

**THE MINUTES OF THE 691ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 MARCH 2020
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Thomas, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:11 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*		*Remotely
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		
Melissa Long (Division of Housing & Community Development)	X		
John Mattioni, Esq.	X*		*Remotely
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair	X		
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X*		*Remotely
H. Ahada Stanford, Ph.D. (Commerce Department)		X	
Betty Turner, MA, Vice Chair		X	
Kimberly Washington, Esq.	X*		*Remotely

* Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, four Commissioners participated in the meeting remotely using Zoom video and audio conferencing software. The Commissioners participating remotely could hear and participate in the discussions in the meeting room via an audio link and could see the images projected on the screen in the meeting room via a video link, but could not see or be seen by the participants in the room.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan E. Farnham, Ph.D., 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 were present:

Paul Jaskot
Anna Maria Jaskot
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Katherine Missimer
Chwen-Ping Wang, Sky Design
Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design, Inc.
Ray Rola, Raymond F. Rola, Architect
Kirsten Kimberg
Nancy Lan
John Lan
Van Chiu
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer
Daniel Torgeman
Eli Alon
Niv Alon
David Fineman, Esq., Fineman Kreckstein & Harris PC
Chaim Gelford
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
German Yakubov
Mary Kessler
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Shayne Shaefer

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 690TH STATED MEETING, 14 FEBRUARY 2020

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:03:00

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners if they had any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 690th Stated Meeting, held 14 February 2020. None were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ACTION: Mr. Hartner moved to approve the minutes of the 690th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 February 2020. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adoption of Minutes, 690th Stated Meeting					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Hartner					
SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

ADDRESS: 123-29 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Install metal entry arch and exterior lighting

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 123-29 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Group G LLC

History: 1903; Corn Exchange National Bank; Newman, Woodman & Harris, architects; alterations/additions, Horace Trumbauer, 1912, 1929, 1931

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create a main entrance for the offices at 123 Chestnut Street. The building is occupied retail and offices uses. The entrance to the upper business floors is located on 2nd Street and is the focus of this application. The intent of the proposed design is to direct attention to this primary entry point for visitors and delivery people.

The proposed construction would take place at the sidewalk area only. Excepting the restoration of the doors and molding, the proposed work would not alter the historic fabric.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct limestone base with card access reader.
- Restore wood entry doors.
- Install three stainless steel tube arches.
- Install bollards in sidewalk.
- Install bluestone paving in the sidewalk area near entrance with stainless steel lettering embedded into the bluestone.
- Install exterior lighting.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The proposed work would not remove distinctive materials or alter character-defining features. It would have minimal impact to the spaces and spatial relationships of the historic property, satisfying Standard 2.
- *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 proposed work including the paving elements, bollards, and limestone base is differentiated from but compatible with the historic building, satisfying Standard 9.
 - Additional information about the lighting design and scheme, materials, and detailing of the vertical elements should be provided to determine if the proposed work is compatible with the architectural features of the historic building.

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed work is fully reversible. Since the construction is focused on the sidewalk area, if it were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the design of the vertical tube arches and exterior lighting is further developed to ensure compatibility with the historic building and district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

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

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:04:50

PRESENTERS: Mr. Thomas presented the continuance request and asked if any Commissioners or members of the audience wished to comment. No one offered comments.

DISCUSSION: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Mr. Hartner moved to continue the review of the application for 123-29 Chestnut Street to the May 2020 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 123-29 CHESTNUT ST MOTION: Continue review to May PHC mtg MOVED BY: Hartner SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 2501-61 N 15TH ST

Name of Resource: Thirteenth & Fifteenth Street Passenger Railway Company's Depot, Car House, & Stable

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Tag CG Philadelphia LLC

Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2501-61 N 15th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Thirteenth & Fifteenth Street Passenger Railway Company's Depot, Car House, and Stable satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the Thirteenth & Fifteenth Street Passenger Railway Company is an early and significant example of the evolution and development of passenger railway companies, and public transit in Philadelphia. The facility was expanded as public transit moved from horse cars, to cable cars, to motorized buses. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the expansion of public transit was one reason for the residential development of this area of North Philadelphia, exemplifying the historical heritage of the community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2501-61 N 15th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2501-61 N. 15th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, and that the property should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:05:22

PRESENTERS: Mr. Thomas presented the continuance request and asked if any Commissioners or members of the audience wished to comment. No one offered comments.

DISCUSSION: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Mr. Hartner moved to continue the review of the nomination of 2501-61 N 15th St to the July 2020 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. Lenard-Palmer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 2501-61 N 15th ST

MOTION: Continue review to July 2020 PHC mtg

MOVED BY: Hartner

SECONDED BY: Lenard-Palmer

VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 1132 MARLBOROUGH ST

Name of Resource: Jacob Souder House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Adam and Jeremy Margent

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 1132 Marlborough Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criterion for Designation J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the Jacob Souder house, a two-and-a-half-story wooden house constructed c. 1810, represents one of the few surviving frame buildings typical of Fishtown's foundational development.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1132 Marlborough Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1132 Marlborough Street satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J.

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:05:49

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas presented the continuance request and asked if any Commissioners or members of the audience wished to comment. No one offered comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Mr. Hartner moved to continue the review of the nomination of 1132 Marlborough Street to the April 2020 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1132 MARLBOROUGH ST MOTION: Continue review to April PHC mtg MOVED BY: Hartner SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

JEWELERS' ROW HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Jewelers' Row Historic District and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The proposed district is located on Sansom Street primarily between S. 7th and S. 8th Street, and along a portion of S. 8th Street between Chestnut and Walnut Streets. The nomination contends that the proposed district, which is composed of 57 buildings constructed between 1800 and 2015, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, G, H and J.

Under Criteria A and J, the nomination states that as the site of Carstairs Row, Printers' Row, and Jewelers' Row, the district has significant character, interest and value as part of the development, heritage, and cultural characteristics of Philadelphia and exemplifies the community's cultural, economic, and historical heritage. In support of Criteria C and D, the nomination asserts that the architectural resources of Jewelers' Row span more than two hundred years and include significant examples of multiple building types and architectural styles important to Philadelphia's history, including (but not limited to) Federal rowhouses, Victorian and early 20th-century commercial lofts, and Depression-era and postwar commercial fronts. The district includes surviving works by a number of architects whose careers have significantly influenced the architectural development of the City, including Thomas Carstairs, Collins & Autenrieth, Theophilus P. Chandler, Frank T. Watson, Louis Magaziner, and possibly even Frank Furness, supporting an argument for Criterion E. Furthermore, under Criteria H and

G, the nomination contends that owing to its unique location along a block of Sansom Street offset from Center City's otherwise regular grid and distinguished by an iconic and distinctive streetscape, the district represents an established and familiar visual feature of Philadelphia and constitutes a distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural and architectural motif.

Since the Historical Commission notified property owners of its intent to consider the historic district, five buildings in the proposed district have been completely demolished. The property owners of 702, 704, 706, and 710 Sansom Street and 128 S. 7th Street submitted demolition permit applications to the Department of Licenses & Inspections prior to the start of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction, vesting their rights in the permits. The Historical Commission did not have the authority to review the demolition permit applications. The demolition permits were issued and the buildings were demolished in accordance with the law. The properties are now vacant lots.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Jewelers' Row Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, G, H and J. The staff recommends updating 113-15 S. 8th Street as a non-contributing addition to 731 Sansom Street. The staff recommends categorizing all buildings as Significant, Contributing or Non-Contributing without separate determinations for façades and storefronts. The staff recommends classifying 702, 704, 706, and 710 Sansom Street and 128 S. 7th Street as non-contributing because they are vacant lots.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Jewelers' Row Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H and J; all buildings should be classified as Significant, Contributing or Non-Contributing, without separate sub-classifications for façades and storefronts; and 113-15 S. 8th Street should be classified as a Non-contributing addition to 731 Sansom Street.

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:06:10

PRESENTERS:

- Attorney Michael Phillips represented the majority of property owners.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas presented the continuance request and asked if any Commissioners or members of the audience wished to comment. He noted that the request came jointly from the owners, nominator, and Councilman Squilla.
- Mr. Lippert asked how many times the nomination has been continued.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that the nomination has now been reviewed by the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Mr. Farnham reiterated that the continuance request comes at the behest of the property owners, nominator, and Councilman Squilla, who will be meeting with all parties to try to reach an agreement.
- Ms. Cooperman opined that, given the difficult review at the Committee on Historic Designation, it is welcome news that the nominator and owners are in conversation and Councilman Squilla is mediating.
- Ms. Sanchez reiterated that Councilman Squilla is scheduling and mediating a meeting between the parties.

- Mr. Phillips noted that the owners, staff of the Preservation Alliance, and Councilman Squilla met and plan to continue discussions in the coming weeks.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Mr. Hartner moved to continue the review of the nomination of the Jewelers' Row Historic District to the May 2020 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: JEWELERS' ROW HISTORIC DISTRICT MOTION: Continue review to May PHC mtg MOVED BY: Hartner SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 FEBRUARY 2020

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:08:49

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 applications for 530 N. 19th Street, 229 Arch Street, 336 S. 17th Street, and 2132 Spruce Street. Mr. Lenard-Palmer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA MOTION: Adopt the Consent Agenda MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Lenard-Palmer					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 530 N 19TH ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Benjamin A. Horst and Denny R. Kwak

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects LLC

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house on top of the main block of this twin house. An application proposing a roof deck and standard-height pilot house, in addition to other exterior alterations, was reviewed by the Historical Commission in January 2020. At that time, the Commission voted to approve most elements of the application, but deny the deck, pilot house, and deck railing, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9. This current application has been submitted in response, and proposes a pilot house that has been reduced in footprint and height, and a deck railing that has been set back from the north property line to the location that the staff has identified as “inconspicuous” from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install roof deck and low pilot house.

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, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportions and massing to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed deck and low pilot house complies with Standard 9. The height of the pilot house has been reduced and the railing has been pulled back so that both are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- *Roofs Guideline, Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*
 - The deck and pilot house would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and would not damage or obscure character-defining features.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval of a wider deck provided the deck rail and HVAC unit are set back behind the front face of the stair house, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 510 E WILDEY ST

Proposal: Demolish chimney; alter rear ell; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mary MacLeod

Applicant: German Yakubov, Haverford Square Designs LLC

History: 1855; William Cramp frame house

Individual Designation: 2/28/1967

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The William Cramp frame house is part of a row of four mid-nineteenth-century frame buildings located on E. Wildey Street in Fishtown. Each building includes a two-story main block with a front-sloping half-gable roof and a two-story rear ell. At some point in the past, all four frame buildings were clad in stucco. The massing and form of the buildings largely remain intact, though the majority of the buildings have acquired one-story additions to their rear ells.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Level roof over two-story portion of rear ell;
- Demolish one-story rear addition;
- Construct two-story addition with balcony;
- Demolish chimney; and,
- Install windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - This application proposes to level the roof over the two-story portion of the rear ell to create useable space at the interior. The roof currently peaks at the east where it attaches to the rear ell of 512 E. Wilkey Street and slopes west. At the lowest point, the interior height is currently 5-feet 7-inches. To achieve additional height at the interior, the roof would be demolished, and the east wall raised. The existing exterior east wall would remain. Most of the rear ell is not visible from the street. The work would alter the roofline but would maintain the existing fabric of the east wall and complies with this standard.
 - The application further proposes to demolish the non-original one-story rear addition and to construct a two-story addition in its place. The proposed two-story addition complies with this standard.
 - The chimney, located on the main block of the building, would be demolished. The removal of the chimney does not comply with this standard.
 - New one-over-one double-hung windows would be installed at the front façade. Wood windows in the historic configuration should be installed to comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the removal of the chimney, but approval of the remaining work, provided that a material such as HardiePlank siding is used to clad the addition and that the front façade windows are an appropriate material and configuration, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:10:28

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Designer German Yakubov and owner Mary MacLeod represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The design includes no differentiation between the original portion of the building and the proposed addition.
- The application proposes to raise the roof of the rear ell, but does not preserve any part of the slope, which is an original condition of the ell.
- The main block of the building would remain intact, and only window replacement is proposed at the front façade.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- While it may be possible to raise the roof of the rear ell and construct an addition, the proposed design is not sensitive to the original character of the building and does not satisfy Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 510 E WILDEY ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 229 ARCH ST

Proposal: Construct addition over parking lot

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Berger Development LP

Applicant: Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola, Architect

History: 1913; Berger Brothers Company; Valentine B. Lee, architect; expanded, 1918

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The building fronting 229 Arch Street, historically known as the Berger Building, was built in two sections. The first was constructed circa 1913 and the second circa 1918. A four-story addition was constructed at the rear of the building in 1990 connecting it to 124 Bread Street, historically known as the Johnson Warehouse, and 234 and 236 Cherry Street. All lots and buildings were consolidated in the early 1990s into a single tax parcel known today as 229 Arch Street.

This application proposes to construct a four-story addition over an existing parking lot at the rear of 229 Arch Street. The new construction will include three stories of residential living space over an open level of parking.

The new addition will connect to existing buildings at the north, south, and west elevations (see Image 2). It will cover the east wall of the 1990s addition and be connected internally. The east wall of the 1990s addition will not be demolished as part of this project. The new addition connects to the historic Berger Building and Johnson Warehouse to the north and south. These connections will be as party walls only, with no internal connections. The new addition will only be visible from Bread Street.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct a four-story addition in existing parking area.
- Create open parking area on first level with three levels of residential living space above.
- Clad exterior façade with red brick to match existing.
- Install double-hung wood windows with a six-over-six sash configuration.
- Create window openings detailed with cast stone lintels and sills.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The proposed addition has limited impact to the Berger Building and Johnson Warehouse.
 - The rear of the Berger Building has been altered previously with a stair tower and 1990s addition.
 - There are no existing openings on the south elevation of the Johnson Warehouse that will be impacted by the new addition. Historic maps show this was once a party wall to a building that has since been demolished.
- *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 proposed six-over-six window sash configurations reflect an earlier time period than the construction dates of the historic buildings on the parcel.
 - The red brick is proposed to match the historic
 - The open parking area is incompatible with the historic property and district.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The new addition will be primarily connected to the 1990s addition. It will use the Berger Building and Johnson Warehouse as party walls. In the future, this addition (and the 1990s addition) could be removed and the essential form and integrity of the historic buildings would be unimpaired.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the first level parking is screened with brick or compatible material; the red brick cladding on the addition is compatible but not matching; and

the proposed windows are a one-over-one double-hung, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the first level parking is screened with a low base or other screen; the trash area is enclosed with screening; the red brick cladding is compatible but not matching; and the windows are a one-over-one, double-hung, aluminum-clad windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 336 S 17TH ST

Proposal: Construct pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lia Gentile

Applicant: Jack Burns Jr., Jack Burns Architecture

History: 1840; alterations, c. 1900

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND: This application proposes to construct a roof deck with a 7'-3" setback from the front façade and a pilot house. There is no setback proposed at the rear of the roof. A standing seam metal roof and Hardie cement siding are proposed for the pilot house. A metal picket railing system is proposed to enclose the deck.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construction of a new roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

- *Roofs Guideline: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*
 - Though the work proposed in this application does not appear to damage or obscure character-defining features, the railing and pilot house would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way, owing to the building's location at the corner of 17th and Panama Streets. Therefore, the work proposed in the application does not satisfy the Guideline.
- *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.*
 - Owing to the inconspicuousness of the proposed railing and pilot house, the work proposed in this application would not protect the integrity of the property and its environment and therefore would not satisfy Standard 9.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval provided the deck is set back from the front façade to align with the pilot house; the height of the pilot house roof is minimized; the structural beams are revised on the Panama Street side to reduce visibility; and the back of the deck is moved away from the rear wall, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1829 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Legalize windows and stucco at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: L&Y Investment LLC

Applicant: Yan Chiu, RJ Construction LLC

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This contributing Italianate townhouse within the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District dates to about 1870.

In August 2019, the applicant requested that the Historical Commission approve a building permit application in order to close out a violation with the Department of Licenses & Inspections related to the application of stucco at the side and rear. During the review of that permit application, the staff learned that, in addition to the stucco work, the windows and door at the rear of the property had also been replaced without a permit. The applicant was advised that the Historical Commission would need to review the entire scope of unpermitted work for approval.

The Historical Commission's file for this property includes three approved building permit applications for interior work from 2017 and 2018. None cover the exterior work. The applicant seeks to legalize the stucco that was applied to the rear and side of the building, as well as the windows and door at the rear.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Legalize stucco at the side and rear of building.
- Legalize replacement windows at the rear of property.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - The brick cladding is a character-defining feature of this property. The Historical Commission would not have approved an application to apply stucco at the rear and side. The stucco fails to meet this standard.

- *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 windows and door that were installed do not replicate the historic features in design, color, texture, and materials and therefore fail to satisfy this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:25:36

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Contractor Yan Chiu represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The size of the window openings at the rear was altered at the time the windows were replaced and the stucco was applied without a permit.
- The existing stucco was applied illegally over exposed masonry walls at the sides and rear of the subject property.
- The rear of the subject property faces a well-used block of Manning Street.
- The applicant could still apply for the make-safe permit in order to address the failing stucco at the side wall, while working with the staff to resolve the illegal work that had been done to the windows and the stucco at the Manning Street-facing wall.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The illegal alterations made to the masonry openings and to the originally exposed brick fail to satisfy Standards 5 and 6.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1829 Spruce Street MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 2132 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Replace roofing, skylight, and roof hatch

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jonathan and Kirsten Kimberg

Applicant: Kirsten Kimberg

History: 1889; Furness, Evans & Co., architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: This Victorian Eclectic townhouse within the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District is attributed to architect Frank Furness and is classified as significant in the district.

In 2013 the owner submitted an in-concept application for guidance about appropriate substitute roofing materials to replace the surviving historic terra cotta roof tiles. The application was withdrawn prior to the Architectural Committee meeting. The staff approved an application in 2015 for work to the existing skylights.

The applicant is now applying to replace the existing terra cotta tiles at the front section of the roof with Certainteed Carriage House asphalt roofing shingles in a color called Brick Red. The replacement of an existing skylight and roof access hatch are also proposed. The skylight and hatch are not visible from the street.

The applicant argues that there would be a savings of approximately 61% according to quotes received for the in-kind replacement of the terra cotta tiles versus the use of the Certainteed Carriage House shingle. The applicant has provided information about the dimensions and appearance of the existing terra cotta tiles. The proposed Certainteed Carriage House shingle does not exactly match the terra cotta but it generally replicates its appearance.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Replace terra cotta tile roof with Certainteed Carriage House shingle in Brick Red.
- Replace sky light and roof access hatch.

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.*
 - Standard 6 requires that the replacement element match the historic material "where possible." Of course, anything is possible with enough money. The standard includes the phrase "where possible" to allow for some discretion with regard to replacement materials. The question in this case is whether the public benefit of the replacement with real terra cotta justifies the significantly higher cost.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the replacement of the skylight and roof access hatch. The staff defers to the Architectural Committee regarding whether it is "possible" to replace the existing terra cotta tiles with new terra cotta.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the capping and flashings match the historic details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 242 DELANCEY ST

Proposal: Demolish rear addition; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul and Annamaria Jaskot

Applicant: Kevin Davey, Hanson Fine Building

History: 1780; Roof 1875; Restored 1960

Individual Designation: 6/30/1959

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

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

OVERVIEW: This three-story building, constructed in 1780 and located midblock on Delancey Street, is considered significant in the Society Hill Historic District. The building was completely rehabilitated in the Second Empire style about 1880; the front façade was clad in scored stucco, the window openings were altered, and a mansard was added. The front façade was reconstructed to its eighteenth-century appearance in the early 1960s. The front slope of the roof on the main block was restored with a dormer, but the rear slope was not; the rear roof on the main block is a flat roof at the four-floor level, a remnant of the former mansard. A small portion of the rear of the building is minimally visible through the shared alley between it and 244 Delancey Street. The existing rear ell is three stories in height and clad in brick with areas of stucco. Several small modern additions have been constructed at the rear ell and the first floor has been stuccoed. The brick of the rear ell includes many scars and several types of

brick, likely resulting from infill and addition. The front section of the rear ell, nearest the main block, appears to be original. Historic maps show that a large, rear addition was constructed between 1874 and 1885, during which time the building acquired its current footprint. The rear addition likely coincides with the new front façade and mansard. It is likely that a third story was added to the original rear ell at that time. While no work is proposed to the front façade, this application seeks to demolish most of the rear ell and construct a three-story brick addition with pilot house.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish rear ell, with the retention of party wall and portions of rear wall of main block;
- Construct three-story rear addition with pilot house.

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 demolish the historic rear ell and construct a new addition in its place. The historic ell was constructed in two phases, with the most recent phase dating to c. 1880. While the new ell would largely replicate the old in materials, scale, massing, and size, it would destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The proposed work does not comply with this standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions or adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be impaired.*
 - The demolition of the existing rear ell and construction of a new addition would result in the loss of a significant amount of historic fabric. If the new construction were removed in the future, the building would not retain its essential form or integrity. The work does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:36:06

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller and Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Liesl Geiger, attorney Carl Primavera, and owners Paul and Annamaria Jaskot represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association submitted a written statement. He noted that the association did not oppose the application, owing to the information

provided by the project team and the staff of the Historical Commission, and to the lack of opposition by the immediate neighbors.

- Neighbor Winston Clement submitted a written statement. He commented that he supports the demolition and reconstruction of the rear of 242 Delancey Street, owing to the large size of the existing ell and its proximity to the property line.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building had been altered from its eighteenth-century appearance to a later nineteenth-century building with the construction of a mansard and changes at the rear in the 1870s or 1880s. The front facade was restored to its historic appearance in the 1960s, but the rear ell was not. The rear ell was altered and added to many times in the twentieth century.
- While most of the front façade retains original material, the front section of the roof on the main block was removed and reconstructed to its original pitch with a front dormer; however, the rear pitch of the roof of the main block was not restored and retains its mansard-era shape.
- The building's rear ell retains no visible original brick and has been repeatedly modified over time, with sections of nineteenth and twentieth-century brick.
- Most window openings at the rear have been altered, and several small additions have been constructed.
- The rear ell was originally two stories and has since been raised to three stories.
- During a site visit, the Historical Commission staff detected no eighteenth-century material at the rear ell and found that the ell largely reflects the mansard period of the late nineteenth-century with several nineteenth and twentieth-century modifications.
- The changes undertaken during the Redevelopment Authority era fall within the period of significance of the Society Hill Historic District.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Demolition of the rear ell would remove non-original late-nineteenth- and twentieth-century material. It would not impact the original eighteenth-century material, which is limited to the main block. The proposed work satisfies Standard 9.
- The proposed addition reduces the mass and returns the ell more closely to its original size, further satisfying Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, with the staff review details, including the size and configuration of the windows of the addition, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 242 DELANCEY ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 260 S 20TH ST

Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Su Bin Jiang and Bo Meng Lin

Applicant: Chwen-Ping Wang, Sky Design

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to demolish the rear wall of the main block and three-story rear ell and replace it with a three-story addition. The addition is proposed to cover the width of the property. Historic maps show that the 1860 building originally had a one-story rear wing (see Figure 1). The existing rear ell was added between 1860 and 1895 (see Figure 2).

The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier version of this application in August 2019 and Historical Commission in September 2019. The Historical Commission voted to deny the application, owing to its incompleteness. The Commission's findings and conclusions were as follows:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The rear ell is not visible from any public right-of-way.
- Historic rear ells can be character-defining features of buildings, even if not visible from the street.
- The proposed scope includes removing the entire rear wall of the main block. It was noted by the Commission that the removal of the full rear wall of the building constitutes a demolition. Because of the lack of the detailed information in the

application, the Commission could not determine if the proposed scope of work constituted an alteration or demolition.

- The new addition will be wider than original ell and will cover entire rear of building and extend rear property line.
- The application is not complete. The drawings and photographs do not communicate fully what currently exists, current conditions, what is being removed, and what the new construction would look like.
- The application requires additional information to fully evaluate the proposed scope of work. Existing condition drawings (elevations and plans) and existing condition photographs should be submitted for review. The Commission must be able to understand what currently exists on the rear ell including information such as window and door openings and overall condition. More fully developed drawings of the new addition should be submitted as well.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application does not provide enough information to fully assess whether the proposed scope of work does or does not comply with the Standards.
- The staff should visit the site and document the rear of the building.
- The application should be revised to provide explicitly the current state of the rear of the building and the proposal for it.

The staff visited the property on 2 October 2019 and verified that rear of property is not visible from the street. The staff observed that the rear ell has been altered several times including the construction of a one-story addition and changes to window openings. During a walk-through of the interior space, the rear ell exhibited sloping floorboards and other signs that the ell has shifted owing to an insufficient foundation. The staff concluded that the rear ell has little or no historic value and is not visible in any way from the right-of-way.

To address the concerns of the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission raised during the earlier review, the applicant has submitted additional drawings, photographs, and an assessment letter from a structural engineer.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish the existing three-story rear ell.
- Demolish the rear wall of main block.
- Construct a three-story addition with rear roof deck on second floor and rear balcony on third floor. The addition will cover the full width of rear property and will have crawlspace rather than a full basement.
- Clad the rear wall with brick.
- Renovate the interior within main block. No work is proposed to the front facade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - Although the demolition of the rear ell will result in the removal of materials and the alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships, none of this area is visible from the public-right of way. Only the front facade facing S. 20th Street is

visible from the public right-of-way and no changes are proposed for the front façade. Although the general form of the late nineteenth-century ell still exists, it has been altered many times. Moreover, the rear ell appears to have been poorly constructed and is in poor condition. Also, the adjacent building no longer has an ell and was built out to the property line at an earlier date. Although historic fabric will be removed, the building's visible historic character will not change to pedestrians walking through the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District.

- *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 historic rear ell is shifting and is structurally compromising the overall building due to the lack of a foundation and a crack in the rear wall. The addition will be the same height as the historic ell and the rear wall will be clad in brick. The adjacent property is already built out to the property line and the proposed new addition will cover the full width of the rear property and be built against this party wall (Figure 5).

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to a lack of information.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:50:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Chwen-Ping Wang, Sky Design, represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Architectural Committee agreed at the 17 December 2019 meeting that the rear ell could be removed if it was done according to approved structural drawings and in compliance with the building code. The Committee's main concern was the safe removal of the rear wall of the main block.
- In response to the Architectural Committee comments at the 17 December 2019 meeting, the applicant submitted the following supplementary materials:
 - Revised architectural drawings;
 - Revised structural drawings;
 - Structural evaluation letter; and,
 - Confirmation that removal of front chimney is no longer part of scope of work.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Although the general form of the historic ell still exists, it has been altered many times and it appears to have been poorly constructed and is currently in poor

condition. The exterior scope of work impacts only the rear of the property and no work is proposed for the front façade. The building's historic character visible from the public right-of-way will not change, satisfying Standard 2.

- The historic rear ell is shifting and is structurally compromising the overall building, owing to the lack of a foundation and a crack in the rear wall. The addition will be the same height as the historic ell and the rear wall will be clad in brick. The adjacent property is already built out to the property line. The proposed new addition will cover the full width of the rear property and be built against this party wall, satisfying Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Mr. Lenard-Palmer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 260 S 20th Street MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Lenard-Palmer					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 19 FEBRUARY 2020

Emily Cooperman, Chair

ADDRESS: 1813-53 N HOWARD ST

Name of Resource: Clifton Mills

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 1813 N HOWARD LLC

Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1813-53 N. Howard Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Clifton Mills complex satisfies Criteria for Designation G and J. Under Criterion G, the nomination argues that the subject property is “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 the subject property is part of “an exemplary surviving textile mill complex that rose in Kensington’s textile district during an important period of economic and technological advancement,” when small-to-medium sized manufacturers were requiring larger spaces to accommodate new machinery in the production of their goods.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1813-53 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 1813-53 N. Howard Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J; and that the boundary of the area proposed for designation should be revised so that the parcel named 1813 N. Howard Street, also identified as Parcel B in the supplemental information provided by the owners, is excluded from that area.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:58:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Katherine E. Missimer represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- A legal subdivision of what was identified in the owners’ supplemental material as Parcel A and B had already been completed.
- Over time, there were many alterations made to Parcel B that compromised its integrity.
- The designation could include the parcel identified as Parcel A and exclude the parcel identified as Parcel B.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property exemplifies the textile mills that rose in the Kensington section of Philadelphia during an important period of economic and technological advancement, therefore satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1833 N. Howard Street (“Parcel A”) satisfies Criterion for Designation G and J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1813-53 N. Howard Street

MOTION: Designate, Criteria G and J

MOVED BY: Cooperman

SECONDED BY: Hartner

VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 5901-13 AND 5915-13 GERMANTOWN AVE & 61-71 AND 73 E HAINES ST

Name of Resource: Germantown High School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 5301 Germantown Avenue Investment Partners; 5901 Germantown Ave In.

Nominator: Germantown United CDC, The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 5901-13 and 5915-41 Germantown Avenue and 61-71 and 73 E. Haines Street, four individual parcels that comprise the former Germantown High School, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the buildings satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G, H, I, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that Germantown High School represents a pivotal moment in the history of public education in Philadelphia in response to Pennsylvania's 1914 passing of the Cox Child Labor Law, which restricted work hours for children and allowed them to enroll in secondary schools. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination contends that the original building is a monumental example of Georgian Revival public school architecture and is reflective of the style of other Philadelphia school buildings constructed in the same period. Under Criterion G, the nomination argues that the open space separating the school buildings from Germantown Avenue was intentionally developed into a park-like setting to serve the high school. Under Criterion H, the nomination argues that the open space embodies "an important visual continuum along Germantown Avenue, a singular place that has offered the public a window to architectural and landscape beauty and grandeur since the 1850s." Under Criterion I, the nomination contends that portions of the property that comprise the open space along Germantown Avenue potentially contain archaeological resources related to seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and early nineteenth-century structures. Under Criterion J, the nomination asserts that Germantown High School was inextricably tied to the Germantown community and its students were reflective of the local population and lingering inequalities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 5901-13 and 5915-41 Germantown Avenue and 61-71 and 73 E. Haines Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G, H, I, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 5901-13 and 5915-41 Germantown Avenue and 61-71 and 73 E. Haines Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, I, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:01:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Emaleigh Doley of Germantown United Community Development Corporation represented the nominator.
- Attorney Brett Feldman and architects Janice Woodcock and Ray Rola represented the owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham clarified that there is a request to designate the properties by the owner, and a request to continue the review of the nomination for 90 days by the nominator. The nominator's request to withdraw the nomination has since been withdrawn.
- Ms. Doley stated that Germantown United CDC and Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society nominated the properties. She stated that she and Mr. Beisert are jointly requesting a continuance and communicated the reasoning for the request to the staff. Ms. Doley read a statement from Mr. Beisert:
 - "As you know, historic designation and zoning have long been two entirely separate matters; however, with the new zoning allowances for designated buildings, which we generally agree with, it is imperative that when asked, the Historical Commission consider how its actions affect communities when designation will lead to a zoning allowance. In this case, Germantown United and the Keeping Society have filed a nomination to designate Germantown High School as historic in April 2019, which we revised in August 2019. In the meantime, the property owner began meeting with the community regarding the development of the high school, which led to a formation of a committee representing numerous nonprofit organizations in the area charged with developing a community benefits agreement related to rezoning of the site to allow for development. During this process, the new zoning allowances were passed as a result of the Task Force recommendations, usurping the work of the committee and related community organizations. We are asking for the matter to be continued until this community benefits agreement is resolved. While some will claim this places an undue burden on the property owner, that is simply not true, given the fact that the owner intends to reuse the building and retain the park in front along Germantown Avenue, as per what the community was told and what the representatives said at the Designation Committee meeting. The lack of an instant by-right zoning allowance does not prohibit the property owner from doing anything with the property that was allowable at the time of

purchase. Since we have offered to either withdraw the nomination or table it, the options tendered place no additional burden on the property owner and, therefore, withdrawal cannot be considered as the creation of an adverse circumstance, nor can tabling the nomination. With so little of Germantown protected and well-known pending development pressures, designation without a postponement to resolve the community benefits agreement could poison future preservation efforts within the community. This case is really no different than the Germantown Boys and Girls Club, which was also tabled and favorably resolved. When this was filed, Germantown United weighed factors related to the community development and historic preservation, which have since changed. Once the process of developing a community benefits agreement began, the community gained the footing needed for you to consider the public good. The PHC has the power to consider the public good as well, which can only be appropriately addressed with a continuance.”

- Mr. Mattioni stated that he was thoroughly confused by the number of units and the disparity in architecture between what looks like the original school building and the later additions. He asked whether it was appropriate to lump all buildings together as a single unit for designation purposes. He questioned whether all buildings on the site qualified for designation, though he added that the original building is worthy. He contended that applying a universal designation may inhibit appropriate development.
 - Mr. Farnham asked the owners’ representatives to address Mr. Mattioni’s question regarding the feasibility of reuse. Mr. Farnham agreed with Mr. Mattioni’s assertion that some parts of the buildings, especially the original building, may have more architectural significance. He added that his understanding is that the nomination makes an argument for the significance of most or all parts of the building.
 - Mr. Mattioni acknowledged that an argument is formulated, but he contended that there are distinctive difference between parcels.
 - Mr. Feldman, the property owner’s attorney, stated that he strongly supports the designation of the building. He added that he and his team have studied the building for 18 months and have compiled a comprehensive development plan that includes apartments, a potential charter school at the request of the community, and work areas. He commented that it is a strange case where the owner of the property is seeking designation to aid in its development with the historic preservation incentive passed by City Council with the Task Force. The building, he continued, has been closed for approximately eight years, adding that a national developer originally acquired the property but stepped away from the project. He noted that his client purchased the property and has held numerous meetings with the community. He opined that his client also owns the former Fulton Elementary School property across the street, which is not designated and not under the same incentive program. He noted that the owner is working with the community on that property’s development. He contended that community discussions would continue. Mr. Feldman stated that he supported the last continuance made by the nominator, but added that the current continuance again made by the nominator has been made in an effort to undermine the incentive program that the owner would like to utilize.

- Ms. Doley claimed that the continuance request is not an attempt to undermine other City processes. She contended that the community has already been deeply engaged with the property owner in conversations about the property's preservation and redevelopment. She added that the city's zoning process is already underway regarding both the former Germantown High School property and the former Fulton Elementary School property. For quite some time, she continued, a Zoning Board of Adjustment hearing has been scheduled for April 15. She informed the Commission that the owner applied for zoning permits and received a refusal in the fall of last year. She contended that her reason for requesting the continuance is to see through the other processes currently underway and to allow for the community benefits agreement. She asked the Historical Commission to hold off on its consideration of designating the property at this time, so as to not influence other factors.
- Mr. Mattioni clarified that his earlier questions were not intended to imply that he finds that the property is not worthy of designation. He then objected to the continuance, elaborating that he is satisfied with the explanation regarding why the owner wants to proceed with designation of the entire property.
- Mr. Thomas opined about dividing the property and considering designation of the individual components. He stated that not all components would satisfy all criteria, but that each component would satisfy at least one, which is the requirement.
- Ms. Cooperman expressed concern over the 90-day continuance, adding that if there is a risk that the community feels it has not sufficiently participated in processes currently underway, the Commission could consider a lesser continuance. She again stated concern over limiting participation from the Germantown community if a continuance is not granted, but asked to see the development project move forward as expeditiously as possible.
 - Mr. Mattioni contended that designation would not interfere with community discussions and that the owner could continue working with the community on developing a program for the site.
- Mr. Farnham sought to explain the situation between the property owner, nominator, and community. He noted that Mr. Thomas served on the Task Force and stated that the Commissioners are all very familiar with the work the Task Force completed. One of the first recommendations that was implemented, he continued, was to incentivize the adaptive reuse of historically designated buildings that were built as single-purpose buildings, like schools and movie theaters. He explained that City Council passed and the Mayor signed an ordinance into effect recently that allows for by-right CMX-3 zoning for historically designated special-use buildings. If this building is designated as historic, he continued, it will qualify for that historic preservation incentive and will not be subject to the Zoning Board of Adjustment and the zoning variance process that will incorporate community participation. Instead, he added, the developer will be able to move forward with a by-right zoning project, albeit one that is subject to the Historical Commission's review. This is one of the first times the incentive would be implemented, and this is a site that is extremely difficult to adaptively reuse. He stated that the staff of the Historical Commission and of the Department of Planning and Development were integral in developing this incentive with Councilman Squilla and others and are very supportive of seeing the developers being able to take advantage of this incentive, which was created

specifically to make it easier to adaptively reuse historic buildings. The way in which the process is made easier, he added, is by preventing the developer from having to go through the complicated zoning process that could be prolonged and render the project more expensive and more difficult to undertake.

- Ms. Edwards inquired whether the size of the project would trigger a Civic Design Review process, requiring involvement from the community.
 - Mr. Feldman answered that it would not but that the property across the street would continue to move through the full zoning process. Mr. Feldman added that the agreements with the community would be included in the zoning process for the former Fulton Elementary School property. He stated that he believes that the zoning process, should he need to continue on that path, would not end on April 15 and would continue indefinitely. He noted that he has heard of plans to appeal if the Zoning Board approves the application.
 - Ms. Woodcock stated that in the last six months there have been individuals painting the building's windows from the interior and starting fires inside. She added that it is nearly impossible to secure the building, despite the owner trying. She stated that allowing the rehabilitation project to move forward quickly is in the best interest of the historic building.
- Ms. Doley claimed that an expeditor working for the owner commented that the vandalism and break-ins are a benefit to them, because it will lower demolition costs. She then opined that she understands the intent of the ordinance and is not opposed to the incentive or designation. She contended that, after listening to the Committee on Historic Designation review and the project architects' comments, she changed from requesting to withdraw the nomination to requesting a continuance. She reiterated that the continuance would allow the community to see through the zoning process, which she suggested is nearly finalized. She argued that the process began before the ordinance was adopted allowing the owner to proceed with a project by-right. She claimed that this situation is causing a fear of designation and preservation but contended that the Germantown community has become unified in this matter, represented by the Germantown Community Alliance. Ms. Doley argued that the issue is not whether the property is historic and should be designated. She asked that the Commission consider the extenuating circumstances and grant the continuance.
 - Mr. Mattioni responded that everyone who has a presumptive stake in this property is in favor of historic designation, but the nominator is asking that the Commission keep the applicant in designation limbo to allow the nominator the opportunity to negotiate a compromise that does not involve designation. He called that motive an improper use of the Historical Commission's processes and stated that the request for a continuance should be denied to allow the Commission to proceed with the designation of the property.
- Ms. Doley stated that she was ceding the floor to other people in her group to speak on behalf of the community. Mr. Thomas stated that he is the chair, not Ms. Doley, and he will grant opportunities to address the Commission.
- Mr. Rola stated that he and Ms. Woodcock have been working with the developers to create a reuse plan for the complex for over one year. During that time, he continued, he and Ms. Woodcock have made a number of community presentations and met with smaller groups of community stakeholders. He argued that they have developed a plan that will preserve the school structures

and provide many community amenities. He contended that the question is not whether the property will be designated but whether it will be designated today or in 90 days. He added that there have been good-faith efforts to complete a zoning process that benefits all but there is no guarantee that the process will result in an agreement; however, he noted that if no agreement is reached, there could be continuances at the Zoning Board of Adjustment for years. Designating the property today, he argued, would guarantee that the project is completed to a high standard of quality and authenticity, which suggested would be a win for the community, the developer, and the preservation community. A continuance, he added, could set into a motion a series of delays that could result in an indefinite hold on the project as the structure continues to deteriorate in an uncertain economy.

- Mr. Reuter inquired about a the end result of the owner obtaining a zoning approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustment and reaching a community benefits agreement as a side agreement, if the property were to subsequently be designated. He questioned whether there would be any legal reason the owner could not abandon the zoning approval and submit a by-right application to get the CMX-3 uses. He then questioned the purpose of the nominators' continuance request and asked whether the nominators are using the request to try to leverage some kind of agreement, which he called a complete manipulation of the historic designation process. He opined that unless the Commission were to never designate the property following the zoning approval, he fails to see what the nominators are asking of the Commission other than to delay the decision for its own sake. He recommended that the Commission proceed with its review of the nomination and determine whether or not to designate the property. He added that the nomination was submitted for the purpose of designating the property. Now that the property can be adapted to CMX-3 uses, he reiterated, the nominators want to withdraw the nomination to leverage an agreement in the context of a zoning permit that ultimately could be abandoned anyway if the property is designated. He added that the Commission routinely designates properties over the owners' objections, when the owner is the private property owner and has the primary constitutional right to the property. He noted that owners object over what they consider perceive to be a negative impact on their ability to use or develop their properties. He commented that he is not aware of a single instance where the Historical Commission has continued or delayed a nomination that is supported by the property owner in order to give additional rights to third parties, especially those that submitted the nomination.
 - Mr. Feldman agreed, and noted that Mr. Reuter had asked how the community agreement would be attached as a proviso. Mr. Feldman explained that the requests made by the community are not zoning-related issues, though he added that the owner is still working out a private agreement related to the adjacent former Fulton Elementary School property, which has not been nominated.
 - Mr. Reuter clarified that the Historical Commission has the prerogative to continue the nomination for any reason it so chooses, but that he is asking for clarity on the situation. He added that more than one year ago, the Commission decided that once the staff has deemed a nomination correct and complete and sent notice to the property owner, the Commission controls the process. The nominator, he continued, has no authority over the nomination, though he acknowledged that any party can request a continuance for any reason. He stated that he would like

the Commission to understand who has the primary rights and whose rights are being affected. He reiterated that third-party agreements do not impact the Historical Commission's process.

- Attorney Justin Hollinger, who is representing Germantown Community Alliance on the community benefits agreement, asked to reiterate Ms. Doley's earlier comments that the situation is unprecedented, owing to the change resulting from the passage of the ordinance. He added that the nominators are not challenging the wisdom of the change but are suggesting that it is a later change that is impacting a process that began earlier. He again asked that the Commission continue the nomination, owing to the timing of the change in the law.
- Mr. Reuter interjected that it was a change made precisely because of this type of situation, when historic rehabilitation projects are made more difficult and less viable by third parties seeking benefits.
- Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission has historically been sensitive to community issues, but that it is also sensitive to its responsibility to act as the principal public steward of historic resources. If a continuance were granted, he observed, and the property was then listed on the Register and the current owner sells the property, the new owner would have the opportunity to invoke the new ordinance.
 - Mr. Mattioni commented that Mr. Thomas's scenario could happen in any event and added that the Commission would need to assume the current owner is not acting in good faith, which Mr. Mattioni stated he refused to accept, given the testimony already offered to the Commission.
 - Mr. Thomas noted that, if designated, the current development project would remain under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission and any plans would be submitted to the staff with the potential for it to be forwarded to the Architectural Committee and to be reviewed by the Historical Commission. He contended that the public process for this project would be enhanced by having the property listed on the Philadelphia Register.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Cornelia Swinson, executive director of Johnson House Historic Site and Underground Railroad Museum and member of Germantown Community Alliance, stated that she protects historic sites and asked the Commission to continue the review of the nomination for a short period in the interest of the neighborhood. She noted that there are numerous historic sites throughout Germantown and that the Alliance takes designation seriously. She then argued that she also has a responsibility to work with the community, adding that the continuance request is to support community involvement. She stated that her support for the continuance comes from her role as a leader in the community, adding that designation impacts the community and not just the building.
- Near neighbor Elfie Harris claimed that the current owner has done little to secure the property and stated that the community benefits agreement process began before the ordinance was passed. She stated that she and the community have invested a great deal into discussions with the current owner and that any development at the site needs to benefit the community. She added that discussions have been occurring for one and one-half years and that if the site is designated now, the community loses the opportunity to continue discussions.

- Mr. Hollinger supported Ms. Doley's statements and her reasons for seeking a continuance. He disputed the owner's claim that it would be difficult to predict the way the stakeholders will impact the process moving forward. He argued that Germantown Community Alliance is well-organized and unified in its approach to the agreement and its terms. He then noted that the agreement is at an advanced stage. He stated that the next few weeks before the April 15 zoning hearing are critical and designation would have a lopsided effect on the bargaining prospects of the Alliance on a process that has been ongoing for a long time.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The nominators have withdrawn their request to withdraw the nomination.
- The nominators are seeking a 90-day continuance.
- The nominators are a third party acting on behalf of the community, and the Historical Commission has the authority to accept or deny any continuance request.
- The property owner is requesting that the Historical Commission designate the property to allow them to utilize the ordinance recently passed by City Council that incentivizes the adaptive reuse of special-use properties.
- The incentive was established to promote the adaptive reuse of single-purpose buildings like schools and theaters.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Germantown High School represents the state-wide codification of a child labor law that allowed children to enroll in secondary schools, satisfying Criterion A.
- The main building represents Georgian Revival public school architecture and reflects the environment of the Germantown community, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The landscaped area along Germantown Avenue presents an intentional design element that creates a buffer between the main school building and the street, and the green space is a significant established feature of the community, satisfying Criterion H.
- The open space along Germantown Avenue is likely to yield important archaeological resources related to the seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and early nineteenth-century structures that have been demolished over time, satisfying Criterion I.
- The school building and landscaped area are not part of or related to any adjacent property, park, square, or distinctive area and do not satisfy Criterion G.
- Though a large and complicated site with many buildings and additions, each component of Germantown High School satisfies at least one Criteria for Designation.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to deny the request to continue the review of the nomination of the properties at 5901-13 and 5915-41 Germantown Avenue and 61-71 and 73 E. Haines Street. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 5901-13 AND 5915-41 GERMANTOWN AVE AND 61-71 AND 73 E HAINES ST MOTION: Deny continuance MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Lippert					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ACTION: Mr. Lippert moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 5901-13 and 5915-41 Germantown Avenue and 61-71 and 73 E. Haines Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, I, and J, and to designate them as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 5901-13 AND 5915-41 GERMANTOWN AVE AND 61-71 AND 73 E HAINES ST MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C, D, H, I, and J MOVED BY: Lippert SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 1045-49 SARAH ST

Name of Resource: Otis Elevator Company Boiler and Engine House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Antal Group Inc.

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1045-29 Sarah Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former boiler and engine house of the Otis Elevator Company, built in 1904, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the property is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works and the Otis Elevator Company. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the building is representative of industrial power plant design of the early twentieth century. Under Criterion G, the nomination argues that the building is part of the earliest, extent, coherent industrial complexes in Fishtown, but does not propose to designate the complex as a district. Many of the other properties associated with the former Morse and Otis Elevator Companies were individually designated in 2015 and 2016.

The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed this nomination on March 12th and recommended that the property satisfies Criteria D and J. The owner, who did not attend the Committee's review, requested that the Historical Commission remand the nomination to the Committee to provide him with an opportunity to participate in the review. The Commission granted the request, sending the nomination back to the Committee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1045-49 Sarah Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but not Criterion G.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION, MARCH 2019: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:51:15

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Thomas presented a request to continue the nomination to the April Committee on Historic Designation meeting.
- No one represented the property owner.
- No one represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked whether the property owner was advised of this meeting.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded affirmatively.
- Mr. Farnham explained that the property owner engaged one attorney initially and that attorney failed to appear and cannot be found, and the owner is in the

process of engaging a new attorney. The owner would like to have time for the new attorney to review the nomination and be present at the meetings.

- Ms. DiPasquale explained that the property owner arrived late to the original Committee on Historic Designation meeting and did not participate in the discussion at the Committee level.
- Ms. Cooperman explained that the Committee reviewed the merits of the nomination and arrived at a recommendation. She noted that she does not believe the nomination needs to be remanded to the Committee, as any and all arguments the owner has in opposition to the nomination or designation could be made before the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Farnham clarified that the property owner missed the original Committee on Historic Designation meeting many months ago, and that, at the owner's request, the Historical Commission remanded the nomination to the Committee at a later date. The property owner subsequently requested several times that the Commission continue and remand the nomination to give him the opportunity to participate. The Commission honored those requests. Mr. Farnham noted that the Historical Commission is now facing the same question it addressed previously.
- Mr. Lippert opined that the Commission could simply move forward with the review without continuing or remanding the nomination.
 - Mr. Reuter expressed concern over this course of action, as the owner is opposed to designation and is not present.
 - Ms. Cooperman opined that the property owner should have the opportunity to present arguments before the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Mattioni opined that the Historical Commission does not have to continue to agree to requests to remand the nomination. He suggested that the fairest course of action would be to grant a continuance to the Commission but not to remand the nomination to the Committee. The Historical Commission is the body with authority. The Committee is merely advisory.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Committee on Historic Designation has already reviewed the nomination and offered a non-binding recommendation.
- The Historical Commission has continued and remanded the nomination several times previously, affording the property owner ample opportunity to participate in both the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission reviews.
- The property owner is able to make any and all arguments he would have made at the Committee level before the Historical Commission.
- The property remains under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination should be continued to the next Historical Commission meeting to allow the owner and his attorney the opportunity to present their arguments, but not remanded to the Committee on Historic Designation.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of the nomination for 1045-49 Sarah Street to the next available Historical Commission meeting. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1045-49 Sarah St MOTION: Continue to April 2020 HC mtg MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 1513 WALNUT STREET

Name of Resource: The Stock Brokerage House of Hano, Wasserman & Company

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: The Business Known as 1513 Walnut LLC

Nominator: The Center City Residents' Association

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1513 Walnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Built in 1929, the former Stock Brokerage House of Hano, Wasserman & Company is a two-story, limestone-faced building that extends from Walnut Street to Moravian Street. Under Criterion D and E, the nomination contends that the subject building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Modern Classical Style as designed by noted Philadelphia architect Grant M. Simon. The nomination asserts that 1513 Walnut Street exemplifies the economic and social heritage of Jewish Americans working to enter the realm of Philadelphia finance in the first half of the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1513 Walnut 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 the property at 1513 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:58:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.

- Timothy Kerner of the Center City Residents' Association represented the nominator.
- No one represented the owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, Save Our Sites, spoke in support of the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building is designated on the National Register of Historic Places as a Significant resource to the Center City West Commercial Historic District.
- Grant Simon, the architect of the building, was the first chair of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Modern Classical Style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building is designed by noted Philadelphia architect Grant M. Simon, satisfying Criterion E.
- The building exemplifies the economic and social heritage of Jewish Americans working to enter the realm of Philadelphia finance in the first half of the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1513 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1513 Walnut Street MOTION: Designate, Criteria D, E, and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)					X
Turner, Vice Chair					X
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:06:45

ACTION: At 11:17 a.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adjournment					
MOTION: Adjourn					
MOVED BY: Mattioni					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lenard-Palmer (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	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 audio 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.