

**THE MINUTES OF THE 682ND STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 14 JUNE 2019
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Thomas, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair	x		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair	x		
Kelly Edwards, MUP	x*		Arrived at 9:07 am
Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property)	x		
Sarah Kaiser (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	x		
Melissa Long (Division of Housing & Community Development)	x		
John Mattioni, Esq.	x		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair		x	
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	x		
Meredith Trego (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	x		
H. Ahada Stanford, Ph.D. (Commerce Department)	x		
Betty Turner, MA, Vice Chair	x		
Kimberly Washington, Esq.	x*		Arrived at 9:08 am

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan E. Farnham, Ph.D., Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

The following persons were present:

Larry Wind, H+W Apartments
Sam Katovitch, Toner Architects
Bart Bajada, Toner Architects
Patrick Boyle, Spring Garden CDC
Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design, LLC
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Kate Jacobi, Mural Arts Philadelphia

Eric Okdeh, Mural Arts Philadelphia
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Totes, John Totes Architecture and Design, LLC
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting Group
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr LLP
Michael Caine, Old First United Church of Christ
Ivy Truong, Community Ventures
David LaFontaine, Community Ventures
Troy Hannigan, Community Ventures
Patrick Isaac, Community Ventures
Kathy Lent, BWA Architecture + Planning
Morris Zimmerman, BWA Architecture + Planning
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association/Crosstown Coalition
Dennis Carlisle, OCF Realty
Lindsey Burstein, OCF Realty
Sam Epstein, OCF Realty
Steven Peitzman
Oscar Beisert

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 681ST STATED MEETING, 10 MAY 2019

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners for any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting, the 681st Stated Meeting, held 10 May 2019. None were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to approve the minutes of the 681st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 May 2019. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adoption of Minutes, 681st Stated Meeting					
MOTION: Approval					
Moved BY: Turner					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards					x
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington					x
Total	10				3

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MAY 2019

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:02:03

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners for comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Ms. Trego moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 125 N. 10th Street, 2213 Green Street, and 314 S. 10th Street. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA					
MOTION: Adopt the Consent Agenda					
MOVED BY: Trego					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards					x
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington					x
Total	10				3

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2026-28 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct four-story multi-family dwelling on vacant lot

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David Altenhofen

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1886

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The vacant lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street was historically the side yard of the double-wide lot for the building at 2028 Spring Garden Street. This applicant submitted an in-concept application in 2018 to gain clarity from the Historical Commission as to its level of review for new construction on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street, and to elicit comments on a proposed four-story, full-width building on the site. At its 13 July 2018 meeting, the Historical Commission unanimously voted to approve the application in concept. This in-concept approval was for a four-story, full-width building on the lot. As required, the applicant has submitted an application for final approval which closely resembles the prior in-concept application.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish non-historic vestibule and site wall.
- Construct four-story multi-family building on vacant lot.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 3: Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.*
 - Aspects of the proposed front façade, including door and windows, replicates the next door building to a level that is not preferred on new construction. These elements do not need to replicate historic elements exactly, but rather should be compatible with those historic elements but not to a degree that it creates a false sense of history.
- *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.*
 - The proposed building is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, but is differentiated from the old in terms of width.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The building is proposed for construction on a vacant lot.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the 13 July 2018 in-concept approval by the Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, with the recommendation that the applicant make some of the revisions discussed to simplify the façade in a manner that allows it to be consistent with the character of the adjacent building.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:03:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Agata Reister represented the revised application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Boyle, representing Spring Garden CDC, opposed the application, and referenced letters by Patricia Freeland of the Spring Garden Civic Association, which were provided to the Commission.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Historical Commission approved in-concept a four-story, full-width building on the lot on 13 July 2018.

- The lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street was historically the side yard of the double-wide lot for the building at 2028 Spring Garden Street.
- In the Spring Garden Historic District inventory, 2026 Spring Garden is listed as a vacant lot.
- The covered alley is provided to satisfy egress requirements.
- The existing site wall and fence on the lot is historic and its documentation has been included with the revised application.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Façade features have been simplified in the revised application to be consistent with, but not identical to, the adjacent building, per the Architectural Committee's recommendation, and satisfying Standard 3.
- The proposed building is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, but is differentiated from the old, satisfying Standard 9.
- The building could be removed in the future and the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to approve the revised application with Façade Option 3, with the staff to review details, including window framing at the fourth floor, pursuant to Standards 3, 9, and 10. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 2026-28 Spring Garden St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Trego					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	10				1

ADDRESS: 6605 AND 6607 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Remove rear additions; construct multifamily dwellings on subdivided lots

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 6605 Ridge Realty LLC & 6607 Ridge Realty LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1868

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District, Contributing,
10/12/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

The buildings at 6605 and 6607 Ridge Avenue are three-story stone twin houses with historic two-story rear ells and non-historic one-story rear additions. Historically, the twin occupied the same parcel, which featured a frame stable at the rear. The land to the southeast of 6605 Ridge Avenue, at the corner of Gorgas Lane and Ridge Avenue, has never been developed.

This in-concept application proposes to remove the one-story additions on the historic houses, constructed in 1940 (6605) and in the 1980s (6607), and to subdivide the properties and construct three multi-family buildings on the subdivided parcels. The new "Building 1," which would be constructed to follow the angle of the corner of Ridge and Gorgas, would be set approximately 10 feet from the existing building at 6605 Ridge.

While the Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction, given the purpose of the thematic, not geographical, district to protect historic buildings along Ridge Avenue, the staff recommends that the Commission treat the new construction at the rear of the property with greater flexibility. The staff recommends that the applicants provide greater consideration to the compatibility of the proposed "Building 1" with the site and the existing structures.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear additions.
- Subdivide properties.
- Construct three, three-story multi-family buildings.

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 replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The buildings at 6605 and 6607 Ridge Avenue have a historic spatial relationship with the intersection of Ridge Avenue and Gorgas Lane. The proposed Building 1 alters this spatial relationship.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed exterior alterations and related new construction do not destroy historic materials that characterize the properties. The new work is differentiated

from the old, but additional information should be provided showing the massing and materials of the proposed construction in relationship to the existing structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept of Buildings 2 and 3, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with the recommendation that additional studies and renderings be provided showing the relationship of Building 1 to the existing buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:21:08

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architects Bart Bajda and Sam Katovitch represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Ridge Avenue and Gorgas Lane are both very old streets, and there are irregularities in the topography of the area that create oddly angled intersections, but the historic buildings themselves are for the most part rectangular in shape.
- Corner buildings are found throughout the district.
- The east elevation of 6605 Ridge Avenue is fairly plain, and the proposed construction of Building 1 would not obscure any significant character-defining details.
- Mansard roofs are found on historic buildings throughout the district but are generally of a later period than the existing historic buildings on the property.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The removals of the non-historic, one-story rear additions are alterations, not demolitions.
- Masonry or stucco are appropriate materials for the proposed construction, but vinyl siding is not found historically within the district and is not an appropriate building material for new construction.
- Contemporary details including the proposed windows for Buildings 2 and 3 are acceptable, but the corner Building 1 should have a more planar, less fussy façade.
- Corner buildings are found throughout the district, and, although there was never a building directly at this corner of Ridge Avenue and Gorgas Lane, the proposed construction does not negatively impact the property or district, satisfying Standard 9.
- The overall height and scale of the proposed buildings is appropriate, and if the plans and elevations are simplified, the proposed buildings will be compatible with the historic property and context, satisfying Standard 9.

ACTION: Ms. Trego moved to approve the application in-concept, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 6605 and 6607 RIDGE AVE MOTION: Approval in concept MOVED BY: Trego SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	10				1

ADDRESS: 125 N 10TH ST

Proposal: Remove sections of rear of building; construct rear addition; rehabilitate front facade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PZ Zhangs Associate LLC

Applicant: Anthony Palimore, Anthony Palimore, RA

History: 1831-32; 1906; 1910; 1967-71; Chinatown YMCA, Chinese Cultural and Community Center; Yang Chou-Cheng

Individual Designation: 6/14/2013

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 125 N. 10th Street is a mid-block parcel between Cherry and Arch Streets in the Chinatown neighborhood. Originally constructed c. 1831 as Federal-style rowhouse, the building's existing elaborate façade and tile roof were constructed between 1967 and 1971 by the Chinese Cultural and Community Center, but the original gabled-roof building is still extant behind the facade. The nomination for the property, which was designated in 2013, identifies the period of significance as 1955-2006, beginning with the year that the Chinatown YMCA opened on the second floor of the building, prior to the construction of the existing façade. In 1966, T.T. Chang, founder of the Chinatown YMCA, purchased the property and formed the Chinese Cultural and Community Center.

The application proposes to remove the second and third-floor side walls, floor joists, and roof of the rear ell, and the rear wall of the main block, and to construct a large rear addition. The front façade would be rehabilitated.

The proposed drawings have been revised from an earlier application that would have demolished a considerable portion of the main block as well as the rear ell. In this proposal, the main block including the rear roof and dormer will be preserved. A portion of the rear roof will be

removed to construct a passageway to the rear ell. Much of the rear ell will be demolished and a four-story full width structure will be added.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Retain main block of building.
- Demolish a small portion of the rear roof slope of main block.
- Demolish second and third-floor side walls and piazza of rear ell.
- Construct four-story addition at rear.
- Rehabilitate front façade.

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 shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The proposed project retains the building's primary character-defining features, the elaborate front façade and roof. It proposes to remove portions of the building that do not fall within the period of significance, but which do speak to the building's evolution. The proposed project complies with this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition is compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the environment. The project complies with this standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed demolition of the rear ell is not reversible. The project complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1624-28 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Install Illuminated channel-letter sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: CP Acquisitions 45 LLC

Applicant: Natalya Atroshyna, EZ Signs LLC

History: 1948, Thalheimer and Weitz, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The office building at 1624-28 Locust Street is classified as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District. This application proposes to install an illuminated channel-letter sign on the sign band above the front entrance. Most of the block is institutional including the Curtis School of Music and St. Mark's Church.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install illuminated channel-letter sign.

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.*
 - The proposed sign is not compatible with the existing streetscape.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:37:17

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance supported the staff's and Committee's recommendations of denial, observing that the site in question is located in the Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District and that this block of Locust Street has no illuminated signage.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- There are no other illuminated signs on this block of Locust Street.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed sign with illumination would negatively impact the streetscape and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1624-28 LOCUST ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	12				1

ADDRESS: 323 ARCH ST

Proposal: Install mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Holly Anne James

Applicant: Kate Jacobi, Mural Arts Program

History: 1850; West elevation stuccoed 1968

Individual Designation: 11/30/1965

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

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

BACKGROUND:

Originally part of a row of four-story buildings, 323 Arch Street is now a free-standing building adjacent to the fountain court of a fire station constructed in 1967. The west party wall of 323 Arch Street features a stucco ghost of a building that predated the four-story structure demolished in the 1960s. Historic photographs indicate that the building's west party wall once contained a mural painted onto plywood and attached in the location of the current proposed mural.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install painted cloth mural on stuccoed portion of party wall using acrylic gel adhesive.
- Seal mural with clear coating and UV protectant coating.

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.* The proposed mural would be applied only to the existing stuccoed portion of the party wall and would be compatible with the historic structure and its context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the lack of a mural design.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:40:18

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Kate Jacobi of Mural Arts and artist Eric Okdeh represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- A design for the mural was provided to the Historical Commission for its review, though the design was not available at the time of the Architectural Committee's review.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The mural is appropriate for the proposed location, satisfying Standard 9.

ACTION: Ms. Edwards moved to approve the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 323 ARCH ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Edwards SECONDED BY: Long					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	12				1

ADDRESS: 2213 GREEN ST

Proposal: Replace illegally-removed brownstone pilasters with cast stone

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: H+W Apartments LP

Applicant: Lawrence Wind, H+W Apartments LP

History: 1886

Individual Designation: 2/28/1967

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

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

BACKGROUND:

Constructed in 1886, the semi-detached Renaissance Revival-style residence is significant in the Spring Garden Historic District. The building's front façade features brownstone cladding and ornately carved brownstone detailing. Between May and September 2018, the applicant removed four brownstone pilasters that divide five windows at the fourth story of the front façade. The work was done without a permit. The applicant noted that the pilasters were flaking and delaminating, though the staff contends that they were in repairable condition. The applicant now proposes to replace the illegally-removed brownstone pilasters with cast stone versions.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace four illegally-removed brownstone pilasters with cast stone.

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 shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
The removal of the brownstone pilasters does not comply with this standard.
- *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.*
Each replacement pilaster would be cast in three pieces and would introduce two ½-inch mortar joints. The replacement pilasters would not match the old in design or material and would alter the historic appearance of the fourth-story windows. Therefore, the proposed work does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised application that proposes a single casting for each pilaster, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6, with the following conditions:

- The staff reviews samples of the Jahn to ensure the best match possible; and
- The fabricator confirms the appropriateness of the reinforcing with the casting.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 314 S 10TH ST

Proposal: Remove rear addition; construct rear addition; replace dormer sash

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Drew A. Moyer and Jude A. Tuma

Applicant: Christina Carter, John Milner Architects

History: 1837

Individual Designation: 6/29/1971

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This four-story brick building at 314 S. 10th Street was constructed in 1837. Archival images show that windows at the north façade were blocked in; this is also apparent due to the change in mortar color at these locations. A rear frame addition is shown on maps up until at least 1931; however, no documentation has been found that indicates when the existing two-story, brick and frame addition was constructed. From 1961 on, building permit applications show the existence of a brick and frame two-story rear addition.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Remove existing two-story rear addition.
- Construct new three-story rear addition.

- Replace dormer windows with 4/4 wood sashes; replace existing siding and moldings in kind and matching original profiles.
- Clean north façade; stain mortar at in-fill locations to better match existing.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The new dormer windows will return to a 4/4 configuration and shall be wood, as seen in archival images.
 - The dormers' siding and moldings will be replaced in kind; non-original elements will be replaced with wood and will match original profiles.
- *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.*
 - The existing two-story rear addition is not original to the period of construction and its demolition will not destroy historic materials;
 - The proposed new three-story addition will be situated in the same location as the existing;
 - The new addition will be differentiated from historic fabric by being set back 2" from the original house and by maintaining a cornice height that is lower than the adjacent historic fabric;
 - The use of brick for the new addition is compatible with the historic house.
- *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.*
 - The proposed addition will be located adjacent to the rear of the historic house and will not alter or obstruct historic fabric or views from the public right of way.
- *Masonry Rehabilitation Guideline: Cleaning soiled masonry surfaces with the gentlest methods possible, such as using low-pressure water and detergent and natural bristle or other soft-bristle brushes. Duplicating historic mortar joints in strength, composition, color and texture when repointing is necessary.*
 - Low water pressure and, if necessary, an appropriate restoration cleaner are proposed to clean the north façade.
 - An appropriate mortar stain is to be applied at the areas of in-fill where the mortar color differs from the rest of the wall in order to create uniformity across the north façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, 10 and the Masonry Rehabilitation Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided mahogany is used for window replacement and the two-story addition is carefully dismantled and documented, with the staff to review the details of the pent

roof, mortar staining, and new brick, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, 10 and the Masonry Rehabilitation Guideline.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 825 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Install marquee; replace entry door; replace entry brick

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Walnut Street Theatre

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners LLC

History: 1905; Walnut Street Theater Annex

Individual Designation: 5/3/1973

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This six-story building was constructed for office use in 1905 and now serves as the entrance to the Walnut Street Theatre. The existing entry doors situated within the vestibule appear to have been approved by the Historical Commission in 2011. The existing illuminated “Walnut Street Theatre” sign appears to have been approved by the Historical Commission in 2013.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install new LED marquee above “Walnut Street Theatre” sign.
- Replace doors at existing entrance.
- Replace brick at entrance.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - Though staff is not opposed to the concept of an LED marquee on this building, the location as proposed would install the marquee directly over a band of decorative terra cotta. Such detailing is a character-defining feature of this building and destroying it or permanently obstructing it does not comply with the Standards.
- *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.*
 - Though staff is not opposed to the concept of an LED marquee on this building, the location as proposed would install the marquee directly over a band of decorative terra cotta. Such detailing is a character-defining feature of this building and destroying it or permanently obstructing it does not comply with the Standards.
 - The proposed entry doors are replacing non-historic doors. Therefore, their removal and replacement does not destroy historic fabric. The proposed doors appear to be compatible with the existing, already altered entrance.

- Though the brick adjacent to the existing entry doors is not historic, the proposed grey color for the replacement brick does not appear compatible with the brick to remain at the side walls of the vestibule. In addition, the smooth texture of the brick face and mortar joints as proposed lend a mismatched appearance rather than a differentiated one.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the entry doors, and denial of the marquee and replacement brick, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the doors and brick replacement, with the staff to review details; and denial of the marquee, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:45:00

PRESENTERS:

- Megan Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- An existing banner is covering a decorative terra cotta feature on the front façade.
- Theaters require marquees.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Covering decorative historic façade features with new signage is not appropriate.
- The location of the marquee as proposed does not satisfy the Standards.
- A marquee could be approved if a more appropriate location was found.
- The proposed brick replacement could be approved if the color better matched the brick at the side walls of the vestibule.
- The entry doors could be replaced as proposed by the applicant.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to approve doors and replacement of the brick, provided the brick color matches the existing side walls; and to deny the marquee as proposed; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

ITEM: 825 WALNUT ST MOTION: Approval of doors and brick with conditions; denial of marquee MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Long					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	12				1

ADDRESS: 219-29 S 18TH ST, UNIT 201

Proposal: Cut new window openings and inset balcony

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Karen Buchholz

Applicant: John Toates, John Toates Architecture and Design, LLC

History: 1925; Penn Athletic Club, Parc Rittenhouse; Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects; alts, Cronheim & Weger, architects, 1957

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND: This application proposes to cut three new window openings and reopen one blind opening at the second floor of the Parc Rittenhouse building at 18th and Locust Streets. The second floor, which was most recently used as office space, is being converted to residential space. All floors above the second floor are already used as residential space.

The building was constructed as the Penn Athletic Club in 1925. The building underwent major renovations in 1957, which were unsympathetic, when it was converted for office space for the U.S. government. At that time, window openings were significantly altered, new window openings and windows were added, and ornamental features were removed. The new window openings were cut based on internal needs, resulting in an irregular window pattern on the exterior. The building was converted to residential use at floors three and above in 2006. The Historical Commission approved many changes for the project, in concept in 2004 and final approval in 2006. A large addition was constructed at the roof and lost ornament was recreated. At that time, the irregular window patterns were regularized and completed at floors three and above. The regularized window pattern was not extended to the second floor in 2006 because it remained office space. The Historical Commission noted that alterations and additions proposed in 2006, including the regularizing of the window openings, would not have been appropriate on many historic buildings, but were appropriate for this building because they overcame the adverse effects of the 1957 renovation.

The second floor is now being rehabilitated as residential space, completing the conversion of the building. The owner of the unit at the corner of 18th and Locust Streets would like to continue the window pattern approved in 2004 and 2006 for floors three and above at the second floor. Two windows would be added on 18th Street and one on Locust Street. The windows would match the historic windows on the second floor, with the exception that they would have brick sills and jambs, not the terra cotta sills, spandrels, and jambs of the historic openings. The new owner would also like to reopen a blind opening on Locust Street for a terrace. Information in the form of a historic photograph as well as photographs of scars on the building demonstrate that the blind opening was a true opening at one time. A replica of metal railings found at the building would be installed in the new opening for the terrace. The Historical Commission reviewed and denied two applications to remove the brick in the blind opening previously, but neither application demonstrated that the opening had been a true opening in the past. Moreover, the denied applications proposed a glass railing and provided no details for the work. The current application offers a justification for reopening the blind opening as well as full details for the alteration.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Cut three new window openings and add windows to match existing windows.
- Remove brick infill in opening and install metal railing to create terrace

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.*
 - The new window openings and windows will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The cutting and installation of the new windows will complete the incomplete window pattern started in 1957 and continued in 2006.
 - The re-opening of the blind opening will recreate a historic if not original condition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approvals in 2004 and 2006.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the new window openings with windows and the re-opening of the blind opening to the width of the current recess, provided the area has no exterior lighting, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:47:41

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect John Toates represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Toates stated that the Architectural Committee supported his plan to introduce new windows to complete the window pattern and likewise supported his plan to reopen the blind opening, but disagreed with him regarding the appropriate width of the reopened blind opening. He explained that he proposed to reopen it to the width of the fire stair openings directly above, while the Committee suggested reopening it to the width of the area that is currently recessed. He observed that the difference of opinion is an architectural one. He stated that he is attempting to be true to the original design intent of the building. When the original design was discussed at the time of construction, the fire stair voids were referred to as a “slit” and a “slot” that differentiated the corner of the building from the remainder of the building. He stated that his plan is true to this original design intent and would reinforce the corner as originally intended. He stated that the area behind the blind opening was once part of the fire stair, but was disconnected from it at some unknown point in time. Mr. Toates addressed a concern of the Architectural Committee, which had suggested that the new terrace created by reopening the blind opening would be used for grills and umbrellas and other patio accessories that would be distracting when seen from the street. He stated that the Committee’s assertion is unfounded; the opening would be only a few feet wide and would bring light and air into the unit, but would be far too small to be used like a roof deck.
- Ms. Cooperman asked about the sequence of changes to the building. She pointed to the 1931 photograph of the building and noted that the blind opening did not appear to be open. Mr. Farnham replied that the 1931 photograph shows that a portion of the blind opening was open, not infilled. He stated that, while the opening in question is discernable as open in the photograph, the similar blind opening to the east along Locust Street, which is currently infilled, is clearly open in the 1931 photograph. Mr. Toates displayed photographs taken from the interior area behind the blind opening that showed that the blind opening had been opened and then infilled with masonry. The brick work has clearly been patched at the opening.
- Mr. Thomas opined that, if reopened, the blind opening should be reopened to the width of the fire stair openings above. If it were reopened to the width of the recessed panel, it would create a very “curious” visual effect. He stated that he would advocate for opening it to the width above, not the recessed width.
- Ms. Cooperman questioned whether the Architectural Committee had, in fact, supported the cutting of the new windows. She questioned whether the Committee would make such a recommendation. Mr. Toates confirmed that the Architectural Committee’s minute accurately reflects the review and recommendation of the Committee, which supported the cutting of the new windows to complete the window pattern started in 1957 and continued in 2006.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The new window openings and windows will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The cutting and installation of the new windows will complete the incomplete window pattern started in 1957 and continued in 2006.
- The re-opening of the blind opening will recreate a historic if not original condition.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed work satisfies Standard 9.
- The proposed work is consistent with the Historical Commission's approvals for the building in 2004 and 2006.

ACTION: Ms. Trego moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approvals in 2004 and 2006. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1.

ITEM: 219-29 S 18TH ST, UNIT 201					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Trego					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman		x			
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11	1			1

ADDRESS: 322-40 RACE ST

Proposal: Relocate building; remove rear ell; construct mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Old First Reformed United Church of Christ

Applicant: David La Fontaine, Community Ventures

History: 1837; First German Reformed Church; altered 1882 and 1968; includes houses at 151 and 153 N. 4th St

Individual Designation: 1/25/1966

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

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND: This application proposes to construct a mixed-use building on the site of the Old First Reformed United Church of Christ at the southeast corner of 4th and Race Streets in the Old City Historic District. The building would include residential and service facilities for homeless men, commercial spaces, and offices for the church.

The site of the new building, along 4th Street to the west of the church building, currently includes an eighteenth-century house classified as significant, a pseudo-colonial house classified as non-contributing, a surface parking lot, and open space. To clear the site for the new building, the non-contributing building would be demolished and the main block of the eighteenth-century house would be relocated to the south against the party wall of the adjacent

building and incorporated into the new building. The rear ell of the eighteenth-century house would be removed. The new building would include a two-story section for church offices adjacent to the relocated house and a five-story section at the corner with commercial space on the ground floor and residential units with support spaces on the upper floors. The new building would be beveled to maintain views of the church from Race Street. The new building would be designed to meet passive house standards and would be clad with brick, cast stone or similar material, EIFS, and metal panels. The church-office section of the building would be clad in cast stone and have the appearance of a separate building. The mass of the new building would be broken down with shifts in height, changes in materials, and the inclusion of bay-like elements. The upper floors would stand on pilotis at the northeast side of the building. It is important to note that, although the land at the corner of 4th and Race is now open, it was historically built up with structures about the size of the proposed building. The clearing of that land post-dates the period of significance of the historic district by many decades.

The eighteenth-century house was rehabilitated in the 1970s. A c. 1900 storefront was removed and the first-floor front façade was restored with a door with marble stoop, window, and bulkhead. Unfortunately, the brick used to rebuild the first floor was not a good match for the brick above. To cover the scar in the brick where a beam was inserted above the storefront, a pent eave was added. The pent eave as well as the cornice were returned onto the south party wall; such returns would have been impossible historically owing to the adjacent building. Chimneys were added at the main block and rear ell.

To move the eighteenth-century house, the rear ell and non-historic chimneys would be demolished. The main block would be shifted to the south, onto the surface parking lot. The front façade would be restored, albeit without the bulkhead. As an alternate, the reconstruction of the c. 1900 storefront is proposed, which would provide an accessible entrance to the building.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Remove rear ell and non-historic chimneys of the eighteenth-century house and move main block south to party wall
- Demolish non-contributing house
- Construct mixed-use building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance prohibits the demolition of a historic resources unless the Historical Commission finds that the demolition is “necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.”

- The Historical Commission must decide whether the removal of the rear ell and relocation of the main block would constitute a demolition. If they do constitute a demolition, the Historical Commission is prohibited from approving the project without first finding that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

Section 14-203(88) of the historic preservation ordinance defines “Demolition or Demolish” as:

- The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.
 - The project does not propose the razing or destruction of the building in its entirety.

- The project does propose the razing or destruction of the rear ell. The Historical Commission must decide whether the removal of the rear ell is a razing or destruction in significant part.
- The project does propose the relocation of the main block. The Historical Commission must decide whether the relocation of the main block is a removal of a building from its site.

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.*
 - The Historical Commission must decide whether the new construction will destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.
 - The Historical Commission must decide whether the new construction will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The Historical Commission must decide whether the new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - The application proposes to incorporate the main block of the eighteenth-century house into the new building. The front façade would be restored, excepting the cellar bulkhead. As an alternate, a c. 1900 storefront that was removed in the 1970s would be reconstructed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the removal of the rear ell and relocation of the main block; and approval in concept of the new building. The staff contends that:

- The removal of the rear ell is not a demolition because it is not a razing or destruction in significant part. The rear ell does not characterize the property and is not part of the essential form and integrity of the historic property because it was not historically visible from the public right-of-way. The removal of the rear ell can be treated as an alteration and does not trigger the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. The removal satisfies Standards 9 and 10.
- The relocation of the main block is not a demolition because the building will not be removed from its site; it will be relocated on the same site. Moreover, placing the building up against a party wall will restore the historic relationship between this building and an adjacent neighbor. The relocation of the main block can be treated as an

alteration and does not trigger the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. The relocation satisfies Standards 9 and 10.

- The restoration of the main block satisfies Standards 2 and 5, provided the eighteenth-century appearance of the first-floor front is retained (in lieu of the reconstructed storefront), including the reconstruction of the cellar bulkhead.
- The overall location, size, and massing of the new building satisfies Standard 9, but aspects of the materials, features, scales, and proportions do not.
 - The relationships between the brick, stucco, and metal panels seem unresolved. Choices of where to place brick and metal panels seem arbitrary.
 - The sizes, scales, proportions, and rhythms of the windows are unrelated to those of the surrounding historic buildings.
 - The use of the metal panels to create bay-window-like elements seems appropriate, but the designs of the bays at the corners seems unresolved.
 - The pilotis at the northeast façade seem incompatible with the historic church.
 - The Race Street façade seems unresolved, especially where the windows at the ends of the corridors create a void at the center of what might be considered the main façade.
 - Overall, the design of the new building should be better related to design elements found in the Old City Historic District. Additional detailing of the new construction should be provided for final approval. While full construction drawings are not necessary, the application should provide some information about details like storefront systems, window and door frames, etc.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the moving of the historic building, removal of the rear ell, and massing and location of the new building, with the understanding that the design of the new building will be revised before final approval.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:03:40

RECUSALS:

- Ms. Stanford recused because she sits on the board of Community Ventures, a partner in the project. She excused herself from the meeting.
- Ms. Long recused because the law firm at which her husband works is representing the applicant.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Pastor Michael Caine, preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton, attorney David Gest, developer David LaFontaine, and architects Morris Zimmerman and Kathy Lent represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Gest stated that when they initially submitted the application they were seeking final approval of all aspects of the application. After receiving some feedback, they decided to seek final approval of the relocation of the house with the removal of the rear ell and in-concept approval of the new construction. He stated that they agree with the staff's and Architectural Committee's recommendations.
- Pastor Caine provided a history of the congregation, which was founded in 1727, bought this property in 1747, built a series of church on the site, left the site in 1882

for 10th and Wallace Streets, and later moved to another site before returning to this site in 1967. When the congregation returned to Old City, it focused on overlooked and forgotten people including the homeless and urban poor. Since 1986, the congregation has hosted homeless persons during the winters. He stated that the homeless accommodations have never been permanent, but would be if this project is realized.

- Mr. LaFontaine explained that his company is a non-profit housing developer, which will partner with the church. He stated that the facility would include units for 34 homeless persons. The building would include 2,400 square feet of commercial space, which was requested by the community. He stated that the project needs a final approval on the moving of the building to pursue funding for the project.
- Ms. Hamilton provided information about the two existing buildings on the construction site. One was built in the 1970s and is non-contributing to the district. The other one, which would be moved, was built in the middle of the eighteenth century and is contributing to the district. She described the historic building. The first-floor has been entirely rebuilt. She showed images of the block at various points in its history. Buildings stood along 4th Street to the corner with Race Street. She stated that, as an alternate, they would like to restore the storefront on the historic building as it is seen in historic photographs.
- Mr. Zimmerman stated that he has been in conversation with Wolf Building Movers about shifting the historic house to the south. Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission's staff will need to review the details of the move and the connection with the building to the south. Mr. Zimmerman then presented the conceptual design of the new building. He discussed the many options that they considered with the congregation. He stated that they concluded that placing the largest mass on the corner will allow more light and air to the side of the church, where the windows are located. Mr. Zimmerman explained how the historic building will connect to the new building. He explained how the floor levels will connect. He then discussed their desire to reconstruct the historic storefront on the historic house to be moved. Mr. Thomas discussed ways of making the house accessible with the storefront. Mr. Zimmerman showed drawings and renderings of the proposed building. He stated that they have reached a conclusion on the massing, but are still working on the materials and detailing.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization does not oppose the relocation of the house or removal of the rear ell. He stated that his organization is agnostic on the reconstruction of the storefront and agrees that the design of the new building needs additional refinement.
- Mr. Farnham pointed out a letter in support of the project from Councilman Squilla.
- Jim Duffin corrected that the building to be moved was constructed in 1775 by a German immigrant.
- Oscar Beisert supported the project but urged that the design of the new building be reconsidered.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The block of N. 4th Street south of Race Street was historically developed to a density like that proposed in this application.

- The rear ell of the historic house does not characterize the property and is not part of the essential form and integrity of the historic property.
- The historic house will not be removed from its site; it will be relocated on the same site. The relocation of the historic house up against a party wall will restore the historic relationship between the building and an adjacent neighbor and will restore the street wall.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The removal of the rear and relocation of the historic house do not constitute demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88) of the historic preservation ordinance.
- The restoration of the relocated main block of the historic house satisfies Standards 2 and 5.
- The overall location, size, and massing of the new building satisfies Standard 9, but the design details should be refined.

ACTION: Ms. Trego moved to grant final approval for the relocation of the house with the removal of the rear ell and to grant approval in concept of the massing and location of the new building. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 322-40 RACE ST MOTION: Final approval of the relocation and approval in concept of the new construction MOVED BY: Trego SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)				x	
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)				x	
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	10			2	1

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR MEETING CONDUCT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:40:20

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas introduced the proposed Guidelines for Meeting Conduct. He stated that the guidelines were intended to ensure participation while allowing the Historical Commission to be efficient.

- Mr. Farnham explained that Commissioners, applicants, and members of the public had recently expressed concerns that the meetings were becoming extremely lengthy and occasionally unruly. The proposed guidelines are intended to clarify responsibilities and expectations of all parties. He noted that the Law Department had reviewed the proposal and made some amendments. He concluded that the guidelines are intended to elaborate on Section 4.6.b of the Rules & Regulations, which authorizes the chair to “impose reasonable limitations upon public participation to ensure relevance and to avoid excessive repetition.”
- Mr. Thomas stated that participation at meetings is essential. These guidelines are not intended to limit participation but instead to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to participate in a timely manner.
- Mr. Farnham observed that the proposed guidelines allow the Historical Commission to deviate from the guidelines at its discretion. The guidelines are not binding, but instead are a set of suggestions for running an orderly, efficient meeting.
- Ms. Cooperman suggested that the Historical Commission clearly inform interested parties that substantial written comments about matters on agendas must be submitted at least seven days in advance of the meeting at which it would be considered.
- Mr. Thomas noted that interested parties should never contact individual Commissioners about matters on agendas. All correspondence should be directed to the Historical Commission’s office.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni asserted that public input is important and should be valued. He contended that two minutes per public comment is not enough. He requested that the Historical Commission create a special category for those with “party status,” like a community organization with expert witnesses, to allow for lengthier testimony.
- Molly Gallagher suggested that the Historical Commission and its advisory committees decline to act on matters when applicants fail to appear for their reviews.
- Jim Duffin suggested that, if adopted, the guidelines are provided on the website and at meetings. He also suggested that, during the review of nominations, the nominators and owners should be given chances to respond to one another.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance agreed with Mr. Duffin and also suggested that the guidelines are provided in the meeting room. He suggested placing a sign with the guidelines in the room.
- Steven Peitzman concurred with Mr. Duffin and requested that nominators have opportunities to respond to property owners.
- Oscar Beisert concurred with Mr. Duffin and requested that nominators have opportunities to respond to property owners.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to adopt the guidelines with the revisions agreed upon by the Commissioners. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Proposed guidelines for meeting conduct					
MOTION: To adopt the Guidelines for Meeting Conduct with amendments					
MOVED BY: Mattioni					
SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED POSTING REQUIREMENTS

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:16:07

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas introduced the posting requirement proposal proffered by the Crosstown Coalition. Mr. Mattioni opined that the Commissioners had not had enough time to consider the proposal. Mr. Thomas agreed. Paul Boni requested to speak on the matter but was told that the Historical Commission would not be considering the proposal at today's meeting, but would take it up at a subsequent meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:27:13

ACTION: At 11:41 a.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: To adjourn MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Kaiser (L&I)	x				
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio 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.