

**THE MINUTES OF THE 725TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 JANUARY 2023, 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 9:02 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	
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 Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner I
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Dennis Carlisle
Tara Lamont
Julia Marchetti
Leah Silverstein
Pat Bailey
Eugene Desyatnik

David Traub, Save Our Sites
Agata Reister, Landmark Architecture
Carolina Pena, Parallel Architecture Studio
Ori Feibush, OCF
Larry Salva
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Company
Joyce Lenhardt
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture
Nancy Goldenberg
Emily Persico
Harrison Haas, Esq.
Gregory Lattanzi
Bart Bajda, Toner Architects
Sam Katovitch, Toner Architects
Sara Pochedly
Meredith Trego, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Amy Lambert
Alex Balloon
Nancy Pontone
Raymond Rola
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Kristene Whitmore
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Lawrence McEwen
Jake Blumgart
Mark Travis
Suzanne Amrich, Archer & Buchanan Architecture
Brenda Bailey
Matthew McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Anabel Pena, Parallel Architecture Studio
Dima Mircheva
Ryan Solimeo
Celia Jailer, Hidden City
Dr. Lynda Thomas-Mabine
Bill Webster
Robert Gurmankin
Jim King
J.M. Duffin
Carl Massara
Jay Farrell
Paul Boni, Esq., Society Hill Civic Association
Michael Koep
Susan Wetherill
Suzanne Ponsen
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Steven Peitzman
John Cacciamani, Chestnut Hill Hospital
Eileen Javers
Allison Weiss, SoLo
Sean Whalen, Esq., Vintage Law
Deborah Gary, Society to Preserve Philadelphia African American Assets (SPPAAA)

Matt Masterpasqua, MASS Architecture Studio LLC
 Hal Schirmer, Esq.
 Steven Standiford
 Cassidy Martin
 Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
 Tim Kerner, Center City Residents Association
 David Fecteau, Philadelphia City Planning Commission

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 724TH STATED MEETING, 9 DECEMBER 2022

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:00

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any suggested additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 724th Stated Meeting, held 9 December 2022. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 724th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 December 2022. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 724th Stated Meeting of the PHC					
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)					
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 20 DECEMBER 2022

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:30

DISCUSSION:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 3704 Ridge Avenue, 832 S. Front Street, 108 Fairmount Avenue, and 1717-19 Mount Vernon 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
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 3704 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Rehabilitate gatehouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Laurel Hill Cemetery

Applicant: Suzanne Amrich, Archer & Buchanan Architecture

History: 1836; Laurel Hill Cemetery Gatehouse; John Notman

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 8/7/1980

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for restoration and rehabilitation of the gatehouse building at Laurel Hill Cemetery. The gatehouse was designed by John Notman and constructed in 1836. The proposed project includes restoration of architectural features and construction of an accessible entrance and an addition for restrooms. The completed project will enable the Friends of Laurel Hill to better use the building and enhance the visitor experience to the historic cemetery.

The project is funded by a Save America's Treasures grant and multiple grants from the State of Pennsylvania. Owing to the funding sources, final project plans must be approved by National Park Service and the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office in addition to the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Restoration of architectural elements and materials.
- Selective demolition.
- Construct new addition for visitor restrooms.
- Enclose entryway area and construct accessible ramp.
- Create additional parking area.

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 alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - o The demolition on the south façade for the addition is selective and does not remove distinctive materials or features. The new accessible entryway is limited to the removal of a masonry step; therefore, the application meets Standard 2.
- *Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.*
 - o The majority of project scope focuses on preserving and restoring existing features of historic façade; therefore, the application meets Standard 5.
- *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.*
 - o The restoration of historic features is based on historic research, documentation, and site assessment, meeting Standard 6.

- *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 addition is compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features, meeting Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - o The addition requires selective demolition on the south building. Existing windows, doors, trellis, and stairs will be removed to allow for the bathroom addition. In the future, if the addition were to be removed, the current configuration on the south elevation could be restored, therefore the application meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommendation of approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 244-58 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Amend approved application with substitute materials

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 244 N 2nd Street OCF LLC

Applicant: Agata Reister, Landmark Architecture

History: 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to amend an application previously approved by the Historical Commission for a property in the Old City Historic District. The project is currently under construction and the applicant is requesting to amend approved materials. The original application, which was approved, included the demolition a non-contributing gas station and construction of 11 new townhouses, four stories in height with roof decks, pilot houses, and garages.

The original application was approved by the Historical Commission in April 2021. This application proposes revising the cladding materials along New Street and Philip Street from brick to vinyl siding and revising the details from cast stone and metal panel to composite board (Azek).

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Amend approval.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed new material is not compatible with the materials and features of the surrounding context of the Old City Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Sean Whalen and architect Agata Reister represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Robert Gurmankin of Franklin Bridge North Neighbors opposed the application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- This request to revise the approved materials was prompted by recent increases in construction materials costs.
- The New Street elevation is a primary façade. It is highly visible along a public street and from the surrounding public right-of-way.
- Philip Street is a private street and is not regulated by the Streets Department. It is not a resource in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District.
- The façade along Philip Street is visible from both Vine Street and New Street. Since Philip Street is a private street, the Commission may factor this into its consideration of an alternate material for the building elevation.
- The vinyl clapboard proposed to replace the approved brick on Philip and New Streets is not compatible with historic materials and features present in the Old City Historic District.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed vinyl material is not compatible with the materials and features of the surrounding context of the Old City Historic District. The application merits approval if the applicant retains the brick cladding on New Street as shown in the original submission and the material on Philip Street is a cementitious material. The brick along New Street should continue around the corner onto Philip Street. If these proposals are incorporated into a revised design, the application would meet Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the amended application, provided that the New Street façade is clad in brick as shown in original submission; the masonry wraps from the New

Street façade onto the Phillips Street façade in the same way as shown at Vine Street; and the material is a cementitious material, not vinyl; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 244-58 N 2nd St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					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				2

ADDRESS: 11 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition; add windows and doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Raymond J. Evers

Applicant: Carl Massara, Carl Masarra, AIA

History: 1775

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

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-historic two-story rear addition and construct a three-story rear addition on a slightly larger footprint, and also construct a glass roof structure on the existing two-story sloped rear addition. Visibility of the rear of the property is limited to the side when looking east on Queen Street from the west. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviewed a similar application from a different architect in August and September 2020, and a revised design in January and February 2021. That scope involved a deck with stair house where the glass structure is now proposed. At that time, the Commission voted to approve the application for the similar scope, provided the new third-floor roof is at least one foot below the height of the existing gambrel roof, the third-floor deck is reduced in size or eliminated, the third-floor balcony is eliminated and the proposed door becomes a window, the bump-up at the third-floor rear door/window opening is eliminated, and the design of new windows at first-floor side of existing building is reconsidered. This application has removed several of those aspects from the scope. The height of the new third floor roof aligns with the height of the existing gambrel roof in this application rather than being at least

one foot below it. The staff has included several pages from the prior applications for reference. This application also proposes new window and doors for the west side elevation, which was historically a shared party wall.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish two-story rear addition; construct three-story rear addition.
- Construct glass enclosure on existing rear addition.
- Insert new window and door openings into former party wall on west elevation.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed rear addition has been designed to be more compatible with the historic building's features, size, scale, and massing, satisfying Standard 9.
 - o The proposed glass structure can be pulled back so that it does not alter the spatial relationships that characterize the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the glass structure is pulled back so that it does not project out beyond the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval of February 2021.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed but approval if revised as suggested, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:37:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Carl Massara represented the revised application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The application was revised to reflect recommendations of the Architectural Committee.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed rear addition has been designed to be more compatible with the historic building's features, size, scale, and massing, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed glass structure has been pulled back so that it does not alter the spatial relationships that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 11 Queen St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					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				2

ADDRESS: 425-29 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct three-story addition; cut window openings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Morgan Cat LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: 1850; extensively altered for St. Andrew's Byzantine Ukrainian Catholic Church, 1946; rectory added, 1952

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert the former St. Andrew's Byzantine Ukrainian Catholic Church and rectory to multi-unit residential complex, with a three-story addition to be constructed at the rear. The church building is the result of extensive alterations starting in 1946 to a mid-nineteenth-century structure used as the Willing Day Nursery. The rectory was built as an addition to the church in 1952.

The proposed scope includes many new window openings on the sides of the main building. Currently there are three historic windows each on the side facades, all in arched openings. The stained-glass windows on the front façade will be retained. At the rear, a three-story addition is proposed to be constructed on top and around the existing two-story rectory building. The addition rises higher than the church roof. The rear of the property is visible to the public from Lawrence Court.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert former church and rectory buildings to residential use.
- Construct three-story rear addition.
- Cut new window openings into sides of church.

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 new windows as proposed for the side facades of the church building remove the historic window openings and are not in keeping with the architectural features of the building.
 - o The three-story rear addition is not compatible with the massing, size, scale, proportions, and architectural features of the historic property and its environment. As designed, it overwhelms the historic church building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:43:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Rustin Ohler and property owner Mark Travis represented the revised application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the application.
- Paul Boni, Chair of the Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee of the Society Hill Civic Association, commented in opposition to the application.
- Steven Peitzman commented about natural versus electric light sources.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The application was revised to show a mansard with dormers as the third floor of the rear addition, and the overall parapet height was lowered, per an Architectural Committee recommendation. The mansard roof is depicted as a dark color but may appear less massive in a lighter color. A different shape for the third floor may be more appropriate than a Victorian-style mansard roof, including a third floor which is fully vertical. This third floor could be a metal and glass system. A three-story rear addition is appropriate for this site.
- The first two floors at the rear were revised to be clad in brick, per an Architectural Committee recommendation.

- The new windows on the side elevations were revised to be more in keeping with the design of the existing window openings, per an Architectural Committee recommendation.
- This building is a difficult building to adaptively reuse and has been vacant for many years.
- The side elevations of the main building are the best locations for cutting new windows for additional light.
- The four existing louvers in the towers are proposed to be replaced with windows to allow light into the space. A compromise may be new louvers made of an alternative material or replacement of just two of the four openings with windows. These masonry openings are not being altered, and the installation of windows here will allow for the adaptive reuse of the building. Louvers can always be installed into these openings in the future should all four receive new windows.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Architectural Committee should review this project again, owing to the revisions already made and the recommendations of the Historical Commission during this review.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the revised application, pursuant to Standard 9, with the suggestion that the applicant submit an updated application incorporating the Historical Commission's comments. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 425-29 Pine St MOTION: Denial; suggestion to submit updated application MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					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				2

ADDRESS: 832 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate to passive house standards; demolish garage; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Carolina Peña and Christopher Yasejko

Applicant: Carolina Peña, Parallel Architecture Studio

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate a historic building to passive house standards, install solar panels, construct a rear addition, and demolish a non-historic garage. An in-concept application for a similar scope, but which also included the new construction of a detached house at the rear fronting S. Howard Street, was reviewed and approved in-concept by the Historical Commission in November 2022. This application for final approval has removed the new construction at the rear from the scope and omits solar panels from the front roof slope. The proposed rear addition is now completely new construction rather than an extra story on the existing rear addition. Specifications for passive house windows are included with the application, which appear as double-hung windows from the exterior, but function as casements in the bottom sash.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate building to passive house standards.
- Construct three-story rear addition with deck.
- Install solar panels.
- Replace windows and roofing.
- Demolish non-historic garage at rear; install gate.

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.*
 - o Replacement of front façade features such as windows and doors to match the historic appearance satisfies Standard 6. Commission staff will work closely with applicant and window manufacturer to ensure details which match historic appearance.
- *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 removal and construction of a rear addition with three stories does not destroy historic materials which characterize the property and is compatible with the historic property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9. The existing two-story rear addition to be removed is not original to the building.
 - o Installation of solar panels only on the rear roof slope satisfies Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a thermal analysis of the interior masonry wall is submitted for the staff's review, the front window lite pattern is revised to be six-over-six and the windows are lighter in color, a muntin profile drawing is submitted for staff review, and the shutter design is revised based on historic documentation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 108 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: CFY Realty LLC

Applicant: Carolina Peña, Parallel Architecture Studio

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 1/14/1976

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove an existing second-story addition at the rear of the historic piazza of this circa 1825 building and to construct a two-story addition on top of the existing first floor. The proposed addition would be clad in brick and match the height of the main block of the historic building. The parapet of the existing garage would be raised to conceal mechanical equipment and a new deck.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a proposal for alterations and additions to this property in October 2022, which was withdrawn before the Historical Commission meeting. At that time, the Committee supported the removal of the second-story bump out of the ell and the construction of an addition that extends to three stories, matching the height and width of the existing three-story ell, and the full width of the property over the garage.

The staff notes that the muntin configuration of the windows shown in the drawings depicts 9-over-9 windows, when the existing windows are 6-over-6.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove second-floor bump out
- Construct addition and deck

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed addition does not remove significant historic materials and maintains the spatial relationship of the main block and piazza that characterize the property.

The addition would be compatible with the historic materials, features, size and scale and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property, satisfying Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the window pattern is amended, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following conditions:

- The brick wall over the garage is changed to a wood screen to keep the mechanical equipment out of view;
- The windows receive a similar head and sill treatment to the existing windows;
- All eave trim dimensions match those of the existing house in terms of height and overhang;
- Any brick seam between the new and existing has a beltcourse or other detail that differentiates it from below.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1717-19 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Alter rear ell; demolish garage; construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mount Vernon Holdings, LLC

Applicant: Matt Masterpasqua, Mass Architecture Studio, LLC

History: 1859; new façade added, 1890

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify and add to the property at 1717-19 Mount Vernon Street in the Spring Garden Historic District. The western half, or 1719 portion, of the double-width property features a three-story brick main block and rear ell constructed c. 1859 and refaced in 1890, and a one-story frame rear addition. The eastern half, or 1717 portion, has historically remained undeveloped except for a garage constructed between 1910 and 1916 at the rear of the lot and a historic iron fence at the front of the lot.

This application proposes to demolish the garage and selective portions of the rear ell and to construct additions. In Fall 2022, the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviewed in-concept applications for this project. The Committee recommended approval in-concept, provided: the southern addition was set back approximately 10 feet; the color and material of the façade of the southern addition is compatible with the historic building to which it attaches; the first-floor windows of the southern addition are further studied; the northern addition is set back from the bay window of the rear ell; and details of the cornice and fence modification are submitted for final approval. The applicants revised following that meeting, increasing the setback of the southern addition from 6 feet 4 inches to 8 feet; revising the façade color of the addition to be more in keeping with the existing building and altering the window configuration of the first floor of the addition; and setting the northern addition back an additional 10 inches from the existing rear ell bay. The Historical Commission found that an eight-foot setback from the sidewalk line to the façade of the addition is acceptable, and

that additional study and details of the exposed side wall of the historic building are needed to show how the proposed cladding and capping connect the historic building and addition.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish garage and portions of rear ell
- Construct additions

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o Although largely enveloped by the proposed additions, the plans retain much of the original fabric of the main block and rear ell. The height, materials, and punched window openings of the southern addition proposed along Mount Vernon Street are consistent with the scale, massing, materials, and features of the Spring Garden Historic District. The application satisfies this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's November 2022 approval in-concept.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided the following details are refined as discussed:

- The treatment of the cornice of the addition and its transition to the existing building is improved;
- The transition between the existing and new first and second-floor materials is improved;
- The first-floor window is adjusted so that it is centered below the windows above, if possible, and so that the elliptical transom has better proportions;
- The brick and mortar colors and mortar joint are a more compatible complement to the existing materials.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 1018-20 AND 1032 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Convert church complex to residential use

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 1031 Germantown Avenue OCF LLC, Pollard Allen OCF LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1870; Immaculate Conception Roman Catholic Church; Edwin Forrest Durang, architect; 1909, Rectory, George I. Lovatt Sr., architect

Individual Designation: 4/12/2019

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to convert the former Immaculate Conception church and rectory in Northern Liberties to residential use. The church, which officially closed in 2020, was designed by Edwin F. Durang and constructed in 1870, and the rectory by George I. Lovatt Sr. in 1909. In the church, the application proposes to insert additional floor levels and install new windows and metal spandrel panels in the existing window openings, and to install new dormers near the base of the steep gable roof on the east and west elevations. The stained glass rose window and transoms on the north elevation would remain. New synthetic slate roofing would replace the existing slate roofing. On the rectory, the application proposes to replace the existing non-historic windows with windows that match the historic appearance, and to install windows in place of an existing garage opening and man door. The window and dormer configurations were revised following the Architectural Committee review in November 2022.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install floor levels.
- Replace windows and doors.
- Replace roofing.
- Alter openings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary or pictorial evidence.*
 - o The proposed windows reflect the consistent horizontal rectangular proportions or divisions of the historic windows.
 - o The existing rectangular grey slate roofing is in poor condition, and if original, is over 150 years old, having outlived the standard service life of slate roofing. A grey synthetic or asphalt shingle in a rectangular shape could approximate the historic appearance of the roofing.
 - o The existing front door slabs are not original. The staff recommends that the design of the new doors be based off the drawings and historic photographs of the property.
 - o The application complies with Standard 6.
- 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 height and slope of the existing roof would make it difficult to reuse without the insertion of windows. The previously proposed shed dormers were small and low in relationship to the large sloping roof, which maintains its full slope at the front and rear of the roof. The revised gable dormers require less removal of roofing material and structure, but the details and proportions of the proposed dormers require additional consideration. The application largely satisfies the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, provided the dormer windows are refined, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs Guideline, provided that:

- the new windows and doors accurately reflect the historic windows and doors,
- the dormers are revised to have a better rhythm and to better integrate with the roof,
- the dormer sills are reduced, minimized, or eliminated, and
- the synthetic slate matches the historic slate.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:18:13

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application largely responds to the earlier comments of the Architectural Committee and staff.
- The revised windows more accurately reflect the historic windows.
- The concept of individual dormers is preferable to single long dormers; however, the proportions and details of the individual dormers warrant additional consideration. Specifically, the proportion of glass to wall as shown is out of keeping with the character of the building and dormers on historic buildings. The applicants should consider shed roofs to allow for wider windows in the openings.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised windows and roofing replicate the appearance of the historic features, satisfying Standard 6.
- The proposed dormers do not damage or obscure character-defining features of the building, and, with modifications, will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application in concept, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1018-20 and 1032 N Front St MOTION: Approval in concept MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					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				2

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 30 NOVEMBER 2022

ADDRESS: 647-59 N 42ND ST

Name of Resource: Mount Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church

Review: Designation

Property Owner: Mount Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church

Nominator: University City Historical Society

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Mount Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church building at 647-59 N. 42nd Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the two-and-a-half story Gothic Revival church satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and J.

The nomination contends that Mount Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church (MOTBC), built by the hands of its African American congregants in 1923, has significant character as part of the development of the African American community in West Philadelphia during the early twentieth century, fulfilling Criteria for Designation A and J. The nomination also argues that MOTBC satisfies Criterion for Designation B through its association with both civil rights activism and the Great Migration, which was characterized by the mass relocation of millions of migrants from the South to the North from 1910-1970. Rev. Marshall L. Shepard, famed civil rights activist and close colleague to Dr. Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., pastored MOTBC from 1926 until his death in 1967.

Only the church building is included in this nomination. The surrounding parking lots and senior housing complex are excluded from the proposed boundary.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 647-59 N. 42nd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and J, and

should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with an amended period of significance to end in 1967 with the passing of Rev. Marshall L. Shepard.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 647-59 N. 42nd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with a period of significance ending in 1967.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:27:58

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Amy Lambert represented the nomination.
- Brenda Bailey represented the church, the owner of the property.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Deborah Gary of Society to Preserve Philadelphia African American Assets (SPPAA) commented in support of the nomination.
- Jim Duffin commented in support of the nomination.
- David Traub commented in support of the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Mount Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church has significant character as part of the development of the African American community in West Philadelphia during the early twentieth century.
- The Mount Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church can be associated with both civil rights activism and the Great Migration.
- The period of significance should be amended to end in 1967, marking the passing of Rev. Marshall L. Shepard.
- Only the church building on the 647-59 N. 42nd Street parcel should be included in the nomination for designation.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Mount Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church, built by its African American congregants, represents the development of the African American community in West Philadelphia during the early twentieth century, satisfying Criteria for Designation A and J.
- Mount Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church also satisfies Criterion for Designation B through its association with both civil rights activism and the Great Migration.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 647-59 N. 42nd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with an amended period of significance to end in 1967. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 647-59 N 42nd St MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, B, and J. Amend period of significance to end in 1967. MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					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				2

ADDRESS: 1722-24 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Peck & Peck Store

Review: Designation

Property Owner: SG National LLC

Nominator: Center City Residents Association

Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1722-24 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. A three-story masonry commercial building known as the Peck & Peck Store Building, built in 1929 in the Art Deco style and designed by the architecture firm of Silverman & Levy, stands on the property.

The nomination contends that the Peck & Peck Store Building satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. It argues that the building reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embodies many of the distinguishing characteristics of the Art Deco architectural style as seen on attached commercial buildings, satisfying Criteria C & D. The nomination also argues that the Silverman & Levy architecture firm, designers of the building, had a significant influence on the development of Art Deco and other modernist styles of architecture in the city of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion E.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1722-24 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1722-24 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:40:25

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Jim Duffin and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub highlighted the importance of designating the commercial buildings in this area on the edge of the Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District. He added that the research in the nomination was done well, and he commended the nominators on their work. He also added that the building was occupied by the Ladybug retail establishment after its association with Peck & Peck and offered a little more historic background as well.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The architectural firm of Silverman & Levy designed the Peck & Peck store building at 1722-24 Chestnut Street.
- The Peck & Peck store building at 1722-24 Chestnut Street reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embodies many of the distinguishing characteristics of the Art Deco style.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Peck & Peck store building reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embodies many of the distinguishing characteristics of the Art Deco style, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The Silverman & Levy architecture firm had a significant influence on the development of Art Deco and other modernist styles of architecture in the city of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion E.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1722-24 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Sánchez seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1722-24 Chestnut St MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, and E MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Sanchez					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					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				2

ADDRESS: 1700-06 RACE ST

Name of Resource: James McGinnis Co. Building/Arthur Mallie Residence/Ellison Apartments

Review: Designation

Property Owner: PD Investments LP

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1700-06 Race Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the group of brick buildings satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. According to the nomination, the James McGinnis Company Building and Arthur Mallie Residence at 1700-02 Race Street, built in 1902, and the Ellison Apartments at 1706 Race Street, built in 1909, exemplify the Georgian Revival style of architecture, a more formal version of the Colonial Revival mode that became dominant in urban residential construction in Philadelphia and other American cities beginning around 1895.

The four-story building at 1704 Race Street is included in the parcel proposed for designation. However, this circa 1850, Italianate-style rowhouse has been subject to alterations that have largely covered the historic front facade and removed several significant original features. For this reason, and because it significantly predates the period when the Georgian Revival style became dominant, for the purposes of this nomination under Criteria C and D, 1704 Race Street is considered non-contributing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1700-06 Race Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, with the building formerly known as 1704 Race Street classified as non-contributing.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1700-06

Race Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:46:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi, Paul Steinke, and Kevin McMahon represented the nomination.
- Attorney Sean Whalen, architect Ray Rola, and property owner Steve Eizen represented the property.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Grossi summarized the historic significance of the property as outlined in the nomination.
- Mr. Thomas asked for confirmation that the building formerly known as 1704 Race Street is described as non-historic in the nomination.
 - o Mr. Farnham confirmed this.
- Mr. Whalen stated that a designation of this property is not warranted. He observed that the original architect, designer, and builder are unknown, and no significant events took place here pertaining to the Parkway project. He stated that these buildings predate construction of the Parkway and that simply surviving is not a Criterion for Designation. He stated that the buildings are “builder-grade knockoffs” and “a mishmash of styles.” He suggested that designation of any building which has simply survived would result in designation of most buildings in Philadelphia. He stated that there must be something more to warrant historic designation. Mr. Whalen explained that these properties were consolidated around 1998, at which time they were used by the Friends Select School but have been vacant yet maintained for several years. He stated that the individuals named in the nomination as associated with the buildings are not significant. He argued against the satisfaction of Criteria C and D. He observed that the buildings have been altered over time, including the façade at 1704 Race Street, resulting in its non-historic classification. He questioned how the Historical Commission would regulate a single property with one section classified as non-historic.
- Mr. Rola presented his Powerpoint slides in opposition to designation. He outlined his credentials and portfolio of adaptive reuse projects as well as the historic properties owned by Steve Eizen during his 45 years in commercial real estate. Mr. Rola displayed the Clio Group surveys for these properties from 1980. He noted that the Clio Group survey form describes 1700-02 Race Street as “Late Victorian Eclectic,” but the current nomination states it is “Georgian Revival.” The Clio Group survey form describes 1704 Race Street as “Greek Revival” whereas the current nomination states it is “Italianate.” The Clio Group survey form describes 1706 Race Street as “Renaissance Revival,” but the current nomination states it is “Georgian Revival.” Mr. Rola observed that the nomination is based on significance owing to architectural style, but there is discrepancy as to the actual style of these buildings. He stated that the Georgian Revival style is not characteristic of a certain era owing to it still being a popular style for new construction today, and not just in Philadelphia. He described character-defining features of the Georgian Revival style and showed how the subject buildings have some of those features but are not pure examples of the style. He stated that symmetry and proportions are important in the Georgian Revival style and these facades are lacking. He opined that the facades are not

attractive, are unbalanced, and do not follow the principles of Georgian architecture. He stated that the brickwork is lacking craftsmanship and repointing was done poorly years ago. He opined that the corner entrance steps, likely where caskets were brought out during use as a funeral home, was not well designed for carrying caskets. He pointed out the pressed stucco “brickwork” on 1704 and 1706 Race Street which covers real brick. He displayed images of classic Georgian Revival buildings in Philadelphia and compared them to the subject property to demonstrate how the subject property is lacking. He opined that the buildings were likely done by draftsmen utilizing catalogs to pick out architectural features.

- Ms. Cooperman stated that Mr. Rola’s argument is misguided, and that “there is no Georgian Revival police out there.” She stated that the Criteria for Designation refer to a period of time, and these buildings are of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Eclectic period with features which look to the Georgian period and Gothic form. She observed that there are many buildings of the same scale and eclectic combination of various style elements, which reflect a vernacular approach to design, and which represent the built environment of the period.
- Mr. Thomas summarized that many buildings in Philadelphia are historically significant but are not pure examples of an architectural style.
- Mr. Steinke thanked the property owner for his stewardship of other historic buildings and stated that the Preservation Alliance nominated the property because it stands out in the neighborhood.
- Kevin McMahon, author of the nomination, argued for the Georgian Revival qualities of the facades. He stated that the buildings are distinctive works of architecture with significant Georgian Revival influences on a prominent Center City corner.
- Mr. Whalen clarified that there are no development or demolition plans for the property. Rather, it is a case where the owner, who has numerous other historic properties, asserts that this property should not be designated at this time, as the architecture does not warrant historic designation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the designation, and opposition to demolition of the buildings, despite there being no application for demolition under consideration.
- Oscar Beisert commented in support of the designation.
- Steven Peitzman commented in support of the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The buildings at 1700-02, 1704, and 1706 Race Street were constructed separately but have since been consolidated into one parcel, being 1700-06 Race Street.
- The nomination classifies the building formerly known as 1704 Race Street as non-contributing, meaning not historically or architecturally significant.
- Many Philadelphia buildings that are historically significant are not a pure example of an architectural style.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The buildings at 1700-02 Race Street and 1706 Race Street exemplify an eclectic Georgian Revival style of architecture, which became dominant in urban residential construction in Philadelphia and other American cities beginning around 1895, satisfying Criteria C and D.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1700-06 Race Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1700-06 Race St MOTION: Designate, Criteria C and D MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					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				2

ADDRESS: 8835 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Julia Hebard Marsden House

Review: Designation

Property Owner: Chestnut Hill Hospital LLC

Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the former Julia Hebard Marsden residence and stable, two buildings on the Chestnut Hill Hospital campus, at 8835 Germantown Avenue and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the buildings satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the house and stable are representative examples of the Colonial Revival “country houses” that appeared in Chestnut Hill following the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the buildings were designed by the nationally significant and Philadelphia-born architect Charles Barton Keen. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the residence and stable contributed to the neighborhood’s status as an elite residential enclave at the turn of the twentieth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the site at 8835 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J. The staff also recommends that the Historical Commission seek a compromise designation that would allow the not-for-profit health care provider, which provides essential services to the community, to

reuse the site effectively while protecting and preserving the most important historic resources at the site.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Julia Hebard Marsden House at 8835 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the boundary amended to exclude the large non-historic parking garage structure.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:33:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Lori Salganicoff of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy represented the nomination.
- Attorneys Matt McClure and Meredith Trego represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission had received a request from the district councilperson's office late in the afternoon one day before this meeting asking the Historical Commission to table this review until the nominator and property owner have an opportunity for additional discussions. He stated that he believed that the request was made on behalf of the nominator, the Chestnut Hill Conservancy, because Ms. Salganicoff was cc'ed on the email making the request. He suggested that the Historical Commission should address the tabling request before proceeding with a review of the nomination on its merits.
- Mr. Thomas asked the representatives of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy and Chestnut Hill Hospital to address the continuance request proffered by the district councilperson's office.
- Ms. Salganicoff read a prepared statement on the merits of designation. She then stated that her organization would be willing to discuss potential compromises with the hospital if the Historical Commission did decide to continue the review.
- Mr. McClure asked the chair to clarify whether he wanted statements on the proposed continuance or on the merits of designation. He noted that Ms. Salganicoff only spoke on the merits of designation.
 - o Mr. Thomas stated that he wanted Ms. Salganicoff and Mr. McClure to limit their statements to the proposed continuance.
 - o Mr. McClure stated that his client opposes the continuance request and explained that he has hospital representatives, consultants, patients, and physicians ready to testify today. Mr. McClure asked the Historical Commission to hear the testimony from those in attendance who are ready to move forward. He noted that the continuance request was received late yesterday.
 - o Mr. Thomas stated that he agreed with Mr. McClure's request to move forward with the review, given that people were not provided with sufficient notice of the continuance request.
- Ms. Salganicoff clarified that the district councilperson's office made the continuance request. The Chestnut Hill Conservancy had nothing to do with the continuance request but would agree to it.
- Mr. McClure stated that his client has spent considerable time and money preparing for today's meeting and hospital staff and consultants are in attendance and ready to testify. Likewise, many members of the public have taken time out of their schedules

- to appear today and testify in support of the hospital. He asked the Historical Commission to allow testimony to be placed on the record today so that the many people attending on behalf and in support of the hospital do not need to return at a later time. He noted that the Historical Commission can always table the matter after hearing from those people and make the final decision on designation at a later date.
- o Mr. Thomas agreed and suggested that the Historical Commission should take testimony today.
 - Ms. Cooperman stated that she supported the request to table or continue the matter without taking any testimony today. She stated that the Historical Commission should give the parties an opportunity to come to a compromise.
 - Mr. Thomas turned the chair over to Vice Chair Washington and stepped away from the meeting.
 - Ms. Washington asked if other Commissioners wanted to speak on the continuance request.
 - o No comments were offered.
 - Mr. McClure objected to a continuance out to March 2023 and stated that he would reluctantly accept a continuance for one month.
 - o Ms. Cooperman stated that she chose March to give the parties sufficient time. She stated that the parties may come to an agreement before the February meeting and request to appear on that agenda.
 - Mr. Reuter noted that four members of the public have their hands raised to speak. He stated that the Law Department has determined that the Historical Commission does not have to take public comment when merely considering continuance requests because no party has rights at stake with a continuance.
 - Mr. McClure stated that this nomination was filed by a third party but, once the Historical Commission accepts the nomination as correct and complete, the nomination belongs to the Commission. This is not an adversarial hearing with two parties, the Hospital and the Conservancy; this is a matter between the Historical Commission and the Hospital. The Historical Commission is not a mediator between two parties. It is charged with determining whether this property should be designated as historic. Ultimately, the decision to designate is the Historical Commission's decision.
 - o Mr. Reuter agreed with Mr. McClure. He stated that this is not a matter with two parties but is between the Historical Commission and the Hospital. He noted that it is related to the Historical Commission's policy on withdrawing nominations. The decision to withdraw is the Historical Commission's alone, not the nominator's. The nominator is not a party to the matter. Mr. Reuter also noted that the person making the continuance request is not in attendance so the basis for the request cannot be known.
 - o Mr. Farnham stated that he assumed that the request to table or continue was initiated by the nominator because Ms. Salganicoff was cc'ed on the email sent by the district councilperson's staff member making the request. He stated that his assumption appears to be incorrect because Ms. Salganicoff has denied any knowledge of or involvement in the making of the request.
 - Mr. McClure stated that he would no longer object to a short continuance because he has just been informed by the CEO of the hospital that several of the people who were planning to testify have had to drop out of the meeting because the meeting has run so long.
 - Ms. Salganicoff stated that she supports a continuance to the March 2023 meeting of the Historical Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue consideration of the matter to the Historical Commission's meeting on 10 March 2023. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 0.

ITEM: 8835 Germantown Ave MOTION: Continue review to March 2023 PHC meeting MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni					X
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	7				5

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

ADDRESS: 1801 N HOWARD ST

Name of Resource: Star Carpet Mill
Review: National Register Comment
Property Owner: 1801 N Howard Street LLC
Nominator: Adrian Trevisan, 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 1801 N. Howard Street located in the Kensington neighborhood of Philadelphia and historically known as the Star Carpet Mill. 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 1801 N. Howard Street states that the property is significant under Criterion A in the Area of Industry and Labor History. The Star Carpet Mill was an important producer of ingrain carpets in Philadelphia during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. It was also a site of labor unrest in the late 1880s, but unique owing to mill owner Joseph Taylor's key role in developing the collective response to the strikes by the mill owners across Kensington. The property is a brick complex composed of six sections built between 1880 and 1891. The tallest portion of the complex is the four-story main building with the other building sections being one to two stories in height. The significance of Star Carpet Mill is evaluated within the historical context established by the Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF), "Industrial and Commercial Buildings Related to the Textile Industry in the Kensington Neighborhood of Philadelphia."

The Period of Significance in the Area of Industry begins in 1880 building construction and ends circa 1908, when founder Joseph Taylor's family ended its involvement with the property. The Period of Significance in the Area of Labor History focuses on a key period of unrest for the local mills during 1884 and 1885. The property was added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 2020.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:09:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission for comments.
- Kevin McMahon of Powers & Company represented the nomination. He spoke on behalf of colleague Adrian Trevisan, who authored the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mr. Beisert stated he was glad to see this nomination and the potential for a Historic Preservation Tax Incentives project at the property.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McMahon acknowledged Oscar Beisert's nomination of the property to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 2020. He stated that Mr. Beisert's documentation provided a good foundation for their work on the National Register nomination.
- Ms. Cooperman said she would be pleased to see this property historically designated at the local and national level. She added that the National Register nomination may indicate a developer may be seeking Historic Preservation Tax Incentives to redevelop the site.
- The Commissioners supported the nomination for listing 1801 N. Howard Street on the National Register of Historic Places.

ADDRESS: 459 W GLENWOOD AVE

Name of Resource: S. L. Allen & Company Factory

Review: National Register Comment

Property Owner: Flexible Flyer Studios LP

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

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

The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 459 Glenwood Avenue located in the Fairhill neighborhood of North Philadelphia and historically known as the S.L. Allen & Company Building. 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 S.L. Allen & Company is significant under Criterion A in the Area of Industry as a leading manufacturer of garden and farming tools. The S.L. Allen & Company manufactured their patented "Flexible Flyer" sled, a widely recognizable American product that came to define recreation and childhood play in wintertime soon after it was released around 1890. The 2.7 acre property at 459 Glenwood Avenue includes two contributing historic resources that represent the surviving buildings of the S.L. Allen & Company factory complex. The largest is a five- and six-story industrial building. Designed by Dodge & Day in 1907 and substantially enlarged with an addition designed by Ballinger & Perrot in 1912, both sections of the factory, known as Buildings 7 and 7A, are constructed of brick and reinforced concrete. The property also contains a one-story, circa 1905 storage building, Building 6, which is located east of the factory. The Period of Significance begins in 1905 when Building 6, the oldest surviving building completed construction, and ends in 1969 when the production facility moved to Ohio and vacated the Glenwood Avenue site.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:14:50

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McMahon said the nomination was fun to write based on the Flexible Flyer's history, as it is such an iconic American product and was made in North Philadelphia. Mr. McMahon added that a Historic Preservation Tax Incentives project is currently planned for the property.

- The Commissioners supported the nomination for listing 459 W. Glenwood Avenue on the National Register of Historic Places.

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:18:02

ACTION: At 12:20 p.m., Mr. McCoubrey moved to adjourn. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: Adjourn MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: O'Donnell					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni					X
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	7				5

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its advisory committees 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.