

**THE MINUTES OF THE 696TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 14 AUGUST 2020
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Thomas, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair	X		
Mark Dodds (Division of Housing & Community Development)	X		
Kelly Edwards, MUP	X		
Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property)	X		
Labaron Lenard-Palmer (Dept. of Planning & Development)	X		
Josh Lippert (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
John Mattioni, Esq.	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair	X		
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		
H. Ahada Stanford, Ph.D. (Commerce Department)	X		
Betty Turner, MA, Vice Chair	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq.	X		

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Marlene Schleifer
David Traub

Jim Duffin
Aaron Wunsch
Elizabeth Okakpu
Richard A Miller
Nancy Pontone
Matt Petrillo
Venise Whitaker
Doug Mooney
Harrison Haas
Angela Gervasi
Shelly Perron
Susan Davis
Paul Chrystie
Frank Brzozowski
Lillian Candela
Guy Laren
Job Itzkowitz
Jim Conners
John Scott
John Manton
Kelly Wiles
Kevin Brett
Lauren Aguilar
Stuart Rosenberg
Alice Kaiser
Humberto Fernandini
Patrick Grossi
Dana Fedeli
Stephanie Boggs
Michael Stepnowski
Deena Gothelf
Philip Rennie
Justin Coleman
Vivek Tomer
Patrick Cusick
Ashley Schwab
Jonathan Doran
Sarah Adamo
Sara Stepnowski
Mary Purcell
Paul Boni
Devon Beverly
Alex Balloon
Matt McClure
Andrew Miller
Josh Fabrizio
Katie Park
Sarah Alderfer
Olivia Biller
Melissa Komar

Mason Carter
Ted Agoos
Chris White
Paul Steinke
Michael Mattioni
Mary Spross
Jenna Horrow
Sarah Macholdt
Mark Coggin
Tom Clark
Graham Nelson
Evelyn Torres
Regina Stepnowski
Hal Schirmer
Ted Rauch
Lorna Katz
Jeanne Curtis
Peter Angelides
Aron Martinez
Hannah Rosenberg
Jan Vacca
Oscar Beisert
Suzanna Barucco
Justin Spivey
Steven Peitzman
George Poulin
Justin Detwiler
Kristin Bray

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 695TH STATED MEETING, 10 JULY 2020

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:45

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff and members of the public if they had any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 695th Stated Meeting, held 10 July 2020. No corrections were offered.

ACTION: Ms. Edwards moved to adopt the minutes of the 695th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 July 2020. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Minutes, 695th Stated Meeting
MOTION: Adoption of minutes
MOVED BY: Edwards
SECONDED BY: Turner

VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, SPECIAL MEETING, 24 JULY 2020

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:07:30

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any additions or corrections to the minutes of the Special Meeting of the Historical Commission, held 24 July 2020. No corrections were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Hartner moved to adopt the minutes of the Special Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 July 2020. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Minutes, Special Meeting MOTION: Adoption of minutes MOVED BY: Hartner SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

ADDRESS: 1533-39 N 7TH ST

Name of Resource: Trinity Reformed Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 99 Real Estate LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1533-39 N 7th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Trinity Reformed Church satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the church exemplifies the “inexpensive, but expressive” form of Gothic ecclesiastical architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the church was designed by influential Philadelphia architect Samuel Sloan, who included an illustration of the building in his 1868 publication of *The Architectural Review and American Builders’ Journal*. The nomination further argues that the modest but expressive design reflects the cultural, economic, and social heritage of Philadelphia’s working-to-middle-class residents.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1533-39 N 7th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that 1533-39 N. 7th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J, and that the property should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:08:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. She noted that the staff supports the request because the property owner requires an interpreter, which would be difficult to accommodate at an in-person meeting.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners to review the practice of granting open-ended continuances of nomination reviews to the first-in person meeting of the Historical Commission. He noted that such continuances were initially granted when the Historical Commission shifted to virtual meetings in May 2020, owing to COVID-19. He stated that such continuances were granted with the assumption that they were a temporary solution while the City's offices were closed. It now appears that virtual meetings will be held into the foreseeable future. He therefore asked the Historical Commission to discontinue this practice of granting open-ended continuances.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that she is somewhat concerned with open-ended continuances and suggested that the Historical Commission find a way to revisit continued matters. She suggested a 90-day limit on continuances.
- Mr. Reuter stated that it may be possible to use interpreters at virtual meetings. He questioned who would pay for the interpreter services.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that, if the Historical Commission intends to terminate all open-ended continuances, it will need to notify all owners with such continuances. He stated that owners must get proper notice. Mr. Mattioni stated that the Historical Commission can change its policy on open-ended continuances, but it should do so formally and then apply the policy consistently.
- Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission could inform all owners with open-ended continuances that they will be ending in 90 days.
- Mr. Reuter suggested sending notices to all owners with open-ended continuances asking them to appear before the Historical Commission for status updates and the establishment of firm continuance dates.
- Mr. Mattioni disagreed with Mr. Reuter regarding status updates. He stated that the Historical Commission should no longer grant open-ended continuances. Those who have such continuances can be called before the Commission for reviews.
- Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission will help people to resolve issues that prevent their appearances at remote meetings.
- Mr. Farnham asked the Commissioners if they sought to change the policy regarding continuances for individual nominations only, but for historic district nominations as well.
- Mr. Thomas and Ms. Cooperman stated that the policy should include historic districts as well.
- Mr. Reuter stated that the Historical Commission should take into account the impacts of lifting continuances on permit review time lines. He stated that he would take the matter up with Mr. Farnham. He noted that ending all continuances at once may be difficult to manage.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to discontinue the policy of granting open-ended continuances of nomination reviews to the “first in-person meeting” and from this point forward only grant continuances to specific dates; and to rescind all “first in-person meeting” continuances and inform owners in writing of the date at which their nominations will be heard. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjust continuance policy					
MOTION: Adoption					
MOVED BY: Mattioni					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 1533-39 N. 7th Street to the October 2020 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Continuance of 1533-39 N 7th St to October 2020 PHC Meeting MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:26:10

DISCUSSION:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the revised applications for 1707 Porter Street, 1232 Waverly Street, and 1730 Wharton Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Consent agenda MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JUNE 2020

ADDRESS: 1707 PORTER ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition, alter side openings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Carley Pascetta and William Pasquarello

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC

History: 1906; James H. and John T. Windrim, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition and alter side openings at 1707 Porter Street. The addition would be visible from Roseberry Street, a service alley at the rear that marks the northern boundary of the district, and from S. 17th Street at the side. The addition would maintain an open porch at the first floor, and be clad in fiber-cement siding. The rear chimney is proposed for removal as part of this project. Many of the openings on the side were previously altered or infilled. A proposal for a similar two-story rear addition on this same block was approved by the Commission in 2003, and a one-story rear addition on this block was approved by the Commission in 2014.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct two-story rear addition and alter side openings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, 14 AUGUST 2020

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition will only be visible from the far side, and rear along a service alley, and will not destroy the features and spatial relationships that characterize the property, owing to its location and context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the chimney above the roof is retained, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the chimney above the roof is retained, an offset, articulation, or reveal is added between the addition and the existing brick, and the vent for the new mechanical system is located towards the rear of the existing building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1232 WAVERLY ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Hallock

Applicant: Susan Davis

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 11/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a rear addition at 1232 Waverly Street. The existing one-story rear addition would remain, and an additional two stories would be constructed on top of it, rising to the height of the existing main block of the house, and extending to the depth of the neighboring rear additions. The existing one-story addition was constructed in 1958. Small decks projecting six feet are proposed for the new second and third floors. The only visibility of the rear of this property from the public right-of-way is via a very oblique angle from a short, fenced section of S. Iseminger Street. Existing two-story rear additions at the neighboring properties further obscure visibility from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with*

the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

- The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. It will not be visible within the context of the front of the building. It will be differentiated from the old by way of materials, and will be compatible with the historic property in terms of materials, features, size, scale, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the third-floor deck is eliminated, the railing for the second-floor deck is a black metal vertical picket design, and the windows and doors have no muntins, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 520 KAUFFMAN ST

Proposal: Construct three-story addition with pilot house at 522 Kauffman Street

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Ashley H. Schwab and Chloe Ann Deon

Applicant: Stephanie Boggs, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes to consolidate the lots at 520 and 522 Kauffman Street and construct a three-story addition on the vacant lot at 522 Kauffman Street. The property at 520 Kauffman Street is designated as historic. The building that stood at 522 Kauffman Street was demolished by order of the City in 1976. The property at 522 Kauffman Street is not designated as historic even though it is currently listed as designated on the Historical Commission's website. That listing is a clerical error that will be corrected. The Historical Commission has jurisdiction over the addition, which will stand entirely on 522 Kauffman, even though that property is not designated because the addition will connect to a designated building. That said, the addition only connects to a party wall that was not exposed historically.

The proposed addition, with pilot house and roof deck, would be set back 11.5 feet from the front of the lot. The façade would be clad in brick, and would feature a masonry fence wall with gate at the sidewalk. No work is proposed for the building at 520 Kauffman Street; however, the door and windows were recently replaced without the appropriate permit and the Historical Commission's approval; the staff will request that the Department of Licenses & Inspections inspect and issue a violation for that unpermitted work.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story addition at side of historic building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. Its setback on the lot allows it to be deferential to the historic building at 520 Kauffman Street. It is differentiated from the old but compatible with the historic property in terms of materials, features, size, scale, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept of the proposed addition, provided the height of the pilot house and pergola is reduced to eight feet, the height of the wall does not rise above the height of the adjacent building cornices, and a line of sight drawing is provided for review by the Commission, with the staff to review details including brick color, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:28:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Stephanie Boggs, architect Richard Miller, and property owner Ashley Schwab represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application satisfactorily addresses the recommendations of the Architectural Committee.
- The door at 520 Kauffman Street is inappropriate and should be replaced.
- The transom bar and lite at 520 Kauffman Street is inappropriate and should be reconfigured to appear like the transom at the adjacent house.
- The windows at 520 Kauffman Street have muntins between the glass and therefore the sash should be replaced or have exterior muntins applied.
- The panning on the sills should be removed.
- The applicant should work with the staff on the approval of the replacement windows, door, and transom.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The windows, door, and transom at 520 Kauffman Street do not match the historic appearance in design or materials and therefore do not satisfy Standard 6.
- The proposed addition does not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. Its setback on the lot allows it to be deferential to the historic building at 520 Kauffman Street. It is differentiated from the

old but compatible with the historic property in terms of materials, features, size, scale, and massing, satisfying Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application in concept, provided the correct windows and door are installed, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 520 Kauffman St					
MOTION: Approval in concept with conditions					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

ADDRESS: 1703 W DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Install vinyl windows on front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Denise Jones

Applicant: Denise Jones

History: 1890

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Contributing, 1/29/1986

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to replace a total of four non-historic windows at the second and third stories of the front façade of this contributing structure. The property owner is seeking approval to use Simonton 6500 vinyl replacement windows. The proposed configuration is 1/1 to match existing. This application is for complete replacement of the sash and frames.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove windows at the second and third stories of the front facade.
- Replace existing windows (sash and frame) with vinyl 1/1 windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - Vinyl windows will match the historic wood windows sufficiently enough to meet this standard. An aluminum-clad window with the correct details could be an acceptable alternative to wood in this case.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:38:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance spoke against the use of vinyl windows and asked that the Historical Commission recommend either wood or aluminum-clad windows.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Vinyl windows compromise the architectural integrity of the house.
- Either wood or aluminum-clad windows would be more appropriate.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposal to install vinyl windows does not satisfy Standard 6.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1703 Diamond St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

ADDRESS: 1607 ST PAUL ST

Proposal: Legalize work to façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Attika Van

Applicant: Damont Lewis, Lewis Living LLC

History: 1885

Individual Designation: 9/26/1967

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 1607 St. Paul Street is one of 16 properties on St. Paul Street and 24 properties on adjacent Rowan Street individually designated as historic in 1967. The two blocks feature two-story red brick Queen Anne rowhouses with projecting bays and porches, cedar shake siding and roofing, and brownstone trim. Nearly all the original Queen Anne windows have been replaced, and a number of buildings now have painted brick facades. Other work to many of the buildings has been undertaken illegally over the course of several decades.

On 27 January 2020, the staff of the Historical Commission requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue a violation to the property for illegal work to the front façade, and a violation was subsequently issued. Prior to the violation, the front façade had a painted brownstone base, lintels, and sills, vinyl windows, a non-original door, and replacement cedar shingles. No permit applications had been approved by the Historical Commission for any past work. Between July 2019 and January 2020, the owner renovated the property. Work to the front façade included painting the masonry façade, capping the cornice, installing asphalt shingles at the bay roof, replacing the cedar shingles with vinyl siding, installing a steel six-panel door, and replacing the original hairpin porch railing with a metal picket railing.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize roofing;
- Legalize painting of masonry façade;
- Legalize door;
- Legalize removal of hairpin porch railing;
- Legalize vinyl siding; and,
- Legalize cornice capping.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - This application proposes to legalize the painting of historic masonry, the covering of the historic cornice, the removal of the original hairpin porch railing, the installation of a steel door, and the cladding of the bay in asphalt shingles and vinyl siding. The work is inappropriate to the historic character of the building and does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:43:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The work completed without a permit between July 2019 and January 2020 altered character-defining features and is not sensitive to the historic building. The work does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1607 St Paul St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

ADDRESS: 1730 WHARTON ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate church; install vinyl-clad windows and ramp railing; remove chimneys

Review Requested: Final approval

Owner: 1730 Wharton LLC

Applicant: Rich Villa

History: 1888; Eighteenth Street Methodist Episcopal Church

Individual Designation: 9/14/1988

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Located at the southeast corner of Wharton Street and S. 18th Street, the former 18th Street Methodist Episcopal Church, constructed about 1888, historically featured wood windows with marbled blue glass. Between fall 2018 and summer 2019, many of the historic windows appear to have been removed without Historical Commission review or approval. The original frames and some of the original marbled blue glass windows remain. The current owners, who purchased the property in 2019, intend to convert the property into residential use. This application proposes to install vinyl windows in most of the window openings, as well as in the louvered belltower openings. Most of the proposed windows feature a two-over-two configuration with a vertical muntin, when historically the building featured a combination of four-over-four (1st floor front), one-over-one (1st floor gable), two-over-two with horizontal muntin (2nd floor front; 1st floor side), and six-over-six windows (1st and 2nd floor side). To accommodate the insertion of an additional interior floor level, the upper floor windows on the side elevation, which historically were single double-hung, six-over-six windows, are proposed to be composed of two sets of hung windows. To create usable space in the belltowers, the application proposes to install windows in place of the existing louvers. The application also proposes to install a solid metal ramp railing that extends to the ground, replace the front doors, and to demolish two

historic, corbelled, rear chimneys to the roofline. The application also proposes rehabilitation work including masonry repairs, which can be reviewed and approved at the staff level.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate building for residential use and insert interior floor level
- Remove remaining historic windows and bell-tower louvers
- Install vinyl windows in most openings, including stacked double-hung windows in side elevations
- Remove corbelled chimneys
- Install solid metal ramp railing with laser cut building name
- Replace entrance doors

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The proposed windows do not replicate, nor approximate, the historic windows in design, texture, or material, therefore failing to satisfy Standard 6. The staff notes that there are a number of incorrect window details in terms of proposed muntin configuration. Based on the floor plans, some of the windows also appear to sit proud of the façade, rather than be set in an appropriate depth within the masonry opening.
 - The corbelled chimneys should be repaired rather than removed in order to satisfy Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed solid metal ramp railing is differentiated from, but not compatible with the historic property, and is visually obtrusive, further blocking views of the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, but approval of an application with a metal picket railing at the ramp and wood or aluminum-clad wood windows at the side elevations and in the bell tower openings, including the installation of stacked double-hung windows in double-height side elevation openings, provided the muntin pattern matches that of the historic windows, and provided the marbled blue glass windows are retained, restored, or replicated in the front façade openings in all but the bell-tower openings, with the staff to review details.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline, but approval provided the following, with the staff to review details:

- wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are used at the side elevations, including the installation of stacked double-hung windows in the double-height openings, provided the

muntin patterns matches those of the historic windows, and the mullion between the windows at the new floor level is as minimal as possible;

- the marbled blue glass windows are retained, restored, or replicated in the front façade openings and communal spaces;
- the original chimneys are restored and kept to present height;
- any exterior condensing or other HVAC units are installed in inconspicuous locations with preference for the ground;
- louvers at corner towers retained, with understanding that glass or operable windows may be installed behind them;
- new doors in the western entrance of the front façade are made of wood, with glass panels to replicate the panel pattern on the jambs.
- a metal picket railing is used at the ramp.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 737 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct six-story building with mezzanine and decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sarah Investment LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects

History: 1955

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a six-story, mixed-use building with a mezzanine and roof decks on the site of a now-demolished, non-contributing building in the Society Hill Historic District. The staff of the Historical Commission approved the demolition of the non-contributing building in October 2019.

The north side of the block, where this site is situated, has an important history as Sansom Row by Benjamin Latrobe, which marks the beginning of rowhouse development in Philadelphia in 1799. Before that time, builders only constructed houses individually or in very small groups. Twelve of the original houses still survive in the row, even if some have been modified. The row now consists entirely of three- and four-story historic buildings clad in red brick, brownstone, stucco, and other masonry.

At its 8 May 2020 meeting, the Historical Commission denied a similar application to construct a six-story building with a mezzanine and roof decks, stating that the size of the party walls overwhelmed the adjacent buildings and the setbacks were too minimal. The current application maintains the size and materials of the party walls and minimally increases the dimensions of the setbacks by two feet. The current design includes a five-foot setback at the fifth story and an additional three-foot setback at the sixth story. The mezzanine would be set back a total of 19-feet from the front façade, with roof decks at the front and rear. The façade materials are similar to the application the Historical Commission reviewed at its May 2020 meeting. The building would feature red brick at its upper stories and cast stone to imitate limestone at the storefront. Aluminum double-hung windows are proposed at the upper stories.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct six-story, mixed-use building with commercial ground floor and set-back seventh-floor mezzanine.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's 8 May 2020 denial of a similar application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's 8 May 2020 denial of a similar application.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:46:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Mr. Rosenberg represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni, representing the Society Hill Civic Association, spoke in opposition to the project. He noted that he agreed with the concerns voiced by Commissioners Cooperman and McCoubrey regarding the specific context of Sansom Row and the project's potential impact on its historic character. Mr. Boni's additional statements reflected the letter submitted to the Historical Commission by the Society Hill Civic Association on 27 July 2020.
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, spoke in opposition to the project. He commented that although he is in favor of the lower four-story portion of the building, he is concerned that approval of this project's substantial overbuild would influence future projects in this historic row.
- Steven Peitzman spoke in opposition to the project.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The overbuild above fourth floor would be highly visible.
- The proposed building is an infill building in a historic row.
- The key context for the proposed building is the adjacent buildings and historic Sansom Row, not the surrounding area.
- Sansom Row, despite changes over time, continues to communicate its eighteenth-century scale.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application is similar to one reviewed and denied on 8 May 2020. The revisions to the application were minor.
- The question of scale in this review is based on Sansom Row not the overall surrounding area and buildings.
- The proposed building would diminish the historic character of Sansom Row.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's 8 May 2020 denial of a similar application. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1.

ITEM: 737 Walnut St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair				X	
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni		X			
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair			X		
Washington	X				
Total	10	1	1	1	

ADDRESS: 527-37 W GIRARD AVE

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Franklin Berger

Applicant: Franklin Berger

History: 1887; N. 6th Street Farmers' Market House & Hall

Individual Designation: Under consideration

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Located at the northeast corner of W. Girard Avenue and N. 6th Street, the former North Sixth Street Farmers' Market is composed of several interconnecting masses constructed between 1886 and 1887, including a prominent headhouse fronting on Girard Avenue (identified in the application as Building A); a two-story hall to the north along N. 6th Street (Building B); and two one-story market sheds with monitor roofs, Building C, which runs along N. 6th Street and connects Buildings A and B; and Building D, which occupies the interior northeast quadrant of

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, 14 AUGUST 2020

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

the lot and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The property is currently under consideration for designation, and has been recommended for inclusion on the Philadelphia Register by the Committee on Historic Designation.

At the time the owners received notice of the nomination, they were under contract to sell the property to a developer who intended to clear the site. The prospective buyer subsequently backed out, and the owners now seek to better understand the impacts of designation and the potential of future reuse and redevelopment of the property.

This in-concept application seeks guidance on several potential future redevelopment schemes.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Scenario 1 calls for the adaptive reuse of all buildings, with the possibility of alterations to the shed roof of Building D.
- Scenario 2 calls for the removal of Building D and the construction of a 6, 8, or 10-story addition in its footprint.
- Scenario 3 calls for the removal of Building D and the partial demolition of Buildings B and C, and the construction of a 6, 8, or 10-story addition.
- Scenario 4 calls for the removal of Building D, and the partial demolition of Buildings A, B, and C, and the construction of a 6, 8, or 10-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - Scenarios 1 and 2 may satisfy Standard 9, as the alterations would be made to historic fabric that is not visible from the public right-of-way. An addition higher than the existing buildings may be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, as it would read as a separate building.
 - Scenarios 3 and 4 propose to remove considerable historic fabric and do not protect the history integrity of the property or its environment.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - Scenarios 1 and 2 satisfy Standard 10, as they leave the essential form and integrity of the historic property intact, provided any new addition are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
 - Scenarios 3 and 4 remove more than half of the existing structures and alter the understanding of the property and, if removed in the future, do not leave the essential form and integrity of the property intact.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept of Scenarios 1 or 2, provided any alteration/addition to Building D is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The staff suggests that, while there are no non-historic components of the property and the shed roofed portions of the property are integral to its history and significance as a farmers' market, given Building D's lack of visibility from the public right-of-way and deep setbacks from both Girard Avenue and 6th

Street, flexibility could be exercised in terms of significant alterations or additions to this portion of the property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of Scenarios 1 and 2, provided the addition on Building D is restricted to four to six stories in height, depending on the design, and that the rooftop monitor of Building C is restored, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:21:09

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Property owner Franklin Berger, representative Deena Gothelf, and architect Ted Agoos represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert supported the Architectural Committee's recommendation for a compromise and flexibility in terms of allowing additional stories at the rear of the property on Building D. He noted that it is an important market shed building, and he supports an overbuild project that allows the exterior envelope to be restored.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The existing historic buildings cover 100% of the property.
- Buildings A, B, and C are the portions of the property that are visible from the public right-of-way, while Building D is not visible from the public right-of-way, and is set back considerably from both Girard Avenue and N. 6th Street.
- The rooftop monitor of Building C and the gable roof of Building B are particularly character-defining features.
- Scenarios 1 or 2 do not negatively impact the character-defining features of the property that are visible from the public right-of-way.
- Depending on its height and details, an addition of up to approximately six to seven stories on the footprint of Building D may be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, as it would read as a separate building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Historical Commission should exercise flexibility in approving alterations to Building D.
- Scenarios 1 and 2 may satisfy Standard 9, as the alterations would be made to historic fabric that is not visible from the public right-of-way. A new addition on Building D should be restricted to approximately six stories in height so as not to overwhelm the existing buildings.
- Scenarios 1 and 2 satisfy Standard 10, as they leave the essential form and integrity of the historic property intact, provided any new addition is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve Scenarios 1 and 2 in concept, provided the addition on Building D is restricted to approximately six stories in height, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent

ITEM: 527-37 W Girard Ave MOTION: Approval in concept MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 527-37 W GIRARD AVE

Name of Resource: North Sixth Street Farmers Market House and Hall

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Franklin Berger

Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 527-37 W Girard Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former North Sixth Street Farmers' Market House and Hall, which is composed of several interconnecting masses constructed between 1886 and 1887, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the property represents the development of Philadelphia in the second half of the nineteenth century as the city transitioned from the use of outdoor, public food markets to privately-owned, multi-purpose, indoor markets and halls. Under Criterion J, the nomination asserts that the mixed-use building played an important role in the cultural, social, and economic lives of the local and predominantly German-American community. The nomination also argues that the building is significant as the work of architects Hazelhurst & Huckel, satisfying Criterion E.

The nomination places the period of significance between the date of construction in 1886 and 1908, the year it ceased operations as a farmers' market, but notes that the community significance may extend through the 1940s, until which time the building remained in use as a public hall and movie theater.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 527-37 W Girard Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, 14 AUGUST 2020

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 527-37 W. Girard Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J, and should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:37:46

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Franklin Berger, Deena Gothelf, and Ted Agoos represented the property owner. Mr. Berger requested that the portion of the property identified as Building D be excluded from the designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination and thanked the property owners for their participation in the process.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- All portions of the property contribute to its historical significance and should remain under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission, but that the Historical Commission would exercise flexibility in approving work to Building D, as it is not visible from the public right-of-way, pursuant to the in-concept application of 14 August 2020.
- Recent zoning legislation provides benefits to owners of properties listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, including increased base zoning and parking minimum relief, but such benefits would not be applicable to the portion of a property excluded from the designation.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property represents the development of Philadelphia in the second half of the nineteenth century as the city transitioned from the use of outdoor, public food markets to privately-owned, multi-purpose, indoor markets and halls, satisfying Criterion A.
- The mixed use building with markets below and a function hall above played an important role in the cultural, social, and economic lives of the community, satisfying Criterion J.
- The building is the work of architects Hazelhurst & Huckel, a significant architectural firm whose work influenced the development of the city, satisfying Criterion E.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 527-37 W Girard satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 527-37 W Girard Ave MOTION: Designate; Criteria A, E, J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

ADDRESS: 1615-31 N DELAWARE AVE

Name of Resource: Bradlee & Co. Empire Chain Works

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: LMM Associates

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1615-31 N. Delaware Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the remaining portion of the Bradlee & Co.'s Empire Chain Works, constructed between 1905 and 1910, is significant under Criteria for Designation C and J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the property is a "rare surviving industrial building at the Delaware River waterfront...that was associated with the maritime railroad and shipbuilding industries." Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the one-story shed building is representative of low-slung masonry industrial buildings of pilaster construction that were once commonplace throughout the River Wards and the larger region.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 1615-31 N. Delaware Avenue satisfies any Criteria for Designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that 1615-31 N Delaware Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:14:12

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, 14 AUGUST 2020

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Attorney Ted Rauch and owners Nick Foreman and Michael Stepnowski represented the property owner and opposed the designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Rauch argued that the property does not represent anything significant about Philadelphia's history and does not satisfy any of the Criteria. He emphasized that the existing building is a fragment of the original building, which historically ran the length of Susquehanna Avenue between Delaware Avenue and Beach Street. The entire roof and roofing system, the walls facing the interior of the lot, and the rear wall are all new. All that remains of the original building are two exterior walls. Addressing the Criteria cited in the nomination, he noted that the owner agrees with the staff and Committee on Historic Designation that the fact that it is a one-story building with brick pilasters does not make it of a distinctive architectural style of any particular era. Regarding Criterion J, he argued that it is difficult to understand how the remaining portion of the building meaningfully exemplifies the cultural and economic heritage of the City of Philadelphia and needs to be preserved for generations to come. He opined that the nomination does not demonstrate that the original company, Bradlee Chain Works, was particularly significant in and of itself and questioned how the preservation of these two walls will help the citizens of Philadelphia understand or appreciate the industrial history of Philadelphia. Mr. Rauch noted that the Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the property satisfies Criterion I for archaeological potential, which is not addressed in the nomination. He opined that the fact that properties across the street yielded archaeological artifacts does not provide evidence that this property would and that it would be improper to designate the property under such speculation. He noted that the letter from the property owner to the Commissioners describes previous ground disturbance, including the removal of underground storage tanks. Mr. Rauch also opined that when a property owner is in opposition, the property should not be designated. He noted that the property was under an agreement of sale at the time notice of the nomination was received, and as a result, the buyer terminated the agreement. Mr. Rauch acknowledged that it is not a hardship case, but noted that the owner submitted two engineering reports detailing the poor condition of the walls and their foundations, which would be costly to save or rebuild. Mr. Rauch concluded that the Commission should strike a balance between the benefit to the public from designating these walls and the burden placed on the property owner by designating it.
- Mr. Foreman opined that the building is ugly, and argued that it is out of plumb, the foundation has failed, and that it would be costly to save or rebuild. He argued that designation would hinder development of the property, since Susquehanna Avenue is one of the better streets to gain access to the property.
- Mr. Stepnowski opined that any additional cost associated with maintaining the property hurts the tenants, which include a minority-owned business, woman-owned business, and a non-profit organization. Mr. Stepnowski explained that the ground has been disturbed numerous times, and that the buildings are constructed on imported soil.
- Mr. Beisert read a prepared statement, noting that the building is related to the maritime history of Philadelphia. He noted that Fishtown and Northern Liberties have lost most of their historic waterfront buildings. Mr. Beisert explained that he submitted additional slides without captions that include photographs of linear buildings

throughout the country and world that housed maritime-related industries such as rope walks and chain and cordage factories. He noted that the Delaware River Waterfront plan includes a call for the preservation of historic waterfront properties. He acknowledged that all that is left of this property are two one-story walls, but argued that they can be preserved and incorporated into a larger development project in the future.

- Mr. Farnham explained the implications of designation under Criterion I, noting that if designated under Criterion I, the Historical Commission could require the property owner to obtain the services of an archaeologist to ensure that archeological resources are not disturbed during a project that involves ground disturbance.
- Mr. Reuter noted that most work on I-95 and Delaware Avenue involves federal funding, which triggers Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and that there are additional federal laws that involve the treatment of Native American remains.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Dana Fedeli supported the nomination and opined that too much working-class and industrial history has been lost.
- Chris White, a tenant of the property, opposed the nomination on the grounds that the designation may cause his rent to increase.
- Jim Duffin opined that the building could be incorporated into a larger development project and suggested that the designation be limited to the two exterior walls along Delaware Avenue and Susquehanna Avenue.
- Mason Carter supported the nomination for its relationship to maritime history.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination and noted that the designation would not require the owners to initiate any work.
- Doug Mooney of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum, and member of the Committee on Historic Designation, addressed the recommendation for designating the property under Criterion I for its archaeological potential. He explained that the archaeological sensitivity of the area is well documented, and the recommendation is based on his expertise as the archaeologist who directed the work on the I-95 project, which has uncovered significant archaeological artifacts in the immediate vicinity in the last few years. He explained that in the area just north of Aramingo Avenue and Palmer Street there are no fewer than six documented archaeological sites, all of which have been found by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. He noted that the area contains significant historic remains owing to the fact that the area has been developed since the 1730s, but also sites containing intact Native American components carbon dated to between 2500 BC and 1300 AD. He further explained that they have uncovered diagnostic artifacts that suggest that the earliest Native American occupation could be as early as 7000 BC, so the area directly across Delaware Avenue from this site documents potentially up to 9000 years of Philadelphia history. He explained that the sites across the street have survived despite more than 300 years of development, the demolition of the properties, and the construction of I-95 on top of them. He noted that some limited disturbance on the site does not diminish the overall archaeological potential, noting that there are large parts of this site that have never been built on. He noted that the building likely does not have a basement so probably has not disturbed too much. To learn more, he suggested contacting the PHMC or reviewing the Digging I-95 website.

- Ms. DiPasquale noted that one additional letter of support arrived that morning from Michelle Shuman, in addition to the letters that were previously provided to the Commissioners.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The original Bradlee Empire Chain Works building featured three sides of masonry construction with an open southwestern elevation lined with a series of light frame structures.
- The original building has been significantly altered, and the two street-facing walls along Delaware and Susquehanna Avenues are all that remains of the historic building.
- The building reflects the maritime history of the Fishtown neighborhood of Philadelphia.
- The building is not of a particular architectural style.
- The area along the historic Gunners Run, between Aramingo Avenue and Palmer Street and the Delaware River is highly sensitive for archaeological potential. Archaeological survey and excavations conducted in the immediate vicinity have yielded artifacts significant in history and pre-history.
- Owing to the nature of the building and the limited development on this property over the years, the property may also be likely to hold archaeological potential.
- The designation of a property under Criterion I does not preclude development of the property, but may require an owner to undertake archaeological survey in response to a proposed project that requires ground disturbance. In such an event, the Historical Commission would likely require Phase IA (documentation) and/or Phase IB (subsurface testing) surveys, and may require up to a Phase III (data recovery) survey, depending on the outcome of the previous surveys and the scope of the proposed work. If no ground disturbance is proposed, the Historical Commission would not require archaeological survey of the property.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property has the potential to yield information significant in history or pre-history, satisfying Criterion I.
- The property reflects the history of the community, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 1615-31 N Delaware Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 4, with one abstention. Ms. Sanchez and Messrs. Dodds, Hartner, Mattioni dissented. Ms. Stanford abstained.

ITEM: 1615-31 N Delaware Ave MOTION: Designate; Criteria I and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)		X			
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)		X			
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni		X			
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)		X			
Stanford (Commerce)			X		
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	8	4	1		

ADDRESS: 1801-03 N HOWARD ST

Name of Resource: The Star Carpet Mills

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Joseph Laragione

Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1801-03 N. Howard Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Star Carpet Mills complex satisfies Criteria for Designation G and J. Under Criterion G, the nomination argues that the complex was “part of and related to a distinctive industrial area and block which should be preserved for its ties to Philadelphia’s manufacturing history, exemplifying the economic heritage of Kensington and Philadelphia.” Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that Star Carpet Mills represents an important and intact surviving example of a nineteenth-century industrial complex with an integrated dye house where ingrain carpets were manufactured, and contributes to the industrial history that defines the Kensington neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1801-03 N. Howard Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, but not G. Criterion G is intended to facilitate the designation of groups of discrete buildings that together form an ensemble, like rowhouses around a city square; it is not intended to facilitate the designation of sites related to broader neighborhood themes like textiles in Kensington or banking in Center City.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1801-03

N. Howard Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, and that the property should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:55:30

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mr. Beisert thanked the Historical Commission for reviewing the nomination.
- Alex Balloon supported the nomination, stating that too few of Kensington's historic structures, particularly its nineteenth-century industrial buildings, are designated as historic. He opined that the nomination is well-written and that the property is worthy of designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- A property satisfies Criterion G when it is part of or related to a group of contiguous properties that create a distinctive area and that should be preserved according to an historic, cultural, or architectural motif.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The complex of buildings represents the textile industry in Kensington, satisfying Criterion J.
- The nomination does not define a distinctive area of adjacent buildings of which the nominated property would be part of or related to; therefore, the nomination does not satisfy Criterion G.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1801-03 N. Howard Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lenard-Palmer seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent. Mr. Mattioni recused.

ITEM: 1801-03 N Howard St MOTION: Designate; Criterion J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Lenard-Palmer					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni				X	
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12			1	

ADDRESS: 4649 UMBRIA ST

Name of Resource: Levering Smick Arbuckle House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Umbria Commons LLC

Nominator: Ridge Park Civic Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4649 Umbria Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the building and the original land associated with it preceded the neighborhood's development, and that several prominent owners over the course of a century contributed significantly to the neighborhood's growth and its current appearance.

This property is slated for redevelopment. The property owner plans to demolish the building and construct a multi-family residential building. The property owner began seeking permits for the project prior to the submission of the nomination or issuance of the notice to the property owner announced the consideration of the nomination.

Section 14-1005(6)(f) of the preservation ordinance governs the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the consideration of a designation. The provision prohibits the Department of Licenses & Inspections from issuing any building permit for any property being considered for designation "where the building permit application is filed on or after the date that notices of proposed designation have been mailed" unless the Historical Commission approves the building permit application or fails to complete its designation process within 90 days. The question in this case is whether a building and demolition permit applications were "filed" with the Department of Licenses & Inspections prior to the mailing of the notice letters. If they were,

then the Department may issue the permit without the Historical Commission's review and the project may proceed regardless of any designation.

The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a zoning permit (1033928) on 5 March 2020 for the complete demolition of an existing structure and for the erection of a detached building for use as multi-family household living with 30 units. A building permit application for the new construction (1055503) was submitted to the Department of Licenses & Inspections on paper on 5 March 2020. Owing to the COVID shutdown, it was superseded by a new eCLIPSE electronic building permit application for the new construction (CP-2020-000875) on 15 April 2020. A demolition permit application for complete demolition (DP-2020-000377) was submitted in eCLIPSE to the Department of Licenses & Inspections on 29 April 2020.

The Historical Commission closed its office owing to the COVID pandemic on 18 March 2020 and cancelled its April Historical Commission meeting and March and April Committee on Historic Designation and Architectural Committee meetings. The Historical Commission announced that it would begin holding remote public meetings on 1 May 2020 and held its first public meeting, a Historical Commission meeting, on 8 May 2020. The Historical Commission was unable to issue notice letters announcing the considerations of designations between 18 March and 1 May 2020, owing to the shutdown and the inability to schedule public meetings.

The nomination was received by the Historical Commission on 13 April 2020. The notice letters announcing the consideration of the designation were sent on 15 May 2020.

The executive director and attorney for the Historical Commission met with the deputy director in charge of permitting at the Department of Licenses & Inspections to verify the permitting timeline. The new construction and demolition permit applications were filed with the Department of Licenses & Inspections on 15 and 29 April 2020, prior to the mailing of the notice letters on 15 May 2020. Therefore, the Department of Licenses & Inspections determined that it was not obligated to refer the permit applications to the Historical Commission for its review. The permit applications are currently under review at the Department of Licenses & Inspections and may be issued without the Historical Commission's approval.

The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination and recommended that the property at 4649 Umbria Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, as the nomination argues, and also satisfies Criterion I, the archaeology criterion, which is not mentioned in the nomination. It should be noted that the new construction permit application, which is not subject to the Historical Commission's review, proposes significant site work that may disturb archaeological artifacts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4649 Umbria Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, but it also recommends that the Historical Commission defer designating the property if it determines that a permit application for the new construction was filed prior to the issuance of the notice letters.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4649 Umbria Street satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission decline to designate the property because permit applications for the demolition of the existing structure and new construction were filed prior to the mailing of the notice letters.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:59:30

CHANGE OF COMMISSIONERS: David Perri, the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections, replaced his designee, Josh Lippert.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Attorney Sarah Alderfer, Marlene Schleifer, and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission received a request the previous day from attorney representing the nominator, Ridge Park Civic Association, asking that the Historical Commission continue the matter. The request, he elaborated, is to allow an investigation into the demolition permit application, to determine whether it was sufficiently stamped to constitute an application that predates the mailing of the notice letter. He clarified that the request does not provide a date to which the matter should be continued, but only requests that time be offered to allow the nominator to conduct an investigation of the permitting timeline. Mr. Farnham noted that he and Leonard Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, met with the Deputy Director at the Department of Licenses & Inspections to verify the timeline. He explained that the demolition permit application was applied for on 29 April 2020, and the notice letter was mailing approximately two weeks later on 15 May 2020. It is the City's position, he continued, that the permit application for demolition, as well as the new construction application that predates the demolition application, do not require the Historical Commission's review. He noted that the Historical Commission has the continuance request to consider and advised the commissioners to consider the request first before they consider the merits of the designation.
 - Mr. Reuter reiterated that there were a number of discussions with the Department of Licenses & Inspections, including the Deputy Director of Permitting and others involved with the applications. He stated that while he understands the basis for Ms. Alderfer's claim in her request for a continuance, what seems to be questioned is whether the Department of Licenses & Inspections should have issued the permit. He clarified that the preservation ordinance states that the Department shall not issue a permit for a property that has been designated or when notice of a nomination is mailed prior to the submission of a permit application. The issue here, he continued, is when the permit application was submitted, and he noted that it was the Department's determination that the application was submitted prior to notice of the nomination. Mr. Reuter stated that notice of the nomination was mailed fairly soon after receipt of the nomination by the Historical Commission staff. He stated that if the nominator has concerns about the Department's determination, they should appeal the issuance of the permit to the Board of License & Inspection Review.

He explained that the Historical Commission has the authority to designate the property, though the owner has an outstanding demolition permit, or it can assume the demolition will occur under the valid demolition permit and decline to designate. The issuance of the permit by the Department, he continued, is an issue for the Department and the Board of License & Inspection Review to decide. He commented that it is not up to this Commission to determine when a permit application was submitted.

- Mr. Thomas reiterated that Messrs. Reuter and Farnham have conferred with the Department to understand their determination and are conveying that the City's position is that application was made by the owner prior to the mailing of the notice letters by the Historical Commission. He further commented that the owner may take action on those permits. He stated that should the Commission designate the property, it would not offer any protection against demolition while the demolition permit remains valid. He added that it is not uncommon, especially in these difficult times, that work may not commence, and the permit may expire. If the building were to be designated, he continued, any new permit would need to be approved by the Historical Commission. He agreed that the Historical Commission could not opine on specifics of the permitting process, since the outcome must be determined solely by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. He asked that the Commission review the nomination.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that a continuance at this late date is inappropriate, especially given that he is satisfied with the staff's explanation that the application for the demolition permit predated the date notice of the nomination was mailed. He added that the request for the continuance should be denied.
- Mr. Reuter asked to hear from the attorney requesting the continuance to allow her the opportunity to respond to the discussion.
- Ms. Alderfer stated that the Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the property be designated under Criteria I and J. The issue, she continued, is that the demolition permit was filed at the end of April but was not issued until the end of July. She added that her concern is that the applications for demolition and new construction were filed to avoid designation.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to deny the request to continue the review of the nomination to a future Historical Commission meeting. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 4649 Umbria St MOTION: Deny continuation to future PHC meeting MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Perri (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

- Mr. Thomas asked to consider the merits of the nomination and requested public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mr. Beisert stated that individual nominations for several Jewelers' Row properties were tabled indefinitely by the Historical Commission until after the buildings were demolished under a valid demolition permit. He asked that a similar decision be made for this property.
- John Manton supported the nomination, noting that the immediate area is historic.
- Mason Carter supported the nomination.
- Hal Schirmer supported the nomination and requested that the Historical Commission not worry about what happens to a designated property following designation. He asked that the owners and neighbors be allowed to "fight it out."
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination and asked that the Historical Commission recognize the significance of the building by designating it. He acknowledged that there are valid permits and noted that the owner may act on those permits. Should the building be demolished, he continued, the designation could be rescinded. He added that, if the new construction project falls through, then the building could remain protected if the Commission moves forward with designation.
- Mary Spross, a near neighbor, supported the nomination, noting that many other neighbors support the designation of the property.
- Venise Whitaker supported the nomination.
- Ms. Schleifer stated that she contacted the owner to encourage him to retain the historic building and construct a smaller building at the rear. She asked the Historical Commission to designate the property.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- An attorney representing the nominator requested a continuance of the review of the nomination to a future Historical Commission meeting to allow time to verify the Department of Licenses & Inspections' determination regarding the filing of the demolition and new construction permits.
- The Department of Licenses & Inspections determined that the new construction and demolition permit applications were filed on 15 and 29 April 2020. The notice letters informing the property owner of the nomination were mailed on 15 May 2020.
- The Department of Licenses & Inspections determined that it was not obligated to refer the permit applications to the Historical Commission for its review, owing to the timeline of the filing of the permits and mailing of notice of the nomination. The permit applications are currently under review at the Department of Licenses & Inspections and may be issued without the Historical Commission's approval.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The demolition and new construction permits, once issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections, will be valid and the owner may act on those permits.
- Owing to its history as one of the oldest continually occupied buildings in Manayunk, the property has high potential for artifact deposits, satisfying Criterion I.
- The building and several prominent inhabitants over the course of a century contributed significantly to the neighborhood's growth and its current appearance, satisfying Criterion J.
- If the building is completely demolished under a valid demolition permit, it will no longer satisfy any Criteria for Designation, and its designation should be automatically rescinded.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4649 Umbria St satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the condition that the designation be automatically rescinded should the staff verify that the building has been completely demolished under a valid demolition permit. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 4649 Umbria St MOTION: Designate; Criteria I and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Perri (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

EMERGENCY MATTERS

ADDRESS: 1600-06 E BERKS ST

Proposal: Demolish building owing to necessity in the public interest

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1600 Berks LLC

Applicant: Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr

History: 1885-90, St. Laurentius Church, Edwin Forest Durang, architect

Individual Designation: 7/10/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the former St. Laurentius church building at 1600-06 E. Berks Street. Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance stipulates that:

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

This application contends that the Historical Commission should approve the demolition as necessary in the public interest to abate a dangerous condition that poses a threat to public safety. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building Unsafe in April 2015. The Historical Commission designated it in July 2015 over the objections of the owner, the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, who claimed that the building was in very poor condition and repairing it would be a hardship. A current owner purchased the church in January 2020.

In June 2020, the owner submitted an engineer's report to the Historical Commission and Department of Licenses & Inspections that indicates that the two towers are failing and pose a public safety hazard. In response to the report, the L&I Commissioner requested that the property owner provide a second engineer's report from an independent, qualified structural engineer. The second report was submitted in early July. It concurs with the findings of the first report and also provides a detailed history of the many recent engineering analyses of the building. After the second report confirmed the findings of the first, the L&I Commissioner requested that the Historical Commission consider the application on an expedited basis at its July 10 monthly meeting, without referral to the Architectural Committee, owing to a need to address the public safety concerns immediately. On July 9, the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections sent a letter to the Historical Commission explaining his request. The letter indicates that the danger posed by the building must be abated as soon as possible, especially before students return to the adjacent school and freeze/thaw cycles begin.

The Historical Commission considered the application at its July 10 meeting and after a lengthy presentation by the applicant, considerable debate by the Commissioners, and extensive public comment, the Commission voted to refer the application to the Architectural Committee for a recommendation.

Owing to the public safety hazard posed by the towers and the Historical Commission's decision to delay a decision to its meeting on August 14, the L&I Commissioner retained an independent engineer to evaluate the building. The Commissioner and the engineer inspected the building on July 24 and the Commissioner issued a letter with the engineer's report to the Historical Commission on July 27.

The Commissioner's letter contends that the Historical Commission should approve the demolition of both towers and that the demolition should be undertaken from the rear, through the sanctuary. He also states that structural bracing or scaffolding of the towers is not a practical alternative to removing the towers. He concludes that the focus should be on saving portions of the building for incorporation into a new building. While discussing his latest letter with the Historical Commission's staff, the Commissioner indicated that the north or front façade along Berks Street and the east or side façade along Memphis Street might be able to be saved and incorporated into a new building, but the rest of the church will need to be demolished to get to the towers from the south or rear along Wilt Street. The Commissioner states in his letter that owing to the tight dimensions of the site, adjacent buildings and narrow streets, the safest and most practical method to demolish the two towers is to stage the demolition from the south side. This approach however necessitates substantial demolition of the former sanctuary.

The Department of Licenses & Inspections is the City agency with the expertise and authority to determine when buildings poses threats to public safety. The Department has determined that this church building poses a hazard to public safety and that the hazard must be abated quickly with the demolition of the towers. The Historical Commission should accept the Department's determination on its face. The task before the Historical Commission and Architectural Committee is to determine whether there are reasonable alternatives when demolishing that might save some of the building while protecting public health, safety, and welfare. The Historical Commission and Architectural Committee should accept the Commissioner's assertion that the Historical Commission should approve the demolition of both towers and that the demolition should be undertaken from the rear, through the sanctuary.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:51:20

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Mattioni recused, owing to his law firm's representation of Holy Name Parish and St. Laurentius School, which have an agreement to salvage elements from the interior.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Mr. Farnham noted that Commissioner Perri of the Department of Licenses & Inspections is attending the meeting, taking his seat on the Historical Commission. He asked everyone to be respectful of the Commissioner's time, owing to other commitments he has later in the afternoon.
- Attorney Matt McClure, engineers Jan Vacca and Mark Coggin, and consultant Peter Angelides represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham noted that, during its previous reviews of this application, the Historical Commission and Architectural Committee accepted lengthy oral testimony as well as many written comments from numerous members of the public. He noted that much of that testimony was unrelated to the review of the application. He suggested that, when taking public testimony today, the Historical Commission apply Section 4.6.b of the Rules & Regulations, which states that "the Chair may impose reasonable limitations upon public participation to ensure relevance and to avoid excessive repetition," and limit public input today to the matters at hand such as the structural stability of the building, methods for abating the unsafe conditions with demolition and/or stabilization, the necessity or lack thereof of complete or partial demolition, the means and methods of removing and/or repairing the towers, and the feasibility, financial and otherwise, of the means of abatement. He noted that public comment is limited to three minutes per person and the staff will act as timekeeper during the review. Mr. Farnham explained that he had received an email from Hall Schirmer approximately 20 minutes ago, at 12:37 p.m., with eight attached files totaling 7MB commenting on today's application. He stated that he forwarded the email to the members of the Historical Commission. He opined that the submission fails to satisfy Section 4.6.b of the Rules & Regulations, which states that substantial testimony must be submitted seven calendar days before the meeting. He stated that there is no way for the Commissioners to digest that much material during the review. He stated that, in his opinion, the materials could be ignored because their submission fails to satisfy Section 4.6.b.
- Mr. McClure noted that the Historical Commission's minutes from the designation of the property indicate that Commissioner Cooperman was involved with the nomination and may be considered part of the nominating team. Mr. McClure observed that the nomination and nominators opined at the time of the designation on the structural condition of the building. He asserted that their statements at that time on the condition were false. He observed that Justin Spivey, who has been retained by the Preservation Alliance in the current matter, was also part of the nominating team and opined on the condition of the building at the time that it was

designated. He asked if it is appropriate for Ms. Cooperman, who served on the nominating team and opined on the condition of the building, to now sit in judgment of an application which makes claims about the condition of the building. Mr. McClure objected to Commissioner Cooperman's participation in the review. He stated that it is as if he represented a client at court and then sat on the appellate panel that reviewed the case. He stated that he is not alleging any violation of the code or ethics, but is claiming that there is the potential for bias.

- Leonard Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, explained that he vetted the issue with the City's Board of Ethics. He stated that the Board's attorney concluded that participating in the review would not violate local or state ethics rules, which are predicated on financial interests. He stated that participation would not violate ethics laws or rules. He stated that disclosure and recusal are not required in this case. He noted that he has requested a public opinion on this matter, but it has not yet been completed. He noted that Mr. McClure is not raising this as a matter of propriety and not the law, in which case Ms. Cooperman is able to make her own decision.
- Ms. Cooper stated that she was not a member of the "team." She stated that she did not work on the nomination, but instead wrote a letter regarding how the church satisfied the Criteria for Designation. She stated that she did not participate in any evaluation of the condition of the building. She stated that she was paid for the preparation of the letter.
- Mr. Reuter added that, even if Ms. Cooperman had worked on the nomination for compensation, participating in today's review would not constitute a conflict under the City's or state's ethics rules. He noted that the Commissioner no longer works for the company that prepared the letter.
- David Perri, the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections and a member of the Historical Commission, stated that the towers are unsafe and the deconstruction of the towers down to a safe level must begin as soon as possible. He recounted the recent history of the building. In June, engineers produced a report that recommended demolition of the two towers. He noted that, upon receipt of the report, he met with the engineers and staff of the Historical Commission and Law Department to investigate. He learned that the engineers recommended approaching the demolition of the towers from the south, through the sanctuary. He stated that he asked the property to retain another engineer for a second opinion. The second engineer produced a report dated 2 July 2020, which confirmed the findings of the first. The Department then hired its own consultant to consider the condition of the towers and the demolition sequencing. On 24 July 2020, Mr. Perri, his chief of emergency services, and the Department's independent engineer inspected the building. He stated that they confirmed that the brownstone cladding of the towers is not the problem. The structural schist backup stone is the problem. It is fractured and leaning by as much as two inches. The towers depend on the bond between the rubble stone and mortar and the mortar continues to deteriorate. The Department and its independent engineer agree with the owner's engineers that the two towers must be deconstructed as soon as possible to mitigate risk. The safest and most practical staging area and the possible fall zone are to the south, where the sanctuary is located. Mr. Perri noted, however, that the entire building does not need to be demolished to demolish the towers. He asserted that the main or Berks Street elevation should be saved and reused as part of a new development. Mr. Perri concluded that the Department recommends to the Historical Commission that it approve the demolition of the two towers to the watertable and the selective

- demolition of the remainder of the building as needed for the safe staging and demolition of the towers. At a minimum, the façade along Berks Street up to the gable should be retained and reused in any future building. The demolition and retention of building elements should be determined in consultation with the Department and the Historical Commission's staff. He emphasized that the towers must be deconstructed immediately for reasons of public safety. He stated that the Historical Commission must approve the demolition of the tower, but the Berks Street façade and perhaps the Memphis Street façade should be retained.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee unanimously concurred that the towers need to be demolished to the watertable. He explained that the Committee questioned the need to demolish the entire church to remove the towers. He asked if the demolition could be approached from the north, not the south. He asked if a demolition expert has been engaged. He asked for options to total demolition. He asked for a plan for the demolition sequencing.
 - Mr. Perri stated that the streets are narrow and the adjacent buildings are close. The church has no setback from the street. It is in a tight rowhouse environment. There is not enough room for a real collapse zone. He stated that his engineer agreed that demolition would need to proceed from the south, perhaps resulting in the demolition of the south and west walls and the roof. He stated that the front façade may need to be braced.
 - Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Perri's conclusions and approach.
 - Mr. McClure stated that he raised the issue about Ms. Cooperman because he had to preserve the argument, but added that he accepts Ms. Cooperman's statements and conclusion. He stated that he will not repeat his experts' testimony from the early meetings. Mr. McClure stated that his team has conferred with JPC, a noted demolition contractor, for advice on the demolition. He stated that everyone agrees that the fall zone must be to the south. He stated that it will delay the demolition by several months to require bracing of the front façade. He stated that protecting the front façade during demolition will require "substantial" bracing. Mr. McClure stated that it is impossible to have an iterative discussion between engineers at a virtual, public meeting. He suggested that the Historical Commission approve the application with the owner's engineers to work out the details with the Department and the Historical Commission's staff. He stated that his client is willing to try to save and salvage portions of the building, but noted that exigency is the issue, that exigency is limiting options. Mr. McClure stated that he reserves the right to file a financial hardship application; he noted that he did not file one because it takes months to prepare and time is of the essence. Mr. McClure questioned the submission of the engineering plan to stabilize the building by the Preservation Alliance at 4:30 p.m. of the afternoon before the meeting. He noted the seven-day rule and commented that the submission is clearly late, especially in light of the fact that the Historical Commission first heard the application over one month ago.
 - Ms. Vacca, structural engineer, introduced herself and reminded everyone that she had prepared a report on the condition of the building in June 2020. She reported that she met with the JPC Group, a demolition contractor, at the site on 3 August 2020. They inspected the church inside and out, including up into the towers. She stated that JPC is known for taking on complicated demolitions at urban sites and is certified by the City. She stated that the representatives of JPC said that the building is in the worst condition of any building they have inspected. They are concerned about failure of the structure, owing to the condition of the backup masonry, especially the mortar. They are worried about a collapse during demolition. She

- stated that nothing can be anchored to the towers during demolition. The JPC representatives stated that they may not allow any workers into the interior of the towers, owing to the dangerous conditions. They are also concerned about stabilizing the front façade on Berks Street. She stated that the stained glass windows should not be removed from the towers or front gable because the frames are providing some support. The JPC representatives stated that they would “harness” the towers so that any debris or collapse would be directed to the south. She stated that they would not attach to the towers, but would harness them. She stated that it would take four to six months to design and install bracing for the front gable. Ms. Vacca stated that she does not see any way to save any of the church in place. It will crumble when the demolition begins. The JPC representatives stated that they would want to demolish the church by hand from a crane, rather than from scaffolding. She stated again that nothing can be attached to the church. Ms. Vacca stated that the towers would be wrapped so that, if they fell, they would fall to the south. She stated that the design for that wrapping has not been undertaken.
- Mr. McClure asked Ms. Vacca to opine on the Plan B design to stabilize the towers. Ms. Vacca noted that the Plan B designers had not been in the church. She stated that there is no way to stabilize the towers in any sort of a permanent way with scaffolding. She stated that the Plan B scaffolding will not hold the towers during a collapse. She stated that the Plan B fall zone is insufficient. The fall zone should have a 135-foot radius.
 - Ms. Vacca stated that debris will fall to the south. Therefore, the remainder of the church likely cannot be saved. She again stressed the very poor condition of the building. She also stressed the need to be able to develop the demolition plan in conversation with the Department of Licenses & Inspections and the staff of the Historical Commission. Time is of the essence and will not allow an iterative approach with the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. Salvaging could be discussed during the demolition planning.
 - Mr. Coggin, another structural engineer retained by the property owner, stated that he has worked with Plan B in the past, but noted that there are flaws in their plan for stabilizing the towers, likely because they have not been in the building. He stated that normal pipe and tube scaffolding is not capable of supporting an uncontrolled collapse. Mr. Coggin stated that the scaffolding would fall if a collapse occurred. He stated that the scaffolding should not connect to the walls. He concluded that the Plan B scheme is not feasible. Mr. Coggin stated that the gable end is not tied back to the trusses. He stated that removal of the towers may result in a failure of the gable wall. The gable wall could begin to collapse above the windows and then fail all the way down to the watertable. Mr. Coggin stated that questions about the demolition could be resolved by working with the Department of Licenses & Inspections.
 - Mr. Farnham noted that Commissioner Stanford left the meeting at 1:00 p.m.
 - Mr. Perri asked Mr. McClure if the owner would commit to reconstructing the Berks Street gabled façade to its historic condition if it was damaged or removed during the demolition.
 - Mr. McClure stated that he can agree to salvaging materials and reusing them in a new building. When a new building is built at the site, it can be a homage to the historic church. However, we cannot commit to rebuilding the front façade because we have no idea what the financial implications would be and whether reconstruction would be economically viable.

- Mr. Coggin stated that some but not all of the brownstone may be able to be reused.
- Mr. McClure stated that they are committed to working with the Historical Commission on any new design as long as the property is listed on the Philadelphia Register.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that he retained Plan B to prepare the stabilization plan after the Architectural Committee meeting on 28 July 2020. He stated that he pondered requesting access to the building, but was pessimistic that it would be granted. Therefore, he did not request access to the building for his engineers. He noted, however, that they would accept access to the building if offered. He asked if the building can be made safe without demolishing it. He stated that demolition is an extreme approach. He claimed that the owner's engineers have not asserted that the entire building must be demolished. Mr. Steinke stated that the property can be stabilized and made safe, without demolition.
- Justin Spivey stated that he did not testify on the condition of the building when it was designated in 2015. He acknowledged that the building has been declared Unsafe, but he observed that it is not currently considered Imminently Dangerous. He asserted that it can be made safe. He stated that the exterior of the church can be scaffolded and the interior can be shored to prevent a collapse. He added that the scaffolding would not attach to the building, but would be in close contact. He stated that the towers will collapse downward, not outward. The Plan B fall zone is correct; the applicants' is not. He stated that stabilization should begin quickly. He noted that the towers have not yet collapsed. He asserted that the demolition to the south is not the only option. He stated that Plan B's scheme can be installed quickly and can provide time for additional investigation. He described Plan B's scheme as an exoskeleton around the towers. Stabilization is feasible and responsible. It will allow time for less destructive alternatives.
- Phillip Rennie of Plan B Engineering stated that his company specializes in stabilizing fragile buildings. He stated that the demolition of these towers should not be uncontrolled, owing to the nearby buildings. He asserted that the applicants were planning an uncontrolled demolition. He contended that they planned to push the towers into the sanctuary to the south. He objected to such a plan. He stated that the houses should be evacuated and the electrical lines moved before any demolition takes place. The safe zone should be secured and monitored. He stated that platforms should be built over the nearby houses and streets. He said that a self-supporting scaffolding structure can be erected to cradle the towers. The towers should be shored from the interior. Portions of the building may need to be removed. Once the towers are stabilized, they can be inspected to see if they can be repaired or need to be demolished.
- Paul Steinke asked to allow Guy Laren and Vivek Tomer to speak. Both were unmuted to speak, but neither responded. The Commission's Zoom administrator called upon them several times to speak, but neither spoke. Mr. Steinke stated that Mr. Laren rehabilitated a church in West Philadelphia. Mr. Laren would also consider purchasing St. Laurentius. Mr. Steinke stated that Mr. Laren believes that he can feasibly rehabilitate the church.
- Andrew Miller, a neighbor, spoke of the dangers of demolition, and provided the 22nd and Market Street collapse as an example. He stated that the owner should stabilize the building.

- Dana Fedeli stated that the owner should post signs that alert people to the danger. She stated that the building is “a solid structure.” The Architectural Committee’s recommendation should be adopted.
- Mason Carter stated that this is a case of demolition by neglect. He supported the approach of the Preservation Alliance and engineer Justin Spivey.
- Kevin Brett stated that the applicant has not submitted “a code-compliant demolition plan.” Mr. Brett lodged many complaints about the owner’s behavior. He asserted that this is a case of demolition by neglect. He objected to demolition and asserted that the Historical Commission should require stabilization.
- Guy Laren explained that he renovated a church in West Philadelphia. He stated that he has never been in St. Laurentius but believes that there might be a way to save it.
- Jeanne Curtis tried to speak but experienced technical problems and was largely unintelligible. She stated that cell phone antennas and emergency services radio antennas should be installed on the church.
 - Several Commissioners stated that Ms. Curtis was largely unintelligible and what they could hear was not relevant.
- John Scott stated that he is a neighbor and a neighborhood representative. He stated that the neighbors support reuse. He claimed that the applicants are proposing an “uncontrolled demolition.” He claimed that no safety precautions are being taken. He asked the Historical Commission to deny the application in order to protect the public. He stated that the building should be stabilized.
- Jim Duffin stated that the complete demolition permit application should be denied. A partial demolition may be acceptable.
- Vivek Tomer stated that the complete demolition permit application should be denied. Stabilization or partial demolition should be required.
- Oscar Beisert recommended that the Historical Commission deny the demolition to compel the property owner to stabilize the building and then deconstruct and reconstruct the towers.
- Hal Schirmer stated that the towers should be rebuilt for cell phone antennas. He said that the towers at St. John the Evangelist were rebuilt. He claimed that insurance should cover all of the costs. He asserted that the Archdiocese of Philadelphia should pay for the repair. Mr. Schirmer discussed the zoning of the site. He stated that the towers should be hand-demolished and reconstructed.
- Venise Whitaker objected to any demolition. The “Philly Fishtown people” matter. She asked the Historical Commission to vote “No.”
- David Traub was unmuted, but never spoke. He was called upon several times, but never spoke.
- Mr. Farnham announced that the public comment period had ended.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas invited the applicants to respond to the public comment.
- Ms. Vacca stated that Plan B’s scheme would not work with simple scaffolding, which could not resist the forces. She stated that holding up the building would require a very substantial steel structure with very substantial footings or foundations.
- Ms. Vacca stated that the applicants have never suggested that the demolition would be an uncontrolled demolition. Any claims that it would be are incorrect. She stated that they would design the demolition with safety as the first priority. She stated that they would have a plan in place during demolition in case the towers did collapse to ensure that they collapsed safely, but they are not intending to cause the towers to

collapse. She stated that scaffolding or girdling would be used to direct any unintended collapse to the south, but the demolition would be designed to avoid a collapse at all costs. She stated that she would never be a proponent of uncontrolled demolition.

- Ms. Vacca stated that she agrees with the City's engineer that the towers cannot be stabilized in the interior because there is very little access to masonry in the interior. She stated that she has not yet laid out a safety plan or a demolition plan. She stated that it is not feasible to build structural steel bracing for the towers. It would not be safe to place workers in the interior of the towers to attach the bracing.
- Ms. Vacca stated that she agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro, the contractor on the Architectural Committee, who asserted that the towers could not be stabilized in place, but had to be demolished.
 - Mr. Coggin added that Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that there is no way to tie the cladding to the backup stone and that the problems with the backup stone and its deteriorated mortar cannot be repaired in place.
- Mr. Coggin stated that they never suggested an uncontrolled demolition. They have always stated that the demolition would be controlled and would happen by hand.
- Mr. Coggin stated that the owner just took possession of the property this year. Claims of demolition by neglect are not viable.
- Mr. Coggin stated that no amount of additional study and no expenditure on stabilization will result in any other conclusion than the fact that the towers need to be demolished. The towers must be demolished to make them safe. Designing and installing scaffolding will take four to six months, during which time the building will remain at risk of collapse. Mr. Coggin also objected to Mr. Steinke's suggestion that the brownstone cladding could be removed and reinstalled. He stated that the primary problems are with the backup masonry, which has failed. The steeples must be removed and the towers must be demolished to make the building safe.
- Mr. Coggin stated that this building satisfies the definition of "Imminently Dangerous" in the Philadelphia Code. Ms. Vacca agreed.
- Mr. Thomas stated that, in his experience, scaffolding would not support these towers. Significant structural steel with large foundations would be required.
 - Ms. Vacca responded that there is no way to stabilize these towers in place. It is not possible. They must be demolished and could then be rebuilt. During the demolition of the towers, they will need to be harnessed so that an unexpected collapse can be directed. She concluded that scaffolding could not be used to harness or stabilize this building.
- Mr. Angelides, the applicant's economist, stated that nothing that Messrs. Laren and Tomer offered changed his mind about the economic viability of a rehabilitated St. Laurentius. He stated that they presented no cost information regarding the rehabilitation of St. Laurentius. He stated that they provided no comparisons between St. Laurentius and the church in West Philadelphia that Mr. Laren reused. Mr. Laren did not acknowledge that he has demolished historic buildings to flip properties. Mr. Laren was incorrect when he claimed that he had asked for entry into St. Laurentius; he never requested access to the building. Mr. Angelides stated that Mr. Rennie made no estimates of the costs to implement the Plan B scheme. Mr. Angelides stated that adding \$1 or \$2 million to stabilize and study St. Laurentius would make the project that much more expensive and that much less feasible.
 - Mr. Thomas stopped Mr. Angelides testimony, asserting that financial hardship is not relevant to today's discussion. Mr. McCoubrey agreed.

- Mr. McClure disagreed, arguing that feasibility determinations are central to the discussion. The Historical Commission cannot require an action like stabilization that is illusory. He asserted that financial information is relevant when reviewing necessary in the public interest applications. Exigency is the key in this situation. Mr. McClure stated that he could have submitted a financial hardship application, but it would have taken months to prepare. The hazard posed by the building does not allow for a many months-long process.
- Mr. McClure stated that the dangerous condition posed by the building must be abated immediately. He stated that Mr. Perri's suggestion that his engineers and demolition contractor work with the Department of Licenses & Inspections and the Historical Commission's staff to determine which parts of the building can be saved or salvaged is a reasonable one. He stated that he doubts that the Berks Street façade can be saved.
- Mr. Perri stated that the engineers retained by the Preservation Alliance mischaracterized the statement by the City's engineer, Urban Engineers, about the structural bracing that is needed before demolition. Mr. Perri read from the Urban Engineers report and stated that the bracing it recommends can be considered "belts and suspenders" for the demolition that would direct any unintended collapse during the demolition into the church building and away from the streets and other buildings. Mr. Perri then stated that the applicants have made this more difficult because they have refused to agree to preserve any part of the main façade of the building that means so much to the community. He stated that the applicants should do everything in their power to save building components that are meaningful to the community.
- Mr. Farnham noted for the record that Commissioner Washington left the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The former St. Laurentius Church building is historically significant and important to the Fishtown community.
- The church building is Unsafe and poses an imminent threat to public health, safety, and welfare, owing to the possibility that the towers may collapse.
- The towers of the church building must be demolished to abate the danger. The towers cannot be feasibly stabilized or repaired in place.
- Other sections of the church building may need to be demolished to safely stage and undertake the demolition of the towers
- The Berks Street façade is the primary façade of the church building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The demolition of the towers of the church building and the selective demolition of other sections of the building for the safe staging and demolition of the towers is necessary in the public interest, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

ACTION: Mr. Perri moved to approve the application as necessary in the public interest, provided the demolition is limited to the two towers above the watertable and other sections of the building as needed for the safe staging and demolition of the towers; and the façade along Berks Street up to the projected gable line is protected during the demolition or reconstructed in kind; with the demolition sequencing and preservation of other building elements to be

determined in consultation with the Department of Licenses & Inspections and the staff of the Historical Commission; pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1, with one abstention.

ITEM: 1600-06 E Berks St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Perri SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards			X		
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Perri (L&I)	X				
Mattioni				X	
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)		X			
Stanford (Commerce)					X (departed meeting at 1:00 pm)
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X (departed meeting at 2:30 pm)
Total	8	1	1	1	2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 06:20:50

ACTION: At 3:25 p.m., Ms. Cooperman moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adjournment					
MOTION: Adjourn					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Perri (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

PLEASE NOTE:

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