell.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Add metal gate at the front entry area.
- Replace second and third-story front windows.
- Replace and reconfigure windows on the side elevation.
- Removal of existing metal four-story fire escape.
- Demolition non-historic sections of the rear façade.
- Construct a wider garage and an addition at the second and third floors (above the proposed garage).
- Enlarge a masonry opening at the fourth-floor rear elevation for access to a new roof deck at fourth level.
- Removal of an existing pilot house.
- Construct new roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 4: Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.*
 - o The front balconies were added when the façade was redesigned in 1925 and should be preserved rather than replaced to meet Standard 4.
 - o Although the building may have originally had two-over-two windows, the reconstruction of the façade in 1925 changed the style of the front façade to Colonial Revival. As part of this significant change, six-over-six windows were added at the second and third floors. To meet Standard 4, the replacement windows should be a six-over-six on the front façade.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed new addition and alterations on the rear façade replace non-historic additions. The massing, size, scale, and architectural features are compatible with the historic building; therefore, it meets Standard 9.
 - o Although the front gate introduces a new element to the historic facade, the setback in the entry vestibule minimizes the visual impact to the building's historic character. The front gate should be installed in a manner that does not damage historic materials in order to meet Standard 9.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed rear alterations could be removed from the historic building the future, leaving the historic building intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The roof deck does not alter the historic slope of the roof and is set back from the roofline. The design of the roof deck and pilot house is compatible with the historic building. The pilot house and deck will not be visible from Spruce Street and will be minimally visible from Manning Street, therefore it meets the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the historic balconies are maintained, and the front replacement windows are compatible with the Colonial Revival Style, pursuant to Standards 4, 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted but approval if the requested revisions are made and information is provided, pursuant to Standard 4, 9, and 10, and Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:07:08

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Jeffrey Wyant represented the revised application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The application has been revised in response to the Architectural Committee's comments. The changes include the following:
 - o The second and third-floor windows were updated from two-over-two to six-over-six double-hung windows to be compatible with the 1925 Colonial Revival Style façade renovation.
 - o The design of the front entry gate has been revised and the associated drawings include more design details. The new gate design is visually more consistent with the existing ironwork balconies.
 - o Lower paneling has been added to conceal roof deck framing and aligned top of paneling with bottom of the deck. As part of this update, the deck railing is now a metal picket railing.
 - o The alcove opening on the fourth floor has been removed and the revised opening is now aligned with the rear wall. Also, the size of the opening has been reduced.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The replacement windows on front façade will be six-over-six double-hung windows; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 4.
- The proposed new addition and alterations on the rear façade replace non-historic additions. The massing, size, scale, and architectural features are compatible with the historic building. Although the front gate introduces a new element to the historic facade, the setback in the entry vestibule minimizes the visual impact to the building's historic character. The front gate design is compatible with the existing balconies on the front façade that appear to date to the 1925 rehabilitation; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 9.
- The proposed rear alterations could be removed from the historic building the future, leaving the historic building intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.
- The roof deck does not alter the historic slope of the roof and is set back from the roofline. The designs of the roof deck and pilot house are compatible with the historic building. The pilot house and deck will not be visible from Spruce Street and will be minimally visible from Manning Street; therefore, the roof deck and pilot house proposal meet the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 4, 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1915 Spruce St MOTION: Approve revised application MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

ADDRESS: 539-41 N 22ND ST

Proposal: Amend approval

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: JLM Investment Group, LLC

Applicant: Augusta O'Neill, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1859

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to amend an application for 539-41 N 22nd Street, which the Historical Commission approved in August 2021. The revisions since the last approval include the removal of the rear ells instead of their repair, the installation of brick veneer on the front façade instead of the restoration of the original brick, and the replacement of front cornice.

This application proposes to convert a single wide building back to its historic form of two residential row houses. The parcel at 539-41 N. 22nd Street was two separate properties with two separate row houses until the 1930s, when an owner purchased both buildings and consolidated them into one. Historic maps and deeds indicate the buildings were combined into a single building sometime between 1931 and 1942. Despite the merging of these properties, the original cornice and majority of front façade window and door openings remain in place. Permastone was installed over the brick on the front facade in 1951. The application proposes to rehabilitate the front elevation to be more compatible with the historic district and the 1859 appearance.

The amended application proposes demolition of the existing rear ells and construction of three-story additions in their place. Zoning records (Figure 5) show this area has been altered over time and is a combination of brick and frame construction. It is presently clad in white vinyl siding. Since the review in 2021, the condition has been assessed by a structural engineer and the applicant is now requesting full demolition of these areas with new construction rather than rehabilitation.

This application also proposed amending the scope of work for the front façade. During the review of the 2021 application, a small section of Permastone was removed and the brick beneath it was restored. The Historical Commission's earlier approval encouraged the applicant to restore the historic brick behind the Permastone. This application requests to remove the Permastone and install a brick veneer over the historic brick rather than restore it, owing to concerns about the condition of the historic brick. The removal and replacement of the historic cornice is also proposed.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- This application seeks to amend the following elements of the previously approved application:
 - o Demolish rear ells owing to condition and construct three-story new additions.
 - o Install brick veneer on front façade.
 - o Remove the historic cornice and replace it in kind.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - o The removal of the PermaStone material on the front façade is appropriate as it was added in 1951 and outside the period of significance for the historic district.
 - o The original cornice and front façade window and door openings shall be maintained.
- *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.*
 - o The applicant removed additional PermaStone to reveal the deteriorated condition of the original brick facade. The application notes that front layer of brick will be removed, and a brick veneer will be installed for replacement. To meet Standard 6, the staff recommends that a full brick is used for the replacement. The brick and mortar should match the building's original masonry.
 - o To meet Standard 6, the applicant should submit information to support the removal of cornice. Replacement shop drawing showing that a matching cornice will be installed should be submitted.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o To meet Standard 9, the applicant has submitted a structural engineer's letter, detailing the structural reasons for removal of the existing eels. The proposed replacement additions were approved by the Historical Commission in 2021.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the requested amendments, with the staff to review the following details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

- An assessment of the condition of the front cornice. If it is deteriorated beyond repair, it should be replaced in kind with shop drawings submitted for approval.
- Proposed replacement brick and mortar submitted for approval. Mockup to be reviewed for approval on site by the staff.
- Revised front façade drawing submitted for approval. The elevation drawing shall confirm the historic location, details, and dimension of the window and door openings. For windows, this must include the openings, header, and sill.
- Shop drawings submitted for approval for new windows and new front entrance including door, transom, and moldings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 416-24 VINE ST

Proposal: Demolish building; construct six-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robert W. McMillan

Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1940

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for the construction of a six-story building at 416-24 Vine Street. The existing 1-story building was constructed circa 1940 and is classified as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. The proposed project includes the demolition of the existing building and construction of a 70-unit, 65-foot-tall multifamily building with ground floor commercial space. The demolition of the existing non-contributing can be approved without a hardship or public necessity finding. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

The property is located at the southwest corner of Vine Street and N. Lawrence Street. The surrounding buildings in this area of the historic district range in height from three to six stories and are clad in red brick. The new building's exterior design references nearby historic industrial buildings. The building's cladding is proposed as a combination vertical and horizontal cement fiber board. A dark gray cement fiber board will be used on the first level and the upper levels will be a medium gray color cement board. All windows will be aluminum clad on the exterior.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing building.
- Construct new six-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The massing, size, and scale of the proposed building are compatible with nearby industrial buildings in the historic district and surrounding neighborhood. Although the architectural features and detailing are a combination of historic and modern elements, in general they are compatible with the historic district. However, the exterior cladding and color scheme are not compatible with the historic district. If the color scheme and cladding materials are revised to be compatible, the application could satisfy Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the exterior color scheme and cladding are revised to be compatible with the historic district, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:13:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Rich Villa represented the revised application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The application has been revised in response to the Architectural Committee's comments. The changes include the following:
 - o The overall color scheme of the upper floors has been revised to a medium gray "stone" color.
 - o The number of quarter round windows has been reduced. The remaining quarter round windows are now tucked into the corners at the top of the building.
 - o The designs of the cornices and pilasters have been revised to strengthen the pattern on the building façade.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The massing, size, architectural features, and scale of the proposed building are compatible with nearby industrial buildings in the historic district and surrounding neighborhood. Although the architectural features and detailing are a combination of historic and modern elements, in general they are compatible with the historic district; therefore, the application satisfies Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the revised application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 416-24 Vine St MOTION: Approve revised application MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

ADDRESS: 2204 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct 10-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Flamingo Bay Investments LLC

Applicant: Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos Architecture

History: 1870; Furness & Hewitt; Refaced c. 1960

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-contributing building and construct a 10-story, mixed-use, commercial, and residential building at 2204 Walnut Street in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District. The overall height of the building would be 117 feet.

In 2019, the Historical Commission approved a two-story rooftop and rear addition for the existing four-story building. The addition would have been set back from the front façade.

In June 2022, the Historical Commission reviewed an application proposing the demolition of the existing building on the property and the construction of a new building. While the demolition was approved, the Historical Commission voted to deny the new building for the following reasons:

- The historic buildings in the immediate area of 2204 Walnut Street are between three and five stories in height. At 10 stories and 117 feet tall, the proposed building is too tall and therefore not compatible with the streetscape or historic district.
- The colors of the historic buildings in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District are typically muted earth tones. The proposed building is white. The color of the proposed building is too bright.

Since the June review, the color of the proposed building has been adjusted and is now more of an earth tone like the extant building. The design of the upper stories has been revised, but the building's height has not changed. The party walls have been articulated. These changes were reviewed at the August 2022 meeting. After much discussion at the August 2022 meeting, the Commission voted to table the application for one month so the application team could speak to interested parties about revising the design. The applicants have submitted a newly revised application for review at the September 2022 Historical Commission meeting.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing building.
- Construct 10-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o At 10 stories and 117 feet tall, the proposed building is not compatible with the streetscape or historic district. The historic buildings in the immediate area are between three and five stories in height. The application does not comply with Standard 9. The height of the proposed building should be reduced to a maximum of six stories, with the upper two stories set back from the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the demolition but denial of the new construction, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:19:50

RECUSAL:

- Ms. Washington recused because the organization for which she works has retained the attorney representing this application for an unrelated matter.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Sergio Coscia and attorney Michael Phillips represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Coscia explained the revisions made to the building's design since the August 2022 meeting of the Historical Commission. He said they relocated what was the ninth-floor unit to the rear of the building. Mr. Coscia stated that they did not increase the height of the building but relocated the ninth-floor unit to what was previously a terrace for a penthouse. He continued that this effectively lowered the perceived building height from street level and reduced the impact of the building on Walnut Street without making it any taller. Mr. Coscia said they further developed the

building's party walls. He pointed out that the previous version showed texture but noted the most recent update further articulated the walls to give them more presence. Mr. Coscia noted that the renderings show how the building massing has been revised and that the eighth floor now appears, from street level, as the top of the building rather than the ninth floor. He also clarified the revised setback dimensions.

- Mr. Phillips observed that the Historical Commission reviewed this project at length last month. He said the most significant change is that the view from the streetscape has been minimized and is now more compatible with the historic district. Mr. Phillips added that he thought the proposed design was acceptable at the August 2022 meeting but believes the recent updates have enhanced the compatibility. He wished to stress that this has been a process and that, through the changes to the setbacks and materials, this building will not detract from the nearby historic resources. Mr. Phillips pointed to the renderings which show the height that develops along Walnut Street as you move west. He concluded that this revised application is consistent with that development and believes the application has benefitted from the most recent changes.
- Mr. Mattioni said he considered the original design to be appropriate but there were concerns voiced about the building's exterior color and additional elements. He stated that the applicant has addressed all of the issues raised primarily based on the streetscape views. Mr. Mattioni concluded that he is ready to approve the revised the proposal and believes it meets most, if not all, the objections raised at the August Commission meeting.
- Ms. Cooperman said she appreciates the changes to the application but still finds that the building is too big for this location. She agreed that it has been improved by the setbacks, but the massing is still too large. Ms. Cooperman pointed out that the height of the building is the reason projects at this location have not been approved in the past. She added that the current proposal had not changed in any meaningful way with regard to the Standards and to the impact on the historic district. Ms. Cooperman recognized there are taller buildings in this part of the district but observed that there is a consistent height on this particular block. She concluded, that, in her opinion, the Historical Commission's job is not just to safeguard individual buildings but districts as a whole, and she believes this building would be too tall and too prominent for the district.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that they are not opposed to the revised application as presented. He said that, although they view the project as less than ideal, primarily owing to its tall height, they recognize that this location is on the edge of the historic district. Mr. Steinke added that it is on a block of Walnut Street that has transitioned during the twentieth century from a residential block to one that is a combination of residential, commercial, and mixed use and one that will continue to evolve.
- Whitney Covalle, a resident of 2200 block of St. James Place, opposed the application.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites opposed the application.
- Steven Peitzman opposed the application.
- Julie Motl, a resident of 2200 block of St. James Place, opposed the application.
- Dustin Dove supported the application.
- Oscar Beisert opposed the application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revisions to the ninth floor have reduced the appearance of building height from the public right-of-way.
- The design of the party walls has been improved with additional articulated.
- The height of building remains at 117 feet.
- The overall revised design responds to concerns raised in earlier reviews in June and August 2022.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed building is located on the northern boundary of the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. While the historic district is primarily composed of low-rise residential buildings, this section of Walnut Street has transitioned away from strictly residential use and evolved toward more mixed-use and commercial buildings that have altered the historic character of the block. Owing to this and revisions made by the applicant to make the proposed building more compatible with the historic block, the application meets Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the revised application, provided the striated metal paneling on the stair tower is replaced with a more compatible material, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 3.

ITEM: 2204 Walnut St MOTION: Approve revised with condition MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair		X			
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman		X			
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel		X			
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington				X	
Total	6	3		1	3

ADDRESS: 2301 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Name of Resource: Rothacker-Orth Brewery and Lager Beer Saloon

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Fairmount LG Holdings LLC

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2301 Fairmount Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the property has significant interest or value as part of the development, heritage, and cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or Nation, as a survivor of the early stage in the development of the city's lager brewing industry, for which Philadelphia was nationally known by the late-nineteenth century. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the corner building, constructed in 1845, exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community, serving as the first location of what eventually became two of the largest lager beer breweries in the adjacent Brewerytown neighborhood of Philadelphia during the late-nineteenth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2301 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2301 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the recommendation to amend the period of significance to 1845 through circa 1900, and to classify any post circa 1900 rear additions as non-contributing.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:47:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.
- Attorney Meredith Trego and preservation consultant Nick Kraus represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Grossi summarized the historic significance of the property as it related to German lager beer brewing and its continuous use as a saloon.
- Ms. Trego agreed that the three-story main block and one-story brick rear addition satisfy Criteria for Designation A and J. She requested excluding the later rear additions from the designation or classifying them as non-contributing, as these lack historic fabric or character-defining features dating to the period of significance.
- Mr. Kraus presented a series of slides, arguing for the significance of only the main block and one-story brick rear bump-out. He explained that the glazed greenhouse addition at the rear dates to 1986, and above that is a mechanical screen enclosure of no historic significance. He explained that exploratory demolition of the cladding over the second-floor rear bump-out showed stucco over wood sheathing, with no

evidence of metal or ornamental cladding. He concluded that there is nothing at the rear portion of the existing site that conveys anything that may have related to a building from that period.

- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee on Historic Designation was in agreement that the greenhouse portion at the rear is non-contributing, but that the Committee wanted more information not just about the second-floor bump-out but about everything that is behind cladding or otherwise blocked from public view.
 - o Mr. Kraus clarified that the second-floor rear section covered in cladding behind the greenhouse addition is a false wall, and that it is open to the sky and is concealing kitchen equipment.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that this information was not understood during the review by the Committee on Historic Designation.
 - o Mr. Kraus apologized for not being able to provide a clear aerial view of this.
- Mr. Thomas opined that nothing historic has survived at the rear other than the one-story brick rear bump-out.
- Mr. Grossi stated that two historic atlases were identified, from 1876 and 1899, which clearly indicate a shallow two-story rear bump-out at the location in question, so there is evidence that this dates to the period of significance. He noted that questions of condition and integrity remain.
- Mr. Kraus commented that there is no extant exterior physical evidence of what would have been the one-story rear ell brewery portion. He urged the Commission to base its decision on what can be seen rather than what is assumed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Bob Powers, a resident of the neighborhood, commented in support of the designation of the entire property including the rear. He suggested that the Commission should designate the entire property and then evaluate significance of the rear upon receipt of a permit application proposing work to that area.
- Dustin Dove, a resident of the neighborhood, supported designation of just the main block and the one-story brick addition at the rear.
- Kathleen Conlon, a resident of the neighborhood, supported the designation.
- Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2301 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the 1980s greenhouse addition to be identified as non-contributing. Mr. Lech seconded the motion.
- Mr. Mattioni asked for clarification on Ms. Cooperman's motion. He asked if the motion includes or excludes the second floor of the rear bump-out.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that the motion was that the greenhouse section is non-contributing.
 - o Mr. Mattioni asked if that includes the second floor of the bump-out as contributing or non-contributing.
 - o Ms. Cooperman reiterated that her motion was that the greenhouse addition be identified as non-contributing.
 - o Mr. Mattioni responded that the non-contributing part then does not include the second floor of the rear bump-out. He noted that he wanted to be clear on the motion.
 - o Mr. Thomas summarized that everything would be contributing except for the greenhouse in Ms. Cooperman's motion.

- o Ms. Chantry asked for clarification on the motion and if the non-contributing greenhouse portion included the false wall paneling behind it.
- o Ms. Cooperman responded that the motion included only the greenhouse portion as non-contributing. She opined that it is still unclear if there is historic material on the first floor under the open metal paneling, behind the greenhouse addition. She stated that there is historic material on the second floor of the rear bump-out. She stated that she does not know what is inside on the first floor, behind the concrete block. She stated that if the Historical Commission had been given material evidence prior to this meeting, it could make an appropriate evaluation. She stated that the Historical Commission knows that the second floor of the rear bump-out is historic material. She reminded the Historical Commission that the nomination is for a saloon and brewery, and both components reflect the significance of the property. She stated that the Historical Commission does not know what historic material is present in the rest of the rear ell that backs the greenhouse addition.
- Ms. Trego stated that her understanding from the review by the Committee on Historic Designation was that the only part of the rear in question was the second floor of the rear bump-out. She stated they would have conducted further investigation on other areas of the rear if they believed there was any questions from the Committee as to the existence of historic material. She stated that they would be happy to investigate further so that the Historical Commission can have all of the information when it makes its decision regarding the designation.
 - o Ms. Cooperman apologized for any confusion regarding the review by the Committee on Historic Designation. She stated that her understanding of the review was that the Committee wanted more information on what is behind the greenhouse addition as well as the second floor of the rear bump-out. She stated that she would be willing to withdraw her motion to allow for the property owner's representatives to provide this additional information at a future meeting of the Historical Commission.
 - o Ms. Sanchez and Mr. Mattioni supported the idea of a continuance to allow for the receipt of this additional information.
- Ms. Cooperman withdrew her motion, with the agreement of Mr. Lech, who had seconded.
- Several Commissioners suggested continuing the review to a subsequent meeting to give the property owner time to gather additional information.
 - o Ms. Trego agreed to a continuance on behalf of her client.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Information was provided by the property owner's representatives regarding the underlying material of the second floor of the rear bump-out.
- The greenhouse addition at the rear was constructed in 1986 and is non-contributing.
- No information was provided by the property owner's representatives regarding potential historic material at the other portions of the rear.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- A continuance of the review of the nomination is appropriate. This will allow time for the property owner's representatives to provide additional information to the Historical Commission regarding the existence or lack thereof of historic fabric at the rear of the property.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 2301 Fairmount Avenue to a future meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 2301 Fairmount Ave. MOTION: Continue to future PHC meeting MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

ADDRESS: 1010 S 10TH ST

Name of Resource: First Italian Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Trustees of the Presbytery of Philadelphia

Nominator: Bella Vista Neighbors Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1010 S. 10th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former First Italian Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the church has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation, as a physical example of the social outreach efforts of the Presbytery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to the influx of Italian immigrants arriving in America. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the church was designed in 1908 by Charles W. Bolton & Son, a prolific family enterprise in Philadelphia in the early twentieth century that specialized in ecclesiastical design and whose work significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the property exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community, as a purpose-built church to serve the Italian immigrant population that had settled in the Little Italy neighborhood of South Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1010 S. 10th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1010 S. 10th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J, but not Criterion A.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:35:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Yevgeny Desyatnik represented the nominator and expressed support for a boundary amendment which would limit the designation to the sanctuary portion of the building and exclude the rear portion of the building.
- Attorney David Gest and church elder Doug Thomas represented the property owner and presented a case for limiting the designation to just the sanctuary portion of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, supported the nomination and suggested the inclusion of Criterion G owing to the adjacent park, despite the fact that the park was not established until decades after the church was constructed.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The former First Italian Presbyterian Church, now Christ Presbyterian Church, was designed by Charles W. Bolton & Son in 1908 to serve the Italian immigrant population of South Philadelphia.
- Both the nominator and property owner's representatives strongly support a boundary amendment which would include designation of only the character-defining sanctuary portion of the building. This compromise was worked out over the past year, during the continuance period, and has the full support of the nominator in an effort to avoid a potential financial hardship case in the future and to encourage other owners in the Bella Vista neighborhood to view historic designation favorably.
- Both the sanctuary and the rear portion, originally used as classrooms, were constructed in 1908.
- The one-story garage appendage was constructed in 1936 and has no historic significance.
- The nomination could be remanded back to the Committee on Historic Designation for further review regarding the historic significance of the rear portion of the building, but this likely would not provide any new information not included in the nomination which states that all extant portions of the building except for the garage were constructed at the same time.
- Designation of the entire structure would not prevent approval of a creative reuse of the rear portion of the building, provided the exterior scope met preservation standards. The Commission could consider alternative materials as part of the renovation scope and could be flexible with alterations which allow for accessibility.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- It cannot accept the boundary amendment offered by the property owner's representatives and nominator because both parts of the building were constructed at the same time.
- The church was designed by Charles W. Bolton & Son, a prolific family enterprise in Philadelphia in the early twentieth century that specialized in ecclesiastical design and whose work significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation, satisfying Criterion E.
- The property exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community, as a purpose-built church to serve the Italian immigrant population that had settled in the Little Italy neighborhood of South Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 1010 S. 10th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the garage portion of the building considered non-contributing. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1010 S 10th St MOTION: Designate, Criteria E and J, garage non-contributing MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

ADDRESS: 2201-21 MARGARET ST

Name of Resource: Blumenthal Brother Chocolate Factory

Proposed Action: National Register Comment

Property Owner: Chocolate Factory LLC

Nominator: Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co., Inc.

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

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 2201-21 Margaret Street located in the Bridesburg neighborhood and historically known as the Blumenthal Brothers Chocolate Factory. 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 nomination for 2201-21 Margaret Street states that the property is significant under Criterion A in the area of industry as a manufacturer of numerous iconic, nationally available chocolate products during the early twentieth century. During the 1920s, Blumenthal developed candies like Goobers, Raisinets, and Sno-caps specifically for the growing movie theater business, making these products familiar to millions of movie-going Americans for decades to come. The Blumenthal Brothers Chocolate Factory is also significant under Criterion C in the area of architecture as a major example of factory design by the Ballinger Company, one of Philadelphia's best-known architectural firms of the day and one that specialized in industrial buildings. The period of significance begins in 1922, when the present factory was completed, and ends in 1969, when Blumenthal Brothers sold the business and ceased to control the company.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:35:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Kevin McMahon of Powers & Company represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McMahon said many are familiar with the chocolate products that were made at this factory, which continue to be available today. He stated the nomination was a fun one to write and looks forward to the building being rehabilitated. Mr. McMahon

pointed out that this is an important example of the Ballinger Company's factory work during this period.

- Ms. Cooperman stated this is very worthy of nomination.
- The Commissioners supported the nomination for listing 2201-21 Margaret Street on the National Register of Historic Places.

ADDRESS: 3600 AND 3601-07 N BROAD ST

Name of Resource: Zion Baptist Church and Educational Annex

Proposed Action: National Register Comment

Property Owner: Zion Baptist Church

Nominator: Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co., Inc.

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

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 3600 and 3601-07 N. Broad Street located in the North Philadelphia and historically known as the Zion Baptist Church and Educational Annex. 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 nomination for the two church buildings, located at the northwest and northeast corners of North Broad and Venango Streets, asserts that the properties are significant under Criteria A and B in the area of Social History for their association with the Reverend Leon H. Sullivan (1922-2001), the nationally influential civil rights leader and social activist who led the church from 1950 until his retirement in 1988. Sullivan's lifelong commitment to racial justice through economic advancement brought the hope of equal opportunity not just to his congregation, but to Philadelphia's broader African American community and to disadvantaged groups across the country. Zion Baptist Church is also significant under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as a major ecclesiastical work in the Modern style by Philadelphia's most prominent Black architect of the post-war period, Walter R. Livingston, Jr. (1922-2011). The period of significance for the area of Social History begins in 1969, the year the congregation acquired the Annex, which played an important role in their mission, and ends in 1988, when Sullivan's tenure as pastor ended. The period of significance for the area of Architecture is 1973, the year Zion Baptist Church was completed. The property meets Criterion Consideration A, owing to its role in the Black community, the leadership of Rev. Sullivan, and the significance of its architectural design. The property also meets Criterion Consideration G.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:39:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.

- Kevin McMahon of Powers & Company represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McMahon said that Leon Sullivan was a towering figure in the fight for civil rights both at the local and national level, so they are pleased to see these buildings get the national recognition they deserve through this nomination. He continued the nomination also recognizes the architecture and that Zion Baptist Church is probably Walter R. Livingston's best-known work and remains in use today. Mr. McMahon explained the nomination is related to a historic tax credit project at the Educational Annex building which is currently planned to be rehabilitated as a community center.
- Mr. Farnham noted that the Historical Commission designated the Rev. Leon Sullivan's house when it designated the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District in 2006.
- The Commissioners supported the nomination for listing 3600 and 3601-3607 N. Broad Street on the National Register of Historic Places.

ADDRESS: 1401 E SUSQUEHANNA AVE

Name of Resource: Penn Asylum for Indigent Widows and Single Women

Proposed Action: National Register Comment

Property Owner: Penn Asylum for Indigent Widows and Single Women

Nominator: Logan I. Ferguson, Powers & Co., Inc.

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

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 1401 E. Susquehanna Avenue located in the Fishtown neighborhood of northeast Philadelphia and historically known as the Penn Asylum for Indigent Widows and Single Women. 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 nomination for the building at 1401 E. Susquehanna Avenue states that the property is significant under Criterion A in the Area of Social History. Penn Asylum is an early and important example of a nineteenth-century, endowed, voluntary, philanthropic institution built specifically to house and care for single and widowed women in reduced economic circumstances. The institution was founded by four local women in 1848 and, although unusual for the time, run entirely by women and non-denominational. The building was constructed in eight phases: c. 1769, 1858, c. 1860, 1887, 1894, 1904 and 1958. Despite the phased construction, the consistency of building material, style and use give the building a cohesive appearance. The Penn Asylum retains its integrity, as both the overall form and defining institutional characteristics remain intact since the last period of major construction in 1958.

The Period of Significance begins in 1858 when Penn Asylum moved into the existing buildings and ends in 1991 when the institution amended its charter to allow men to be admitted as residents. The property was added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 2020.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:43:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Logan Ferguson of Powers & Company represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Ferguson said this nomination presented the opportunity to tell a good story about a great neighborhood institution. She explained the nomination is part of a historic tax credit project, and the building will continue to serve the neighborhood through residential use. Ms. Ferguson noted the rehabilitation plan for the historic building does not include any significant interior or exterior changes.
- The Commissioners supported the nomination for listing 1401 E. Susquehanna Avenue on the National Register of Historic Places.

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:46:40

ACTION: At 11:48 a.m., Ms. Cooperman moved to adjourn. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: Adjourn MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

PLEASE NOTE:

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

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

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

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