

**THE MINUTES OF THE 654TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2017
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, chair
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D.
Michael Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Steven Hartner, Department of Public Property
Melissa Long, Division of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C
Laura Spina, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
H. Ahada Stanford, Ph.D., Commerce Department

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

ALSO PRESENT

Mickey Herr, Philadelphia Landmarks
Elsbeth Brown
Suzanna Barucco, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
J.F. McCarthy
John Christinzio
Giuliano Apadula
Keith Braccia, PMC Property Group
Jonathan Stavin, PMC Property Group
Oscar Beisert
Jacob Waters
Laura Keim, Stenton Museum
Brett Peanasky, Klehr Harrison
Melissa Romero
Michelle Calais, The Seabrook group
Venise Whitaker
David S. Traub, Save Our Sight
Janet Kalter
Charles Peruto
Robert Willis
Luca Segato, Eimer Design
Elcano Aldous
Leigh Anne Schriever
Jennifer Ko

Josh Chestnut, Icon
Katherine Waldman
Julia Levenson
R. Volpe
Gleb Dolgy, D2 Solutions
Jose Hernandez, JKR Partners, LLC
Joshua Harris, Office of Councilman Johnson
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
J.M. Duffin
Patricia Walsh
Tom Collins, Phoenix Masonry
Ori Feibush, OCF Realty
Steven Cohen
Dave Lockett, AC Moore
Michael Salomone
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Tom Kelly, CBS3
Allie Gunther
Brianna Bloodgood
John Plotz
Arielle Harris
Kevin Dolan, La Salle University
Liz Fassih
Chris Miskell
Rob Paladino, Landmark Design
Arel Kodst
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
Darien Wyn
Courtney Keel
Michael Mattioni, Esq., Mattioni, Ltd.
Mark Merlini, Brickstone
John Pringle, Stantec
Peter Moriarty, Brickstone
Elizabeth Scott, OCF Realty
David Patchefsky
Rhonda Manis
Carry Mangel
Aaron Wunsch
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
Christine Cho
Angela Trucks
Dan Dougherty, Firsttrust Bank
Kate McGlinchey, Old City District
Chen Chang
Tina Lapsia
Jenny Xia
Kathy Dowdell
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Fink, Gupta, Hartner, Long, Mattioni, McCoubrey, Royer, Spina, and Stanford joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 653RD STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to adopt the minutes of the 653rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 January 2017. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REQUESTS TO CONTINUE NOMINATION REVIEWS

227 E ALLEN ST

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: The Business Known As 227 E Allen, LLC

Nominator: Andrew Fearon & Oscar Beisert

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 227 E. Allen Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 227 E. Allen Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. This nomination argues that the Jacob Deal frame dwelling is a rare surviving example of the wooden houses associated with the early development of maritime Philadelphia.

Prior to the nomination's April 2016 submission date, the owner had obtained a building permit for exterior alterations. The permit for this work was issued in October 2015. The work authorized under that permit may be undertaken without the Historical Commission's intervention or oversight.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Spina moved to continue the review of the nomination for 227 E. Allen Street for 90 days to the Historical Commission's meeting in May 2017. Mr. Fink seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 228 RICHMOND ST

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Carlos Lopez

Nominator: Kensington & Olde Richmond Heritage, LLC

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 228 Richmond Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 228 Richmond Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that

the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. This nomination argues that the Jacob Deal frame half-gambrel house is a rare surviving example of the wooden houses associated with the early development of maritime Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 228 Richmond Street for 90 days to the Historical Commission's meeting in May 2017. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2017

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE

ADDRESS: 1736 GREEN ST, AKA 1735 BRANDYWINE ST

Proposal: Construct three-story building on subdivided lot

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Loonstyn Development L.P.

Applicant: John Loonstyn, Wallace St. Construction LLC

History: 1891; Willis Hale, architect; subdivided lot at 1735 Brandywine Street

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

- the front door is in the plane of the main façade;
- the lintel at the entryway is directly over the door with the panel eliminated, or the doorway includes a transom or other historically consistent element;
- the shutters are either eliminated or revised to be historically appropriate in size and detailing;
- the brick façade incorporates a return of one and a half or more courses;
- the rooftop equipment is located with a large setback from the front façade, with the location to be confirmed with the staff; and
- a terminating feature is added to the cornice, such as a turn, corbel, or other historically appropriate element.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story building with a roof deck and pilot house on a newly created lot facing Brandywine Street. The property was historically associated with 1736 Green Street, but has been subdivided from it. A one-story garage constructed around 1960 stands on the subdivided lot. Although it was all one property known as 1736 Green Street at the time of the district designation, the rear portion of the lot was listed separately as 1735 Brandywine Street in the Spring Garden Historic District inventory and classified as non-contributing. The front façade of the proposed structure includes a brick veneer, one-over-one windows, a six-panel door at a recessed entryway, an Italianate-style cornice, cast stone base, and cast stone lintels and sills. The east side of the property, which would be visible from Brandywine Street, would be clad in composite siding.

DISCUSSION: Attorney Henry Clinton and developer John Loonstyn requested that the Historical Commission continue the review of the application for 1736 Green Street (1735 Brandywine Street) for 30 days to allow the developer and the community to discuss the project.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to continue the review of the application for 1736 Green Street (1735 Brandywine Street) for 30 days to the Historical Commission's meeting in March 2017. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas introduced the consent agenda, which included applications for 1524-34 South Street, 701-39 Market Street, 6316 City Avenue, 135 S. 17th Street, 313-15 S. Chadwick Street, 100 S. Broad Street, and 900-38 E. Washington Lane. Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. Mr. Thomas asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia provided a reminder that the Alliance holds an easement on the façade of the Royal Theater at 1524-34 South Street, and as such it would still need to review and approve any proposed treatment of the façade. Attorney Sean Whalen responded that the property owner has been working with the Alliance, as well as the staff of the Commission, and intends to continue to do so.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 1524-34 South Street, 701-39 Market Street, 6316 City Avenue, 135 S. 17th Street, 313-15 S. Chadwick Street, 100 S. Broad Street, and 900-38 E. Washington Lane. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1524-34 SOUTH ST

Proposal: Retain historic façade; construct mixed-use building and seven townhouses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Royal on South Street, LP

Applicant: Jose Hernandez, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1920; Royal Theater; Frank E. Hahn, architect

Individual Designation: 9/7/1978

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the banner signs, owing to incompleteness, but approval of all other aspects the application, provided the color of the black sections of the South Street façade is revised; the open façade-pergola element is removed from the black section of the façade to the west of the historic façade; the stone trim returns on the sides of the historic façade are retained; and metal panels are installed above a masonry base, not at grade, on Kater Street; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to amend an approval to construct a mixed-use, residential and retail, building at the Royal Theater on South Street. In July 2015, the Historical

Commission approved the demolition of all but the front façade of the Royal Theater and the construction of a mixed-use building behind and beside the historic façade, extending back to Kater Street at the rear. A new developer has stepped in to undertake the project and proposes to amend the approved design in two ways. First, the front façade adjacent to and above the historic theater façade has been redesigned. Second, the mixed use building has been reduced in size and seven townhouses are now proposed at the rear along Kater Street. The theater façade would still be restored. The parking for the complex would still be accessed from Kater Street.

The amended design shares many similarities with the approved design. However, the redesigned façade on South Street appears to encase and surround the historic façade more than the earlier façade, detracting from the independence of the historic façade and exacerbating its appearance as a two-dimensional, not a three-dimensional, object. A change in rhythm, materials, and/or coloration of the new façade above the historic façade may minimize the impact of the new construction on the historic resource.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 701-39 MARKET ST

Proposal: Install canopy with signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Independence Center Realty LP

Applicant: Mark Merlini, Brickstone Realty

History: 1859; Lit Brothers Store; various buildings, 1859-1906

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 6/30/1970

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the design shown in the rendering dated January 13, provided the piers are slightly thinner and read as three-dimensional objects, the vertical video screens inside and outside align, and the canopy is flashed to metal transom panels, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes a canopy with video screens and signage at the main entranceway to the Lits Brother Store, which is located at about the midpoint of the 700-block of Market Street. A large, non-historic, canvas canopy stood at the main entranceway until recently, but it has been removed. In January 2017, the Historical Commission approved an in-concept application for the canopy as currently proposed, provided the video screens were not included on the outer and front sides of the piers supporting the canopy. The Commission approved of the video screens on the inner sides of the piers as well as the underside of the canopy roof. At the January Historical Commission meeting, the applicants agreed to remove the screens from outer sides of the piers; however, those screens are depicted on the drawings in the current application because the application was submitted before the Commission met in January.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 6316 CITY AVE

Proposal: Construct multi-family building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 6300 City Line DP Partners LP

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Non-contributing, pending

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that a parapet should be included to hide mechanical equipment and the beltcourses should be adjusted to be the same heights.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story apartment building on a vacant lot at the corner of 63rd Street and City Avenue in the pending Overbrook Farms Historic District. Apartment buildings of similar height and massing to the proposed building stand on the two adjacent lots. Located at the edge of the historic area, the surroundings are quite varied with a train station with large parking lot and commercial structures on the opposite side of the street. The design could be improved with a stronger element rather than a void at the corner. However, in its present form, the building is differentiated from but compatible with surrounding buildings in terms of massing, scale, rhythm, and materials.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 319 CHERRY ST

Proposal: Construct six-story building on existing parking lot

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: John G. Traver Co.

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: parking lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the proposed building fails to satisfy Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of May 2016.

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission has recently reviewed several applications for the development of the property that includes a building on 4th Street, a historic school building with later additions behind the 4th Street building, and a vacant lot running south from the school building along Orianna Street to Cherry Street. This application only pertains to the new construction on the vacant lot at Orianna and Cherry

The site in question is considered an "undeveloped" site in a historic district, so the Commission's jurisdiction is limited to Review-and-Comment jurisdiction. For new construction on undeveloped sites in historic districts, the historic preservation ordinance gives the Historical Commission the authority to offer non-binding comments on the construction, but not the authority to approve or deny that construction.

The application proposes to construct a six-story building with an open space fronting on Cherry Street. The building would feature a glass façade facing Cherry Street and a wall of regular punched windows facing Orianna Street. The west wall, which would be a party wall, would be stuccoed. The massing ignores the Commission's earlier recommendation to limit the building on this site to four stories in height to ensure compatibility with the surrounding historic district. The application does not identify the proposed materials or colors.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Stuart Rosenberg and attorney Michael Mattioni represented the application.

The Commission first took up the issue of the level of review. Mr. Mattioni said that the site is undeveloped and therefore the application merits comments only, not a plenary review. He said that the garage is a separately deeded parcel. Mr. Thomas asked about the removal of the pent roof that projects over this property. Mr. Thomas asked if the projection of the pent, a potentially illegal addition, means that the property is not vacant. Mr. Farnham said that an undeveloped site can include various non-historic structures like parking kiosks. He said that he would not consider the projecting pent from another property to render the site developed. Ms. Spina asked how the applicants plan to use the garage the building if they are blocking the door to that property. Mr. Rosenberg said that that property would not be used for now. Mr. Baron asked if the plans for the new building will have a solid wall against the garage door or whether it will have an opening to connect to the existing garage. Mr. Rosenberg said that, as of now, it will be a solid party wall. Mr. Thomas said that it sounds to him a vacant lot. Hearing no comment to the contrary, the Commission proceeded on that basis. Taking up the comments on the new construction, Mr. McCoubrey said that he agrees with Mr. Baron's summary of the Committee comments but that he wishes to add the comment that the masonry of the Orianna Street façade should wrap around onto Cherry Street.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment.

Rhonda Manis said that she is a new resident on Cherry Street. She said that the garage is currently a functional garage that is used. She asked how they will get their car in and out. Mr. Thomas said that it is the responsibility of the owner of the garage to make a new opening if necessary. They stand to lose their access. She said that new construction should be compatible to the district. Mr. Thomas explained the Commission's jurisdiction in cases of undeveloped sites in historic districts; the Commission has the authority to comment, but not to deny. Ms. Manis said that, at a minimum, the first-floor facades should be constructed of brick.

Janet Kalter said that it is a shame that the applicants ignored the Commission's earlier recommendation for a four-story building. She said the new building is out of scale and character with the district and she hopes the architect will listen to the community's concerns.

Job Itzkowitz of the Old City District restated on behalf of his association his objection to the proposal for reasons of scale and reiterated his support for the staff recommendation.

David Pachefski, an Orianna Street homeowner for 15 years, said the height of the building at 65 feet is too high and out of scale for this street. The building will be industrial rather than residential in character. Mr. Pachefski said that he thinks that this is a "work around" to eventually build the original structure, which includes the properties to the north. Mr. Thomas said that an owner must comply with many rules including the zoning. He suggested that, if the zoning does not appear to be appropriate for the area, the neighbors should ask the City to rezone it.

The Commissioners informally agreed with the Architectural Committee's comment, but decided that they did not need to officially adopt it owing to the nature of the application.

ADDRESS: 135 S 17TH ST

Proposal: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 135 WA Partners LP

Applicant: Dorann Matthews, Forman Sign Company

History: 1915; Latham Hotel

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitter Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the illuminated signs, provided they are reduced in size to fit within the masonry openings; approval of the wall signs, window sign and window decals, with the staff to review details; and denial of the aluminum plaques; pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage at the first-floor commercial space of this corner building at 17th and Walnut Streets, which has two commercial entrances. The proposed signage includes two sets of illuminated letters, two non-illuminated aluminum plaques, two non-illuminated wall signs, one non-illuminated window sign, and various vinyl window decals.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 111 S INDEPENDENCE E MALL, UNIT A

Proposal: Apply clear coating to masonry

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Glenn Hugo / MRP Realty

Applicant: Thomas Collins, Phoenix Contractors, Inc.

History: 1893; Philadelphia Bourse Building; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 1/26/1971

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 7.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to coat all masonry at the significant Bourse Building including brown sandstone, brick and terra-cotta with coatings and sealants. Although the applicant claims that the coatings would be protective, coatings often have the opposite effect, trapping moisture within masonry and encouraging spalling and other damage.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Contractor Thomas Collins and consultant George Estridge represented the application.

Mr. Estridge stated that he surveyed the masonry of the building in question. He determined that the masonry was in fairly good condition, but that some of the terra-cotta was inconsistent in tone when sounded. He reported that the glazing was somewhat abraded. He recommended an Edison coating as a glazing consolidant, restoring the water repelling characteristics and

sheen of the masonry. He also recommended a patch and repair product. He suggested applying a consolidant to the brownstone. He said it would tie cracks together and prevent further deterioration. The face brick is very dense. The inside brick is much softer. He said the water repellent he proposes would shed water and protect interior air quality. He said that in a wind driven rain event water could get into the second layer of the brick. He added that, if water got in, it could cause mold. He said this would protect interior finishes. They want to clean the building, make it water tight and finally protect the interior finishes.

Mr. Baron reported that the staff has already approved a permit for repointing, caulking, removal of loose pieces of masonry, and restoration of those pieces within one year. Mr. McCoubrey asked if there has been any testing of these coatings on the building. Mr. Estridge said that there has been sounding of the masonry but not testing. Mr. McCoubrey said that sounding is typically used for finding pieces that need to be replaced, not coating. Mr. Estridge said that they are concerned with small cracks in the brownstone that could eventually lead to larger damage. Ms. Cooperman asked again if there has been testing. Mr. McCoubrey said that the brick is a very dense brick that should not need to be coated. He said that a complete presentation on the proposal should be made to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Thomas said that they are concerned not just with appearance, but also with the effects of the coatings on the masonry. He said that we are not in a position to make a final determination without more information. The applicants asked which specific tests are being requested. Mr. McCoubrey said that the stone can be analyzed to determine porosity and its suitability to accept these coatings. Ms. Cooperman suggested that they talk to a stone conservator. They also recommended talking with staff to determine what tests are necessary and then discuss the new information with the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 7, and to encourage the applicant to undertake testing, seek additional expertise guidance, and submit a new application for review by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. Ms. Spina seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 117 LEAGUE ST

Proposal: Legalize as-built new construction

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Einstein Investments LLC

Applicant: Janelle Snyder, SnyderLAW

History: 1815

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application to legalize the existing as built condition as well as the request to legalize the siding on the party walls and to approve revising the design of the cornice, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval of 8 January 2016.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize as-built construction. On 8 January 2016, the Historical Commission approved an application for the removal of the rear ell and rear wall of the main block and the construction of a three-story rear addition with pilot house and deck where the older rear ell had stood. The owner subsequently went beyond the approved scope of work and, without a permit or approval, demolished not only the rear ell and wall but also the structure and roof of the main block. The Department of Licenses & Inspections building

declared the remaining sections of the building Imminently Dangerous and they were demolished. Since that time, the staff has worked with the owner on what was intended to be an accurate reconstruction of the main block, with a rear ell and pilot house as approved by the Commission. The drawings that the Historical Commission approved on 8 January 2016 specified, "Existing Roof at Main Block to Remain; Patch and Repair as Required," and showed the height of the original roof as 37 feet 9 inches. However, it does not appear that this height accurately reflected the actual height of the original building. The reconstruction drawings approved by the staff showed the roof of the main block at plus or minus 34 feet 8½ inches and specified that the "Height/slope of roof to be checked against ghost of roof on party walls. Elevation not to exceed historic height." However, an inconsistent measurement on the rear elevation drawing shows the roof of the main block at plus or minus 37 feet 9 inches. The height of the parapet is shown at 34 feet 2 inches, and the roof deck at 30 feet 8 inches. In all drawings, the rear deck and parapet are shown as lower than and hidden by the main block roof. As built, however, the new construction parapet rises above the main block, making it highly conspicuous from the public right-of-way. The staff does not consider the as-built condition to be consistent with either set of approved drawings. The drawings may have included inaccurate dimensions, but they always clearly depicted the rear addition and deck with parapet as being lower than the ridgeline of the historic main-block roof. The staff considers that relationship, the relationship of the height of the ridgeline to that of the new construction to be paramount.

The application is accompanied by a summary of events composed by the developer's attorney. The staff resolutely disputes the accuracy of the summary.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Owner and developer Michael Salamone and Robert Willison of Edison Investments represented the application. The applicants distributed revised architectural drawings to the Commissioners.

Mr. Baron displayed a photograph of the building in its present condition showing the parapet of the roof deck visible over the top of the original ridgeline of the main block of the building. He said that the Committee recommended pulling this parapet back and replacing it with an open railing so that it was no longer conspicuous. He said that they also asked for the side to be covered in stucco as shown on the drawing. Mr. Baron said that the revised drawing shows the parapet pulled back but not an open railing. He said that the drawing does not stipulate the correct heights of the roofs or moving the mechanical units to an inconspicuous location. Mr. McCoubrey echoed his statement, saying that the Committee asked for the parapet to be replaced with an open rail pulled back, potentially with a jog to allow for less visibility. He said that it is very difficult to review because none of the drawings reflect the existing conditions.

Mr. Salamone said that he is "OK" with pulling back the parapet. He explained that he built the party wall with siding rather than stucco in order to avoid cracking and a subsequent lawsuit. Mr. Thomas said that stucco should not crack if applied correctly. He said that it is a very common treatment. Mr. Thomas said that, if they are willing to make these changes, then the staff can approve the application.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment.

Angela Trusco, the neighbor to the west, said that when this project was first reviewed by the Commission, it was supposed to be a lower three-story building. She said that it is a huge "Chinese wall" against her property. She said that the owner has damaged her property. She said that Mr. Salamone is lying to the Commission and that he wanted to demolish this property

from the beginning. She said that the addition has visibility from every direction, above all the other houses. She said this a neighborhood of ancient houses. There were no good reasons to demolish this house. Mr. Thomas asked if the Commission approved an addition of this size. Mr. Baron said that the Commission approved the addition, although it was supposed to be lower than the ridge of the historic building except for the stair tower which was always going to be higher than the existing ridge. Mr. Thomas asked if the building at this size was approved by the Commission. Mr. McCoubrey said that, although he was not at the original Committee meeting, the building was never shown accurately. A three-story building with stairhouse was approved by the Commission. Mr. Thomas said that much of the question of massing is a zoning question.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application as submitted, but approve the revised architectural drawings submitted to the Historical Commission on 10 February 2017, provided that the parapet is replaced by a metal railing wherever visible from the public right-of-way, the siding on the party walls is replaced with stucco, and the railing is set back from the front façade and the mechanical equipment is located such that they are not conspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval of 8 January 2016. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2127 ST JAMES ST

Proposal: Enclose front porch with glass and aluminum structure

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Merion Ruth Rogel

Applicant: Steven Cohen, Steven S. Cohen, Architect P.C.

History: 1923; English Village; Spencer Roberts, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with the following provisions:

- the existing windows are retained and not replaced with bi-fold or tri-fold doors;
- the detailing of the greenhouse is submitted to determine its acceptability; and
- the detailing includes dimensions and materials, profiles, and the planes of the front wall relative to the entry vestibule and house.

OVERVIEW: This application follows a previous application to construct an addition, called a plant porch, in place of a non-historic trellis at the front façade. The building, listed as significant in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District, is one of the 20 distinctive cottages that comprise English Village. While the previous application proposed to construct a masonry and glass enclosure at the front façade, this application proposes to construct an aluminum and glass greenhouse structure in the same location. The existing front façade window would be converted to a set of bi-fold doors located at the interior of the addition. The area under consideration totals approximately 61 square feet.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Steven Cohen represented the application.

Ms. Keller clarified that the applicant initially submitted the application for final approval, but that the Architectural Committee had voted to recommend that the application be approved in-

concept. She stated that it was her belief that the applicant would like to continue as originally intended and be considered for final approval today.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Cohen to describe the revisions to the application. Mr. Cohen explained the changes made to this application, which included adding small decorative elements and detailing the windows and area beneath the roofline. He stated that he attempted to keep the structure small and simple and contended that the proposed design maintains some consistency with the original design, as well as consistency with the Architectural Committee's requests.

Mr. Thomas asked which street the building's west elevation faces. Mr. Cohen replied that it faces 22nd Street and added that 2127 St. James Street is the last English Village property, located in the corner, before exiting through the arch. Mr. Cohen noted that he submitted a series of photographs in his application and that the photograph displayed on the screen showed the building's existing condition that includes the trellis at the front façade, a feature that would be removed with the construction of the addition. The proposed structure, he then asserted, would be reversible.

Mr. McCoubrey remarked that it was the opinion of the Architectural Committee that the building's original fabric would not be altered, as long as the west façade windows remained in place. He further commented that the front façade addition would be easily removeable. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Committee expressed concern over the detailing, materials, and functionality of the mullions and muntins. He suggested that the application be submitted to the Architectural Committee for one more round of review. He noted that the application shows stucco at the base, though the Committee had suggested that it be revised to masonry. He also raised concern over the projection of the addition beyond the vestibule. The Committee, he reiterated, expressed a desire to see the application one more time, should it receive conceptual approval by the Commission.

Mr. Cohen responded that, if the Commission were to request stone at the base, he would revise the drawings to include the material, though he argued that the base material would not be visible from the public right-of-way. He then stated that he had submitted the revised drawings with the intention of returning to the Architectural Committee, but was advised by the staff to continue with the current application. He asserted that the approval process has been taking a toll on his client, who is in her eighties. Regarding the projection of the addition beyond the vestibule, Mr. Cohen continued, an issue arises with the elimination of the bi-fold and tri-fold doors that were proposed to provide access from the living room to the new structure. In having to use the existing kitchen door for access and eliminating the projection, he added, the greenhouse structure would partially block the entryway.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. McCoubrey if the changes he noted, assuming the owner is amenable, could be reviewed at the staff level in order to advance the project. Mr. McCoubrey answered that he believed the staff could review the details. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the revisions would include: changing the proposed stucco at the base of the new structure to a masonry material, preferably stone, to be consistent with the existing base material; finalizing the treatment of the small greenhouse projection and resolving the connection at the vestibule; and developing the details, profiles, and sections of the elements that are ordinarily presented to the staff.

Mr. Cohen indicated that he detailed the small projection to include mullions and muntins that turn the corner at the vestibule. He argued that rather than making it solid, he incorporated glass

to make it more transparent. He then asked the Commission for clarification on which staff member he would work with and whether it would be Ms. Keller. Mr. Thomas confirmed that it would be Ms. Keller and encouraged Mr. Cohen to have her review the drawings once they have been revised to reflect the Commission's recommendations.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided the addition has a stone or other masonry base and the details are developed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 313-15 S CHADWICK ST

Proposal: Construct addition and roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Josephine and Robert Volpe

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural

History: 1860; Women's SPCA of Pennsylvania

Individual Designation: 10/5/1978

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval with the following revisions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9:

- the addition's S. Chadwick Street façade is limited to a single plane, though a slight articulation in plane could be considered;
- the setback from S. Chadwick Street is about 10';
- the deck has a metal vertical-picket railing rather than a glass railing;
- the addition's windows are simplified with the removal of the muntins;
- the materials of the addition are simplified; and
- the redesign of the roof overhangs is considered.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-story addition with two roof decks, create a second-story open space at the rear, and install new windows and doors. The building is located midblock on Chadwick Street. While the rear is not visible from a public right-of-way, the property is located directly across from a parking lot, making the front façade and rooftop highly visible to the public. The proposed third-story addition would be set back eight feet from the Chadwick Street façade and would contain a green roof in the set back area. Lower and upper roof decks with glass railings are proposed just south of the addition. A portion of the roof would be demolished at the rear to create an open second-story space, and a rear window would be enlarged to provide light and air to a new deck. The front façade of the former carriage house was previously altered when it was converted to an SPCA office. This application is seeking to reinstall windows and doors according to a historic survey that predates the SPCA conversion.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 100 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: LBT Limited Partnership, LP

Applicant: Ed Eimer, Eimer Design

History: 1898; Land Title Building; Daniel H. Burnham & Co., architect

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, with the following suggestions for a subsequent application:

- all illuminated pinwheels are removed from the window openings, with no anchoring into any keystones;
- the illuminated pinwheel proposed on top of the panel signs can remain, but the size of the panel signs should be reduced and limited to one panel sign on each street frontage; and,
- the details related the anchorages into the masonry and the electrical conduits are provided and appropriate.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage in each window opening and over the entrance to the proposed retail space at the corner of Broad and Chestnut Streets. The logo signage in the arched window openings would be internally-illuminated acrylic suspended from a steel frame. The application also proposes to install three powder-coated aluminum box signs with illuminated acrylic lettering at the corner window bays, and over the Chestnut Street entrance.

Following the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant revised the proposal to conform to the Architectural Committee recommendation.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 1726 SPRUCE ST, AKA 1727 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct townhouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1727 Delancey LP

Applicant: Shimi Zakin, Atrium Design Group

History: 1870; subdivided lot at 1727 Delancey Place

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to subdivide a parcel that runs from Spruce Street back to Delancey Street and to construct a single-family four-story residence on Delancey Street. Currently, the Delancey end of the site is open and used for surface parking. To accomplish the subdivision, a non-historic, one-story rear addition would be removed from the Spruce Street building.

The Commission previously reviewed and approved a proposal for this property that featured a four-story house on Delancey with pilot house, a front-loaded garage, and no setback from the sidewalk. The new proposal is similar in design to the previous project, with brick and zinc panel cladding, and vertical aluminum-clad fenestration; however, the current proposal sets the building back from the sidewalk 20 feet, creating a “front yard” with an asphalt parking pad and brick wingwalls.

The staff contends that, while the front-loaded garage of the previous proposal was not ideal, the 20-foot setback from the street further disrupts the rhythm of the historic district. If the “front yard” parking is determined acceptable, the staff recommends the use of pervious paving and the installation of a decorative gate across the driveway opening.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Snežana Litvinović, developer Yoav Shiffman, and attorney Michael Phillips represented the application.

Mr. Phillips reiterated that the Commission approved a prior plan that did not include the 20-foot setback, but that the neighbors have appealed the zoning approval for the previous design that did not include the setback. He noted that zoning requires the setback. He asserted that the setback, although not the preferred option, is an effort to negotiate with the neighbors and come to a reasonable compromise that would also become a by-right plan. He explained that it is essentially the same design but with surface parking instead of a garage. He noted that they would be open to using pavers but not a gate, as he did not believe a gate would be allowed.

Mr. Zakin noted that the most major change in the design from the previous proposal is the elimination of the garage door and the addition of first-floor windows that match the second and third-floor windows. The new design, he noted, also includes lighter colored panels, as recommended by the Commission previously, as well as a front door flush with rest of the massing.

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

Mr. Thomas expressed confusion over the neighbors’ desire to see a building set back from the street, noting that this block does not have any buildings like that. Mr. Thomas questioned the zoning requirement for the setback. Mr. Phillips explained that RM-4 zoning requires a 20-foot setback, and that they obtained a variance for that, but that variance has been appealed.

Mr. Zakin explained that there are only four properties on this side of this block of Delancey that have fronts on the street, with most others being garages, parking areas, or rear yards for Spruce Street properties. Mr. Thomas replied that one of the problems is that this block was historically lined with carriage houses for the Spruce Street properties, which extended block to block. He noted that the question is whether this application meets the Standards and the character of the historic district. Mr. Phillips opined that the owner is between a rock and a hard place, and asked that the Commission use its discretion to approve this departure from the guidelines.

Mr. Thomas agreed with the staff recommendation that the setback does not conform to the Standards, but opined that pervious pavers and a gate would make the proposal more acceptable. Mr. Zakin responded that a gate may be possible, and that they could work with the staff to explore various options. Mr. Thomas opined that the gate should be an open metal gate that would provide a continuous street edge and continuity along this side of the block. He noted

that the opposite side of the street already has a continuous street edge, and that the hope on this side of the block is that any project will improve the street and district, not detract from it.

Ms. Cooperman opined that the crucial difference is that it should look like a front yard rather than a front parking pad, and that comes down to using the appropriate details. Mr. Zakin responded that they can try to do that. Ms. Cooperman noted that part of it is the relationship to the aesthetic to the street, which is an urban rather than suburban context. Mr. Zakin responded that he planned to give thought to the design of a gate and to use the appropriate materials, suggesting that brick may be an appropriate paving material. He noted that his intention is not to create an overhead gate. Mr. Thomas and Ms. Cooperman responded that an overhead gate would not be appropriate. Mr. Zakin suggested that maybe it would be an iron gate. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that these were details that the staff could review. Mr. Thomas agreed, noting that if staff objects, it can remand it to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Thomas suggested that the design should be revised to have a nice fence with nice brick paving, which should feel like a finished space, not just a parking pad. Ms. Cooperman noted that another detail that would be helpful is the introduction of plantings, and differentiating a path to the door versus the parking area, which would reduce the sense of this just being a place to park cars. Mr. Thomas agreed, noting that he has seen instances where a smoother stone or brick is used along with a person gate, and rougher paving for cars. Mr. Zakin replied that he will explore options and work it out with staff.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided the parking area includes a gate and appropriate paving and landscaping, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 900-38 E WASHINGTON LN

Proposal: Demolish shed; construct two sheds

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City Parks Association

Applicant: Chris Van de Velde, Awbury Arboretum Association

History: 1862; Francis Cope House

Individual Designation: 5/7/1981

District Designation: Awbury Arboretum Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the construction of the three-bay storage shed, but denial of the demolition of the existing Significant shed, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the three-bay storage shed, with the staff to review details including the doors and the brackets in place of columns, but denial of the demolition of the Significant shed, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

OVERVIEW: The original application proposed to demolish an existing shed and to construct two sheds around a slightly reconfigured parking area at the rear of the Francis Cope House in Awbury Arboretum. The proposed sheds would be clad in board and batten wood siding with carriage-style overhead doors and wood columns designed to resemble those of the Cope house.

The shed originally proposed for demolition is listed as Significant in the district inventory and is attributed to Yarnall & Cooper, architects of the Francis Cope House. However, no date of construction is listed for this structure, and its appearance, even if altered, does not suggest contemporaneous construction with the 1862 Cope house. The 1895 and 1910 Bromley atlases indicate a carriage house structure associated with the neighboring John S. Haines estate. No auxiliary wooden structures are identified on the Francis Cope property.

The staff contends that the carriage house shed is inaccurately identified as Significant in the district, when at most, it should be contributing; however, given its classification, the shed should be rehabilitated or reconstructed to its original appearance, rather than demolished.

Following the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant withdrew the proposal to demolish the existing shed, and noted that they were willing to make all modifications to the design of the other proposed shed suggested by the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 2500 S CLEVELAND ST

Proposal: Install gate and parking pad

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Giuliano Apadula & Amanda Apadula

Applicant: John Christinzio

History: 1910; John Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to its recent recommendation of denial for a similar application.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a parking pad at the rear of this corner property located in the Girard Estate Historic District. A section of non-historic fence and raised patio would be removed to accommodate the one-car parking pad. The section of existing historic hairpin fence would be retained, and a new section to mimic the historic would be erected, which would include a foldable gate along the proposed driveway. Greenery is proposed along the driveway and along the side of the property. The Historical Commission approved a very similar application for a property in Girard Estate in January 2017, provided the parking area was paved with a pervious material.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. John Christinzio and property owner Giuliano Apadula represented the application.

Mr. Christinzio explained that Mr. Apadula will arrive momentarily. Ms. Spina asked about landscaping. Mr. Christinzio responded that there is limited space, so the existing trees will remain, but there is no room for additional landscaping other than possibly near the property line with 2502 S Cleveland Street.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee once again suggested that the rear yards of Girard Estate are character-defining features and therefore adding parking at the rear does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. It also results in the removal of part of the stone retaining wall. Mr. Christinzio responded that the stone retaining wall is not original to the

building, and historically the property's steps came down to grade. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee objected to losing one available street parking spot that would be used at all times, to provide one private rear-yard spot that would not be used as consistently. Mr. Thomas responded that that concern is not the issue to be addressed by the Commission. Ms. Cooperman stated that this application is different from the previously approved application, where the rear yard was already covered in concrete at the time of designation. She suggested that the subject yard is intact. Mr. Christinzio responded that this yard is currently completely paved in concrete.

Mr. Apadula arrived. Mr. Thomas summarized that this is a corner property with a visible rear yard, and that typically the rear yard is a landscape feature. He stated that the previous application was denied by the Commission. Multiple Commissioners corrected this assertion, stating that the Committee had recommended denial, but that the Commission approved the previous application. Mr. Christinzio suggested that landscaping could be added along the side of the property. Mr. Mattioni asked if the rear yard is completely covered with concrete. Mr. Apadula stated that it is. Mr. McCoubrey countered that he sees a planting bed in the photographs. Mr. Apadula responded that it is concrete under the planting bed, which is just some mulch that he put down over the concrete. He stated that the immediate neighbors are in support of the project. Mr. Mattioni asked if he would be amenable to using pervious paving as opposed to solid concrete in the rear yard. Mr. Apadula affirmed this.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application with the hairpin fencing and gate, elimination of the raised patio, installation of textured pervious paving, and appropriate landscaping, with the staff to review details. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 3. Ms. Cooperman and Spina and Mr. McCoubrey dissented.

ADDRESS: 2311-13 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Reopen window openings and construct new brick façade over existing façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2311 Spruce Street Partners

Applicant: Keith Braccia, PMC Property Group

History: front wall rebuilt, 1945; front wall stuccoed, 1974

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate the front façade of this former stable, which was heavily altered in 1945 and again in 1974. This application proposes to reopen former window openings on the second and third floors, which are evident in the attached photograph taken in 1968, and install new doors on the first floor. The application also proposes to build a new brick wall in front of the existing brick and stucco wall. The applicant executed a similar scheme with a new brick veneer in front of an existing facade at a non-designated property at 11th and Pine Streets; a photograph of the result is included for your reference. The staff suggests that the front wall should be rebuilt in a manner that allows it to remain flush with the neighboring property, rather than sit proud of the row out in the right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Keith Braccia and Jonathan Stavin of PMC Property Group represented the application.

Mr. Braccia distributed revised drawings to the Commission. Ms. Broadbent explained that the revised design of the façade was simplified to reflect comments of the Architectural Committee, but that the applicant still requests permission to build a new brick veneer wall in front of the existing brick and stucco wall.

Mr. Stavin stated that they assessed the condition of the underlying brick and determined that they do not intend to remove all of the stucco to expose the underlying 1940s brick façade. Mr. Thomas agreed that the simplified building design reflects the utilitarian history of the building. Mr. Stavin confirmed that the façade will be one width of brick forward of the property to the west. There is no adjacent building to the east. Mr. McCoubrey asked if stucco was removed to determine the condition of the brick façade. Mr. Braccia responded that they are not willing to remove the entire stucco surface, but there are areas where the stucco is missing, and there one can see that the brick is not in particularly good condition. Mr. McCoubrey responded that it is better to have a clear understanding of the condition of the brick. Mr. Stavin passed around his cellular phone, which contained two recent photographs where the brick was exposed. Mr. McCoubrey commented that there is a risk of attaching into brick for which the applicant does not understand its condition. Mr. Stavin responded that they will obviously work safely and the new façade will improve the appearance of the building immensely. Mr. McCoubrey commented that, from a design perspective, the revised application reflects all of the comments from the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its 10 February 2017 meeting, with the staff to review details. Ms. Spina seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 828-38 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Install ATM in altered storefront

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Korman Communities

Applicant: Richard Seitchick, Joe Freidman Construction Corp.

History: 1925, Horace Trumbauer, architect, Benjamin Franklin Hotel

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

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

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

- inserting the new system within the existing stone surround, and restoring or replacing in kind the stone surround;
- installing the new system at the plane of the façade or no more than two feet recessed from the façade;
- omitting any canopy;
- avoiding creating a billboard;
- greatly reducing the red in the signage and introducing more neutral tones to be more in keeping with the historic building;
- giving the frame being inserted within the surround a thinner profile;
- considering a stone water table.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-original aluminum and glass storefront at the easternmost opening along the building's Chestnut Street façade and to replace it with a new storefront design. The proposed storefront would consist of a metal panel clad canopy over existing stone trim, aluminum panels with a custom graphic powder coated finish, an ATM, and a swing door to allow service access only. The current configuration, with the exception of a recessed entry door, stands in plane with the face of the building. The proposed configuration would recess the entire aluminum panel and door system approximately 2 feet from the main façade. The Preservation Alliance holds a façade easement on the property.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Gleb Dolgy represented the application.

Mr. Thomas asked that a representative from the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia comment on the application, since the organization holds an easement on the property. Paul Steinke, executive director of the Alliance, stated that the Alliance's Easement Committee reviewed the initial proposal, but has not yet seen the revised proposal.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that one of the Architectural Committee's recommendations was to restore the fractured molding that surrounds the storefront opening. In looking at the application, he continued, it seems to show the original damaged molding. Mr. Dolgy responded that he misunderstood the Committee's recommendation and thought the Committee found it preferable to maintain the existing stone surround. He added that he is amicable to restoring the granite to match the original design intent. Ms. Cooperman asked whether the surround is granite or limestone. Mr. Dolgy answered that, from his initial assessment several months ago, he believed it was granite. Ms. Cooperman replied that it would be important to definitively determine the stone type. Mr. Dolgy responded that he would make all possible efforts to

ascertain the stone type and to match it. Mr. Thomas observed that the base material below the fire department connection consists of granite with limestone above. He opined that the configuration is typical and questioned the material of the surround.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none. He then noted a comment made by a member of the Architectural Committee that the previous design resembled a billboard with an ATM. The revised design, he continued, has a similar quality within the very fine classical façade. Mr. Thomas suggested that the applicant research ATMs in historic buildings in other cities in the United States in addition to World Heritage cities abroad. He offered an example in Spain, adding that while he understands the location of an ATM needs to be apparent to potential users, the proposed design overwhelms the façade. He acknowledged that the revised design is less overwhelming than the original red design, but asserted that the concept resembles a large poster in a stone façade and appears out of scale for the size of the building.

Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Thomas's comments and inquired about the storefront's original configuration. Mr. Dolgy answered that the previous occupancy was a jewelry store. It was his understanding, he continued, that the one-story structure attached to the Benjamin Franklin Hotel served as utilitarian space. He clarified that the structure is attached to the hotel but is separated by a wall, so there is no entry at the interior.

Ms. Cooperman remarked that the mid-century storefront inserted in the one-story structure is interesting.

Regarding the scale of the proposed signage, Mr. Dolgy argued that it appears large when viewing only the one-story structure. However, he continued, in viewing the sign from the context of the street, the structure and signage are much smaller than the surrounding fabric, to the point where they become dwarfed. Mr. Dolgy contended that making a statement with this design to identify the ATM is appropriate in this specific opening. Mr. Thomas replied that an elevation showing the proposed design in relation to the entire building would be helpful. He then observed that a highly ornamented stringcourse continues across the property and that the one-story structure likely functioned as a service entrance. He opined that the hotel would have been held back from the property line to allow for windows on the east façade.

Ms. Spina asked the applicant if he is considering incorporating lighting at the façade to create a sense of security for ATM users. Mr. Dolgy confirmed that lighting would be included at the recessed area.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the design should resemble a storefront or a glazed system, adding that in its current form it more closely resembles painted plywood. He commented that it lacks the character and quality of other openings in the building. The proposal, he continued, would be more acceptable if it were made to appear as a glazed storefront with spandrels and glass. With that level of change, Mr. McCoubrey asserted, the proposal would need to be reviewed again by the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Thomas recommended that the applicant consider examples at various locations along Walnut Street in Center City. He then discussed the existing awnings on windows of the Benjamin Franklin Hotel and commented that the ATM's visibility is less important from directly across the street and more important from down the street. He contended that the proposed ATM would be situated midblock and would be better served by a projecting awning that contained color and typography, similar to those existing over nearby storefront windows. Mr.

Thomas suggested detailing the storefront to incorporate stone with a classical motif to fit in architecturally and potentially increase visibility to customers.

Mr. Dolgy thanked Mr. Thomas for his comments, adding that his suggestions were discussed with the Architectural Committee. Ultimately, he continued, the Committee determined that a red awning would be more objectionable than the original proposal, and that influenced his decision to revise to his current design. Mr. Dolgy noted that his concern with solely relying on a canopy was that it would not be visible at night. Mr. Thomas responded that a Commissioner had earlier inquired about lighting for visibility and safety reasons. He opined that occasionally applicants seek approvals but overlook lighting. He stated that the plans to illuminate the space and any fixtures would need to be reviewed. He again encouraged Mr. Dolgy to research ATMs in other classical buildings throughout the city where the ATMs are both visible and well illuminated. Mr. Dolgy clarified that he has always intended to illuminate the space. He explained that the 18-inch setback shown in the plan was recommended by the Architectural Committee to provide safety to the user. Mr. Thomas replied that the Commission would need to review the proposed lighting and recommended that the application be reviewed by the Architectural Committee. Ms. Cooperman reminded the Commission that the frame would need to be further investigated and detailed.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to remand the revised application to the Architectural Committee for review. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2000 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Install rear elevator addition and decks with doors

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2000 Delancey Place Condominium Association

Applicant: A. Charles Peruto, 2000 Delancey Place Condominium Association

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add an elevator and decks on the south façade of this townhouse. The Historical Commission approved the renovation of this building in November 2008. At that time, the owner restored the symmetrical rear façade and original entry portico and added a garage with deck located away from the restored façade. A decision was made at that time not to install an elevator as the interior was being rehabilitated. Now, the condominium units have been sold and several owners would like an elevator. This application would demolish the restored portico and add decks with doors.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Charles Peruto and A. Charles Peruto represented the application.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification on the location of the entrance to the elevator. Mr. Peruto explained that the canopy entrance was a new element where they wish to build the tower. He said that there are other examples in the neighborhood where this has been done. Mr. Thomas explained that there is a Park Service brief on making buildings accessible, which the Commission follows. Mr. Thomas asked for interior plans. Mr. Peruto explained the plans in the

Commission packet and showed why he could not put the elevator inside. Mr. Thomas said that he received approval for an exterior elevator for the Swedish Museum. Mr. Baron clarified that the portico on this building was an accurate restoration at the time of the renovations to the building. Mr. Thomas said that it is a shame that you still will need lifts to get people to their units even with the elevator. Mr. Thomas asked if there is enough room for the lifts. Mr. Peruto confirmed that there is enough room. The elder Mr. Peruto said that he wants to stay in his unit. When he spoke to others in the building they were excited to have an elevator.

Mr. Baron said that the balconies are a separate part of the application. Mr. McCoubrey emphasized that the garden facade of this building also has significance. Mr. Peruto said that it faced a parking lot for a long time. The Commission members looked at a historic photograph. Ms. Cooperman asked if the roof deck is part of what is before them. Mr. Baron said that it was approved earlier. Mr. McCoubrey confirmed that the applicants are widening the historic windows for the new elevator vestibule. He asked if they need to make the elevator tower as wide and create landings at each level. Mr. Thomas stated that he is in favor of approval. Ms. Cooperman noted that, in light of the significance of this façade, she is not comfortable with approving both the balconies and the elevator tower. Mr. Thomas stated that he is in favor of the balconies as well. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the balconies are highly visible from 20th Street. It is a beautiful symmetrical facade and the balconies will destroy this symmetry. There are decks on the roof and over the garage to provide outdoor space.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to approve the portion of the application related to the elevator tower, but to deny the portion of the application related to the decks and access doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ADDRESS: 4101-05 LUDLOW ST

Name of Resource: Monumental Baptist Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: St. James Pentecostal Church

Nominator: University City Historical Society

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4101-05 Ludlow Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4101-05 Ludlow Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, I, and J. The nomination argues that the Monumental Baptist Church provided a religious anchor to the West Philadelphia African-American community, functioning as the place of worship for the second oldest African-American Baptist congregation in Pennsylvania.

The Historical Commission tabled the nomination for 120 days at its October 2016 meeting.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert explained that the property owner had requested a continuance to allow time to identify funding. He stated that Elizabeth Stegner of the University City Historical Society had unsuccessfully attempted to contact the owner to inform him of potential funding sources.

Mr. Thomas noted that the October meeting, when the nomination previously came before the Commission, was four months ago. He commented that he assumed the property owner was advised of the meeting. Ms. Keller confirmed that the staff sent notice of the meeting to the property owner and that the owner had not contacted the Commission's staff.

Mr. Thomas stated that absent any request for a continuance made by the property owner, the Commission would need to take some action. Mr. Beisert remarked that the church is one of the oldest sites in West Philadelphia. Mr. Thomas reiterated that procedurally the Commission agreed to a four-month continuance and no new request has been made. He asked for questions and comments from the Commissioners and the public. Ms. Cooperman stated that if the Commission chooses to designate, it would not preclude the owners from pursuing funding. Mr. Beisert responded that Ms. Stegner has identified several good potential funding sources.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4101-05 Ludlow Street identified in the nomination satisfies Criteria for Designation A, I, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2101 W CLARKSON AVE

Name of Resource: Mary & Frances Wister House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: La Salle University

Nominator: Arielle Harris

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Mary & Frances Wister House at 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It proposes designating a portion but not the entirety of the very large tax parcel. The nomination argues that the house and associated land satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. The nomination contends that the house, constructed in 1868 by William Rotch Wister, is significant as part of the mid-to-late nineteenth century development of the Germantown community, which was home to several important Quaker families including the Fishers and Wisters. Those families molded the development of the area as it transitioned from that of large country seats for the wealthy to a more suburban character. The nomination further contends that the building is significant as the birthplace and early home of Frances Anne Wister, one of the founders of the Philadelphia Orchestra, and an important figure in Philadelphia history. The nomination also argues that the property, attributed to local architect James C. Sidney, is architecturally significant for embodying distinguishing characteristics of the picturesque Rural Gothic style, popularized by architects such as Andrew Jackson Downing and Alexander Jackson Davis.

The Historical Commission tabled the nomination for 90 days at its November 2016 meeting.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Fink recused. Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorneys Carl Primavera and Kevin Dolan and preservation consultant Robert Powers represented the property owner.

Arielle Harris, the nominator, read a prepared statement in response to the letter submitted by attorney Carl Primavera on 2 February 2017:

I would like to begin by saying that I agree with La Salle's counsel that 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue is not significant as it relates to Charles Willson Peale's 16 year tenure at Belfield. However, Peale sold the Belfield estate to the Wister family, who lived in Peale's former house, built 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue across the street, and maintained the property for 159 years. The two properties are thus closely related.

There is also, a misunderstanding by La Salle's counsel about the legal parcel on which these properties sit. While La Salle notes that the two properties were once on separate legal parcels, the initial sale of the land to the Wister family in 1826 was all as one parcel, and all the land remained within the Wister family and their descendants until 1985, even as parcels were divided.

Indeed, this is why I submitted a separate nomination for this property to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, as opposed to an amendment to the existing nomination for Belfield, which deals with Charles Willson Peale. The property, as I argue, is significant on its own as the birthplace of a Philadelphia civic figure, Frances Wister, as an example of Germantown's nineteenth century residential architecture as was designed by renowned architects of the period, and of its place in a "Quaker compound" of long-standing Germantown families.

The nomination has received overwhelming community support, including from the Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks, which was founded by Frances Wister, the woman born in this house, the Philadelphia Orchestra, for whom Frances Wister volunteered and worked; the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, professors at the University of Pennsylvania and Bryn Mawr College, Germantown Historical Society, Historic Germantown, Baynton Hill Neighbors RCO, and last but not least, a significant number of La Salle University alumni, professors, students, and staff who, since the submission of the nomination, have gotten in touch with me to reminisce, strategize, and inquire about the fate of the Wister Studio. As is detailed in the letter of support that Emeritus Professor of English Jim Butler submitted to the Commission and which you have read in preparation for this meeting, the Wister Studio, Little Wakefield, and Belfield were used by him to engage students in primary historical research right on their own campus – at the properties themselves and at La Salle's Special Collections. Many representatives from the aforementioned groups are here today to express their enthusiasm for this nomination and for that of Little Wakefield.

In their letter to you, La Salle makes the argument that since 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue is the only house that survives from the group of houses that the Wisters built on their property, it has lost historic significance due to its lack of context. But isn't the opposite true, that it is more essential than ever to protect that very property that is the only surviving example of what was once there?

As you consider this nomination, I would also like to state for the record La Salle's wanton disregard for historic resources in Germantown as they have expanded their campus. As I detailed in an article I wrote for Hidden City Philadelphia this week, La

Salle engaged in a strategy of acquiring surrounding land with no regard to extant historic houses, institutions, and landscapes, demolishing what was in their way to achieve their campus vision. Years before these buildings were even demolished, the Philadelphia Historical Commission and the Pennsylvania Museum and Historical Commission (SHPO) had included some of them in reconnaissance survey work, as they recognized their architectural and historical merit. These institutions include the House of the Good Shepherd Home for Colored Girls, Church of the Redeemer Presbyterian Church, almost every property built for the Wister family compound – including two designed by the prominent architectural firm of Cope & Stewardson, and finally, the Jewish Foster Home – which despite being protected on the local register was demolished illegally without any permits.

On that end, La Salle argues that the designation of 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue would prevent the university from meeting its needs by housing more students on its campus. The supporters of this nomination are here today because we believe that the value of historic properties supersedes that of institutions. Since La Salle just built a \$35 million business school, it is clear that they are wealthy in intelligence and resources and can find a solution that does not destroy a critical historic resource to La Salle, Germantown, and the city of Philadelphia.

To conclude, the Wister studio is historically significant and carries deep value for Germantown and the city of Philadelphia. As I described in my nomination and as supporters across the city have agreed, 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue meets and exceeds criteria for designation as listed in the Philadelphia city code. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Primavera noted that he would speak briefly of the reasons La Salle is opposed to designation. He explained that La Salle had been looking to delineate and reduce the boundary of the Belfield designation, and that application was submitted almost on the same day as the nomination for this building. Mr. Primavera acknowledged that Belfield was considered very important and remains very important. He noted that there was a street that ran between that estate and the Wister house, but at some point the street stricken and the properties merged. He opined that the property in question is non-contributing to Belfield. He believed that the nomination noted that this building represented part of a family compound or maybe a pod of rental properties, and opined that the interest and significance of that complex is no longer there because the context has changed since the other buildings have been lost. He opined that this property does not have individual significance. He argued that the campus has demands and the university has obligations, and that the Trustees believe that the “ad hoc” or “chaotic” intervention by private citizens, however well intended, creates a difficult exercise in controlling their own fate as an institution. He asserted that, although a handsome building, this building is not part of what made this area historic, which was the relationship to Charles Wilson Peale. This building has no relationship to Peale, he noted. He explained that the university does not like the annexation of more and more buildings in a situation where the amount of land already covered by Belfield is huge, and opined that this is a “nibbling away” of the room for La Salle to function.

Mr. Primavera asked Mr. Powers to speak about why the university was originally trying to change the boundaries of the Belfield designation. Mr. Powers explained that his firm was hired by La Salle in the late summer/early fall to take a look at the existing Belfield designation because there is confusion over what the designated boundary includes. He noted that the Commission’s early designations, such as Belfield in 1956, were simply documented with a name or address but no boundary. He noted that he was hired to try to put the pieces together

to figure out what the original designation encompassed, and that the conclusion he came to was that the Belfield mansion and seven associated outbuildings were really the resource covered by the original designation in 1956. He noted that there was a change of parcel size in the 1980s, at which time the address of 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue encompassed both the Wister house and Belfield buildings. He noted that, based on map research, he believes Belfield designation did not include the Wister house. Mr. Primavera noted that he included what he believes should be the boundary of the Belfield designation in the letter he submitted. Mr. Powers explained that his firm documented the other outbuildings around Belfield.

Mr. Primavera asserted that Belfield is actually the building that should be the driving force for preservation. He opined that the context of the Wister house does not reflect what may have previously been meaningful. He opined that the building does not have a relevant relationship with Frances Wister, who lived there for two years. He noted that the architectural value of the building was discussed at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting, but that he thinks that there is only circumstantial evidence that J.C. Sidney may have been the architect, but no direct evidence. He conceded that the design is typical of the period, but opined that it is not significant in its own right. He requested that the Commission deny designating the house, but if the Commission was inclined to move forward, he asked that the Commission reduce the boundary of Belfield so the boundaries make sense and the whole multi-acre parcel is not designated.

Mr. Dolan reiterated Mr. Primavera's statements. He noted that, while he understands and respects the position of the nominator, La Salle disagrees that the property satisfies the Criteria. More broadly, he continued, the university is not in favor of the impact that this nomination and the nomination for Little Wakefield will have on the university's ability to work on a campus master plan moving forward. He opined that the piecemeal restriction of a non-expansive campus may limit the university's ability to meet its institutional goals. He noted that the letter submitted by Mr. Primavera mentions the potential impact on student housing plans, and explained that there have been community issues in the past and the university wants to effectuate a campus-wide master plan to expand housing and bring students on campus from the neighborhood.

Mr. Farnham clarified that La Salle did previously submit a proposal to clarify the boundary of the Charles Willson Peale house, Belfield, which is adjacent to the house under consideration, but ultimately withdrew that request to clarify those boundaries. He explained that the question of the boundary for Belfield is not before the Commission; what is before the Commission is the designation of this particular building, which does define a very clear boundary.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment.

Aaron Wunsch, professor of architectural history at the University of Pennsylvania, spoke in support of the nomination. First, he noted, it should be crystal clear that no one is proposing adding this house to the Belfield designation; this building is being nominated individually on its own merits. He explained that no one is arguing its significance for its association with Peale. Secondly, he noted, the circumstantial evidence connecting it to J.C. Sidney is quite strong. Third, he opined, the argument for why this house should not be added to the Register amounts to, "this house is not Belfield." He noted that he cannot disagree with that, but the argument that nothing that is not Belfield can be significant is not logical.

George Boudreau, professor of history at La Salle University, spoke in support of the nomination on behalf of himself and other members of the La Salle faculty. He noted that two other

professors submitted letters in support of the nomination, James Butler and Cathy Holochwost. He noted that it may be somewhat unusual to have La Salle's faculty weighing in in opposition to La Salle's attorney, but he is there at the request of the president of the Faculty Senate, Dr. Bill Price, who could not be in attendance. He joked that everyone has learned about the importance of checks and balances recently in American culture, and this may be another one of those moments. He noted that he joined La Salle as its public historian in 2014, having been a long-time member of the Penn State-Harrisburg faculty and taught at other institutions, and prior to that was the historic site manager of the Powel House, where he lived while he wrote his doctoral dissertation. He noted that one of the things that delighted him when he joined La Salle's faculty was that the university was preserving the birthplace of the founder of historic preservation in Philadelphia, Frances Anne Wister. Frances Wister, he argued, was as important as the Levy family who saved Monticello, Pamela Cunningham who saved Mount Vernon, and W.A.R. Goodwin who saved Colonial Williamsburg. Most of the known names are men, he noted, but women have been at the core of preservation from the very beginning in the United States. Frances Wister was one of these women. He noted that he is currently trying to research her to understand why there has not been more significance given to this incredible character who saved Powel House, Grumblethorp, the Academy of Music, Elfreth's Alley, and on and on. He explained that Dr. Price contacted him about 36 hours ago asking if he could speak, and that the Faculty Senate executive committee would meet this afternoon, and asked him to report on this property and Little Wakefield. He noted that eight historic properties would be part of the discussion in a meeting on 28 February. He explained that the faculty uses these buildings as teaching tools and research opportunities, and more importantly, as La Salle enters a renaissance, for ways to connect to the community and serve the community and students. Preservation and the study of these sites can serve La Salle's students. He noted that he cannot speak for the entire faculty and is not a senator, despite speaking at Dr. Price's request, but can say that the faculty is very concerned about this issue, and he feels honored to be on the faculty that could potentially after today have two additional historic properties that are significant in their own right.

Mickey Herr, communications director for the Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks explained that she is in a unique position to speak to the life of Frances Wister. She noted that Dr. Boudreau reminded her that La Salle has an incredible opportunity to embrace this history, which has been sort of dismissed over the years. She explained that she would focus on Frances Wister, the founding member of the Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks, or PhilaLandmarks. She summarized the detailed letter submitted to the Commission by PhilaLandmarks on 1 February 2017, noting that it is ironic that the birthplace of a woman who spent her life protecting buildings should require any protection at all. She explained that Frances Wister is known for many things, particularly her love of music and the Philadelphia Orchestra, but as the earliest leader of PhilaLandmarks, Frances Wister had a deep love for preserving Philadelphia. In 1932, Horace Wells Sellers said it best, "While many people deplored the constant destruction and mutilation of our old buildings, little beyond an expression of regret took place until Miss France A. Wister, President of the Civic Club, having become thoroughly aroused, decided to act." She noted that the history of Philadelphia is full of stories of the men who are credited with creating Philadelphia, and that walking down the street, one will find plaques honoring many men, but little mention of Frances Wister other than the occasional mention of her fundraising work. PhilaLandmarks has moved away from preservation efforts to focus on being stewards of four historic landmarks as house museums, she explained, but in recent years, has recommitted to discovering its roots and has been doing a lot of research on Frances Wister. She noted that the organization partnered with Philadelphia History Museum to create an exhibition called "Saved! Preserving Old Philadelphia: 85 Years of the Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks," the research for which reminded her of

several salient points about the significance of Frances Wister. First, Frances Wister had the idea of developing a survey of old Philadelphia when she saw the country's founding history disappearing owing to redevelopment, and in 1929 successfully funded the Philadelphia Survey. Completed by the end of 1931, the survey included 131 photographs along with detailed drawings. Modern preservation in Philadelphia is based on her work, Ms. Herr continued, which even precedes Charles Peterson's establishment of the Historic American Buildings Survey. Secondly, through the process of the survey in January 1931, Frances Wister learned of the potential demolition of the Powel House. She immediately galvanized citizens, established PhilaLandmarks, and raised enough money to purchase the house, all within four months. Today, Powel House is one of Philadelphia's most celebrated houses. Third, as president of PhilaLandmarks, Frances Wister would lead the charge to save some of Philadelphia's most iconic landmarks today: the Second Bank, Elfreth's Alley, Independence Hall, and Wister family homestead, Grumblethorp. Fourth, her advocacy through the 1930s and 40s, particularly of the founding of Independence National Historical Park, would set the stage for the redevelopment of Society Hill into one of the nation's most successful urban renewal projects. Although Charles Peterson gets credit for branding the area as Society Hill, it was actually Frances Wister who first used that name. In learning more about Frances Wister, PhilaLandmarks reached out to present-day preservationists to ask which properties they were most concerned about losing. Imagine their surprise when Frances Wister's birthplace appeared on that list. Ms. Herr asserted that Frances Wister's important contributions to Philadelphia have been overlooked for too long, and that the city can and should do better job of honoring her, and in preserving women's history in general. Ms. Herr concluded that the designation of Frances Wister's birthplace is a perfect place to start.

Oscar Beisert spoke in favor of the nomination, and noted that he has been a resident of Germantown for five months. When he was looking to purchase a property, he was told that one of the things that he would notice was institutions infringing on Germantown. He proffered that about 50% of the parcels in Germantown are non-taxable. He explained that many residents in Germantown are concerned with the lack of protected buildings in Germantown. He noted that this is an example of a building that is on the edge of a campus that could potentially be erased when it could be incorporated into the campus instead.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was any additional public comment in regards to the Criteria for Designation.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination for the Mary & Frances Wister House demonstrates that the portion of the property at 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue as identified in the nomination satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, and to designate that portion of the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1701 LINDLEY AVE

Name of Resource: Little Wakefield

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: La Salle University

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1701 Lindley Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, J, and that the property furthermore satisfies Criterion I, although it not addressed in the nomination.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a portion of the property at 1701 Lindley Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It proposes designating a portion but not the entirety of the very large tax parcel. The nomination contends that the house known as Little Wakefield and associated land satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. The nomination argues that Little Wakefield, constructed in 1829 for Thomas Rodman Fisher, is significant for its association with the Fisher family, who founded the nearby Wakefield Mills, one of the earliest “modern” knitting mills in America. It also argues it is significant for its association with other important and interrelated families of Germantown, including the Logans, Carpenters, and Wisters. The nomination also argues that the house and gazebo are significant for their association with the National League for Women’s Service (called the National League of Workers in the nomination), a women’s organization founded in 1917 to provide wartime aide. Little Wakefield was used by the particularly active Germantown branch of the organization as an educational facility and demonstration center, and the gazebo was constructed as part of this role. The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as a modest, Quaker interpretation of the Federal and Greek Revival styles.

The Historical Commission tabled the nomination for 90 days at its November 2016 meeting.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Fink recused. Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorneys Carl Primavera and Kevin Dolan represented the property owner.

Ms. DiPasquale noted that the gazebo was destroyed by a storm in April 2016.

Oscar Beisert presented some additional photographs of the property and offered a response to the letter report submitted by La Salle’s counsel on 2 February 2017 suggesting that the house is not significant and that the Fisher family was not important. He presented a lithograph from Yale University’s website showing the Wakefield Hosiery Mill in Germantown. Little Wakefield is visible through the trees, he noted. He explained that down at the bottom of the hill is Fisher Lane (now Logan Street), which is now a historic district. Fisher’s Lane was named for the Fisher family because they had a mill on this street as early as the American Revolution. He explained that the only building left from this complex is Little Wakefield. Little Wakefield changed a little over time, he noted, in particular with the removal and reconstruction periodically of the porch. Mr. Beisert presented photographs of the property from its time as a demonstration center associated with the Women’s League that was doing work towards the war effort in World War I. He opined that the argument that since the gazebo is gone that there is no context with the demonstration center is wrong. He presented photographs of women working on a project at Little Wakefield itself. He noted that there were many postcards made of the famous Little Wakefield, which are now available at many historic institutions (Free Library, Library of Congress, La Salle’s own website). He noted that the house became more famous

when Mary Fisher married George Washington Carpenter Jr., who had grown up at Phil Ellena in what is now Pelham. They lived there and the house became locally famous in relationship to Ms. Carpenter. Lastly, he presented an etching, which is one of the first local etchings done by Joseph Pennell, and is available at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, the Library of Congress, and La Salle University Art Museum. He argued that the notion that Little Wakefield and the Fisher family are not significant is absurd and this house was not designated in the past simply because it does not date from the 1700s.

Laura Keim, curator of Stenton, noted that her museum is property of the National Society of the Colonial Dames, of which Frances Anne Wister was a member. Ms. Keim noted that she wrote her own letters in support of both La Salle property nominations. She argued that the diary of Sidney George Fisher adds some weight to the fact that this is a tremendously significant Philadelphia family, on which much is written. She noted that Stenton is a close neighbor of La Salle and originally was a 500+ acre farm, with the house itself sitting less than a mile from La Salle's boundary. She explained that she often uses La Salle's collections and campus history to engage underserved schoolchildren with the History Hunters Youth Reporter Program that includes a partnership between Stenton and the La Salle University Art Museum. More broadly, she commented that these properties represent the class of landed merchant industrialists who settled in Germantown and inherited a settlement pattern whereby which, even as Germantown suburbanized, a tradition of houses and factories side by side continued. She noted that that situation may seem incongruous today, but is no less deserving of preservation. Ms. Keim concluded that designating this building only adds to the potential interest for La Salle to think about ways to engage its history and its community.

James Duffin, who helped with research on the nomination, asked to address the assertion that this was not a significant building. He highlighted a well-known book published in 1912 called *Colonial Homes of Philadelphia and its Neighbors*, which contains over 350 pages and outlined all the prominent historic buildings in the area. At the end of the book, he explained, there is a list of buildings they called "Of interest for architectural or other reasons." That list contained 26 buildings in the City of Philadelphia that were not in Fairmount Park. Of that 26, only six buildings remain. Five of those six are already designated; Little Wakefield is the sixth.

George Boudreau, professor of history at La Salle University, remarked that many members of the faculty had no idea that Little Wakefield still even existed, but were thrilled to discover it. He noted that this property is a perfect example of the type of property addressed in a book called *Urban Alchemy*. He explained that there is an effort between various public and private agencies to deal with properties that face what used to be Wingohocking Creek as a historical space and environment. He noted that he does not consider this building at risk because it is still actively used for offices, and he cannot see putting a dorm in this location. He reiterated that he is honored to be a faculty member at a university that preserves these historic buildings.

Mr. Primavera asked for his comments from the previous review of 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue to stand for this property, and noted that La Salle remains opposed to this nomination as well. He explained that the resources of the university represent a variety of historical and cultural but also land resources. He noted that the gazebo is gone, and asked how to delineate the designation so that areas beyond Little Wakefield are not thrown in happenstance. He noted that La Salle purchased a gazebo kit to put in place of the old gazebo. He reiterated his request that the property not be designated, but if it is, to exclude areas not essential to the grounds around Little Wakefield, and to not impede construction of the new gazebo. He argued that this is a lesson in real time with long-term implications. Mr. Dolan reiterated that when the nomination was submitted, the gazebo had not been around for several months, and La Salle

had already undertaken purchasing of a replacement gazebo. He reiterated the university's opposition to designation, but if designated, requested that the boundaries be delineated to the structure itself and not the surrounding land. Mr. Thomas asked to clarify the boundary. Ms. Cooperman noted that at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting, the archaeologist on the Committee expressed his expert opinion that this site was extremely sensitive archaeologically. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that there is a smaller boundary proposed in the nomination; it is not the whole tax parcel. She noted that the boundary includes the area where the gazebo was, as well as an approach to the building that was there historically, which was addressed at the Committee meeting. Ms. Cooperman suggested that the new gazebo be considered non-contributing. Mr. Beisert noted that as the nominator, he supported the designation of the house with a slight buffer around it. The nomination is not intended to hamper development, but to protect the historic resource.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination for Little Wakefield demonstrates that the portion of the property at 1701 Lindley Avenue as identified in the nomination satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, I, and J, with the understanding that the gazebo has been destroyed and the new gazebo to be erected will be considered non-contributing, and to designate that portion of the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 706 SANSOM ST

Name of Resource: Henry C. Lea Publishing House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: RP Sansom Street LLC

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend to the Historical Commission that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 706 Sansom Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, E, G, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 706 Sansom Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination states that the Henry C. Lea Publishing House, which stands on the site, was designed by the architectural firm of Collins & Authenrieth for publisher Henry C. Lea and constructed in 1866. The nomination stipulates that the period of significance is 1866 to 1922. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, E, G, and J.

The Historical Commission considered and tabled the nomination at its November 2016 meeting to its February 2017 meeting. The Commission tabled the nomination because a developer holds a valid permit to demolish the building that is not subject to the Commission's review and is under appeal. When it tabled the nomination, the Commission opined that designating the property in light of the valid permit and pending appeal of the permit would result in confusion.

ADDRESS: 704 SANSOM ST

Name of Resource: Electrotpe Foundry

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 704 Associates

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend to the Historical Commission that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 704 Sansom Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, G, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 704 Sansom Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination states that the Electrotpe Foundry, which stands on the site, was designed by the architectural firm of Collins & Authenrieth for publisher Henry C. Lea, constructed in 1877, and altered in 1890 by the same firm. The nomination stipulates that the period of significance is 1877 to 1922. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, G, and J.

The Historical Commission considered and tabled the nomination at its November 2016 meeting to its February 2017 meeting. The Commission tabled the nomination because a developer holds a valid permit to demolish the building that is not subject to the Commission's review and is under appeal. When it tabled the nomination, the Commission opined that designating the property in light of the valid permit and pending appeal of the permit would result in confusion.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nominations for 706 and 704 Sansom Street to the Historical Commission. Attorney Carl Primavera represented the equitable owner. Patrick Grossi and Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

Mr. Farnham provided background on the circumstances surrounding this review. He stated that there is a demolition permit submitted for these two buildings and other buildings on this block. The demolition permit application was submitted prior to the submission of the nominations, and prior to the notification to the property owners from the Commission that it would consider nominations to designate these two properties. In the City's reading of the historic preservation ordinance, this Commission has no authority to review building permit applications that are submitted to the Department of Licenses and Inspections prior to the Commission assuming jurisdiction over a property. The building permit applications were submitted in August, and the Commission's jurisdiction began in September with the issuance of written notice to the property owners. It is the City's position that the demolition permits for these two properties remains valid, and that work could be undertaken without the review of this Commission. Whether it rejects the nominations, tables the nominations, or designates, the City's position is that this Commission has no authority to review the demolition permit applications, and the work described in those applications could be undertaken without any involvement by this Commission. The zoning permit was appealed and that appeal was underway when the Commission last considered these nominations in November 2016. That has since been rejected by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The building permit for the demolition is under appeal before the Board of Licenses and Inspections Review. That Board held a first hearing on 31 January 2017 and tabled the matter out to a later date. This Commission is essentially in the same place that it was in November. The nominations are once again before the Commission for consideration, there is a valid demolition permit, and there is an appeal of that permit.

Mr. Thomas asked about the benefit to not resolving the matter at this meeting. Mr. Farnham responded that he would not say that there is not a benefit to resolving the issue at this meeting, other than if the Commission does choose to designate the properties, and the buildings are subsequently demolished under the existing permit, the Commission would either then have the authority to review the new construction project, or it would consider a rescission application. Postponing a decision on the designation really would have no impact other than perhaps saving the Commission time and energy of reviewing the rescission request that would likely result. Whether the Commission chooses to designate at this meeting or not, it will be faced with this issue at some point in the future. The Commission's options today are that it can reject the nominations, table the nominations, or adopt the nominations and designate. Rejecting the nominations would mean that the matter ends. Tabling or designating would mean that the Commission will be compelled to address this in one way or another, either through the review of the permit for the new construction if the demolition is followed through, or the review of a rescission application.

Mr. Mattioni commented that designating the properties will only have real meaning if the demolition permit is reversed on appeal, if the developer decides not to undertake the project, or if the permit is allowed to lapse. Mr. Thomas opined that the buildings meet the Criteria, so it is a procedural question. Ms. Cooperman commented that a rescission request is a fairly straightforward matter. She continued that it behooves the Commission, as the organization that is tasked with preservation in Philadelphia, that if there is any chance that any of the circumstances that have just been described should take place, these buildings will be protected by designation. She opined that the buildings meet the Criteria for Designation. Mr. Fink commented that the Commission should remain consistent with what it has done in the past, and allow the permits to play out before it makes a decision. Ms. Cooperman responded that she understands, but would be willing to risk that in order to assure that the buildings are protected should any of the circumstances change. Ms. Stanford asked how demolition would be allowed to take place during this holding period. Mr. Thomas explained that a demolition permit was applied for prior to the submission of the nominations or notification to the property owners, so it is considered to be a valid permit. Mr. Fink commented that the Department of Licenses and Inspections has issued the permit, and that permit is under appeal, and the developer is awaiting the results of that appeal before proceeding.

Mr. Gupta commented that the Commission is tasked with evaluating a nomination based on the Criteria for Designation, and unless there is a likelihood that additional information is going to be provided related to the merits of the nominations, the Commission has what it needs in front of it to make a decision today. Whatever might happen in the future on how the parties interpret an issued permit, or actions that the owner might take, is not before the Commission today. He stated that the Commission should evaluate the nominations on their merits, because future consequences are not before the Commission today.

Mr. Primavera cautioned that the Commission would create a huge misunderstanding with the public by choosing to designate. He stated that this would damage his client in the courts, and create false expectations. He stated that the Commission is bound by the laws. Mr. Fink has said that the demolition permit is good, so when the Commission says that it is unhappy with that and it wants to send a message, it is undercutting the rule of law that the City Solicitor, Chairman, and expert have said. He suggested that the Commission do nothing, and not interfere, impede, or in any way work inconsistent with his client's legal vested rights. He stated that they have already been through Civic Design Review, and the buildings will be demolished. If the Commission chooses to designate, they will then have to go through an Architectural Committee review, and have to face the people who have committed to go to the ends of the

world to fight this project. There is already a process under Civic Design Review, so they would be inhibited because of the addition of a review process. He claimed that their vested rights under the Pennsylvania Constitution free them from any action which will in effect be a retrospective impediment to their rights. He stated that it would be unconstitutional to be subject to a plenary review by the Commission for structures that are no longer standing. He opined that the members of the Commission have deep feelings, but the rule of law and the preservation ordinance must restrain the Commission members from their otherwise personal desire to “hold onto every brick and stick.” Mr. Primavera continued that the investment community throughout the United States is looking at Philadelphia. He claimed that the investment community wants to see if the Commission plays by the rules, or if it allows personal feelings to trump the law. He suggested that the Commission either deny the nominations, or table the review to allow the permits to play out. He reiterated that choosing to designate sends a message to the courts and to the public that is inconsistent and creates a lack of consensus. Ms. Spina clarified that when this project went to the Civic Design Review Committee, it was for information only, and the Civic Design Review still needs to occur in order for the zoning permit to be issued. Mr. Primavera concurred.

Paul Steinke, representing the nominator and the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that while the Alliance’s appeal for the original 16-story tower zoning application was denied, it has not yet received written notice of the denial from the Zoning Board of Adjustment, which will trigger the right to appeal. He stated that the demolition permit was issued on 9 November 2016. The nominations were submitted after the demolition permit application was submitted, but before the demolition permit was issued. He opined that there is an interpretation of the code, which Judge Carpenter of Common Pleas Court agrees with, that says that if a nomination is filed before a demolition permit is issued, the nomination has standing. He noted that it is not the law today, but there is one judge who found it to be the case. He stated that the task in front of the Commission today is to decide if the buildings meet the Criteria for Designation, and the Commission is not required nor obligated to pay attention to the legal circus going on around the project. He stated that the preservation of the Jeweler’s Row streetscape is important, and that point of view has been echoed by numerous organizations over the past several months, including Mayor Kenny, who twice urged the developer to preserve the facades. He noted that the Alliance has also repeatedly asked the developer to preserve the facades, but the developer has repeatedly rejected the idea. He claimed that if the Commission chooses to designate today, it will send a signal as the steward of Philadelphia’s historic resources that it agrees that the Jeweler’s Row streetscape is important and should be preserved. He opined that whether the decision ends up having the force of law does not matter today, but what does matter is a clear signal that the Commission can send today that preserving these facades should be done by this developer. He reminded the Commission that the Boyd Theater was demolished in 2014 for a high-rise residential tower that may never be built, resulting in the loss of a historic building for a vacant lot. He asked that the Commission not let that happen again, and choose to designate so that the buildings enjoy the protection afforded by listing on the Register should the project not move forward or the permits expire. Mr. Steinke stated that he would like to reserve time to raise a related issue about which the Commissioners received a letter, regarding an adjacent property at 700 Sansom Street that is listed on the Register.

Ms. Stanford asked if there had been a discussion about preserving the facades. Mr. Thomas explained that the Commission has not discussed it because it has not yet designated the properties. It is only if they are designated that the Commission would discuss how the buildings are to be treated. Mr. Primavera commented that he has previously heard that the Commission is not in favor of retaining only the facades of historic buildings. He stated that the developer has

no intention of retaining the facades, because it does not work with its program, but it may also not be a preservation technique that is viewed favorably.

Mr. Gupta stated that he agrees that the Commission should observe the rule of law, and asked if the ordinance in any way speaks to the instance where a valid permit is issued, and if the issuance of a valid permit in any way compromises the Commission's jurisdiction over a designation. Mr. Mattioni responded that the answer is yes. He stated that he understood the City Solicitor to have said previously that the Commission is without jurisdiction once there is a demolition application made and then ultimately issued, where the application predates the notification of a property owner of a proposed designation. He opined that it is the correct interpretation of the ordinance that governs the Commission. He recommended that the Commission choose the same action as last time, and table the review of the nomination. Mr. Gupta asked how the matter was placed on the agenda in the first place, if the ordinance is clear that the Commission does not have jurisdiction. He opined that the Commission has conceded that it has jurisdiction simply by tabling. Mr. Mattioni responded that he has not conceded, but others may have. Mr. Fink stated that the Commission has been fairly consistent in tabling matters until the life of the permit plays out one way or another before it takes an action. He continued that the Commission needs to be consistent; otherwise it is sending a mixed message to the community. Mr. Thomas commented that there is no timeframe in which it has to act on the nominations. Mr. Gupta asked again why the matter was placed on the agenda, if the Commission has consistently refused action on matters that have a valid permit issued that predates the nomination. Mr. Fink responded that there is nothing in the ordinance that addresses this specifically, but the ordinance does say is that if a nomination is submitted, then the Commission is to hear it. The decision-making process is up to the Commission, and the Commission has been consistent in the absence of law to try to deal with these situations so as to not perpetuate an idea that it is giving false hope to something that it has no control over. Mr. Gupta commented that the long-term solution is that the ordinance should be amended to address this. Mr. McCoubrey commented that there are two sides to perceptions. There is the perception of the owner, and the perception of the city and the public at large. Mr. Mattioni commented that the only perception the Commission has to deal with on that score is that people assumed that when it did not act or could not act, that somehow it was complicit in causing the destruction or loss of a historic structure. He stated that this is absolutely untrue and an inaccurate and false impression, and that continuing this conversation over and over again perpetuates the false impression that the Commission does have some authority to make a difference in this circumstance. He stated that it does not, and no matter what it does, it will not make a difference on the outcome of the permit that has been issued and whatever decisions are made with respect to the issues of validity of the permits. He described it as an exercise in futility. He recommended that the appropriate action now is to do same thing it did in November, which is to table the review of the nomination, but this time without an end date, pending the outcome of the matters related to the demolition permit. Ms. Long suggested tabling the reviews of the nominations of 706 and 704 Sansom Street indefinitely. Mr. Mattioni agreed. Mr. Thomas suggested that Ms. Long offer a motion that includes a timeframe, until the validity of the demolition permit is resolved. Ms. Long and Mr. Mattioni agreed.

MOTION: Ms. Long moved to table the reviews of the nominations of 706 and 704 Sansom Street indefinitely, until the validity of the demolition permit is resolved. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion.

Mr. Steinke commented that this is the exact path that the Commission took regarding 4046-48 Chestnut Street, and in that case, a judge made a ruling to stay the demolition, and all during that time, the Commission had an opportunity to make a decision on that nomination, and

instead it continued the review of the nomination until the stay was lifted and the building was demolished, and then it denied the nomination because the building was demolished. He urged the Commission to choose a different path this time, asserting jurisdiction, even though it may not have force of the law in the long run. Mr. Mattioni responded that, with reference to Judge Carpenter's decision, it relied upon what he believes were erroneous facts, but she made findings of fact which are unique and there is no suggestion that any of those facts apply here. He continued that there were other avenues of recourse that the parties had, and which they did not take, but nonetheless there were findings of fact that suggested some kind of chicanery, and he has not heard any suggestion of that going on here. Mr. Steinke reminded the Commission that he would like to discuss 700 Sansom Street.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment. Aaron Wunsch, from the University of Pennsylvania, commented that this construction project has not been nearly as transparent or clear-cut as it has been represented from a zoning or Department of Licenses and Inspections perspective. He commented that the project has changed radically over the last six months. The first iteration was determined to be by-right, but no such conclusion has been issued about the newest proposal. He commented that the Toll Brothers letter to the Commissioners refers to the public confusion created by the 10 November 2016 continuance. He commented that the decision at that time was prudent, but now it is time to act. He urged the Commission to not concern itself with whatever decisions Department of Licenses and Inspections may or may not have made about the project in its current form, but rather focus on the question of whether or not the nominations are valid and persuasive. He commented that the Commission has letters from leading architects and architectural historians stating that they are, and there is also the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Historic Designation, which should carry weight.

Kathy Dowdell commented that she is speaking as a member of the public, and agrees with Commissioners Gupta and Cooperman. She stated that she is not confused at all, and opined that the Commission has the simplest task out of this whole process. That task is to review the nominations and determine if the buildings meet the Criteria for Designation. She commented that what is confusing to the public is the continuing inaction when there are historic resources that need to be designated and that are threatened. She disagreed with interpretations she heard regarding 4046-48 Chestnut Street, commenting that she was in the courtroom, and it was very clear that it was the inaction of the Commission to designate those buildings that ultimately led to their demolition. She commented that the Commission may think the buildings are still protected and under its jurisdiction if it does not designate today, but she would disagree with that. She commented that it is really important to have an answer to the question of whether or not the buildings meet the Criteria for Designation, which would provide clarity and not add to the confusion.

David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that Save Our Sites has been a long time advocate for preservation along Sansom Street, and that Philadelphia is all about rows. He commented that the organization supports the designation and the position of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia.

Arielle Harris claimed that the permits in question are for the construction of the 16 story tower, but new permits will need to be issued for the 29-story tower. She suggested that, if the Commission chooses to designate the buildings today, it means that it is protecting the site from the 29-story tower that the public is generally opposed to. Mr. Farnham responded that this is not correct. Ms. Harris asked why. Mr. Farnham explained that the permit that exists today is a permit to demolish the existing structures on the site. It does not address the new construction in any way.

Suzanna Barucco, board member of the Preservation Alliance, encouraged the Commission to make a decision at this meeting. She commented that the Commission has a responsibility to the public, and there are many members of the public that have come to these hearings month after month, waiting for a decision from the Commission. She commented that the Commission has a responsibility to the public and others that have a concern about these sites and would like the Commission to do its job and make a decision one way or another on these nominations, rather than continue the review.

Oscar Beisert, architectural historian, urged the Commission to make a decision regarding the nominations. He commented that it would send a message to Philadelphians that these buildings are historic. He commented that the buildings are listed on the National Register, adding to the confusion by the public. He commented that the City is allowing people to demolish buildings two blocks from Independence Hall, and these buildings speak to the City's legacy in publishing and as a medical center in America. He commented that making a decision today sends a clear message that, when asked to preserve the facades, it is the least incivility that Toll Brothers can do. He commented that tabling the nominations sends a message that the Commission is not allowed to make a decision, or the buildings may not be historic.

Katie Dylan, a resident of Jeweler's Row, commented that city government can be especially frustrating because each issue has different committees and rules that need to address it. She continued that it is the Commission's duty to rule on the merits of the nominations, and thus protect the city's historic assets, as the Commission is the official steward of the City's historic assets.

Venise Whitaker, a graduate from the Citizen Planning Institute and member of the Faithful Laurentians, agreed with all previous comments from the public. She commented that people go to places for experiences, and these are multigenerational buildings. She commented that planning is about place but more importantly about people. She commented that she supports the Alliance's efforts to designate these buildings.

Alex Palmer, a lifelong Philadelphia resident, urged the Commission to make a decision one way or another because tabling shows that the authority of the Commission can be bypassed. He suggested that even a denial is a decision that is better made rather than ignoring the nomination.

Michael Phillips, attorney for the property owner, stated that at the November meeting it was discussed that this is a two-step process. The first step is to determine whether or not the property satisfies the Criteria for Designation. The second step is exercising discretion, and utilizing the role as a Commission to determine if it is in the best interest to take these steps, or whether it will muddy the waters, or whether it will be futile. He suggested that the Commission step back, maintain jurisdiction, and allow the other process to play out so that the Commission is not wading into a situation that is creating more confusion and more litigation and wasting city resources. He commented that tabling the review does not change anything from where the Commission was in November, and the factors that led to the first continuance are still unchanged. He stated that he supports the motion on the table.

ACTION: By a vote of 8 to 3, the Historical Commission adopted the motion proffered by Ms. Long and Mr. Mattioni to table the reviews of the nominations of 706 and 704 Sansom Street indefinitely, until the validity of the demolition permit is resolved. Ms. Cooperman and Messrs. Gupta and McCoubrey dissented.

Mr. Steinke commented that there is still the additional matter of 700 Sansom Street. Mr. Farnham stated that he forwarded Mr. Steinke's letter to the Law Department, and the Law Department advised the Commission not to entertain a discussion on 700 Sansom Street. He stated that the City's position is that 128 S. 7th Street is not designated. He noted that Mr. Steinke is appealing a permit disputing that assertion, but this matter is not on the agenda, and it is the Law Department's direction to the Commission not to undertake a discussion of the matter without proper notice. Mr. Steinke responded that he would like to read his letter for the record. Mr. Mattioni objected, stating that the matter is not properly before the Commission. Mr. Steinke responded that he is not asking for a discussion, but would like to read his letter into the record. Mr. Mattioni repeated that the matter is not properly before the Commission. Mr. Steinke commented that he is not sure what Mr. Mattioni means. He stated that it is an issue about a designated property at 700 Sansom Street, and how it relates to a project that is proposed to go up immediately adjacent to it. He stated that the building is 217 years old and fragile. He again asked to read his letter. Mr. Mattioni responded that he has read the letter, and he assumes the other Commissioners have read it. Mr. Steinke responded that he would not be surprised if not everyone had read it, as the Commissioners have a lot of paper. Mr. Mattioni reiterated that the matter is not before the Commission. Mr. Steinke asked to defer to the Chair. Mr. Thomas responded that issues of threats to historic properties are brought to the staff. He stated that the Commission cannot start having the public raise issues on any building at its meetings. Mr. Steinke asked if he can expect the matter to be on the agenda for the March meeting. Mr. Farnham asked if he is intending to submit a request to the Commission to certify or amend or in some way make a change to the boundary as it understands it for the designation of 700 Sansom Street. He noted that it would have to go to the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Steinke responded that the answer is no, because the boundary is what it is. He asked that the matter be considered for inclusion on the March agenda. Mr. Beisert suggested that the Commission could amend its current agenda at that moment. Mr. Steinke responded that that will not happen, because everyone is too hungry. Mr. Thomas commented that if the Commission were to take up the matter, it would need to provide information to the public in advance. Mr. Steinke stated that it is a serious issue because he believes the Commission has jurisdiction over 128 S. 7th Street, and the Commission needs to consider that. Mr. Mattioni responded that there is an orderly process, of which Mr. Steinke is well-aware, and ought to follow. Mr. Steinke responded that he believes that he is following the process, and he will see the Commission in March. Mr. Thomas suggested that he bring the matter to the Commission. Mr. Steinke asked in what way he should bring it to the Commission, other than the letter that was already sent outlining their position. Mr. Thomas asked if the issue is that there a building for which there is an application for demolition, which is part of a property that is under the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Steinke responded yes. Mr. Thomas responded that it is not something that the Commission can decide just sitting around the table. It should be brought to the staff, and the staff will act immediately, as they would with any such request. If it is found that 128 S. 7th Street is in fact still certified, that will obviously change how the Commission handles it. Mr. Steinke welcomed the staff's justification as to why it is or is not part of the 700 Sansom parcel between now and the March meeting. Mr. Farnham responded that Mr. Steinke asked the question of the Historical Commission: Is 128 S. 7th Street designated? The response back, after speaking with the Law Department, was that the property is not designated. Mr. Steinke could nominate the property, or could propose to amend the boundary of 700 Sansom Street to include the property, but he does not have the capacity to simply ask the Commission to opine on something, especially in light of the fact that Mr. Steinke has an appeal pending before the Board of Licenses and Inspections Review that is predicated on precisely this claim, that the Commission made a mistake and the property is designated. Mr. Farnham continued that Mr. Steinke will have his opportunity to make his argument that it is, and he will hear the

City's argument that it is not, before the Board, and the Board will make a decision. If the Board cannot make a decision, and needs additional information from the Commission, it can ask the Commission to weigh in. He stated that the Rules and Regulations and ordinance do not allow someone to simply appear before the Commission and pose a question. Mr. Mattioni opined that Mr. Farnham is absolutely correct, and the matter should not be discussed any further. Mr. Thomas continued the conversation by mentioning subdividing a property. Mr. Steinke responded that you cannot subdivide your way out of a designation, and that is the point. Mr. Thomas commented that he is hearing that it is a separate property. Mr. Steinke responded that it is now, but was not in 1981, and he will leave it at that. Mr. Thomas continued the conversation, asking about next steps if the answer given to Mr. Steinke is not satisfactory. Mr. Mattioni stated that Mr. Farnham told Mr. Steinke that it is part of his appeal. If it is part of his appeal, it does not belong before the Commission. Mr. Steinke responded that it belongs before the Commission because the Commission's job is to be the steward of designated properties. Mr. Mattioni responded that Mr. Steinke just wants to pick a fight, and it is the wrong time and wrong place to do it. Mr. Steinke disagreed. Mr. Mattioni stated that it is true, and that Mr. Steinke has heard the position of the City, and that further pursuit and trying to get an advisory opinion from the Commission is out of line and inappropriate, particularly if it involves a matter that is on appeal.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 1:53 p.m., Ms. Long moved to adjourn. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

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

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Accessibility Guideline: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§ 14-1004(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.