

**THE MINUTES OF THE 644TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 8 APRIL 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, chair
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
Melissa Long, Office of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Thomas McDade, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Betty Turner, M.A.

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

ALSO PRESENT

Ted Singer, Onion Flats
Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia
Steven Savage, SRS
Stephen Foley, Foley Beam Architects
Jackie Gusic, InHabit LLC
Samantha Kin, Samantha Kin Design
Joseph Menkevich
John Manton
Oscar Beisert
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel LLP
Kathy Dowdell, AIA Philadelphia
Ken Milano
George Thomas, Civic Visions
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr LLP
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr LLP
Darin Steinberg, Esq.
Celeste Morello
Dana Fedeli
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP
Andrew Fearon

J. M. Duffin
Darrell R. Bradsbery, Second Baptist Church of Frankford
William Martin, Fox Rothschild
Eric Fitzsimmons
Julie O'Connell
Josh Horvitz, Esq., Fineman Krekstein & Harris
Paul Horos
Don Simon, Central Roxborough Civic Association
Bill Golderer
Megan Fitzpatrick, Ambit Architecture
Steve Watson
Serge Nalbantian, Liberty Property
Kathryn Martinez, Liberty Property
Rev. Michael Caine, Old First UCC
Rich Orlow
Greg Diehl, Old City District
Debbie and Larry Mangel
Father Dennis Gill, Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul
James J. Bock, Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul
Bryn-Erin Kerr, Philadelphia City Planning Commission

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Gupta, Hawkins, Leonard, Long, Mattioni, McCoubrey, McDade, Merriman, Royer, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to nominate Sara Merriman as vice chair of the Historical Commission. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

MINUTES OF THE 643RD STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 643rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 March 2016. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

Mr. Farnham introduced requests to continue the reviews of nominations for 30 W. Chestnut Hill Avenue and 1115-27 Frankford Avenue for 90 days. He explained that the property owner and nominator jointly made the request for 30 W. Chestnut Hill Avenue. He explained that the property owner and neighbors jointly made the request for 1115-27 Frankford Avenue; the nominator neither supported nor opposed the request. Ms. Cooperman recused from the consideration of the request for 30 W. Chestnut Hill Avenue, owing to her involvement in the preparation of the nomination.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to continue the review of the nomination for 30 W. Chestnut Hill Avenue for 90 days, to the Historical Commission's meeting on 8 July 2016. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to continue the review of the nomination for 1115-27 Frankford Avenue for 90 days, to the Historical Commission's meeting on 8 July 2016. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MARCH 2016

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 2050 Locust Street, 1318 Pine Street, and 300 Market Street. Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. He then asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 2050 Locust Street, 1318 Pine Street, and 300 Market Street. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1416-22 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Replace windows and doors; cut opening; construct stair tower and walkway

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Elk Street Management

Applicant: Ted Singer, Plumbob LLC

History: 1891; 10th District Patrol Stable; Charles O'Neill, contractor

Individual Designation: 1/1/3000

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the following:

- the applicant submit a site plan and photographs of the building's context and views for Commission's review;
- the stair addition is constructed of masonry and with a base;
- the doors on the stair addition are more in keeping with the design of the historic building;
- the applicant submit plans showing the location of mechanical equipment, hoods, and roof vents for bathrooms and kitchens;
- the exterior walkway is constructed only of iron, steel, and/or corrugated metal, but no glass;
- wood windows are used on the front elevation;
- the applicant evaluates retaining the base at the new side entrance except at a door cut, perhaps by retaining the existing windows and cutting down large door between them; the front entranceway is designed based on the historic photograph, with a high lintel and large wood doors.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate an existing commercial space on the ground floor of this former police stable building into a restaurant and to create two residential units on the upper floors. Since the time of the Architectural Committee review, the applicant has revised the drawings to reflect some of the Committee's recommendations and to retain additional

historic fabric. The revised application proposes to retain and rework the existing front door, which although non-historic, is generally compatible with the character of the building. Where the original proposal called for the cutting of a door and windows on the south side of the building, which would have removed a portion of the historic stone base, the revised proposal removes only the brick between two windows for the installation of an additional window.

The application also proposes to construct a small, enclosed stair addition at the rear to provide access to a new suspended exterior walkway along the north wall for access into the new residential units on the second floor. Per the Committee's recommendation, the suspended stair is constructed entirely of metal, with no glass, and the addition is constructed of masonry. The doors on the addition have been revised to be more in keeping with the design of the historic building.

The property is currently under consideration for designation; it is not yet designated. Planning for the renovation was underway at the time the nomination was submitted. While not all aspects of the application satisfy a strict interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the Commission may invoke its transition rule, which allows for the consideration and approval of development plans in process at the time of designation.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ted Singer and owner Paul Horos represented the application.

Mr. Thomas asked if the applicant would like to offer any additional comments; Mr. Singer stated that he had nothing to add. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. McCoubrey if the revised design was in keeping with the Architectural Committee's discussion. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the revised design nicely reflects the Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment. John Manton commented that the building looks more like a firehouse than a police stable. Mr. Thomas responded that his comment was more appropriate to the designation discussion, which will take place later in the meeting. Ms. DiPasquale corrected Mr. Manton, explaining that the building in question was a police stable, not a firehouse, and noted that it had attached to the rear of a police station, now demolished, facing N. Front Street.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the revised application as reviewed by the Historical Commission at its meeting of 8 April 2016, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 141-43 N 4TH ST AND 319 CHERRY ST

Proposal: Demolish rear building; construct 6-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: John G. Traver Co. Inc., c/o Steven Savitz

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1780

Individual Designation: 4/26/1966

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, and, pending the outcome of additional research, perhaps Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. The Committee commented that the scale and massing of the proposed new construction is too large; that the structure should be reduced in height; and that more information about the history, structural condition, and changes to the schoolhouse building should be provided.

OVERVIEW: This application seeks in-concept approval for the development of a parcel that includes 141-43 N 4th St and 319 Cherry Street. The original application proposed to demolish one- and four-story structures at the rear of 141-43 N. 4th Street, and to construct an L-shaped, six-story building on the site, which would be combined with a vacant parcel at 319 Cherry Street. The eighteenth-century property at 141-43 N. 4th Street, which was individually designated in 1966 and categorized as Significant in the Old City Historic District inventory in 2003, would be retained and would become a stand-alone building once again. The primary question for this in-concept review is in regards to the rear four-story building and the vacant lot.

The structures at the rear of the property are not explicitly called out in the Old City Historic District inventory, however additional research and a site visit by the applicant following the Architectural Committee confirmed that the four-story structure at the center of the parcel is, in fact, an eighteenth-century school building that was associated with the German Reformed Church on Race Street, and which was converted to a warehouse in the nineteenth century. The structure appears to have had a story added, and the rear is stuccoed, but the north elevation retains its brick watertable and Flemish bond pattern, and the original window and door openings are easily discernible. The razing or partial razing of the structure would constitute a demolition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).

Since the Architectural Committee review, the applicant has revised the plans to retain the former school building, but to construct two additional stories on top of it, and to cut large, industrial windows into the rear stuccoed wall. Plans for the construction of the new six-story building on 319 Cherry have changed only slightly, mostly in terms of materials.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ryan Lohbauer and developer Steven Savage represented the application.

Mr. Lohbauer explained that his client does not yet own the property, but is considering purchasing it. He is in a due-diligence phase and is seeking to understand the constraints that the Historical Commission may place on the redevelopment of the site. He noted that the in-concept review is aimed at determining boundaries for the development, and that they are committed to returning to the Committee and Commission with a more fully conceived design at a later date.

Mr. Lohbauer noted that, at the recommendation of the Architectural Committee, he had conducted additional research and a site visit that supported the staff's assessment that the

building in question was a 1796 school building associated with the German Reform church. The school building was later heavily modified. He stated that the structural report states that the remaining structure is in relatively decent condition, but would require extensive maintenance. Since the Architectural Committee, he continued, he had talked with the staff and tried to adapt the design to retain what he believed to be the most important elements of the historic building so that they remain visible. He opined that the building is minimally visible from the public right-of-way, and that both the 4th and Cherry Street views are artificial, as buildings historically filled in the blocks where there are now parking lots. Only a portion of the historic façade is visible from Race Street, he noted.

Mr. Lohbauer opined that they would offer to retain the façade in order to try and preserve something that is visible and in the public interest, but that it would be done at significant expense as the mortar joints need to be replaced and the façade likely underpinned to meet the building code. As a result of the additional expense, he argued, it would be important to have additional floor area with the construction of additional stories to offset cost of preservation activities.

Regarding the comments about height offered by the Architectural Committee, Mr. Lohbauer noted that there is a historic five-story structure on Orianna Street that is over 60 feet tall, which exceeds the height of his proposed design. He argued that, if the question is whether the height is compatible with the historic context, the answer is yes, and the proposed building would fit into the context of the industrial period in which this area developed.

Mr. Lohbauer summarized that they would like an approval of the overall bounds of the proposed development, and would return with a much more detailed proposal, if it makes sense to do so.

Ms. Hawkins clarified for the new Commission members that the Historical Commission has jurisdiction over a building's entire exterior envelope, whether it is visible from a public right-of-way or not. Ms. Hawkins noted that the current proposal appears to retain most of three walls and to push out the rear wall. Mr. Lohbauer confirmed her assertion. Ms. Hawkins responded that, in her experience, such an alteration would constitute a demolition, and would require a demolition review prior to the project moving forward. Mr. Lohbauer asked whether that would mean a hardship application. Ms. Hawkins responded that there are a few avenues to a demolition approval, which the staff could explain to him if necessary, but that there is little left of the building in this proposal and that she could not see how it would not be considered a demolition in the legal sense. Mr. Lohbauer asked how the Commission identified the threshold when a project transitions from an alteration to a demolition, noting that they propose to retain the majority of the existing brick shell.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that, in regards to the proposed height and massing, while there is a taller building at the opposite end of Orianna Street, the buildings are smaller at this end of the street. There are two gable-end structures facing Cherry Street; the proposed building would be six stories with a blank party wall facing the historic structures. He noted that he continued to support the staff's and Architectural Committee's recommendations that the height, particularly along Orianna Street, is too great. He noted that the proposal seems to be predicated on maximizing floor area, and does not necessarily take into account the context; it is simply based on the height limits in Old City. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the Old City height limit of 65 feet is a zoning protection designed to protect the area from buildings that would be too tall. The FAR, he continued, is an important component for evaluating the site from a development standpoint. Zoning allows for 500% and the current proposal is at 440%, he noted. An additional reduction, perhaps into the neighborhood of 300%, would significantly limit density.

Regarding the adjacent lots, Mr. Lohbauer noted that the gable-roofed structures are adjacent to a large parking lot that is certain to be developed in the future, likely with a tall structure that transitions from the proposed corner property to the gable-roofed properties. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Commission cannot speak to future development, and must address the current context, not a speculative future context. Mr. Lohbauer argued that the existing context is an artificial context created in the 1960s.

Mr. Thomas asked about the proposed treatment of the west wall of the six-story corner building. Mr. Lohbauer responded that it would likely be brick or another compatible material, using 320 Race Street as a successful example.

Ms. Hawkins echoed Mr. McCoubrey's comments, noting the traditional development pattern in Philadelphia. There is a hierarchy, with principal streets, i.e. 3rd, 4th or Race Streets, having taller buildings. Also, the corner buildings tend to be larger, with smaller buildings at the centers of blocks. Mr. Lohbauer agreed, but noted that a historic aerial of the area shows that this was a tall block during its industrial period. He opined that it is really only a creation of the 1960s that makes the area seem like Colonial Williamsburg.

Ms. Merriman asked whether the historic school building would support an additional story on it. Mr. Lohbauer responded that it currently can be considered a four-story building, including a half-height basement, two stories of the 1796 structure, and an additional story constructed in the 1880s or 1890s. He noted that the structural engineer looked at the brick wall, and recommended significant reinforcing and repair of the wall so that it can support additional stories. Ms. Merriman asked if the historic structure would support a third additional story on top of it. She suggested shifting some of the density from the corner of Orianna and Cherry Street. Mr. Lohbauer responded that it might be feasible and something to consider, but that it would trigger zoning variances. Others suggested that the historic school building should be protected, not enlarged. Mr. Lohbauer noted that the church is concerned about the overall height at the development, especially at the school building.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the primary resource to keep in mind is the historic building. She noted that, as proposed, only two elevations of the building would remain, with one being encased in the building and the other being blown out, and two stories being added on top. At some point, she noted, there is not a lot of historic building left. She reiterated that she could not see the current proposal as anything but a demolition because the side and roof have been removed completely. Ms. Cooperman concurred. She opined that there is no way to construe the amount of material being removed as anything but a demolition. Mr. Lohbauer responded that damage has already been done to the façades that are visible from Cherry Street, and opined that whatever architectural detail was there when the building was constructed has been removed or obscured. Ms. Cooperman responded that it is not clear what fabric remains underneath the stucco, but that there is no information that shows the feasibility or infeasibility of retaining the wall.

Mr. Lohbauer commented that the biggest challenge is the configuration of the site and figuring out how to preserve some of the historic structure but also develop the property profitably. He noted that the way structure "C," the 30ft x 60ft schoolhouse, is sited with deep setbacks from the surrounding streets makes it difficult to develop without removing or enclosing some of the walls. He noted that the stuccoed walls on the east and south-facing facades were historically not visible.

Mr. Thomas noted that he understands the limitations of the schoolhouse and suggested that the comments of the Commissioners may help the applicant. He observed that, by the 1916 Sanborn, the building had been encased on two sides. He noted that, as a school, the building likely had a gable roof, and asked if it has a flat roof now. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the roof is now flat. Ms. Cooperman responded to Mr. Thomas's point that the building had been partially encased, clarifying that the 1916 Sanborn shows only a one-story structure around the school building. The historic building was not completely encased.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment. Adjacent property owner Larry Mangel commented that he lives directly across Orianna Street from the proposed development, and that there is not enough room to build a six-story building on the site. He stated that he is opposed to the proposal. Mr. Thomas responded that the question about whether there is enough room gets into the architectural and structural design, and is not the Commission's concern today. Mr. Mangel noted that he would continue to stand opposed. Mr. Thomas responded that it would be helpful if Mr. Mangel would explain his opposition in terms of historic resources. Mr. Mangel responded that he believes the development will be terrible for the street, which is beautiful. He noted that all of his neighbors will oppose the development, which will overwhelm the block.

Reverend Michael Caine commented that he is the pastor for Old First Reformed Church on Race Street, the institution that built the schoolhouse. He noted that his church has an interest in the property, and would be interested in purchasing it if possible. Historically, he noted, the building was associated with the church and is important to Old City and its development. He noted his appreciation that the revised proposal retains a portion of the historic building, but expressed concern about the density of the proposed development. He noted that they would appreciate it if the owners and architects would continue to be in contact with the church.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance sympathized with the argument that Old City is equal parts industrial and residential, but expressed concern on this particular site for the schoolhouse at the center of the parcel. He concurred with the concerns expressed by Commissioners that the building must be treated as sensitively as possible, and that the amount of removal of historic fabric as currently proposed is arguably a demolition. He expressed his confidence that something sensitive to the context of Old City could be achieved on this site, but noted that it would include the retention of the schoolhouse.

Mr. Lohbauer asked if it was possible to keep all four brick walls but remove the roof, and whether that would constitute a demolition. Ms. Hawkins responded that occasionally the Historical Commission has approved one-story additions on existing buildings, but it depends on how it is done. Ms. Hawkins opined that a lighter addition on top of the building with a thinner link to the new construction on Orianna Street that allowed for the reading of all four corners of the historic building might be acceptable. She noted that the links should appear new and different. Mr. Lohbauer asked whether additions to the structure that block or encapsulate the walls would be acceptable or defeat the purpose. Ms. Hawkins responded that it is impossible to talk theoretically about the possibilities, and that the staff could help guide a revised design. Mr. Thomas commented that there are multiple layers of regulation, and that the applicant may need to apply for an economic hardship exemption.

Mr. Thomas encouraged the applicant to work with the staff on revising the application. Mr. Lohbauer asked if there was a way to take the temperature of the Commission to determine what sorts of changes may be appropriate. Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission would not vote on individual elements, but that he would be happy to continue the discussion, if necessary. Mr. Thomas noted that, in terms of height, taller buildings tend to be on major

streets; Race is a major street, but Cherry is not. Mr. Schaaf agreed, noting that the location of the church and its yard adjacent to 320 Race gives that property room that would not be available at the corner of Cherry and Orianna. Mr. Lohbauer responded that, when 320 Race was constructed, there was a structure next to the church, and argued that, as such, the proposed construction fits the historic context. Mr. Thomas responded that he understands Mr. Lohbauer's comments, but asserted that the Commission is looking at the current impact on historic resources. He noted that there are still slimy, Dickensian alleyways in parts of Philadelphia, but at the time those were constructed, no one was paying attention to the impacts on their neighbors. Mr. Thomas noted that the historic school is an important building, although it has been altered, and that the offer to restore the 200-year-old facades is helpful in understanding what was there.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the in-concept application, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2050 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Construct garage and roof deck with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mary Dandrea

Applicant: Stephen Foley, Foley-Beam Architecture

History: 1897; Art Deco base and grille, c. 1930

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the garage door is located in the plane of the existing rear wall, and a mockup confirms that the deck, railings, mechanical systems, and any vents are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house and to install a garage at the rear of the building. The property is located mid-block on Locust Street, within the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District, and its rear faces Latimer Street. The installation of the garage would involve demolishing the rear wall below the existing second-story deck and placing the garage door four feet inside the building from the current plane of the wall. The pilot house for the proposed roof deck would be positioned at the center of the roof space, so it would not be visible from a public right-of-way. In the proposed configuration, the railings would be partially visible from S. 21st Street. It is unlikely that any element of the deck would be visible from the front, but that lack of visibility should be verified with a mock up.

The application also proposes to remove paint from the front façade, replace windows at the front and rear of the property, and replace deck boards at the existing second-story deck. This work can be reviewed for approval at the staff level.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1318 PINE ST

Proposal: Reconstruct garage; construct rear addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James and Pamela Gertie

Applicant: Jackie Gusic, InHabit, LLC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 3/28/1961

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with revised Option A as presented to the Architectural Committee on 22 March 2016, provided windows are added in the garage door, the deck railing is metal, and the cap stones are made thicker, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct a rear garage, add a roof deck and trellis on top of the rebuilt garage, and construct an interior stair between the first and second stories. Two options are presented. Option A locates the stair addition at the rear of the rear ell, which would result in the removal of the second-story rear wall, a section that contains a previously modified window opening. Option B locates the stair addition at the side of the rear ell, which would be less visible from Waverly Street and would result in the removal of a section of the side wall. In both options, the garage door would remain its current width. The 1300 block of Waverly Street, at the rear of this building, has the appearance of a service alley, with the exception of two non-historically designated fronts of houses halfway down the block.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 300 MARKET ST

Proposal: Construct 4-story mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: MSP Philly I, LP

Applicant: Samantha Chan Kim, Samantha Kim Design LLC

History: 1785; Demolished by fire, April 2014

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including the color palette, provided the following:

- the dimensions of the cornice are restudied, the bottom band is potentially eliminated, and the entire feature is lowered by eliminating some of the height from the third floor;
- the base is reduced to a single piece of stone at a height of approximately 12 inches;
- the windows in the bays have a transom arrangement with the horizontal element toward the tops of the openings;
- the windows currently shown as six-over-six are revised to two-over-two;
- the roof deck is set back 10 feet from the front façade; and,
- no mechanical equipment or vent is visible from a public right-of-way.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story mixed-use building on a vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. The building, situated at the southwest corner of S. 3rd and Market Streets, would contain retail space on the first floor and twelve apartment units on the

second through fourth floors. The design is consistent in scale and materials with neighboring buildings and would contain architectural features, such as bays and a decorative cornice, found on other buildings within the district. The predominantly brick building would have a coursed cast stone base, Azek paneled storefronts and bays, and six-over-six double-hung windows. A roof deck with a stair tower is also proposed and would be housed behind a parapet.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 900-16 W LEHIGH AVE

Proposal: Install ADA ramps; modify windows; replace doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: La Luz Del Mundo

Applicant: Jafet Granados, J&E General Contracting

History: 1888; St. Simeon P.E. Church; Frank R. Watson, architect; bell tower, 1903, Watson & Huckle; stained glass, 1911, D'Ascenzo Studios

Individual Designation: 3/8/2002

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9, and owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remodel this church. The architectural drawings submitted as part of the application do not clearly delineate the proposed work. The application does not include existed and proposed drawings, a cover letter detailing the work, or a clear explanation of the work on the building permit application. The drawings appear to document the removal and replacement of historic fabric and the installation of elements that do not match historic and existing elements.

The plans propose two ADA ramps. However, sufficient information is not provided. The materials are not noted. The treatment of the existing steps is not indicated. The plans include a schedule for door replacement, but the proposed doors do not replicate the historic doors shown in photographs. In addition, windows shown on the elevation drawings differ from those in existing photographs, even though the no work is specified on the drawings. The plans appear to legalize the removal of windows and tracery. On the west or "right" elevation, the vertical mullions have been removed from three openings at the first floor and three windows have been removed at the second floor. On the east or "left" façade, the elevation drawing shows modified doors and at least 10 modified windows. Photographs seem to show that tracery has been removed from at least one side of the tower already and is planned to be removed from three sides of the tower.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Thomas stated that the application was very unclear and difficult to understand. He concurred with the Architectural Committee's assessment that it was incomplete. The other Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was public comment. John Manton asked if the church in question was the Mars Hill Church. Commissioners questioned the relevance of the query and noted that the church was originally St. Simeon P.E. Church, but has housed several congregations over time.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9, and owing to incompleteness. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 1726-32 ARCH ST

Proposal: Remove fence; regrade site; convert three windows to doors

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Arch Street Presbyterian Church

Applicant: Mark Thompson, Mark B. Thompson Associates LLC

History: 1855, Joseph C. Hoxie, architect, Arch Street Presbyterian Church

Individual Designation: 9/26/1961

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with the following comments:

- the stainless steel flashing detail should not be exposed, and any waterproofing should be at grade or below;
- the drawings showing the reconfiguration of the 18th Street entrance should be revised to accurately reflect the proposed changes; however, the Committee is amenable to removing the single step adjacent to the sidewalk and one or two risers at the doorway, as well as leaving the existing threshold in place;
- the Committee objects the conversion of three windows to doors at the south elevation and asserts that it would not be permitted because it is not code compliant.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert three existing windows on the south elevation into doorways to create a new entrance to the Arch Street Presbyterian Church. The current entrance along Arch Street requires visitors to climb eight steps, while the new entrance along Cuthbert Walk would be situated near grade. In addition to the partial removal of each existing window, the conversion would involve removing a portion of the masonry wall below each window to lengthen the opening. The area adjacent to the new Cuthbert Walk entrance would also be reconfigured into a plaza.

As part of the construction of the Comcast Innovation and Technology Center at 1800 Arch Street, the City of Philadelphia has authorized an increase in the elevation of 18th Street between Cuthbert Street and Arch Street. In response to the change in grade adjacent to the church's west site wall, the application proposes to remove the non-historic fencing and historic curb along 18th Street and to install a new 8" granite curb. The brownstone cheek walls, steps, and landing at an 18th Street entrance will be removed and reset, and brick paving to match the existing paving will be installed at this location. New plantings and precast concrete pavers will replace existing paving along the rest of this elevation.

The staff contends that there is insufficient justification for replacing the historic curb, although removal of the non-historic fence and resetting of the brownstone cheek walls, steps, and landing of the west entrance comply with the Standards. Any new paving should be completed with material to match the existing brick pavers. The proposed conversion of three windows to doors on the south elevation should be limited to the conversion of one window to a single door.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Mark Thompson, attorney William Martin, and Pastor Bill Golderer represented the application.

Mr. Martin introduced the project, explaining that the surrounding construction and grade changes for the new Comcast building were planned over the objections of the church representatives. As a result, he continued, the church engaged with the developer to reach an agreement on how to integrate the church site and allow it to thrive in the community. He noted the Architectural Committee's objections to certain aspects of the original application and stated that the revised plans present a creative resolution to the significant changes occurring around the site.

Mr. Golderer remarked on his experience revitalizing derelict and abandoned houses of worship, using the example of his work at the Broad Street Ministry. In that instance, he continued, he opened the congregation, made it handicap accessible, and participated in a \$4 million restoration that respected the building's integrity while adapting it to its current use. Mr. Golderer explained that he came to the Arch Street Presbyterian Church seven years ago, a time when it had only three members and had long since ceased to be a vital part of the community. He stated that he reinvigorated the church and, at present, the congregation is surging, diverse, and welcoming. One issue, he noted, is that the church building does not appear welcoming; it appears closed. With the neighboring project being undertaken by Liberty Property Trust and Comcast, Mr. Golderer elaborated on the challenge faced by the congregation and described it as either an obstacle to the church's growth and revitalization or an opportunity. He acknowledged the need to retain historic fabric, and commented that the church is in a central position within the corporate corridor, remaining the only building excluded from the corporate profit regime. He described the church as a place where people can gather and reflect, and indicated that the church could become further involved in the community. He concluded by elaborating on the church's needs-blind preschool, in existence for the past three years, that services nearly one hundred families. He stated that the church is positioned to further add value and benefit the Center City corridor.

Mr. Thompson offered a presentation of the revised application to outline the three major points that were identified by the Architectural Committee. He felt the revisions directly addressed two of those concerns through the reconfiguration of the stairs outside the 18th Street entrance and the lowering and coating of the stainless steel flashing. He elaborated on his decision to maintain the conversion of the three windows to doors on the south elevation. Mr. Thompson stated that Liberty Property Trust and Comcast have agreed to extend the plaza to the church's doors, which would make the entrance accessible. The revision, he continued, incorporates the historic sills to indicate the extent of the original window openings. He emphasized the accessibility created by the conversion of windows to doors and noted that the new entrance would welcome the public to the church.

Mr. Schaaf asked why three doors are necessary and asked whether one at the center would be sufficient. Alternatively, he suggested that the center opening could remain in its current condition as a window, and the flanking openings could be converted to doors. Mr. Thompson responded that the purpose of three doors is for the egress of the congregation, to maintain the temple appearance, and to allow for civic activities inside the church that could engage passers-by on Cuthbert Walk.

Ms. Merriman stated that the proposal is thoughtful and carefully considered and that she understands the rationale for the three doors opening onto the plaza. She continued that she would be prepared to make or accept a motion that supported the approval of the application as submitted to the Historical Commission.

Ms. Hawkins remarked that the applicant has studied all of the Architectural Committee's concerns, which is evident through the incorporation of the window sills in the design at the south elevation and the treatment of the west stair to eliminate any safety issues.

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

Mr. Mattioni stated that the proposal is sensitive and preserves the historic fabric of the church while adapting it to its contextual changes. Mr. McCoubrey added that, as a representative of the Architectural Committee, he now better understands how the three doors will function and will create two fronts to the church. He continued that the greenway would invite the public into the church and provide transparency. Ms. Cooperman commended the applicant, but stated that her principal concern is the specific detailing of the doors and noted that the doors as presented are too close in design to the original doors of the north façade. She encouraged the applicant to more clearly articulate the difference between the historic and proposed doors. Mr. Thompson agreed to work with staff to differentiate the new doors from the historic doors. Mr. Thomas added that past applications have proposed solid wood doors and specifically noted the proposal for the doors of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. He explained that there are glass doors behind the historic wood doors; during the day, the wood doors are open and the glass doors allow views into the building. Mr. Thomas continued that there are some accessibility details to consider, commenting that the railings do not have balusters. He stated that the staff would review details for the work.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 8 April 2016, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 17 MARCH 2016

Jeffrey Cohen, Acting Chair

101A W GRAVERS LANE

Nominator: Jennifer Robinson

Owner: 101 Gravers LLC

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property, as amended to include 101A W. Gravers Lane only, satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 101A W. Gravers Lane as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. At the time the Historical Commission notified the property owner of the consideration of the nomination, the property was known as 101 W. Gravers Lane. Since the initial notice was sent, the property has been subdivided into 101A, 109, and 111 W Gravers Lane. The proposed boundary in the nomination includes the 101A parcel only.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, H, I, and J. The nomination argues that the single-family residence, with the main block constructed by stonemason Lewis Headman in 1867 and 1868, is a well-preserved example of a vernacular interpretation of an architect-designed dwelling. The nomination also contends that the building is significant for being a visual landmark in Chestnut Hill, owing to its location on a corner lot,

and that the site may be likely to yield information important in history, as the house sits approximately on the site of the former Union Chapel.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Commission. Julie O'Connell represented the nomination. Attorney Josh Horvitz represented the property owner.

Ms. O'Connell stated that it was brought to her attention that the new owner of the property had contacted the Chestnut Hill Historical Society about a possible easement on the property, and as such, Ms. O'Connell asked the Commission to table the review of the nomination to its next monthly meeting. Mr. Thomas responded that he understood the reasoning for the request. Lori Salganicoff, executive director of the Chestnut Hill Historical Society, noted that she has met with the new owners, who are considering an easement. If they do not choose to move forward with the easement, she continued, her organization would support the designation of the property. She asked the Commission to give the new owners a moment of breathing space before deciding how they would like to proceed.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to table the review of the nomination for 30 days to the next monthly meeting of the Historical Commission on 13 May 2016. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1105-09 FRANKFORD AVENUE

Nominator: Oscar Beisert

Owner: Frankford Avenue Properties, Inc.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1105-09 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1105-09 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed as two separate buildings in the late nineteenth century, is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works (1886-1910), and the Otis Elevator Company (1910s-1940s), as well as for its association with Steven A. Morse, an eminent inventor and manufacturer. The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as representative of the Italianate style and architectural forms that were popularized by large industrial enterprises of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The nomination opines that the complex is the earliest, extant, coherent industrial complex in Fishtown, and as such, represents a familiar and established visual feature of the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Commission. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Community members Ken Milano, Andrew Fearon, and Dana Fedeli advocated for the designation of the Frankford Avenue properties.

Mr. Fearon stated that the community is in full support of the designation. Mr. Milano added that 1105-09 Frankford Avenue is just one of eight or nine properties that were associated with Morse and Otis Elevator Works, and they would have written a district nomination for all of them, but were told they had to do them one at a time. Mr. Milano opined that Fishtown is overdue for a historic district, and that a moratorium on districts does not make sense. He stated

that Fishtown is under assault by developers, and as soon as neighbors find out a building is susceptible, demolition permits have already been pulled. He likened it to a game of whack-a-mole, and that it is getting out of hand. He lamented that developers are taking perfectly good historic buildings and demolishing them every day. He described his family's history in Fishtown, and noted that the Frankford Avenue properties in question are the gateway into the community.

Mr. Thomas suggested focusing on the nomination at hand. He noted that he had recently been to the bicycle repair shop at this property, and noted that a new door has replaced the roll-up door. He noted that may matter in terms of permitting and approvals, but opined that the new door is more appropriate than the roll-up door.

Mr. Milano commented that the corner building at 1101-03 Frankford Avenue is already designated.

Ms. Cooperman asked if it would be possible to have a common history for several individual properties that were once part of the same complex, rather than repeating the history several times. Mr. Farnham responded that it would be possible to nominate two adjacent interconnected properties with one nomination or a few properties as a very small historic district. Ms. Cooperman noted that there are likely other properties in Fishtown that could be dealt with as complexes to avoid the repetition. She urged the nominators to think carefully about the information they include, noting that nominations do not need to go back to Year One. She asked nominators to look at the most important context, noting that, if the background information they include is not relevant, it is distracting. She recommended that nominators carefully consider the background information they include, as too much unnecessary information detracts from the strength of the argument. She reiterated the comments of the Committee on Historic Designation that the nominations should be more focused.

Mr. Beisert commented that he and the Fishtown neighbors have been discussing having a boilerplate nomination or multiple properties documentation form for wooden houses in the neighborhood. Ms. Cooperman recommended working with staff to determine the most efficient strategy, noting that nominating properties piecemeal is not efficient. Mr. Milano responded that he and others have already done documentation on frame houses, of which he has already counted 150. Mr. Beisert asked if there are any members of the Commission who could work to create a boilerplate nomination for something like wooden houses. Mr. Thomas responded that the issue of districts will be something that the new Commission will consider soon. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff awaits the direction of the new Commission, and will implement whatever the Commission asks the staff to implement. Mr. Thomas noted that it would be helpful for the Commission to have a public meeting to discuss designation policies and procedures. Mr. Farnham noted that much of the designation process the staff implements currently is not dictated by the Commission's Rules & Regulations, but by the past practice of the Commission. The newly appointed Commission, he continued, is free to revise and augment its processes and policies as necessary. Mr. Thomas noted that there are many potential historic districts, so any meeting should have ample public notice.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1105-09 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, and to designate the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1111-13 FRANKFORD AVENUE

Nominator: Oscar Beisert

Owner: Frankford Avenue Properties, Inc.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1111-13 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1111-13 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed in 1899, is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works (1886-1910), and the Otis Elevator Company (1910s-1940s), as well as for its association with Steven A. Morse, an eminent inventor and manufacturer. The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as representative of the Italianate style and architectural forms that were popularized by large industrial enterprises of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The nomination opines that the complex is the earliest, extant, coherent industrial complex in Fishtown, and as such, represents a familiar and established visual feature of the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Commission. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Community members Ken Milano, Andrew Fearon, and Dana Fedeli advocated for the designation of the Frankford Avenue properties, and echoed their comments from the previous review.

Mr. Mattioni asked if it would have been possible to consider this nomination with the previous nomination, since both properties have the same history. Mr. Thomas responded that that it is part of a larger discussion on the process of designation for a later date.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1111-13 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, and to designate the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1416-22 FRANKFORD AVENUE

Nominator: Andrew Fearon, Kensington & Olde Richmond Heritage, LLC.

Owner: Stablefish, LLC.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1416-22 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1416-22 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the building, constructed in 1891-92 as a police patrol stable, is significant as an example of the commitment of the Bureau of Police to enlarging its services city-wide through the construction of police stations and patrol houses. The nomination contends that the building is significant for its eclectic architectural style, which was popular in the late nineteenth century, and embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Victorian Gothic and Romanesque Revival styles.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Andrew Fearon represented the nomination. Paul Horos represented the property owners.

Mr. Horos voiced his support for the nomination. The Commissioners thanked him for his support of the nomination and noted that nomination makes cogent cases for the satisfaction of Criteria D and J.

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

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1416-22 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J, and to designate the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

81-95 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE

Nominators: Richelle Gewertz and Sonja Lengel, PCPC Interns; Oscar Beisert, Jim Duffin, c/o Laura Spina

Owner: VMDT Partnership

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Commission table the nomination to allow the nominator to revise it and remand the revised nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation for review.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the rowhouses at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, H, and J. The nomination states that the row is the oldest intact row of houses in Philadelphia between the Delaware River and Front Street, and represents the development of Northern Liberties, as well as Coates Street (now Fairmount Avenue). The nomination argues that the rowhouses are typical of the Federal style of architecture in Philadelphia, and owing to their age, represent a longtime familiar visual feature of Philadelphia's built environment. The nomination further argues that the rowhouses exemplify the cultural, economic, social and historic heritage of the Beach Street Mission, later known as the Friends Mission No 1, which was the first Guild House in the neighborhood started by local Quakers.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Commission. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination. Attorney Michael Sklaroff, preservation consultant George Thomas, and Rich Orlow, counsel to the ownership, represented the property owner.

Mr. Beisert noted that he is one of the authors of the nomination, which is being sponsored by the City Planning Commission. Mr. Schaaf commented that the nomination is currently being re-written under the terms of the findings of the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Commission was considering the nomination today. Mr. Farnham responded that the recommendation of the Committee is not binding, but is advisory only. Therefore, the nomination is before the Commission, which could choose to table it as the Committee recommends, to designate, or not to designate.

Ms. Hawkins asked the staff to clarify that, since the property is under consideration for designation, the Historical Commission would have jurisdiction over any proposed changes to the property during the tabling period. Mr. Farnham responded affirmatively, noting that that

would be the case unless the work was permitted prior to the notice of the consideration of the nomination.

Mr. Sklaroff opined that this is an unusual situation in which a nomination was submitted by the Planning Commission, and that it follows a meeting that the property owners had with the Planning Commission concerning the development of the site, which has been assembled with the adjacent Greyhound maintenance facility. Mr. Sklaroff commented that they expressed to the Planning Commission staff at that time that they had not yet decided whether to keep the structure at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the Historical Commission to reject the nomination without leave to amend. He noted that, as was clear at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting, the nomination was not worthy of adoption. He stated that he and his colleagues were prepared to demonstrate four reasons why this building should not be designated, and that no amendment to the nomination will satisfactorily resolve those issues. First, he opined, the loss of character-defining features is remarkable. Commissioner Thomas interjected, commenting that the Commission wanted to hear a general remark from the property owner, but that the Commission still needed to address the recommendation of the Committee to table the nomination before hearing all the arguments. Mr. Sklaroff responded that this nomination process began in April 2015, and that they did not hear about it until December 2015, and that now it is April 2016, and the nomination has been lingering for a year. He stated that, on its merits, the building should not be designated, and that he and his colleagues would like to demonstrate that. He opined that the building has been altered so heavily over the years that it has lost all historic fabric, there is no historic context because there is nothing around it, and that with regards to the presence of the Friends Mission, which is arguably the most significant aspect of its history and Criterion J, there is nothing of historic fabric that is particular to the period that the Mission occupied the property. Commissioner Thomas responded that, before the Commission delves into whether the nomination and property are worthy, they needed to discuss the mechanics of the Committee's recommendation. He asked Mr. Schaaf to address the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Schaaf responded that Mr. Sklaroff is correct in that the nomination as written is inadequate, but that that does not mean that it is lacking completely in merit in terms of how these 1828 rowhouses had become an office building by 1921. He opined that, given time, the nomination can be rewritten in such a way as to establish that these are important buildings along the riverfront and are quite significant in terms of their history, no matter how much they have been changed. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated that the nomination has been lingering for a year, and that after a year, there is not a worthy nomination, and that there is nothing worthy about the buildings, and that where it is now, isolated from any historic context, and the most significant thing about it is the twenty years that the Friends Mission occupied it.

Commissioner Thomas asked when the nomination was actually submitted. Mr. Beisert responded that he had submitted a lengthier nomination last year, which was withdrawn, and a new nomination was put forward by the Planning Commission. Mr. Sklaroff responded that this nomination was submitted in April 2015, and that, for some reason, it was modified by the Planning Commission, who under the City's Code has a role in historic designation, but does not have a role in nominating. He stated that this is the Planning Commission's work product, and that the property owners are faced with the fact that they met with the Planning Commission to discuss plans, but never heard that the Planning Commission had issues of designation. He stated that they are entitled to have the full Historical Commission consider the merits of the nomination, and opined that no revised nomination could address the lack of suitability of designation of this property. Mr. Schaaf responded that the Committee on Historic Designation disagreed with that assertion, and in its findings of 17 March 2016, asked that the nomination be revised.

Mr. Farnham clarified that Historical Commission received a nomination authored by Mr. Beisert on 1 July 2015. He noted that that nomination was dated 7 April 2015, but the date of receipt was 1 July 2015. The Historical Commission staff then reviewed the nomination and determined that it could be reviewed by the Committee on Historic Designation and then the full Historical Commission. He stated that the staff notified the property owner on 22 September 2015 that the Committee on Historic Designation would review the nomination on 2 December 2015, and that the Commission would review it on 11 December 2015. The property owner then requested, through Mr. Sklaroff, a continuance of the review of the nomination, which was continued to the Committee meeting on 17 March 2016. At some point during the process, Mr. Beisert and the City Planning Commission staff determined that the City Planning staff would revise the nomination and resubmit it under its name. The Historical Commission was not privy to the discussions between Mr. Beisert and the Planning Commission staff. Mr. Farnham noted that the property owner was re-notified on 12 February 2016 that a new nomination had been submitted in place of the old nomination, and that it would be reviewed at the Committee meeting on 17 March 2016, and at the Historical Commission meeting today. Commissioner Thomas asked Mr. Farnham to clarify that the old nomination was scheduled for review on 17 March 2016 as well. Mr. Farnham responded that it was tabled to that meeting by the Historical Commission at the request of the property owner, and that during that period, the nomination was revised. Mr. Sklaroff responded that he had misunderstood the timeline, and had assumed the date of April 2015 from the nomination form. Mr. Farnham responded that the nominator dated the nomination form as April 2015, but the nomination was not submitted to the Historical Commission until July 2015. He added that Mr. Sklaroff may not have been aware of the actual date of submission.

Mr. Beisert commented that some of the information the Committee asked for was in his original nomination. Mr. Schaaf responded that that is accurate.

Mr. Gupta asked why the Planning Commission stepped in as the nominator. Mr. Beisert responded that the Planning Commission staff had begun a nomination several years ago, but it was incomplete, and he had heard from a number of people in the preservation community that there was interest in seeing this row of houses, which is immediately adjacent to the waterfront, designated. Mr. Beisert noted that he suggested to the Planning Commission staff that they use the information from his nomination to revive their own nomination, which an intern had started but not finished several years ago.

Commissioner Thomas clarified that the nomination reviewed by the Committee on Historic Designation was written between December and March. Mr. Farnham responded affirmatively, noting that the staff notified the property owners of the revision more than 30 days prior to the Committee meeting, essentially starting the process from the beginning.

Commissioner Thomas asked for clarification about the Planning Commission's authority to submit nominations. Mr. Farnham responded that any person or organization may nominate a property for designation to the Philadelphia Register; there are no limitations; one need not be the property owner, or even a citizen of the City. Mr. Sklaroff responded that it raises issues that the Planning Commission, under the preservation ordinance, has a review role, and that under the new zoning code has a relationship to the Historical Commission. He stated that his primary concern is in regards to their candid discussions with the Planning Commission, in which there was never any indication that the Planning Commission was interested in designating the property. Commissioner Thomas responded that Historical Commission staff nominates properties to the Register and then the full Commission reviews those nominations. He stated that he does not perceive any delays in notification or other issues.

Commissioner Thomas summarized that the Commission essentially has two requests before it: one, to move forward with the current nomination, as requested by the property owner; and two, to table the review of the nomination to allow time for revisions, as recommended by the Committee. He asked for Mr. Schaaf's feedback as a representative of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Schaaf responded that the current nomination is lacking, but that the Committee felt it prudent to table the nomination to allow the nominator to revise the nomination and remand it to the Committee for review. Mr. Beisert commented that there is already a deadline from the staff for the revisions. Ms. Broadbent responded that that is true if the nomination is to be reviewed at the next Committee meeting.

The Commission members discussed limiting the period of time for revisions. Ms. Hawkins stated that the property owner has a right to a timely review, and as such, recommended that the Commission remand the nomination to the next Committee on Historic Designation meeting. Mr. Farnham noted that Section 1005-6(f) of the Ordinance states that, if an applicant submits an application while a nomination is under consideration, the Historical Commission has 90 days to act on the application. If the Historical Commission does not approve the application or act on the nomination within 90 days, it is deemed approved. He noted that, were Mr. Sklaroff to submit a demolition application today, the Commission would have to either finalize the designation or approve the application within 90 days. Commissioner Thomas responded that that makes sense, as a tabled nomination could be continued indefinitely without review. He noted that the Committee tends to meet quarterly, which can put an additional burden on a property owner. Mr. Farnham responded that he has not done the exact math, but that he believes 90 days would allow the Commission to review the revised nomination at the July 2016 meeting. The Commissioners noted that it is approximately 90 days to the July 2016 Commission meeting.

Mr. Beisert asked if the nomination would have to go back to the Committee. Mr. Farnham responded that, if the nomination is changed significantly, the nomination would need to be reviewed by both the Committee and Commission. Commissioner Thomas commented that applying the expertise of the Committee on Historic Designation to the nomination would be important. Ms. Cooperman noted that she reviewed the nomination, the minutes from the Committee meeting, and the consultant's report, and echoed the Committee's feeling that there is merit for significance in the property.

Mr. Sklaroff asked whether the property owner would have the opportunity to see the revised nomination in advance. Mr. Farnham responded that it would be his opinion that the Commission is obligated to provide the property owner 30 days notice of the revised nomination.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to table the nomination to allow the nominator to revise it. If a revised nomination is submitted to the Historical Commission by the close of business on 13 May 2016, the revised nomination will be reviewed by the Committee on Historic Designation on 15 June 2016 and by the Historical Commission on 8 July 2016. If a revised nomination is not submitted by the close of business on 13 May 2016, the Historical Commission will review the current nomination and its Committee's original recommendation on 8 July 2016. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1736 MEADOW STREET

Nominator: Joseph J. Menkevich

Owner: Second Baptist Church of Frankford

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1736 Meadow Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, I, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the former Wilmot Public School at 1736 Meadow Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, I, and J. The nomination argues that the Italianate school building, attributed to architect James C. Sidney working under the supervision of Superintendent of School Buildings Lewis H. Esler, is a rare survivor of a “Philadelphia Plan” interior, popularized by Samuel Sloan beginning in the 1850s. The Wilmot Public School was intended for the education of African-American children, and was staffed by an African-American principal, teachers, and janitor. The building and its surrounding yard are the site of the 1811 Frankford Public Burial Ground, which is said to contain the bodies of African American civilians and Civil War veterans.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Commission. Joseph Menkevich represented the nomination. Pastor Darrell R. Bradsbery of Second Baptist Church of Frankford represented the property.

Mr. Menkevich stated that his nominations typically are associated with dead people or cemeteries. He commented that his work is inspired by co-nominator Rosemary Clayton, and he is carrying on her work, since she has passed away. Mr. Thomas commented that the nomination is thoroughly written.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1736 Meadow Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, I, and J, and to designate the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

6128-32 RIDGE AVENUE

Nominator: John Manton

Owner: Roxborough Real Estate Group

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6128-32 Ridge Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the former Roxborough Trust Company building is significant as part of the development of the Roxborough neighborhood, for whose inhabitants it was built in 1924. The nomination further contends that the building, designed by architects Heacock & Hokanson, embodies defining characteristics of the late Beaux Arts style.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Commission. Nominator John Manton and Don Simon of the Central Roxborough Civic Association represented the nomination.

Mr. Simon stated that the Central Roxborough Civic Association is in support of the nomination. Mr. Manton stated that neighbor Kay Sykora was present earlier in the meeting, and she is in support of the nomination.

Mr. Thomas commented that the building has an accessible entrance via a masonry ramp on the side of the building. Mr. Manton responded that the ramp does not lead to an entrance, but rather to the former location of an ATM. Mr. Manton stated that the owners were notified of the nomination, but they have not attended any meetings related to the designation.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6128-32 Ridge Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, and to designate the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

900 S 20TH STREET

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 900 S. 20th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate St. Charles Borromeo Church and rectory at 900 S 20th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E. The nomination argues that hybrid Romanesque/Baroque St. Charles Borromeo Roman Catholic Church is architecturally significant as part of the national culture of the post-Civil War era when combinations of “revival” styles emerged in American architecture. Its rectory is a fine example of the Second Empire architectural style. The nomination further contends that the church is significant owing to its architect, Edwin Forrest Durang, one of the foremost American ecclesiastical architects of the late nineteenth century.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Leonard recused for this and the following two nominations, owing to her brother-in-law’s employment at the law firm representing the property owner. Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Commission. Nominator Celeste Morello represented the nomination. Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner.

Mr. Phillips stated that, on behalf of the parish, the Archdiocese neither opposes nor supports the nomination.

Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance, stated that his organization supports Ms. Morello’s nominations for historic religious properties. He stated that he needed to leave the meeting, so his comments pertain to this and the two nominations to follow. He opined that the designation of religious objects and/or properties does not represent a violation of the separate of church and state, and stated that the Commission has previously designated historic religious properties. Mr. Thomas confirmed that the Commission has a long record of designating historic religious buildings.

Ms. Morello commented that one of the reasons she nominated this property, besides its stunning architectural features, is because it is the only Roman Catholic Church in the Center City area that is not historically designated.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 900 S. 20th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E, and to designate the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

246-60 N 4TH STREET

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Owner: St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the paintings in the west-wall side altars in St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church at 246-60 N. 4th satisfy Criteria for Designation A and E. Mr. Cohen dissented.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate two oil-on-canvas paintings over west-wall side altars in St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church at 246-60 N. 4th Street as historic objects and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the paintings, executed by decorative artist Filippo Costaggini, satisfy Criteria for Designation A and E. The nomination argues that the paintings are significant works of art by an important designer, Filippo Costaggini, whose artistic production has significantly influenced the cultural development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation, and that the paintings have significant value as altarpieces that exemplify the demand for this type of decoration for Roman Catholic churches, representing a firm cultural trait adapted to the American Art tradition, as a transference from Western Europe.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Commission. Nominator Celeste Morello represented the nomination. Attorney Michael Phillips, Reverend Gerald Dennis Gill, and James J. Bock, Jr. represented the property owner.

Ms. Morello stated that the two paintings have historic value because Filippo Costaggini succeeded Constantino Brumidi in Washington D.C. as the chief fresco artist for the interior of the United States Capitol. She stated that Costaggini had a very small portfolio when he first arrived in the United States, and these two paintings represent some of the artwork from that very small portfolio that he would have had to present to Congress in order to get the job.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the paintings are an attached feature of the building, or if they are removable. Ms. Morello responded that the paintings are detachable. Mr. Thomas clarified that the paintings are being proposed for designation as objects. Ms. Hawkins responded that she is trying to reconcile whether they are furnishings. Ms. Morello responded that they are decorative art, which is different from fine art. Ms. Cooperman asked about the means of attachment. Mr. Phillips responded that he does not know the means of attachment, but can confirm that the paintings are removable.

Mr. Phillips introduced Reverend Gerald Dennis Gill, the Director for the Archdiocese of Philadelphia's Office for Divine Worship, and James J. Bock, Jr., who serves as the Archdiocese of Philadelphia's Secretary for Temporal Services. Mr. Phillips stated that there are two ways to view the nomination. He observed that the paintings are objects that are the personal property of the Catholic Church, and are sacred religious works of art, and are not secular items. He stated that the Catholic Church takes great care to protect and maintain its objects of worship, they are in no way in jeopardy, and the Catholic Church is best suited to exercise care and control over its items of Catholic identity. He stated that, from a pragmatic standpoint, he does not believe it would be a utilization of the best resources of the Historical

Commission to designate personal property and objects of a religious faith as historic when the designation will inevitably result in First Amendment litigation. Ms. Cooperman asked if Mr. Phillips is contending that these are liturgical objects. Mr. Phillips responded affirmatively. Ms. Cooperman asked if the paintings are used in service. Mr. Phillips responded affirmatively. Ms. Cooperman asked for details. Rev. Gill responded that, specifically for the art features in the Cathedral, he would not define them as elements used in the service; however, like the church building itself, it contributes to worship. Ms. Cooperman asked if they are essential to worship. Rev. Gill responded that they are not essential, but everything that comprises the building is part of the worship.

Ms. Hawkins defined “object” as “a material thing of functional, aesthetic, cultural, historic or scientific value that may be, by nature or design, movable yet related to a specific setting or environment.” She stated that this is clearly art that is specific to this environment and designed for this space. She opined that the paintings can qualify as objects. Mr. Phillips responded that he is not arguing that point.

Mr. Phillips asked Rev. Gill to speak to the purpose of these objects. Rev. Gill responded that they are always building new churches, and just like when the Cathedral was conceived, built and decorated, everything that is part of the plan has the purpose of contributing to worship. The purpose of the paintings in question is to foster the worship of God.

Ms. Morello asked if the designation will stay with the paintings, even if they are removed or relocated. Mr. Phillips responded that the Historical Commission regulations define “destruction” as “removal,” and therefore the removal of these sacred works of art would be subject to the Commission’s review. He stated that the designation of these objects would violate the separation of church and state. He continued that the Catholic Church must remain free to erect, alter or remove any of its religiously-significant elements within its own houses of worship, and if the church were to decide to alter or remove a sacred work of art, it should not have to first ask the City of Philadelphia whether it can do so.

Mr. Gupta stated that the Commission just designated another religious property prior to this review, which Mr. Phillips neither opposed nor supported. He asked why Mr. Phillips would not apply the same argument to the designation of any religious property, irrespective of whether it is interior or the building itself. Mr. Phillips responded that the exterior architectural elements of a building have a secular identifiable purpose, and anyone can look at the buildings and appreciate them in the architectural style in which they were constructed. He continued that the discussion is now about a painting of the Blessed Virgin Mary ascending into heaven, and there is no non-secular argument that can be made that these paintings do not inspire the faith and are not central to the Catholic faith. Ms. Cooperman questioned whether an art historian could assess the paintings for their artistic technique, value and merit. Mr. Phillips responded that that would be secondary to the primary purpose. Mr. Gupta asked about the primary purpose of the building. Mr. Phillips responded that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has said that cities have the right to exercise jurisdiction over the exterior portions of buildings, and a building can be repurposed and still one can appreciate the exterior. He continued that the paintings cannot be repurposed into anything other than items of religious holy significance to the Catholic faith. Mr. Gupta responded that the paintings could be placed in an art museum. Mr. Phillips responded that that would constitute a removal of the paintings, which is akin to demolition in the eyes of the preservation ordinance. Ms. Hawkins responded that the designation would not prohibit such a thing, but rather the designation would mean that the Commission would be a party to that discussion. She continued that, if the church building were converted to condominiums, she did not think that the Commission would stand opposed to the paintings being removed and put to another liturgical use or displayed in a museum. Mr. Phillips asked

Mr. Bock to discuss the Archdiocese's ecclesiastical exchange program. Mr. Bock explained that the program has been in operation for 25 years, during which time it has successfully placed sacred items with other Catholic institutions when there is a need to close a church or parish. He stated that the program protects those items that are sacred to the Catholic Church.

Ms. Morello commented that the entire ceiling was designated last summer in St. Augustine's Church, as an example of one of the earliest existing fresco programs in the United States. She also noted that designated paintings inside Old St. Joseph's Church were removed for repairs. Mr. Phillips responded that the Archdiocese did not receive notice of those nominations, and there was no support or opposition because the Archdiocese was absent, and so that does not set a precedent.

Mr. Phillips opined that the time and resources spent by the Commission would be better served in other realms, and not the path of religious items of personal property. He asked if the staff believes that the designation of personal property and the litigation to follow with the Archdiocese of Philadelphia is a prudent use of time and resources of the Commission. Mr. Mattioni responded that the Commission should not be charged with making the determination of constitutionality of the ordinance under which it operates. Mr. Phillips responded that he is not asking for the Commission to make that determination, but rather to exercise the discretionary authority that it is given to determine if it is worthwhile to fight for the designation and protection of items by the City of Philadelphia that do not need protection, because they are sacred holy items that belong to the Catholic Church. Ms. Morello disagreed, stating that the paintings are not holy or blessed. Mr. Mattioni stated that the Commission should not get involved in the question of how significant the paintings are to the church. He stated that the Commission can accept the notion that the paintings are very significant regardless of whether they are objects of worship themselves or just used as an adjunct to the practice of the religion. He stated that the Commission should not get involved with that, except to the extent that it may play a role in telling the Commission whether the nomination is worthy of approval.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission is charged with looking at the Committee on Historic Designation's recommendation, and determining if it agrees with the recommendation. Mr. Phillips asked for the staff to comment. He noted that the words "religion" and "theology" are not mentioned in the Criteria for Designation. Mr. Thomas responded that this is a complex issue, and that the objects need to only meet one criterion to be designated. He noted that the Commission has been involved in controversial reviews in the past. Mr. Phillips responded that he is asking the Commission to exercise discretion regarding this designation. Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. Phillips for being cordial about his arguments, but stated that the Commission has an obligation to act on the nomination. He mentioned Dream Garden and the SS United States as designated objects. Mr. Phillips responded that he is not arguing against the designation of objects. He explained that his arguments should not be construed as a threat, but it is inevitable that there will be First Amendment concerns to be addressed, should the paintings be designated as historic objects. He opined that the Archdiocese should not have to ask for permission from the City of Philadelphia to send one of these paintings to the Vatican.

Mr. Schaaf explained that the Committee on Historic Designation had a difficult time with the review of the paintings. He stated that the argument that the paintings only have religious significance within the context of the church is the portion of the argument that the Committee had difficulty with, opining that there is a cultural and social dimension to the paintings themselves. He commented that the Philadelphia Museum of Art contains one of the most important religious paintings in the United States, which is not a designated object, but has great cultural and social content. Ms. Morello commented that Costaggini's artistic style was part of a movement, as he was asked to complete these paintings in the style of Raphael. Mr.

Phillips responded that the distinction is that these paintings are within the church, not an art museum, and the Archdiocese would have to ask the City of Philadelphia for permission to remove, alter or lend the paintings. He stated that the primary purpose of the objects is to inspire the faithful when they walk into the church, and the idea is to give glory to God, not to the paintings. He quoted several sentences from the nomination to draw a distinction between the subject paintings and those in a museum. Ms. Morello asked if the Commission is consulted when the Cathedral needs repairs to the exterior of the church building. Mr. Phillips responded that the current discussion is regarding the designation of interior objects within the church.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment. Joseph Menkevich opined that the legal arguments should be handled in Orphans Court, and that most Catholic churches in Philadelphia have been donated.

ACTION: Mr. Gupta moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the two oil-on-canvas paintings over west-wall side altars in St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church at 246-60 N. 4th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E, and to designate the objects as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Gupta excused himself from the meeting.

209-25 N 18TH STREET

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J. Mr. Cohen dissented.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate five oil-on-canvas paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street as historic objects and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the paintings, executed by artist/decorator Constantino Brumidi, satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J. The nomination argues that the paintings are significant works of art by an important designer, Constantino Brumidi, whose artistic production has significantly influenced the cultural development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation, and that the oil paintings exemplify the heritage of Philadelphia's Catholic community.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Commission. Nominator Celeste Morello represented the nomination. Attorney Michael Phillips, Reverend Gerald Dennis Gill, and James J. Bock, Jr. represented the property owner.

Ms. Morello stated that these paintings may be the only remaining Brumidi paintings in Pennsylvania. She commented that Brumidi completed the paintings in Washington D.C., at which time they were transported to Pennsylvania and installed in the dome.

Rev. Gill asked that the review of this nomination be delayed. He stated that he was brought in late as far as the discussion and nomination of these paintings, and he would like additional time to better understand the designation process, the work of the Commission, and the

outcome of when something is designated as historic. Ms. Morello gave her blessing to a continuance. Mr. Thomas opined that the paintings are not in danger.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to table the review of the nomination five oil-on-canvas paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street for 30 days, at the request of the property owner, to its meeting on 13 May 2016. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

934 SNYDER AVENUE

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Owner: Jean Bruno

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 934 Snyder Avenue satisfies any Criteria for Designation.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 934 Snyder Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation A. The nomination argues that the circa 1915 rowhouse is significant as the residence of Angelo Bruno, the head of the Philadelphia-South Jersey Family, a branch of the American Mafia, from 1953 until his murder in 1980. The nomination argues that the FBI's investigations of Bruno played a significant role in the development of important law enforcement techniques and statutes used to prosecute members of organized crime syndicates and the house should be preserved because it is representative of those innovations in law enforcement.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Commission. Nominator Celeste Morello represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Morello stated that laws that were enacted to address organized crime did not exist prior to Angelo Bruno's tenure as head of the Mafia. She explained that she contacted other cities to determine if there are historically designated sites related to individuals who may be considered notorious and loathsome. She noted that the Commission designated 2176 E. York Street last year, which was associated with John Ruhl, a person with a criminal record and who was imprisoned at Eastern State Penitentiary. She commented that Bruno was never convicted of a felony, and was not a member of a hate group, unlike Malcolm X for whom Philadelphia has a park named, and whose house will be considered for historic designation. She stated that Malcolm X's house in Boston is designated as historic. She referenced an article from that day's *Philadelphia Inquirer*, written about a banker charged under the RICO law. She noted that there is a National Museum of Organized Crime and Law Enforcement in Las Vegas; the Biograph Theater in Chicago where John Dillinger was shot is on the National Register; the Dallas Theater in Texas where Lee Harvey Oswald was arrested is on the National Register; the Ruth Paine house in Texas where Lee Harvey Oswald stayed is on the National Register; Louisiana has designated sites affiliated with Huey Long and are open to historic designation of Mafia-related sites because the Mafia apparently had its earliest origins in New Orleans; and organized crime under Irish rule has recently been recognized with two historic markers for Molly Maguire executions in Pottsville and Jim Thorpe, Pennsylvania. She stated that Bruno represents a very ugly history in Philadelphia, and it is not something to be celebrated, but it affected the lives of everyone. She opined that the building has no aesthetic or architectural value, but that the value lies in the fact that Bruno lived there during the time that Philadelphia's corruption was on the front page of every newspaper because it was such an issue. She questioned whether future generations will not know about MOVE, the Black Panthers or

Malcolm X. She reiterated that Malcolm X was part of a hate group and was imprisoned, and yet there is a park named after him in Philadelphia. She also referenced McMichael Park in East Falls, stating that about 50 people died in the Philadelphia Bible Riots of 1844 while Morton McMichael was sheriff. She stated that Philadelphia has an ugly history, and there will be no historic marker in front of the Bruno house, and Bruno does not deserve to be regarded as a good person or a hero, but organized crime became defined during his tenure as Mafia boss, and owing to that, laws were enacted to address organized crime.

Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Schaaf about the concerns addressed during the review by the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Schaaf responded that the Committee struggled with the link between Bruno, the house, and changes in law enforcement. He stated that the Committee wanted to be able to make the link, but Bruno simply lived there, which made a thin case for the connection. Ms. Morello responded that there is no doubt that Bruno conducted criminal business from the house. Mr. Schaaf commented that Jeffrey Cohen, Acting Chair of the Committee, noted that Bruno decided to remain in a small house in South Philadelphia rather than move to a grand estate in the suburbs, likely so he could keep close tabs on the neighborhood and his sub-bosses. Ms. Morello opined that there is no difference between this building and the John Ruhl house. Mr. Schaaf responded that the John Ruhl house was a Frank Furness-designed house and was designated for criteria related to architecture, in addition to Criterion A. Mr. Farnham referenced the minutes from the Committee meeting, noting that Mr. Cohen stated his support of the designation of a monument that represents a dark side of history, and was in no way opposed to that type of designation. Rather, Mr. Cohen's reason for rejecting the nomination was that it proposed the designation for the association with Bruno. Mr. Farnham stated that Ms. Morello had responded that the designation was based on the association of the property to changes in law enforcement. Mr. Cohen had responded that the nomination does not make any real connection between Bruno and his house, and those changes in law enforcement, except that he lived in the house while the changes occurred. Ms. Morello stated that they were not changes, but rather developments, and that organized crime law enforcement simply did not exist prior to the Kennedys ascendance in Washington, D.C. Mr. Farnham responded that the point that Mr. Cohen made was that the developments occurred during that period but the nomination makes no connection between those developments in law enforcement on the one hand and Bruno and his house on the other. Ms. Morello responded that the nomination states that the organized crime strike force of the United States Attorney's Office was created in 1968 and these units were not established in every major city, but they were in Philadelphia, owing to the level of organized crime activity.

Ms. Cooperman summarized that the event which is allegedly significant, which in this case is the development of law enforcement techniques, did not happen in the building at 934 Snyder Avenue. She stated that the Commission should not designate a house based on a significant event, when the event did not take place at that house. She stated that the Commission is not saying that Angelo Bruno is insignificant, and the Commission is not saying that these types of histories should not be recognized, but it is indicating that there is no clear link between the law enforcement developments and the Bruno house.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to find that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 934 Snyder Avenue satisfies any Criteria for Designation and to refuse to designate it as historic. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 12:49 p.m., Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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

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

Section 1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.