

**THE MINUTES OF THE 714TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2022
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair (Architectural Historian)	X		
Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		Arrived at 11:16 a.m.
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Mark Dodds (Department of Planning and Development)	X		
Kelly Edwards, MUP (Real Estate Developer)	X		
Patrick O'Donnell (Department of Public Property)	X		
Sara Lepori (Commerce Department)	X		
John P. Lech (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
John Mattioni, Esq.	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair (Architect)	X		
Stephanie Michel (Community Organization)	X		Arrived at 9:35 a.m.
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq. (Community Development Corporation)	X		

Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, all Commissioners, staff, applicants, and public attendees participated in the meeting remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown Civic Association
Alex Hansrote

Shahd Tantawi
George Earl Thomas, Civic Visions
John Delutis, Midwood Investment and Development
Romina Mollaj
Kevin McMahon
Takumi Goto
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Michael LaFlash, Heritage Consulting
William P. Redican Jr, Goldenberg Group
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker and Partners
Thom McIntyre
Jared Z. Mintz, Goldenberg Group
Jay Farrell
Nick Kraus, Heritage Consulting Group
Jason Tucker
David Mercuris, Goldenberg Group
Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
R. Freedman, Goldenberg Group
Michael Clemmons
Omar Zaater, k YODER design
Norman P., Goldenberg Group
John Scott
Kevin Yoder, k YODER design
Jason Sherman
Alex Balloon, Tacony CDC
Celia Jailer
Andrew Goodman
Joseph Donohue, Studio 111 Architecture
Monica Wyatt, Studio 111 Architecture
Robyn Oliver
Adam Goodman, Goodman Properties
Hal Schirmer, Esq.
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Jane Golden, Mural Arts
Joel Miller
Troy Bianchi
Mary McGettigan
Sarah Levick
Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
Steve Palmer, Goldenberg Group
Matthew Murphy
Tony Bracali
Paul Horning, Clemens Construction
Susan Wetherill
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Christine Furman, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
Venise Whitaker
Gloria Del Piano
Bruce Laverty
Jeffrey Ogren, Esq., Bochetto and Lentz
Thom McIntyre

Donna Rilling
Michele Gaffney
Spencer Yablon, CBRE
Odessa Tate
Steven Peitzman
Meiyi Li
Libbie Hawes
Nancy Pontone
Christina Brown
Tom Donaghy
Elizabeth Milroy
Ken Milano
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Jack Hubbell
Quadir Hughes
Liliya Luhavaya
Peter Angelides, Econsult Solutions
Amy Lambert
Levi Dick, Aritzia
Celeste Morello
Justin Detwiler
Shamir Norman
David Smith
Kendall Miller
Christina Brown
Tom Witt, Esq., Cozen O'Connor
Richard Wentzel, Thornton Tomasetti
Dennis Carlisle
D. Greenfield, Thornton Tomasetti
Rev. Evelyn Barnes
Giselle Tenemaza
J.M. Duffin
Sabrina Campodonico
Howard B. Haas

REMEMBERING BETTY TURNER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:25

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas, Ms. Cooperman, and Mr. Mattioni remembered Betty Turner, who passed recently, as a dear friend, colleague, educator, and community advocate.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 713TH STATED MEETING, 14 JANUARY 2022

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:07:12

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical

Commission, the 713th Stated Meeting, held 14 January 2022. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 713th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 January 2022. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 713th Meeting					
MOTION: Adoption of minutes					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JANUARY 2022

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:07:45

DISCUSSION:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 329 S. 17th Street, 317 Lawrence Court, and 251 S. Van Pelt Street. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 329 S 17TH ST

Proposal: Restucco side wall; install mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marlon Travis

Applicant: Jane Golden, Mural Arts Philadelphia

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The property at 329 S. 17th Street is a contributing structure within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The southern elevation of the building is a stucco wall that faces on to a surface parking lot. A similar structure stood at 331 S. 17th Street, to the south of the building in question, until 1957, when it was demolished, exposing the south party wall of 329 S. 17th Street.

This application proposes to restucco the existing stucco wall in order to prepare the surface for a future mural in partnership with the Mural Arts Program. According to the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations Section 6.15:

6.15.a.2 Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.

6.15.a.3 Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.

6.15.a.4 The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees, and staff shall not consider a mural's content as a part of its review of any application for a building permit, but may consider size, scale, and relationship to the historic context.

For this mural, Mural Arts plans to work with Nationalities Service Center to create a mural that would be designed and produced by Philadelphia-based artist Michelle Ortiz. Though the artwork has not yet been designed, the theme of the mural will likely acknowledge the work of the Nationalities Service Center, currently in its 100th year.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Restucco side wall;
- Install mural.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The mural is proposed for an unadorned existing stucco, former party wall, which was not historically exposed or finished, satisfying Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a.2 of the Rules and Regulations.
 - o The proposed location of the mural would not alter or obscure any historic fabric, satisfying Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a.3 of the Rules and Regulations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.15 of the Rules and Regulations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the applicant submits an image of the artwork prior to installation; and information on the stucco, attachment of the parachute cloth, and sealant; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.15.a.3 of the Rules and Regulations.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 312-14, 316, AND 318 RACE ST

Proposal: Demolish rear ells; construct six-story building; rehabilitate façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Race Street Apartments LLC

Applicant: Monica Wyatt, Studio 111 Architecture & Associates

History: 1831

Individual Designation: 6/5/1980

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes work to three properties within the Old City Historic District. The building at 312-14 Race Street, considered contributing in the district, dates to 1831 and historically functioned as a hotel. It consists of a four-story main block with two rear ells that are minimally visible from the public right-of-way. The buildings at 316 and 318 Race Street are classified as non-contributing and were both constructed in the 1950s.

This application proposes to demolish the non-contributing buildings and the two rear ells of the contributing building at 312-14 Race Street. A new four-story building with setback fifth and sixth stories would be proposed to replace the non-contributing structures. The new building would span the three properties at the rear.

An in-concept application for this project was reviewed by the Historical Commission at its 9 April 2021 meeting. At that time, the Commission found that the rear ells of 312-14 Race Street were narrow, in poor condition, and were compromised. It further found that complete demolition may not be appropriate and may not satisfy Standard 9. It concluded that the overall massing of the new construction was satisfactory, including the potential visibility of the additions, though a five-story rear structure was considered at that time.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing buildings at 316 and 318 Race Street;
- Demolish rear ells of 312-14 Race Street;
- Rehabilitate main block of 312-14 Race Street; and
- Construct six-story building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o Demolition would be limited to the non-contributing buildings at 316 and 318 Race and the largely non-visible rear ells of 312-14 Race Street. Visibility of one of the existing ells is limited to the view through a narrow private alley off Orianna Street. The work complies with this standard.
 - o The proposed new construction would be limited to four stories along Race Street to maintain the scale of the streetscape. An additional story would be set back from the front façade of all three structures and would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The addition at 312-14 Race Street would minimally intersect the rear of the existing building's main block. The massing, size, and scale of the new construction and addition comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as presented, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:08:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architects Monica Wyatt and Joseph Donohue represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application at its 9 April 2021 meeting proposing the complete demolition of the rear ells of 312-14 Race Street and the five-story massing of the new construction proposed at 316-18 Race Street, with an addition at the rear of the historic buildings. The Historical Commission concluded that the rear ells of 312-14 Race Street were narrow, in poor condition, and were compromised. It further found that complete demolition may not be appropriate and may not satisfy Standard 9. It further determined that the overall massing of the new construction was satisfactory, including the potential visibility of the additions.
- The application for final approval proposes to demolish the rear ells at 312-14 Race Street and the non-contributing buildings at 316 and 318 Race Street. Portions of the rear wall of the historic building's main block would be retained, but the entire wall is not structurally sound or salvageable.
- The application has been supplemented and revised to include demolition plans, restoration details, storefront details, and information on materials, as requested by the Architectural Committee.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The massing, size, scale, and materials of the new construction are appropriate and satisfy Standard 9.
- The extent of demolition at 312-14 Race Street is acceptable, owing to the compromised condition of the rear ells.

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

ITEM: 312-14, 316, AND 318 RACE ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 2111 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Demolish roof; construct roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Frank Defazio

Applicant: Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The property at 2111 Locust Street is a three-story brick Italianate building located mid-block with no visibility of the rear from a public right-of-way. In its current form, the building has a gently gabled roof over the main block and a flat roof over the rear ell. The roof of the rear ell had been raised at some point in the past, evident by the additional height of the masonry wall at the rear relative to the adjacent building to the east. The gable over the main block remains in its original form.

This application proposes to demolish the rear roof behind the ridge line to allow for more ceiling height at the interior and to allow for the installation of a roof deck. A pilot house would be constructed at the center of the roof behind the ridgeline and would slope toward Locust Street. A trellis is also proposed over a portion of the deck. Other work includes installing new windows and recladding the rear ell in HardiePlank siding.

The staff suggests that if the rear roof were retained, a roof deck and pilot house could be appropriate, provided they are inconspicuous from Locust Street. The staff also suggests locating the deck and pilot house as far off the main block and onto the rear ell as possible.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear roof;
- Construct pilot house and roof deck;
- Install new windows; and
- Reclad rear ell.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The application proposes to demolish the rear portion of the roof to construct a roof deck and pilot house. Only the front slope would remain. While the flat roof of the rear ell has been raised at some point in the past, the subtle gable of the main block should be considered a character-defining feature and should be retained. As proposed, the application does not satisfy Standard 9.
 - o The alterations to the rear, including the recladding with HardiePlank siding, creation of a new opening, and infilling of a window, would not be visible from a public right-of-way and comply with Standard 9.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing*

use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.

- o The proposed roof deck and pilot house would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, but the demolition of the rear roof would result in the loss of the character-defining gable. As proposed, the work does not comply with the Roofs Guideline; however, if the rear gable is retained and the deck and pilot house are moved further onto the rear ell, the work may remain inconspicuous and satisfy the guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:23:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Lauren Thomsen represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application proposes to retain the front and rear slopes of the gable roof, with removal of fabric limited to a small portion of the rear slope to accommodate the pilot house. The flat roof of the rear ell would be removed, and the deck would be limited to this area.
- The existing chimneys would be retained rather than removed.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The entire gable roof, including the front and rear slopes, are character-defining features of the building. The roof of the rear ell was demolished and raised in the past and is not original. The revised scope proposing to retain the gable roof satisfies Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.
- The proposed windows and rear cladding are appropriate and satisfy Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the height and massing of the pilot house are minimized, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 2111 LOCUST ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 317 LAWRENCE CT

Proposal: Alter window openings; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joao Soares and Bernita Spagnoli

Applicant: Kevin Yoder, k Yoder Design

History: 1970; Lawrence Court Townhouses; Bower & Fradley, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes to construct a rear addition, insert a new window opening at the recessed front entrance, and install new windows at the third-floor front and rear mansards of this courtyard residence constructed c. 1970. An in-concept application proposing the same scope was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its December 2021 meeting. At that time, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, with the recommendations that the new fenestration at the mansard should be eight-unit ribbon windows, a vertical division should be added to the second-floor rear doors, the balcony parapet and railing should be redesigned to be less solid, and that rooftop mechanical equipment should not be visible from the public right-of way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. This application for final approval addresses those recommendations. The rear of the property is partially visible from Cypress Street to the north.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove first-floor rear masonry wall.
- Cut down second-floor rear windows into doors.
- Construct rear addition.
- Construct new window opening at recessed front entry.

- Install new windows at third-floor front and rear mansard to better replicate original fenestration.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed work is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including the brick color, pursuant to Standard 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 251 S VAN PELT ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition; alter façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David Fetkewicz and Michele Leff

Applicant: John Hayes, Blackney Hayes Architects

History: 1880; Alice Kraft School of Rhythm; 1954, new façade

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes façade alterations and a third-story addition to a former carriage house which has been significantly altered since its original construction about 1880. The carriage house was originally part of the property at 244-46 S. 21st Street but was subdivided off in the 1940s. The existing façade dates to 1954, when the building was converted to single-family use. Before that, the building was converted for use as storage and dance studio. The adjacent third-story additions to the carriage houses at 247 and 249 S. Van Pelt Street were approved by the Historical Commission in 2012.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install doors and windows in new openings on the first floor and existing openings on the second floor.
- Remove non-historic pent roof and construct brick cornice.
- Construct third-story addition set back 6.5 feet from front façade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be*

differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

- o The proposed work is compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the metal panel or shingle system at the addition is not darker than a lead tone, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1723-29 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Alter facade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John DeLuits, Honey Nuts LLC, c/o Midwood Investment & Development

Applicant: Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects

History: 1956; Nan Duskin Store; Thalheimer & Weitz, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the front façade of the building at 1723-29 Walnut Street. The building at 1723-29 Walnut Street was created when the existing buildings were rehabilitated for the Nan Duskin Store by architects Thalheimer & Weitz in 1956. The building is classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District. In light of its classification as non-contributing, the building itself should not be treated as a historic resource and any alterations to it should be judged based on their impact on the historic district, not on the building. Although there is a diversity of age and styles of buildings within the immediate vicinity, buff or light-colored masonry—brick, stone, and cast concrete—is a character defining feature of this area of the historic district. The proposed material for the updated storefront includes black steel and aluminum, black stone, aluminum, spandrel glass, and clear glass.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Extend section of façade that fronts directly on sidewalk.
- Reclad exterior and install new steel storefront.
- Demolish section of façade and install aluminum curtain wall.
- Replace windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

- o While the size, scale, proportion, and fenestration of the proposed façade renovation is compatible with the neighboring buildings of the historic district, the proposed exterior cladding and color of that cladding is not and does not meet Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:29:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architects Michael Schade and Christine Furman, and John Delutis of Midwood Investment and Development represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The façade cladding material was revised from a black metal panel to a buff-colored brick, which addressed the main concerns of the staff and Architectural Committee.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The size, scale, proportion, fenestration, and materials are compatible with the neighboring buildings; therefore, the application meets Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1723-29 WALNUT ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 19 JANUARY 2022

ADDRESS: 727-35 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Thrift Park, Inc.

Proposed Action: Classification in Chestnut Street East Historic District

Property Owner: Chestnut 733 Associates LP/Goldenberg Group

Applicant: Goldenberg Group

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

OVERVIEW: At its November 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission designated the Chestnut Street East Historic District, which includes properties on the 600, 700, and 800 blocks of Chestnut Street as well as some cross streets. The nomination included the parking garage at 727-35 Chestnut Street in the proposed district and classified it as non-contributing. The Committee on Historic Designation disagreed with the nominator's proposed classification and recommended classifying the parking garage as contributing. The Historical Commission subsequently adopted that recommendation and classified the parking garage at 727-35 Chestnut Street as contributing when it designated the historic district.

An attorney representing the owner of the garage subsequently objected to the classification of the garage as contributing, asserting that his client had received notice letters stating that the property would be considered as non-contributing in the historic district but had not been notified that the Committee had recommended upgrading the classification to contributing, fundamentally changing the way that the Historical Commission would regulate the property. The Historical Commission's attorney reviewed the matter and decided that the Historical Commission should not upgrade the classification of a property from non-contributing to contributing during its review of a historic district nomination without notifying the property owner, who may want to participate in the deliberations regarding classification. The Commission's attorney has directed the Historical Commission to throw out the original

contributing classification and to consider anew the classification of the garage at meetings of the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission so that the owner has an opportunity to participate in the deliberations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends classifying the parking garage at 727-35 Chestnut Street as non-contributing because new research shows that the reasons cited for upgrading the classification from non-contributing to contributing during the original review were not based on fact:

- the architectural firm of Silverman & Levy did not play the lead role in the design of the parking garage;
- the parking garage was not directly related to the nineteenth and early twentieth-century commercial buildings within the district, but was instead erected to provide parking for customers of the Gimbels Department Store, located on Market Street, outside the historic district; and,
- the parking garage was not an early example of a short-term parking garage in Philadelphia. The first short-term parking garages were built more than 20 years earlier.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend to the Historical Commission that it classify the property at 727-35 Chestnut Street as contributing to the Chestnut Street East Historic District.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:36:40

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney David Smith and consultants Nick Kraus and Peter Angelides represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Smith explained that there are two reasons why the property does not warrant a classification of contributing, which are summarized in a letter he submitted to the Historical Commission. He stated that, first, the facts do not support a contributing classification because the property does not satisfy any of the Criteria for Designation cited in the historic district nomination. He stated that, second, it would be bad public policy to classify this building as contributing. The parking garage is a blight on the historic district. He stated that this corner location should be redeveloped to bring people and prosperity to the district.
- Mr. Kraus, a preservation consultant, is “incongruent” to the historic district and should not be classified as contributing to the historic district. He displayed a presentation and discussed why, in his professional opinion, the garage does not contribute to the historic district. He catalogued the many alterations and additions to the garage. He addressed the Criteria cited in the nomination as well as Criterion I, the archaeology criterion, which was not included in the original nomination but was added by the Committee on Historic Designation. He stated that, in his firm’s professional opinion, the construction of the garage, which covers the entire site, with two levels of below-grade parking and reinforced concrete foundations would have destroyed any archaeological artifacts that may have existed on the site. He stated that it is highly unlikely that archaeological resources survive at the site.

- Mr. Angelides stated that he is an economist, city planner, and was a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Historic Preservation. He stated that there are many vacant storefronts and low-quality establishments in the immediate area, which is struggling. He stated that the garage is partly responsible for the state of the neighborhood. It is a terrible use for a corner property. "The garage is a blighting influence on the other historic buildings in the district." He stated that not only does the garage itself have an adverse impact on the neighborhood, but it is also preventing owners of nearby properties from investing in their historic buildings. The construction of a by-right 400-unit residential building at the site would bring 500 to 600 residents to the area and significant tax income to the City. Preventing the demolition of the garage will preserve the blighting influence on the neighborhood.
- Mr. Smith pointed to the engineer's report but did not call the engineer to testify. He then offered a summary of his team's position.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that he sees no reason to save this building when it has an adverse influence on the community.
- Ms. Edwards agreed. She also noted that this area is a transit node and should be redeveloped in a way that takes advantage of the transportation facilities.
- Mr. Thomas stated that this sort of information would typically be reviewed by the Committee on Financial Hardship.
- Mr. Reuter explained why this matter is before the Historical Commission and noted that there will be other, similar matters like this on upcoming agendas. He also explained that the Historical Commission has broad discretionary powers when considering nominations. He stated that this is not a demolition application and is not being considered under the hardship or necessity in the public interest provisions that are intended for the review of demolition applications. He stated that the Historical Commission may classify this property as contributing or non-contributing as it sees fit and may take into account any arguments including the argument that the garage is a blighting influence and redevelopment would better serve the city. He informed that Historical Commission that it does not have a duty to designate every resource that is deemed historic. He stated that the Historical Commission should designate when designation is beneficial to the public, to all Philadelphians. He concluded that, when considering designations, the Historical Commission can take into account economic factors. The benefits that might accrue from classifying this property as non-contributing and allowing it to be redeveloped are relevant to the designation question.
- Mr. Farnham agreed with Mr. Reuter that the Historical Commission is never obligated to designate simply because it has determined that a resource meets one or more of the Criteria for Designation. The Commission may designate when a resource meets one or more of the Criteria for Designation, but it should only designate when designating is good public policy. He stated that the first section of the historic preservation ordinance, the Public Policy and Purposes section, provides guidance. He stated that that section of the ordinance directs the Commission to designate resources to preserve the education, culture, traditions, and economic values of Philadelphia; to protect the character of neighborhoods; to strengthen the economy, enhance attractiveness, and stabilize and improve property values; and to foster civic pride. He concluded that not every historic resource should be designated. The Commission should designate when preserving resources will benefit the city.
- Ms. Washington stated that she does not see any evidence that the garage has significance and is contributing to the historic district.

- Ms. Sanchez agreed and stated that she considers this building to be non-contributing.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee on Historic Designation determined that the parking garage is significant because it represents an important evolution within the commercial district that accommodated the automobile. She stated that the garage is not important as a signature building by Silverman & Levy or as an early parking garage but is instead important because it documents the changes taking place in the district after the Great Depression, when people drove to the shopping district. She stated that it may have been built for Gimbels, but it was not only built for Gimbels. The automobile has been a crucial part of the life of downtown Philadelphia. The continuing history of commercial Center City is important. The collaboration of an architect and engineer with a stylistic result is important. This is not a signature building by Silverman & Levy but it is notable. She stated that the nearby surface parking lots are also responsible for the blight, not just this building. She suggested that this parking garage might be demolished for yet another surface parking lot. She stated that Mr. Kraus, the property owner's preservation consultant, is not qualified to make determinations about archaeology. She noted that she and Mr. Kraus have similar backgrounds and training and she does not consider herself qualified to make determinations about archaeological potential. She stated that the archaeologist on the Committee on Historic Designation found that this site had the potential to contain archaeological resources.
 - o Mr. Kraus responded that he personally did not make the determination about archaeology. The determination was made by a professional archaeologist who works at his firm. He merely reported on that archaeologist's finding. He added that his letter states that fact clearly.
- Mr. Smith concluded that the parking garage deviates from the character of the rest of the historic district and should be classified as non-contributing. Regarding the speculation about the reuse of the structure, the engineer's report clearly states that this building cannot be reused as suggested by some. The floor-to-floor heights of eight feet are inadequate for other uses and the building's capacity to carry additional weight is insufficient. The reuse of this building is precluded.
- Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission has a much larger job than the Committee on Historic Designation. The Committee offers advice on the satisfaction of the Criteria for Designation. The Historical Commission has great discretion and considers many factors beyond the Criteria, which may collectively be called the public policy factors. The Historical Commission is not bound to accept the Committee's advice and automatically designate when the Committee finds that the Criteria are satisfied. The Historical Commission includes members with expertise in many areas who represent various positions. Ultimately, the Historical Commission is charged with making the best possible decision for the city, which is usually but not always designation or a classification of contributing.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert stated that he listed this property as non-contributing when he authored the nomination, but now believes that it should be classified as contributing.
- Jim Duffin stated that the Historical Commission should make its decisions about classification in districts and designation generally based on the satisfaction of the Criteria for Designation and should not consider any other factors.

- Amy Lambert stated that the Committee on Historic Designation decided to designate this building and it should be designated. She stated that a building can be significant, even if a significant architect's name is not associated with the building.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that historic preservation should be conceived as a tool for managing change. The character of this building is clearly different from the character of the rest of the district. He stated that it is hard for him to imagine the Historical Commission applying the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to this building in perpetuity. He stated that classifying this building as contributing would undermine the Historical Commission's credibility with regard to designation. He concluded that this building should be rightfully classified as non-contributing.
- Venise Whitaker stated that this building should be reused.
- Mary McGettigan of West Philly Plan and Preserve stated that the Historical Commission should be independent of the Department of Planning and Development.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Compelling the property owner to preserve the parking garage at 727-35 Chestnut Street according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in perpetuity is not in the best interest of Philadelphia.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property at 727-35 Chestnut Street merits as a classification of non-contributing in the inventory of the Chestnut Street East Historic District.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to classify the property at 727-35 Chestnut Street as non-contributing in the inventory of the Chestnut Street East Historic District. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1.

ITEM: 727-35 Chestnut Street MOTION: Classify as non-contributing MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman		X			
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11	1			1

ADDRESS: 138 W WALNUT LN

Name of Resource: John E. Fryer House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Gloria Del Piano

Nominator: Staff of the Historical Commission

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 138 W. Walnut Lane in Germantown as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation A because it “is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.” From 1972 to 2003, the property at 138 W. Walnut Lane was the home of Dr. John E. Fryer, a psychiatrist and a national leader in the gay civil rights movement whose advocacy was instrumental in convincing the American Psychiatric Association (APA) to end its classification of homosexuality as a psychiatric disorder in the early 1970s. The classification stamped homosexuals as emotional deviants and lent medical authority to laws that made homosexual acts and even public gatherings of homosexual persons illegal. In 1972, Fryer spoke at the APA’s annual convention and objected to the APA’s classification of homosexuality as a psychiatric disorder. Fearing retribution for his position, he appeared in disguise as Dr. Anonymous. Fryer’s courageous effort to speak out as a homosexual psychiatrist against psychiatry’s decision to pathologize homosexuality changed the APA’s position, a major shift with ramifications in myriad realms from medicine to the law that marked a key point in the gay civil rights movement. In 1973, the board of the APA voted to remove homosexuality from its list of mental disorders and to urge that “homosexuals be given all protections now guaranteed other citizens.” The members of the APA ratified the decision in 1974. Fryer lived at 138 W. Walnut Lane until his death in 2003.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 138 W. Walnut Lane satisfies Criterion for Designation A.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 138 W. Walnut Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E, with a Period of Significance of 1860 to 2003.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:52:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham explained to the Historical Commission that the property owner has requested a 30-day continuance of the review to have an opportunity to speak to the staff and better understand the implications of designation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property would remain under the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction during any continuance period requested by the property owner.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- A 30-day continuance is reasonable and should be granted.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for the property at 138 W. Walnut Lane to the Historical Commission's meeting of 11 March 2022. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 138 W Walnut Lane					
MOTION: Continue to March 2022 meeting					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

ADDRESS: 2100-20 W ALLEGHENY AVE

Name of Resource: Steel Heddle Manufacturing Company Complex

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: AM8 Group Steel Heddle Building LP

Nominator: Heritage Consulting

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2100-20 Allegheny Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Steel Heddle Manufacturing Company Complex, constructed over a span from 1919 to 1951, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the company was “one of the largest weaving loom accessory suppliers in the United States, [and supplied] the nation’s textile industry with the most technologically advance steel heddles and associated loom harness equipment.” Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the complex is significant owing to its association with the William Steele & Sons Company, a leader in the construction of industrial, manufacturing and commercial structures between the late nineteenth century and the 1930s.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2100-20 W Allegheny Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2100-20 W. Allegheny Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:55:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Michael LaFlash of Heritage Consulting represented the nomination and the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Steel Heddle Manufacturing Company Complex was constructed over a span from 1919 to 1951.
- The complex is associated with the William Steele & Sons Company.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Steel Heddle Manufacturing Company was a significant national supplier of weaving loom accessories, specializing in the most advanced equipment available, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- William Steele & Sons Company was a leader in the construction of industrial structures between the late nineteenth century and the 1930, satisfying Criterion E.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 2100-20 W. Allegheny Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A E and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 2100-20 W ALLEGHENY AVE MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, E and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

ADDRESS: 1232 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: DeLong Building

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Realkore 1232Chestnut LLC

Nominator: Preservation Alliance

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1232 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the corner building, constructed in 1900 as a speculative office venture for inventor and manufacturer Frank E. DeLong, satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. The nomination argues that the building is significant as an important Philadelphia example of the commercial aesthetic popularized in Chicago beginning in the 1880s. Popularly known as the Commercial Style, but also referred to as the Chicago School, this form of tall building construction prioritized the expression of structure over superficial ornamentation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1232 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1232 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:58:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi and Kevin McMahon represented the nomination.

- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub representing Save Our Sites supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination.
- Celeste Morello supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building was constructed as a speculative office venture for inventor and manufacturer Frank E. DeLong in 1900.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building is an important Philadelphia example of the commercial aesthetic popularized in Chicago beginning in the 1880s, commonly known as the Commercial Style, but also referred to as the Chicago School, satisfying Criteria C and D.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1232 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1232 CHESTNUT ST MOTION: Designate; Criteria C and D MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

ADDRESS: 917 DICKINSON ST

Name of Resource: "Iron Plantation Near Southwark, 1800" (object)

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: United States Postal Service

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a mural inside of the Southwark Station Post Office as an historic object and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the mural, painted in 1938 and titled "Iron Plantation Near Southwark, 1800," satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the mural has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation, as one of the many New Deal paintings commissioned by the Treasury Department's Section of Fine Arts in the 1930s. Under Criterion J, the nomination claims that the mural exemplifies the cultural, political, social, or historical heritage of the community in terms of its content, which was typically chosen to reflect the local community.

While the Historical Commission may designate a mural as historic, the Historical Commission may not be able to exert plenary jurisdiction over proposed work to this mural. The City's historic preservation ordinance empowers the Historical Commission to review building permit applications to ensure that the work proposed in those applications satisfies preservation standards. The United States Postal Service, a federal agency, may not be required to obtain building permits from the City of Philadelphia and therefore may not be subject to the Historical Commission's review. Any designation would be honorary but would not empower the Historical Commission to exert oversight over the mural.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the mural inside the Southwark Station Post Office at 917 Dickinson Street satisfies Criterion for Designation A but not Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the mural inside the Southwark Station Post Office at 917 Dickinson Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:04:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Historical Commission may not be able to exert plenary jurisdiction over proposed work to this mural, and therefore the designation may be honorary.

- The mural is currently installed on an interior wall of the Southwark Station Post Office.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The mural has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation, as one of the many New Deal paintings commissioned by the Treasury Department's Section of Fine Arts in the 1930s, satisfying Criterion A.
- The mural exemplifies the cultural, political, social, or historical heritage of the community in terms of its content, which was typically chosen to reflect the local community, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that that the mural inside the Southwark Station Post Office at 917 Dickinson Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 917 DICKINSON ST					
MOTION: Designate mural; Criteria A and J					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

Ms. Carney joined the meeting.

ADDRESS: 1651 KINSEY ST

Name of Resource: Burial ground, Campbell A.M.E. Church of Frankford

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Campbell African Methodist Episcopal Church

Nominator: Joseph Menkevich

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the burial ground and site at 1651 Kinsey Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The church, Campbell AME Church of Frankford, is already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places as of 4 February 1982. This nomination seeks to highlight the historic significance of the site itself. The nomination contends that the site satisfies Criteria for Designation A, I, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the site is associated with the lives of persons significant in the past, including persons associated with the AME Church of the Borough of Frankford and landowners of properties that were conveyed to the Church. The nomination provides biographies of those persons. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the site exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social and historical heritage of the Black community of Frankford. Under Criterion I, the nomination argues that the site, which is labeled on an 1834 map as “Burying Ground and Meeting of the Blacks” may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, as a large section of the cemetery remains undisturbed, and the church building on the remaining section appears to have been constructed in a way to not disturb the burials which lie beneath.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the site at 1651 Kinsey Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, I, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the site at 1651 Kinsey Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, I, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:30:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the nomination or the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination.
- Venise Whitaker supported the nomination.
- Celeste Morello supported the nomination.
- Hal Schirmer supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The church building, Campbell AME Church of Frankford, was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places as of 4 February 1982.
- The current nomination covers the site itself rather than the church building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The site is associated with the lives of persons significant in the past, including persons associated with the AME Church of the Borough of Frankford and landowners of properties that were conveyed to the Church, satisfying Criterion A.
- The site may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, as a large section of the cemetery remains undisturbed, and the church building on the remaining section appears to have been constructed in a way to not disturb the burials which lie beneath, satisfying Criterion I.
- The site exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, and historical heritage of the Black community of Frankford, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Washington moved to find that the site at 1651 Kinsey Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, I, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1651 KINSEY ST MOTION: Designate site; Criteria A, I, and J MOVED BY: Washington SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

ADDRESS: 1031 SHACKAMAXON ST

Name of Resource: Joseph Langer Building

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Kathryn Bartolomeo

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1031 Shackamaxon Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Joseph Langer Building satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the building fronting Day Street reflects the environment in an era characterized by vernacular, half-gambrel “flounders” of frame construction. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the property represents the historical heritage of the neighborhood’s early period of development, as well as the cultural, economic, industrial, and

social history of the people who founded and formed Fishtown and the larger Kensington community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1031 Shackamaxon Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1031 Shackamaxon Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, I, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:38:28

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Ken Milano supported the nomination.
- Celeste Morello supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination.
- Troy Bianchi supported the nomination.
- Venise Whitaker supported the nomination.
- John Scott supported the nomination.
- Michele Gaffney supported the nomination.
- Jason Sherman supported the nomination.
- Hal Schirmer supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The nomination proposes to designate the entire parcel of 1031 Shackamaxon Street, though it identifies only the two-and-a-half-story “flounder” as contributing. The one-story rear portion of the building is identified as non-contributing in the nomination, owing to a lack of information.
- The property is located next to I-95 in Fishtown, an area with high potential for archaeology, as evidenced by the recovery of numerous archaeological resources from a neighboring property. The property at 1031 Shackamaxon Street formerly housed both residential and industrial uses, and artifacts from those uses are likely to be uncovered in the future.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The half-gambrel frame “flounder” fronting Day Street represents the once-common building type historically found throughout the River Wards. The nomination satisfies Criterion C.
- The property has high archaeological potential and satisfies Criterion I.
- The property represents the industrial and residential development of the Fishtown community and satisfies Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Carney moved to find that the property at 1031 Shackamaxon Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, I and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia

Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1031 SHACKAMAXON ST MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, I and J MOVED BY: Carney SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

ADDRESS: 919-21 LOMBARD ST

Name of Resource: Smith Whipper Houses

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Hutchinson Properties Partnership LP

Nominator: Donna J. Rilling and Michael Clemmons

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 919-21 Lombard Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property, which encompasses two formerly separate rowhouses constructed circa 1840, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, B, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination asserts that the property is significant as the former residences of important African American abolitionists, reformers, businessmen, and civic activists Stephen and Harriet Smith and William and Harriet Whipper. Stephen Smith purchased the property at 921 Lombard Street in 1840 from fellow abolitionist Robert Purvis and resided there until his death in 1873; his wife continued to live there until her death in 1880. The Whippers purchased 919 Lombard Street in 1867. The Smiths and the Whippers were central to voluntary organizations focused on the betterment of impoverished Philadelphians, aided freedom seekers, were at the forefront of antislavery efforts, and were key activists of the region's Black community. Under Criterion B, the nomination explains that the Smiths hosted key leaders of the antislavery movement, including John Brown, William Still, Frederick Douglass and Henry Highland Carnet, at their home in March 1858 as part of a fundraising campaign for Brown's Harpers Ferry mission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 919-21 Lombard Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 919-21 Lombard Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, I, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:56:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. He stated that property owner contacted the staff on 10 February 2022 requesting a continuance. Mr. Farnham said the owner did not indicate opposition to the nomination but would like more time to prepare for the Historical Commission's review.
- Donna J. Rilling represented the nominator.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 919-21 Lombard Street to the Historical Commission's meeting of 11 March 2022. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 919-21 LOMBARD ST					
MOTION: Request to continue to March 2022 PHC meeting					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

ADDRESS: 6930 HEGERMAN ST

Name of Resource: Tacony Baptist Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Tacony Baptist Church

Nominator: Tacony Community Development Corporation

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6930 Hegerman Street, historically known as Tacony Baptist Church, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic

Places. The nomination asserts under Criterion J that the congregation is one of the oldest religious institutions in Tacony and has been a part of the community's religious, social, cultural, and industrial history since its founding in 1881. The church, initially planned in 1883 and construction completed in 1885, is significant through its connection to the Disston family and as a gathering place for community members for over 135 years.

Under Criterion F, the nomination states that the 1915 addition was constructed of 2500 discarded grindstones from the nearby Disston Saw Works and is the only known sandstone church in the United States built of industrial by-products, thus earning the nickname "The Grindstone Church." In their original industrial and circular form, grindstones were used to sharpen saws during the production process but would be discarded after a few months of use. The use of grindstones in the construction of the church's sanctuary exemplifies the building's industrial roots in the Tacony neighborhood.

The proposed period of significance is 1883 to 1959. This date span reflects the 1883 date of construction planning through the establishment of the Northeast Geriatric Clinic at the church in 1959.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 6930 Hegerman Street satisfies Criteria for Designation F and J. The staff also recommends a correction be made to the nomination on page 11. The church did not close during the Covid-19 pandemic but implemented alternate ways of meeting to protect the health of its members.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6930 Hegerman Street satisfies Criteria for Designation F and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:01:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Reverend Evelyn Barnes represented the property owner.
- No one represented the nominator.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub supported the nomination.
- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The church congregation supports the nomination.
- The historic bell described in the nomination is still in the church and is functioning.
- The nomination successfully supports the Criteria for Designation.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The church is significant through its connection to the Disston family and as a gathering place for community members for over 135 years, satisfying Criterion J.

- The 1915 church addition was constructed of 2500 discarded grindstones from the nearby Disston Saw Works and is the only known sandstone church in the United States built of industrial by-products, satisfying Criterion F.

ACTION: Ms. Washington moved to find that the property at 6390 Hegerman Street satisfies Criteria for Designation F and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 6390 HEGERMAN ST MOTION: Designate, Criteria F and J MOVED BY: Washington SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 1206 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Philadelphia Federal Credit Union

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 1206 Chestnut LLC

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1206 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that building, constructed in 1922 and re-clad in 1963, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the property represents the development of Center City, Philadelphia from residential to commercial in the late-nineteenth through mid-twentieth centuries. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the front façade of the building, installed in 1963, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Mid-Century Modern style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1206 Chestnut Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D, and that the arguments made for Criterion A better reflect Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1206 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:09:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi, Paul Steinke, and Libbie Hawes represented the nomination.
- Attorney Jeffrey Ogren, historic preservation consultant George Thomas, and architect Richard Wentzel represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Grossi refuted arguments in anticipation of opposition to designation. He stated that the property owner's consultants contend that the building is unusable. He stated that the Preservation Alliance does not deny that a building such as this presents zoning and programmatic challenges, but that these are not insurmountable and can be mitigated with creative approaches. He stated that the adjacent property at 1208 Chestnut Street was proposed for redevelopment but that the building permit for demolition has expired, and any proposed work at that property should not impact the Historical Commission's review of this nomination.
- Ms. Hawes, the author of the nomination, summarized the historic significance of the property and thanked the architect's son for providing her with his drawings.
- Mr. Ogren summarized his client's opposition to the historic designation of the property. He stated that there are no windows facing Chestnut Street above the first floor. The rear of the building has an egress stair without windows. The property does not extend back to Sansom Street but is landlocked at the rear. Soon after his client purchased the property, it was announced that there would be a new tall building constructed at 1208 Chestnut Street. He stated that the building at 1206 Chestnut Street cannot be used for any purpose, owing to its landlocked status and complete lack of windows. He described it as a box without value. He stated that historic designation is intended to benefit the city, but a designation of this property would not be a benefit to the city because it would freeze the building and make the site unusable. His client tried to sell the building but, owing to the pending historic designation, the property has no value, despite it being zoned CMX-5 and in Center City. He introduced Richard Wentzel of Thornton Tomasetti, a Registered Architect.
- Mr. Wentzel outlined code requirements for habitable space, including windows and egress. He displayed a long list of prohibited uses for this particular building. He stated that one cannot make this building work without windows, and that the building will never be able to meet the International Building Code requirements. He described the current dangerous egress method from the upper floors. He noted that some people have suggested simply adding additional floors on top of the existing building to make the building useable, but the existing structure has a rubblestone foundation and will not support any additional load without significant structural interventions. He stated that, without windows, there is no rational or code-compliant way to make the building work.

- Mr. Thomas presented the case against historic designation based on the limitations of the building itself and the Criteria for Designation. He stated that the building has no windows with no allowed use and therefore has no value. He stated that the pending demolition and new construction at 1208 Chestnut Street will mean that the windows on the side of 1206 Chestnut Street will not be legal. He opined that no rational developer would take on this project knowing that no windows will ever be legal. He stated that this is a condition created by the architect. He noted that the original windows on the west side were glass block and were later replaced. The current owners purchased the property sight-unseen and believed that the front façade was full of windows, when in fact it is a solid wall behind the 1960s façade. He stated that the architect in 1962 agreed to not use the fourth floor because there was no adequate means of egress, and 20 years later, when the owner wanted to use the fourth floor, they were forced to fireproof the central stair, but not connect the central stair to the front exterior wall. The building still did not meet code requirements. Mr. Thomas provided information on the building's architect, Lee Casaccio. He opined that Casaccio's projects were second-tier designs which included low-end apartment houses, grocery stores, garages, and clichéd commercial buildings. He suggested that the aluminum dots on the front façade come directly from The Mint, the famous Las Vegas casino. He suggested that the front canopy was a standard motif as well, used at Food Fair grocery stores. He questioned how this building fits into the context of Philadelphia commercial architecture, and if we would regret the loss of the building like we now do for Frank Furness-designed bank buildings. He suggested that the answer is no. He stated that the nomination offers no real context of Philadelphia Mid-century Modern architecture. He referenced the Preservation Alliance's spreadsheet of 481 Mid-century Modern buildings, for which this building has the wrong original name, wrong construction date, and wrong architect. He concluded that this is a minor building by a minor architect working in a way that undermined the future use of the building. Mr. Thomas returned to discussing the limitations of the building, stating that a dead building with no windows does not enhance economic values. He reminded the Commission that it is not just designating a façade, but rather an entire building. He stated that the Commission is free to designate but it does so at a cost, both to the property owner who will have a building with no value, and as a major liability to a community that is beginning to evolve. He stated that two-thirds of the storefronts on this block are vacant. He compared this building to the Victor Gruen-designed Robinson's building at 1020 Market Street, stating that the situation here is the same as that property where there was also not adequate light and air, and the historic designation was overturned.
- Mr. Ogren summarized his arguments against designation, stating that nothing about the building if designated will strengthen the City's economy or improve property values; rather, it will make the building an unusable relic on Chestnut Street. He stated that designation of this property would amount to a taking, as the value is in the ability to develop the site. He stated that the Commission cannot ignore that development is coming to the adjacent property at 1208 Chestnut Street, because it directly impacts the property at 1206 Chestnut Street.
- Mr. Mattioni questioned why the Commission would designate this property given the information provided thus far. He opined that the building does not fit with the context of Chestnut Street.
- Commissioner Thomas commented that, absent a perpetual easement from the owner of 1208 Chestnut Street, it appears that the Department of Licenses and

Inspections would not allow windows in the party wall and therefore this building would not be very useable. He stated that the issue is whether this building can be reused.

- o Ms. Edwards commented that this is a unique situation, and asked if the storefront could be preserved but not the upper floors, to allow for more flexibility.
- o Commissioner Thomas responded that the issue is getting people into the building and then into the upper floors if there are multiple tenants. He asked if removing the façade and putting it elsewhere would be an option.
- Mr. Steinke commented that the Commission should not forget that the property is zoned CMX-5 which means that an overbuild is possible. He referenced Inga Saffron's 2014 *Philadelphia Inquirer* article which referred to this building as "a modernist gem with almost pop art sensibility."
- Commissioner Thomas agreed that the building is a modernist gem but asked if the Commission needs to anticipate an inevitable hardship because of all the documentation presented. He asked what could be done with floors two through four, even with an overbuild. He summarized that there are grave problems in terms of the reuse of this building.
- Ms. Carney asked about rear access to the building.
 - o Commissioner Thomas responded that there is a small alleyway.
 - o Mr. Thomas clarified that the alleyway is blocked by the fire tower.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey stated that there would have to be significant alterations to the rear of the building to provide reasonable means of egress. He agreed that the front façade is the character-defining feature of this building, but it is a polished stone façade. He questioned the viability of a reuse consistent with preservation standards, given the circumstances with the front façade.
 - o Commissioner Thomas agreed with Mr. McCoubrey, stating that the front façade is a gem, but it is on a closed box that lacks light, air, fire safety, and tenant access.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Amy Lambert commented in support of the nomination. She stated that just because the value of a building is not apparent, does not mean that the value does not exist. She suggested that the owner needs to think more creatively about the reuse of the building, and that the owners of the adjacent property at 1208 Chestnut Street could purchase this property.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the nomination and suggested that skylights could be incorporated to provide light into the building.
- Hal Schirmer commented that the existing windows are not illegal because the west wall is set back nine inches from the property line. He read from real estate listings for the property.
- Jim Duffin commented in support of the nomination and suggested that the discussion was turning from the merits of the nomination to adaptive reuse proposals, for which the nominator was not prepared to discuss. He recommended that the Commission obtain more information about potential reuses before making a decision about the designation, if that is what the Commission intends to base its decision on. He suggested that an entirely new building could be constructed behind the façade and windows could be inserted into that façade, and then the historic façade could be reinstalled.
- Mary McGettigan, representing West Philly Plan and Preserve, commented in support of the nomination and suggested that the property and the adjacent property

at 1208 Chestnut Street be merged by the Historical Commission and the City Planning Commission.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED:

- Commissioner Thomas reiterated that the façade of this building is a gem but reminded everyone that the Commission cannot compel the adjacent property owner to purchase this property.
 - o Mr. Reuter agreed and stated that the Historical Commission should not be considering adaptive reuses that depend on the adjacent property. They are completely separate properties with different owners. He stated that the economic impact and public benefit can be considered. He suggested that the Commission could request additional information from the property owner if the Commission believes it does not have enough information at this time to determine if a designation here would ultimately be futile. He reminded the Commission that it is under no obligation to make a determination today.
- Ms. Cooperman referenced the National Products buildings and how the iconic façade was retained but then a large overbuild and new building was placed behind it to make the project feasible. She stated that facadectomies are done all the time. She stated that the majority of this building cannot be seen which offers an opportunity for any future development.
- Mr. Ogren stated that they have explored alternative uses and light wells and other various options, which is the reason for Mr. Wentzel's presentation. He stated that the feedback from the public of simply building on top or joining with the adjacent property or turning it into an art gallery are all not feasible. He stated that Mr. Wentzel maintains that the windows in the party wall are not legal and would have to be blocked up.
- Mr. Thomas reiterated that the building does not comply with fire code requirements. He stated that the central tower was fireproofed but no exit was made to get out to the street. He stated that this is a dangerous building that has worked around code regulations for years. He stated that the Commission cannot compel an owner into giving away its building to save a façade that blocks light, air, and access.
 - o Mr. Lech spoke from the perspective of the Department of Licenses and Inspections. He stated that many good points have been made related to reuse, but that the owner could seek variances to get around code compliance.
 - o Mr. Mattioni expressed concern if the suggestion from the Historical Commission is to seek variances to overcome safety issues. He stated that there has been much speculation about what can be done to work around the building's constraints, and that the Historical Commission has not heard adequate information to be able to overlook these constraints. He stated that it is clear that the building presents many challenges, and it may not be fair to saddle the owner with those problems related to reuse.
- Commissioner Thomas opined that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation. He questioned if it was good public policy to designate it as historic. He stated that the Commission may need a more thorough analysis of reuse options.
 - o Mr. Mattioni reminded the Commission that it has previously voted to determine that a property satisfies one or more Criteria for Designation, but not to designate it as historic because it is not good public policy to do so.
- Ms. Michel excused herself from the meeting.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission should designate the property as historic because the property satisfies one or more Criteria for Designation; the

basic role of the Historical Commission should prevail. She stated that designation and hardship are two different processes.

- o Commissioner Thomas responded that the Historical Commission is not here to harm people, but rather to protect historic resources. The Historical Commission should only designate when doing so makes sense. He stated that more research would be needed to determine if this façade could be removed, and then windows installed, and then the façade reinstalled, or some version of that solution in order to save the façade but allow for light and air and access.
- Mr. Lech clarified his earlier comment, explaining that there is usually a trade-off to increase code compliance in one area when it cannot be met in another area.
- Mr. Ogren thanked the Historical Commission for its consideration. He stated that comments have been made about not having enough information, and he requested that the Commission continue the matter, tell him what additional information it needs, and allow him to gather said information, rather than designating the property today without the additional information the Historical Commission believes that it needs in order to make a determination.
 - o Mr. Mattioni responded that the Preservation Alliance as the nominator should also provide more information and should meet with the property owner's representatives. The burden of proof should not be placed solely on a property owner, who did not seek out designation.
 - o Mr. Ogren responded that he would be happy to meet with the Preservation Alliance.
 - o Mr. Steinke responded that the Preservation Alliance would welcome the opportunity to meet with the owner and his representatives. He asked the Historical Commission to continue the review of the nomination to allow for this meeting to take place.
 - o Commissioner Thomas reminded everyone that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction would remain during any continuance period.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property will remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- A continuance of the review of the nomination will provide time for the property owner's representatives and the Preservation Alliance to have a discussion.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of the nomination for 1206 Chestnut Street to the April 2022 Historical Commission meeting, to allow time for the Preservation Alliance and the property owner's representatives to meet. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1206 CHESTNUT ST MOTION: Continue to April 2022 Historical Commission meeting MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X Left at 1:32 p.m.
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

REQUEST TO WITHDRAW

ADDRESS: 1826 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Aldine Theater

Proposed Action: Withdraw Nomination

Property Owner: Sam's Place Realty Associates, LP

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1826 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Aldine Theatre, constructed in 1921, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the theatre has significant character, interest, or value as one of the last remaining first-run movie palaces in Philadelphia. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the Aldine was the work of prominent local builders William Steele & Sons. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the Aldine represents the commercial development of Chestnut Street in the prestigious Rittenhouse Square neighborhood after the turn of the twentieth century.

Following the submission of the nomination and notification to the property owner, the nominator uncovered additional information not presented in the nomination, which is posted on the Historical Commission's website as additional information.

The Committee on Historic Designation previously reviewed a nomination for the property in March 1986 and recommended against designation owing to the loss of architectural integrity of the interior and the front doors. The Historical Commission adopted the recommendation of the Committee at its April 1986 meeting and declined to designate the property. The staff notes that

the interior of the property is not under consideration, and that the Historical Commission routinely designates properties that have alterations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1826 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:47:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented a request to withdraw the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance represented the nominator and stated that his organization and the owner had agreed to a façade easement for 1826 Chestnut Street. Owing to this agreement, he explained they are jointly requesting that the Historical Commission allow the nomination to be withdrawn.
- Attorney Adam Goodman represented the property owner and stated they support the request for withdrawal. He said the owner has agreed to a perpetual façade easement with the Preservation Alliance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jim Duffin, representing the Center City Residents Association, stated they are supportive of nomination withdrawal and future façade easement.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- An agreement has been made between the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia and the owner of 1826 Chestnut Street for a perpetual façade easement.
- During the negotiation period, the owner has agreed to only perform routine maintenance on the building and to not make any significant changes.
- Owing to the future façade easement, the nominator and owner are jointly asking the Historical Commission to allow the nomination to be withdrawn.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The façade easement will provide equal protection to historic designation and the request should be granted.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to grant the request to withdraw the nomination for 1826 Chestnut Street. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1826 CHESTNUT ST MOTION: Grant request to withdraw MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:45:32

ACTION: At 1:55 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: Adjourned MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

PLEASE NOTE:

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

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

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