

**THE MINUTES OF THE 655TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

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

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Oscar Beisert
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Kathy Dowdell
Michael McDermott, Coyle, Lynch & Co.
Angelo Fatiga, Pennoni
Stephen Kazanjian, Real Estate Strategies
Nancy Weinberg, Save Our Sites
Julia Frayman
Zory Shmidoff
Olga Shorokova, Alfa Engineering Inc.
Thomas Adams, Pennoni
Joe Loonstyn
Peter Angelides, Econsult
Matthew Ritsko, Intech Construction
Jan Vacca, The Harman Group
Dustin Downey, Southern Land Co.
Tim Downey, Southern Land Co.
Clara Wineberg, AIA, Solomon Cordwell Buenz
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr
John Loonstyn

Jed Levin
Logan Dry
George Thomas, CivicVisions
Fred Baumert, Keast & Hood
Henry Clinton
Leonard F. Reuter
Celeste Morello
John Phillips, PVCA
Carolyn Healy, PVCA
Scott Woodruff, DesignBlendz
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Doug Mooney, Philadelphia Archaeological Forum
Venise Whitaker
Alan Greenberger

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Fink, Gupta, Hartner, Long, Mattioni, McCoubrey, Royer, Schaaf, Stanford, and Turner joined him.

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

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 654th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 February 2017. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

SELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

Mr. Thomas explained that the position of vice chair of the Historical Commission was vacant because the former vice chair, Sara Merriman, had resigned from the Commerce Department to take a job in the private sector. Mr. Thomas suggested Ms. Turner as vice chair.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to appoint Ms. Turner as the vice chair of the Historical Commission. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REQUESTS TO CONTINUE NOMINATION REVIEWS

Mr. Thomas and Ms. Cooperman recused from the discussion of the continuance request for the nomination for 100 S. Independence West Mall. Mr. Farnham presented the requests to continue the reviews of the nominations for 2041-55 Coral Street, 1642 Fitzwater Street, 100 S. Independence West Mall, 1600-06 And 1608-10 E. Berks Street (objects in St. Laurentius Church), and 3500-10 Lancaster Avenue to the Historical Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of the nomination for 2041-55 Coral Street and remand it to the Committee on Historic Designation meeting in June 2017, and to continue the reviews of the nominations for 1642 Fitzwater Street, 100 S. Independence West Mall, 1600-06 And 1608-10 E. Berks Street (objects in St. Laurentius Church), and 3500-10 Lancaster Avenue and remand them to the Committee on Historic Designation meeting in April 2017. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas introduced the consent agenda, which included applications for 2222 Delancey Place, 613 Pine Street, 15 Bank Street, 2322 Pine Street, and 1736 Green Street (aka 1735 Brandywine Street). Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. Mr. Thomas asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 2222 Delancey Place, 613 Pine Street, 15 Bank Street, 2322 Pine Street, and 1736 Green Street (aka 1735 Brandywine Street). Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1918-20 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Complete demolition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1911 Walnut Street LLC

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr LLP

History: 1910; Dolan Garage

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Historical Commission deny the application, owing to the demolition, which does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, unless the Commission finds that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. The Committee additionally recommended that the application is thorough and complete; no other studies or analyses are required.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP RECOMMENDATION: Mr. McCoubrey moved that the Committee on Financial Hardship recommend to the Historical Commission that the building at 1918-20 Sansom Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; that the owner has demonstrated that the sale of the property is impracticable because the application shows that a listing for sale with a third-party broker would be futile; that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return; and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed; pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the building at 1918-20 Sansom Street. The property is not individually designated, but is classified as Contributing in the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The building was constructed as a garage in 1910 and subsequently housed offices for a construction company, marketing firm, and other businesses before being converted for use as a funeral home. The building has been vacant since 1997.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance limits the Historical Commission to approving demolitions in two instances only, when the demolition is necessary in the public interest, and when the building cannot be reasonably adapted for any purpose. The application

contends that the building is in very poor condition and therefore cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. The case that the building cannot be reused is made in an affidavit with supporting exhibits. The affidavit recounts the recent history of the property and attempts to redevelop it. The exhibits include a series of reports by consultants regarding the existing conditions at the property as well as schematic architectural designs, construction cost estimates, and financial analyses for three proposed reuses, restaurant/retail, single-family residential, and office. The application concludes that none of the likely reuses is financially feasible.

The Historical Commission retained a consultant, RES, with expertise analyzing the feasibility of the adaptive reuses of historic buildings to assess the application and make a recommendation to the Historical Commission regarding the validity of its claims. The consultant's conclusions are presented in a written report.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorneys Neil Sklaroff and David Gest, developers Tim and Dustin Downey, engineer Fred Baumert, financial analyst Peter Angelides, and construction cost estimator Matthew Ritsko the application.

Mr. Sklaroff introduced the members of the development team. He reported that his client, 1911 Walnut LLC and Southern Land Co., purchased the property and several adjacent properties in February 2015. He noted that his client successfully developed 3601 Market Street, a 26-story building. He described the lots in question. He stated that this application relates to the proposed demolition of the building at 1918-20 Sansom Street only. His client will submit additional applications for the renovations of the buildings at 1904 and 1906-16 Sansom and the new construction on the remainder of the site. He reported that he submitted an application to the Historical Commission in October 2015 to demolish the three buildings on Sansom Street: the Rittenhouse Coffee Shop, the Warwick Apartments, and the Garage. Since that submission, Southern Land has been working with neighboring stakeholders, the City Planning Commission, and the Office of Council President Clarke to create a plan of development. Pursuant to those discussions, Southern Land is narrowing its request and now seeks approval for the demolition of the Garage building only. The Rittenhouse Coffee Shop and Warwick will not be demolished, but will be used for affordable housing. The renovation and new construction work on the other sites will be submitted under separate applications.

Mr. Sklaroff explained that his team analyzed the Garage and has documented that analysis in several reports included in the application. He stated that he would like to call on some of his experts to verify and explain the reports. He observed that his consultants looked into numerous possible reuses for the building and eventually narrowed the investigation down to three uses, which will be presented to the Commission.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that curriculum vitae are included in the application for all consultants. Mr. Baumert, a structural engineer with Keast & Hood, stated that he has significant experience with historic buildings. Mr. Baumert stated that he prepared a report on the building in question, which was included with the application. He stated that he visited and inspected the building twice, once with a masonry contractor. He stated that he inspected every aspect of the interior and exterior of the building. He noted that the building is supported by steel beams that span across the space from masonry party wall to masonry party wall. The side walls are bearing walls, but the front wall is not. The walls are brick are 8 to 12 inches thick. The brick walls are stained with salts, which results from water infiltration into the brick walls. The water has washed the lime out of the mortar that keeps the brick in place. The mortar has been turned into

powder. The water has corroded the steel beams. The steel beams would need to be strengthened and, in some cases, replaced. The front wall is in “very poor condition.” It would be difficult to salvage. The interior brick in the front wall is entirely deteriorated. Water has damaged the inside and outside of the wall. The brick is coming apart, owing to the moisture and freeze-thaw cycles. Mr. Baumert stated that various campaigns of maintenance work have used a very hard, cement-based mortar that has damaged the brick. The faces of the brick are spalling off because of the hard mortar. Mr. Baumert stated that it would be very difficult to retain the front wall in place and repair it. The beam at the front wall needs replacement; to replace it, the second floor and roof would need to be shored. The steel beams supporting the floor slabs are in very poor condition, especially where they pocket into the walls; they would need to be repaired or replaced. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Baumert if he provided a list of recommendations in his report. Mr. Baumert stated that he did provide recommendations and still agrees with them. Mr. Baumert stated that, if one could maintain the walls rather than replacing them, the building would need to be dried out owing to the extensive saturation. It would take as long as two years to dry out the building. Drawing the moisture out is a very slow process. Mr. Sklaroff stated that Mr. Baumert would answer any questions posed by the Commission. The Commission asked no questions.

Mr. Sklaroff directed the Commission’s attention to a report by consulting engineers Edwards & Zuck on the air conditioning, heating, electrical, plumbing, and fire protection systems in the building. He noted that the engineers concluded that those systems do not exist in the building in any usable form. He also directed the Commission to a second report by consulting engineers Edwards & Zuck, which details the systems that would need to be added if the building were rehabilitated. Mr. Sklaroff then discussed the environmental reports by Pennoni. The reports detail hazardous materials like asbestos discovered in the building and the costs of remediating those hazards.

Mr. Sklaroff stated his architectural consultant devised schematic plans for the three reuse scenarios that seemed most viable in light of the building’s location and configuration. Mr. Sklaroff explained that the structural engineering firm reviewed the Keast & Hood analysis of the structure as well as the architect’s schematic plans and proposed the structural remediation and improvement necessary for reuse. Describing their process, Mr. Sklaroff reported that Intech provided construction cost estimates for each of the three adaptive reuse scenarios, restaurant/retail, single-family residence, and office, based on the reports of the architectural, structural engineering, environmental engineering, and systems engineering consultants. He introduced Mr. Ritsko of Intech Construction, who discussed the construction cost estimates at Exhibit N in the application. Mr. Ritsko explained that he and his colleagues have 30 years of experience generating construction cost estimates. He stated that he relied on the expert reports presented earlier as the basis of his cost estimating. He stated that he and others at his firm visited the site and inspected the building and also reviewed all of the expert reports. He stated that they established a scope of work and then prepared a detail cost estimate for each of the three reuse scenarios. He stated that each of the three scopes is different, but similar. Each of the cost estimates is about \$3 million. He stated that his company has 30 years of collective experience working on construction cost estimating in Philadelphia. Mr. Ritsko explained that he has presented two versions of the cost estimates. The first version of the estimate is the original Intech estimate. Then ICI reviewed the estimate and made suggestions. The second version of the estimate is the original Intech estimate reconciled with the ICI corrections. Mr. Ritsko explained that the estimate also changed slightly when the two buildings to the east were removed from the project. It costs more to dry out the Garage alone than it costs to dry it as part of a larger drying project with the other buildings. He stated that the items that changed between the first and second versions were the drying costs and the kitchen

cabinet correction offered by ICI. He stated that the estimates were provided in February 2016. He stated that the estimates were not adjusted for the escalation of construction costs from 2016 to 2017. Also, the building has deteriorated more over the intervening time. Mr. Farnham explained that ICI is International Consultants, Inc., a construction cost estimating firm that RES, the City's independent consultant, hired to undertake independent construction cost estimates to verify the accuracy of Intech's estimates.

Mr. Angelides stated that he is a Principal at Econsult Solutions, Inc. and teaches at the University of Pennsylvania. Econsult specializes in the analyses of economic development, transportation, and real estate projects and in public policy and finance. Mr. Angelides stated that he has prepared several financial feasibility analyses for applications to the Historical Commission and other venues. In preparation for his work on this project, he reviewed all of the expert reports and discussed the project with the experts. He stated that he and the team considered many possible reuses, but decided to analyze the three most likely of success in depth. He stated that he analyzed three scenarios in depth, restaurant/retail, single-family residential, and office. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the financial analyses are in the report at Exhibit Q. He asked Mr. Angelides if he still agrees with his analyses. Mr. Angelides stated that he does agree with them.

Mr. Angelides displayed a Powerpoint presentation. He provided his conclusion first. He stated that there is no use to which 1918-1920 Sansom Street may be reasonably adapted given the cost of renovations and the revenues that can be expected by those uses. He stated that the building cannot be reused in an economically viable way. He stated that he analyzed three scenarios, restaurant/retail, single-family residential, and office. For the restaurant/retail use, the total project cost is projected to be \$4.5 million, the annual net operating income would be \$100,000, the completed project value would be \$1.0 million, the value created would be -\$3.5 million, and the net present value would be -\$2.1 million. For the single-family residential use, the total project cost is projected to be \$4.2 million, the sales income would be \$1.8 million, the completed project value would be \$1.3 million, the value created would be -\$2.9 million, and the net present value would be -\$2.0 million. For the office use, the total project cost is projected to be \$4.5 million, the annual net operating income would be \$100,000, the completed project value would be \$0.7 million, the value created would be -\$3.8 million, and the net present value would be -\$2.4 million. In general, one would lose about \$2 million on a \$4 million investment in this building.

Mr. Angelides showed a map of the 1918-1920 Sansom Street location and displayed a current photograph of the building. He displayed a photograph of the deteriorated condition of the interior and explained that it would require a significant investment to be reused.

Mr. Angelides explained that he not only undertook financial analyses, but also conducted numerous interviews to understand the current state of the marketplace. He looked at comparable rents and sales in the area and talked to experts in those fields. He stated that he looked at financing costs, construction costs, development costs, and operating costs as well as operating revenue. He explained that he also considered incentives. He noted that the only as-of-right incentive is the Philadelphia tax abatement. He stated that he also considered other potential subsidies like low-income housing subsidies and historic tax credits, but noted that they are not guaranteed, but only potentialities. He stated that the historic tax credit is not included in his base analysis, but is included in a variation and does not change the conclusions. He concluded that his analysis is predicated on realistic assumptions for revenues and costs. However, it does include one unrealistic assumption. It assumes that a bank would

provide a loan based on the construction costs. A bank would not provide a loan based on construction costs, but would only loan on the value created, which is negative.

Mr. Angelides discussed the three reuse scenarios. He stated that the configuration of the building limits options. It is a long, narrow space. It lacks windows on the sides and has no possibility of windows on the sides; skylights could be installed. It has low ceiling heights. He displayed architectural plans and discussed the gross and net space for the three reuse scenarios. He discussed the retail scenario first. The architectural plans show that the building would provide 4,312 square feet of retail space over two floors. He contended that 1918-1920 Sansom Street is not ideal retail space. He stated that retail renters like corners and wide street frontages. It is not on a corner. It has an undesirable interior layout. It is a larger space than most retailers want and a deeper space than most want. The 1900-block of Sansom Street is not prime location. Sansom Street retail is focused on lower value uses. The block of Sansom Street around 1918-1920 is not a developed or inviting streetscape. He displayed a table of current asking rents for comparable, nearby retail space. The rents varied from about \$20 to about \$50 per square foot. He reported that his analysis assumes \$52 per square foot for the ground floor and \$27 per square foot for the second floor. He reported that the retail use would generate \$100,000 in net annual income when accounting for vacancy and operating expenses. He stated that the development cost for the retail scenario is \$4.5 million and concluded that the operating income would not support such an investment. He stated that the net present value for the retail scenario would be -\$2.1 million; there would be no return on investment; and the net value of project would be -\$3.5 million. He stated that retail or restaurant is not a feasible reuse scenario.

Mr. Angelides then discussed the residential scenario. He stated that this scenario presumes that the building would be used as a single-family residence. Single-family units in the area usually sell for \$300 per square foot to \$500 per square foot. The inability to install windows in the side facades severely limits the number of bedrooms. The building at 1918-1920 Sansom Street, fully rehabbed, is estimated to sell for \$341 per square foot. He displayed tables of recently completed and current sales of comparable, nearby properties. The sales ranged from \$204 to \$578 per square foot. The house would sell for \$1.8 million in current dollars, or \$1.91 million at the time of sale in a few years. The cost to sell would be \$150,000. The net revenue from the sale would be \$1.76 million. He reported that the development cost would be \$4.2 million, but the net revenue would only be about \$1.8 million, today, but \$1.91 when it would be ready for sale. The residential project would have a net present value of -\$2.0 million; no return on investment; and a net value of -\$2.9 million. He concluded that residential is not a feasible reuse scenario.

Mr. Angelides then discussed the office scenario. The schematic architectural plans propose a 4,104 square foot leasable office building. It would likely be a single-tenant office space because of the size and layout. The building would result in Class B office space owing to configuration, low ceilings, and low natural light. Also, the location is "weird." He displayed a table of asking rents for comparable office space in the area. He explained that asking rents are between \$18 and \$26 per square foot. He estimated an achievable rent of \$23 per square foot for this building. Mr. Angelides stated that his firm recently obtained office space for itself of about the size in question. The analysis his firm undertook very recently for its new office space showed that the proposed rents used in the rental scenario were very reasonable. He stated that his model predicts a total annual revenue of \$95,000. Factoring annual operating expenses of \$30,000, it would produce a net annual income of \$65,000. The development cost would be \$4.5 million, which is greatly in excess of the value generated. The net present value would be -

\$2.4 million; there would be no return on investment; and the net value of project would be -\$3.8 million. Commercial office space is not a feasible reuse scenario for this property.

Mr. Angelides displayed a table summarizing his results and showing that none of the scenarios would produce a feasible project. Mr. Angelides stated that he conducted a variety of sensitivity analyses to determine the effects of adjusting assumptions on the outcomes. He displayed a table with his results. He tested the outcomes when removing all land costs; adding in federal and state historic tax credits; using ICI's costs estimates; adding 20% to the rents and sales prices; and combining all four sensitivity tests. Even when simultaneously removing all land costs, adding in federal and state historic tax credits, using ICI's costs estimates, and adding 20% to the rents and sales prices, there is no scenario that is close to feasible. The best case scenario, single-family residential, is still \$900,000 in the red with all of the adjustments to the financial model. Mr. Angelides concluded that there is no use to which 1918-1920 Sansom Street may be reasonably adapted, given the cost of renovations and the revenues that can be expected from those uses. No reuse project is feasible.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Angelides if he considered a mixed-use project with retail on the first floor and residential on the second floor. He stated that the lack of windows at the sides at the first floor would not be an imposition on a retail use and the second floor could have skylights. He also noted that, if the building were rehabilitated for single-family residence for sale, it would not be eligible for the historic preservation tax credits. Mr. Angelides agreed that the building would not be eligible for the tax credits if sold outright as a residence, meaning that the project is even less viable than the sensitivity analysis shows. Mr. Angelides then discussed the mixed-use scenario. He noted that they did consider such a scenario. He stated that the upper-floor rent for the retail scenario, \$27 per square foot, is comparable to residential rental rates. Therefore, the upper-floor retail and residential analyses would be almost identical. However, construction costs for residential and mixed-use are greater. One can safely conclude that a mixed-use building would not be financially feasible; "it wouldn't even come close." Mr. Thomas noted that creating a private entrance to the second-floor residential would be difficult. Mr. Angelides concluded that one "could build that building, probably, but the numbers don't work."

Mr. Sklaroff asked if anyone had questions. Mr. Thomas noted that Southern Land purchased the property two years ago. He noted that the building suffered while vacant, beginning in 1997. Mr. Sklaroff responded that the condition of the building exacerbates the difficulty in reusing it, but the configuration with low ceilings and few windows also makes it difficult to reuse. Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission has a responsibility to determine whether the current or past owners have responsibility for the current condition. Is this a case of demolition by neglect? Mr. Sklaroff stated that this owner has no responsibility in allowing the condition to deteriorate. The building was in the current condition when purchased two years ago. Mr. Thomas agreed that the current owner is not responsible for the poor condition.

David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that this matter is of considerable importance. The decision on this application "will have significant ramifications and set precedent for the future." Mr. Traub insisted that he be allotted as much time for his presentation as the applicants were given for theirs. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Traub to move away from the microphone because his voice was much too loud. He stated that this application is different than the proposed demolition of Jeweler's Row because this building is already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Although it is only one building, "Philadelphia is being chipped away at, one building at a time. I say 'chipped away at.'" He claimed that these three buildings, the Warwick Row or the Sansom Three, are a trio of buildings; there are three of them. He challenged the notion that contributing buildings in historic districts are less important than significant buildings,

because a historic district would be nothing without the contributing buildings. “Demolishing designated buildings creates cynicism on the part of the citizenry and discourages them from proposing further designations, which we all want to do.” He claimed that Southern Land is not eligible for a hardship finding because it is the “end-user” of the building. Southern Land purchased the building to “incorporate” it into the larger development. Southern Land has no intention to sell or rent the building separately. It intends to incorporate this space into a new building on the adjacent lot. The building cannot be analyzed individually. He commented that the façade of this building is beautiful and the entry portal is a distinguished piece of architecture. The three historic buildings have fused together over time as a trio in the public consciousness, and to destroy one is to spoil the integrity of the whole. He opined that tourists want to enjoy a mix of old and new buildings, and the city needs to retain its low buildings like those found on this block. He suggested that the front façade and approximately 20 feet of the existing building be retained and incorporated into the new construction project. He commented that the building is not much larger than a typical townhouse, and townhouses are always having their front facades restored. He opined that it cannot be considered a burden for a development company as large as Southern Land. He referenced the Divine Lorraine, which was vacant for many years prior to its ongoing restoration. He stated that Inga Saffron reported that Southern Land was unaware of the condition of the buildings when it purchased them. He added that Southern Land stated that it would incorporate the historic buildings into its tower project. Mr. Traub contended that Southern Land should have sealed the building when it purchased it two years ago. He stated that the building was in very poor condition when purchased two years ago, but any additional deterioration over the last two years is self-inflicted. Mr. Traub stated that the degree of financial hardship should be measured against the owner’s financial capacity. Southern Land is not impecunious. The cost to restore this building is “miniscule” when compared to the total project cost, which is “millions and millions of dollars.” The building is the size of two townhouses. Mr. Traub stated that renovations to the building in question “would be a hardship for me or any other small developers who do such work in Philadelphia, but not for Southern Land,” which has lots of money. Small developers struggle with buildings in poor condition. It is “an insult” that Southern Land, with all of its money, claims a hardship. Mr. Traub suggested keeping the façade and first 10 or 20 or more feet of the Garage building. The preserved façade would serve as a model that we can all be proud of. Mr. Traub displayed a rendering of the streetscape on the 1900-block of Sansom with the building restored.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance shares in spirit an affection for this building. He stated that his organization has reviewed the application and does not oppose it. He asserted that the application demonstrates that the building meets the test of hardship. He stated that the Alliance also appreciates that the developer will preserve the other two buildings on the site. He stated that the Alliance appreciates the way in which the developer has worked with the community. He stated that the condition of the building is very poor, owing to its vacancy and the water infiltration. He concluded that the Alliance does not oppose this project.

Nancy Weinberg introduced herself and stated that she is a member of Save Our Sites. She claimed that Philadelphia has recently been designated as a World Historical Site. Mr. Thomas corrected that it was designated as a World Heritage City. Ms. Weinberg asserted that the city “has some responsibility for maintaining that responsibility.” This building with the other two “is more than the sum of its parts and achieves a greater significance for the city historically and economically as well.” She suggested that “that be recognized and observed as a valid criteria.”

Cary Bryan introduced herself as a resident of the area. She stated that these buildings have been subject to neglect for 20 years. She asked why, if Southern Land has owned the building for two years, there is a “broken, open window next to the front entrance.” It would be easy to put up a board. She asked why Southern Land let it rot. She stated: “I’m angry. Yes.”

Oscar Beisert introduced himself as an architectural historian. He stated that he is not opposed to the project. He asked for the preservation of the Sansom Street façade. Saving facades is standard in other cities. To demolish the façade would be a waste of the architectural value.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that his client will attempt to save elements of the front façade for use elsewhere in the project. He also noted that his client will preserve the two adjacent buildings for use as low-income housing. He asserted, however, that these efforts by his client should have no bearing on the Commission’s decision in this case, which should be predicated solely on the case regarding feasibility of reuse. Mr. Sklaroff objected to Mr. Traub’s misconception that the extent of the financial resources of the property owner is the proper measure for hardship. Mr. Thomas noted that recordation is sometimes required when a building is approved for demolition. Mr. Sklaroff again observed that he is not asking the Commission to base its decision on the preservation of elements of the building or the preservation of the adjacent buildings. Mr. Sklaroff asserted that Southern Land is working in good faith with numerous parties, but will not know whether it can save elements of the façade until the demolition work is underway. Mr. Sklaroff contended that what is preserved or not preserved should play no role in the Commission’s decision. The Commission must consider feasibility of reuse only. He concluded that the Commission must not compel the property owner to expend funds on preservation if it determines that the property suffers from a hardship. Mr. Sklaroff acknowledged that the property and surrounding properties will continue to be subject to the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction.

Mr. Downey stated that he is sympathetic to those who would like the building saved. He stated that he is sorry that he cannot save it all. He stated that he has promised to save the Warwick and the Coffee Shop and he will honor that promise, but it is costing significant amounts of money to save them. He stated that he will be more careful about what he promises in the future. He again stated that he will keep his promise. Mr. Downey stated that he will endeavor to save elements from the Garage building, but he cannot commit to saving them until he has a better understanding of them. Mr. Sklaroff stated that they could demonstrate that the Warwick and the Coffee Shop also suffer from hardships, but will save them nonetheless. Mr. Sklaroff stated that they will submit applications to restore the Warwick and the Coffee Shop as housing in the near future. Mr. Mattioni noted that the Historical Commission is bound by the historic preservation ordinance and cannot simply do as it chooses. He observed that it would be nice to find someone with deep enough pockets to restore everything, but the Commission cannot compel a property owner to restore the building or salvage elements if it has found that there is no reasonable reuse for a building and demolition is the only way to restore value to the property. Mr. Mattioni concluded that the Commission must comply with the law.

Mr. Gupta asked Mr. Downey if he had considered saving the front façade. Mr. Downey responded that they have considered saving it, but doing so would be almost impossible. He stated that he could recall his engineer from the audience to testify about the problems with saving the façade, but the primary problem is that the brick is in such poor condition that it would crumble if disturbed. Mr. Downey stated that he cannot commit to saving the façade because it would be very difficult and expensive to save it. Mr. Gupta asked why the brick of the Garage is in worse condition than that of the adjacent Warwick. Mr. Sklaroff responded that the all three buildings are in very poor condition. Southern Land has committed to saving the

Warwick and Coffee Shop, but cannot save the Garage. He stated that Southern Land will not make money on those properties. It will be very expensive to dry them out for reuse; the drying alone will take eight months to two years. Mr. Baumert, the structural engineer, added that the brick on the Garage is much softer and in worse condition than the brick at the Warwick. He noted that the interior brick of the Garage is so soft that one can grab handfuls of clay with bare hands. The front façade does not have sufficient integrity to be saved. Mr. Sklaroff added that they considered every possibility with the Garage and concluded that it could not be saved.

Mr. Traub stated that this “economic hardship doesn’t abide with the nature, spirit, and letter of the historic preservation ordinance. It applies to some situation that this is not and their argument is really in the abstract.”

Mr. Beisert stated that he is not opposed to this project and understands the need to demolish almost the entire building, but saving a façade is not impossible. He observed that facades are saved and incorporated into new construction frequently in Washington DC and also in Louisville, Kentucky. It is a common practice, but not a desirable practice from a preservation perspective. It is a standard practice. He claimed that he has witnessed eight-story facades preserved in areas of Washington DC with less economic viability than this area. He contended that saving the front façade would be a good compromise. He asserted that this building is 30% of the total amount of historic fabric on the entire block. He noted that the Commission approved the demolition of the Boyd Theater and remarked that the new construction project to replace it may not even occur. He urged the Historical Commission to require the preservation of the façade, claiming that “it is done everywhere else.” Mr. Thomas disagreed with Mr. Beisert’s contention that facades are not retained and reused in Philadelphia. He noted that the Historical Commission recently approved the incorporation of the historic Royal Theater façade into a new building. He noted that the Historical Commission also approved the retention of two facades and their incorporation into a larger project for the Curtis School of Music on the 1600-block of Locust Street. Mr. Thomas stated that he could point to a dozen examples of the preservation of historic facades in Philadelphia. He dismissed Mr. Beisert’s claim that facades are never preserved in Philadelphia. He observed that the question before the Commission is whether the building can be feasibly reused. He noted that the conditions are similar at the other two buildings in the row, but the developer has agreed to save them at great cost. He stated that the Commission cannot require an “angel” to step in and save buildings at a financial loss. Mr. Baumert refuted Mr. Beisert’s testimony. He stated that his engineering firm knows how to preserve and reuse facades; it is not ignorant. In this case, the façade is too deteriorated to save. Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Baumert that his firm has the knowledge and capability to engineer the preservation of facades and their reincorporation into new buildings.

Ms. Weinberg stated that she “would like to suggest that there is a larger and relevant civic responsibility to save this façade. Thank you.”

Meg Sowell and Stephen Kazanjian of Real Estate Strategies-RES Advisors, the independent consultants retained by the City to analyze the application, presented their conclusions. Ms. Sowell provided a summary of her decades of experience with housing and commercial rehabilitation projects, including as the project manager of the historic Jekyll Island Hotel. She stated that she and Mr. Kazanjian collaborated on similar work in Baltimore. She stated that Mr. Kazanjian has extensive experience in such analyses. Ms. Sowell explained that her firm subcontracted to construction cost estimator, ICI, which evaluated and corroborated the costs included in the application. She stated that ICI has extensive experience with historic buildings. Ms. Sowell directed the Historical Commission to their report. She stated that she agrees with the analysis undertaken by the applicants. She stated that she and her partner were unable to

identify any feasible reuse for the building in question at 1918-20 Sansom Street. She stated that the building suffers because of its poor condition as well as its configuration; it is very deep with few windows at the front and back and no possibility of windows on the side facades. She noted that the documentation in the application indicates that the front façade was replaced about 1950, when the building was converted from a garage to an office building. It is a lovely façade, but it is not historic; it is a later addition.

Ms. Sowell stated that she and Mr. Kazanjian undertook an independent analysis of the application. She stated that her company has been involved with this case on behalf of the Historical Commission since November 2015. She stated that they inspected the interior and exterior of the property. The building is in extremely poor condition. She stated that they walked the neighborhood and looked at the surroundings in order to understand the building in its context. By understanding the context, they were able to evaluate potential reuses. She reported that they met with representatives of Southern Land, Center City Residents Association, the Preservation Alliance, private developers, and other parties to understand the real estate environment. She stated that they reviewed and verified all of the numbers in the application. She stated that they questioned all of the construction costs in the application. They considered all of the redevelopment scenarios. They assessed all of the assumptions and calculations provided by Econsult. She reported that they surveyed rental and sales prices in the area to ensure that the numbers in the application reflected reality. She noted that they re-analyzed the numbers used in the application, which was first prepared more than one year ago, to ensure that they had not changed over time. She reported that the analyses are still valid. She noted that three sets of cost estimates for the construction of the three most viable reuses were generated. The applicant's consultant, Intech, generated the first. The consultant's subcontractor, ICI, generated the second. And Intech generated the third, based on the comments and criticisms from ICI. Ms. Sowell stated that they analyzed the three reuse strategies proposed by the applicant as well as other strategies like a nightclub, industrial use, garage parking, hotel use, and apartments. The building would only accommodate eight apartments or 10 hotel rooms, not enough for it to be profitable. She stated that the building was too small for any useful light well. Ms. Sowell stated that they reran the analyses for the three selected uses. She explained that they reran the retail scenario with updated comparable costs based on the current rental market in the immediate area. She reported that the conclusions of their analyses were so close to Econsult's conclusions that they considered Econsult's older analysis to continue to be valid; in that analysis, Econsult concluded that restaurant and retail were not feasible. Ms. Sowell explained that they ran the single-family sensitivity analysis as had Mr. Angelides, but also added the historic tax credit into the single-family residential because one could fashion a scheme where the house was rented for the five-year recapture period. However, even with the added tax credit, no land cost, 120% of the revenue, the lower ICI costs, and all of the subsidies, the single-family scenario was not feasible. She stated that they tested the per-square-foot cost of the single-family house and found that theirs was almost equal to Econsult's. She stated that they then explored what would happen to values if the immediate neighborhood improved very quickly with nearby development. They also explored adding amenities to the house like a rooftop garden and garages. However, even with an optimistic outlook and added amenities, along with the other sensitivity changes, the house option was not feasible. She explained that they reran the office analysis using lower costs, higher rents, more incentives, and no land costs, and still ended up with a project that was not feasible. Ms. Sowell concluded that there is no reasonable use for the building in question. There is no financially feasible way to adaptively reuse the building. The value generated by any new use as measured by net present value is insufficient to provide a reasonable return on the investment required to renovate the properties. Mr. Kazanjian agreed.

Mr. Schaaf asked if Ms. Sowell had assessed a scheme to add floors to the building. He noted that floors had been constructed on a historic building on the 700-block of Chestnut Street. He noted that that building originally had additional floors, but they had been removed. The project replaced the missing floors. Ms. Sowell asked Mr. Farnham to answer the question. Mr. Farnham responded that, for a finding of financial hardship, the ordinance requires the Historical Commission to find the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. The Commission must decide what constitutes a "reasonable" adaptation. He noted that the Commission discussed the limits of a reasonable adaptation during the Boyd Theater case. The former director of the Preservation Alliance had suggested during that review that one could convert the Boyd auditorium into office space by leveling the existing floor and adding floors. The conversion would have required major renovations. The Commission concluded that that was not a reasonable adaptation. One could add 50 stories to a two-story building to make it profitable, but that addition would not be a reasonable adaptation. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Commission would need to determine, for example, whether adding two stories on a two-story building, thereby doubling the space, was a reasonable adaptation. He advised the Commission that it is the body that decides what is and is not reasonable. Mr. Farnham observed that adding a stair tower or a small penthouse addition might be reasonable, but doubling the space of a building probably was not.

Mr. Traub spoke again, asserting that the analysis of the feasibility of reuse was "out of focus, very much in the abstract, and does not apply to this situation." "There is no intention to sell or rent this property as a separate parcel." He asserted that Southern Land intends to use this property as an extension of the rental property immediately to the west. There is a use for the building as part of the larger development. It can be incorporated into the scheme. He said that the developer should retain 10 or 20 or 25 feet of the front of the building with the façade.

Mr. Thomas asked his fellow Commissioners if the Commission should require the developer to provide photographic documentation of the building before it is demolished. Mr. Farnham explained that Section 14-1005(6)(c) of the historic preservation ordinance allows the Commission to require an owner, at the owner's expense, to document a building to be demolished according to the documentation standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey and the Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) for deposit with the Historical Commission. He noted, however, that this building has been documented extensively over the last 15 years or so, as various property owners have sought to demolish it. He reported that the Historical Commission holds extensive information on the building, and additional documentation would be superfluous.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to find that the building at 1918-20 Sansom Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; that the owner has demonstrated that the sale of the property is impracticable because the application shows that a listing for sale with a third-party broker would be futile; that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return; and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed; and to approve the application for complete demolition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. Mr. Fink seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2222 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct roof decks with pilot house

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alex Bastian & Marta Parentes Ribes

Applicant: Charles Capaldi, LCaVA Architects, llp

History: 1877

Individual Designation: 9/12/1974

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mockup demonstrates that the rooftop construction is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, including to a potential height of seven feet to account for umbrellas; the railing is changed to a black metal picket; a front elevation is provided; and the pilot house roof and walls are minimized, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct roof decks and a pilot house on the main block and rear ell of this property. The pilot house would provide access to a front deck, set back 12 feet from Delancey Place, and a rear deck, set back nine feet from the rear wall. The pilot house would be partially visible from Fidler Square, as is the pilot house at the next door property at 2220 Delancey Place, which the Historical Commission approved in 2002 along with a deck on the rear ell.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 613 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct additions at front and rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Igor Frayman

Applicant: Paul Kremer, Alfa Engineering Inc.

History: 1990; Stephen Varenhorst, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story addition at the Pine Street façade and a third-story addition at the rear. The building is identified as Contributing in the Society Hill Historic District. However, the current building was constructed in 1990, replacing the c. 1980 structure, which was classified as Contributing in the inventory because of the involvement of the Redevelopment Authority in its construction. The addition at the front façade would mimic the elements of the building's original detailing, such as its precast stone trim, slate roofing, red brick veneer, metal railings, and window configurations. Similarly, the rear would incorporate slate roofing and precast stone trim at the cornice, and would duplicate the existing window configurations of the second story.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 15 BANK ST

Proposal: Install mural on side wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: ASI Management

Applicant: Ambrose Liu, Philadelphia Mural Arts Advocates

History: 1855

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided stainless steel fasteners are used and that the details include wall spacers and spacing to allow airflow behind the panels, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a mural on the north wall of 15 Bank Street. An application for the same mural was approved by the Commission at its 8 July 2016 meeting, but at that time the application proposed to install the mural on a similar wall located at 304 Arch Street. The wall at 15 Bank Street is a former party wall, is constructed of brick, and is currently stuccoed. The proposed project will be a collaboration between artist Marcus Balum, students at Mastery Charter School–Lenfest Campus, and the Mural Arts Program. The mural would incorporate a series of sixty-three brushed-aluminum composite panels of various sizes, printed with photographs taken by students. Each panel would be anchored to the wall by 12 four-inch masonry screws. The mural would be concentrated at the west end of the wall and would not obstruct any existing masonry openings.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 1635 WAVERLY ST

Proposal: Construct four-story single family residence

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Robert Saltzman

Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee offered no formal comment, but commented that the applicant take into consideration all of the suggestions offered during the discussion.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct four-story, single-family residence with a front-loaded garage and a roof deck with pilot house. The house would be clad in brick for the first three stories with limestone details and aluminum-clad casement and fixed windows. The fourth floor would feature a shallow, standing seam mansard roof with a large dormer window. A roof deck would be accessed by a sloped pilot house, and enclosed by a parapet wall on the sides, but a metal railing at the front and rear.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Logan Dry represented the application.

Mr. Dry explained the changes suggested by the Architectural Committee that the owner was willing to make. He noted that the revised design tried to mimic more of the punched window pattern of the block. He noted that he also considered two single dormers but the smaller dormers did not align well with the breezeway and the design ended up with one dormer overhanging the cantilever. He explained that he also removed the fussier arched and limestone details, and simplified the facade. In terms of massing, he explained that the oddly shaped pilot house is pushed back as far from the front as possible, but is limited by a relatively compact floorplan.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that in terms of the massing and the height of the building, the Committee suggested it should be a three-story building as opposed to a four-story building. Other than that, he noted, the design changes accurately reflect the Committee's comments. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the dormer be revised to spread the windows out more to eliminate the panels on the sides and fill out the dormer more.

Mr. McCoubrey also suggested differentiating between the color of the muntins and the glass, both of which are depicted as black in the rendering. Ms. Cooperman commented that, if the windows were wood, the color would be more flexible, and it would be more in keeping with the block. Mr. McCoubrey opined that aluminum-clad windows would be fine, but suggested using a lighter color that gives some contrast.

Ms. Cooperman questioned the planned material for the face of the dormer. Mr. Dry responded that the proposed material is a large format metal panel. He noted that if he makes the windows larger, he would still use a larger format metal panel, but could attempt to replicate more of a traditional dormer construction.

Ms. Royer asked whether the dormer windows will also have divided lites. Mr. Dry responded that in the current design, the two smaller windows will but the middle one will not. He noted that if he revises the size of the windows, he is open to using muntins across all three. He explained that he wants to keep the scale cohesive without getting too busy. Mr. Thomas replied that dormers often have a different pattern than the windows below, and opined that it is important to be consistent and have muntins. Ms. Cooperman asked if the dormer windows are casements. Mr. Dry responded affirmatively.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the comments offered by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 125 CHRISTIAN ST

Proposal: Rebuild third-floor gable wall; construct roof deck at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alex Aberle

Applicant: Alex Aberle

History: 1820

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the masonry work, with the staff to review details, but denial of the deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, which stipulates that decks should be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the pitched roof of the rear ell of this corner property. The deck would be accessed via an existing dormer window, which would be cut down to create a door. The wood deck structure would be supported on approximately four, five-foot tall painted posts and enclosed by an open, wood balustrade on the street side, with a five-foot high privacy fence at the party wall.

The proposed construction would be highly conspicuous from both Christian Street and S. Hancock Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Thomas stated that, if this deck were in a less conspicuous location and if the building were in the middle of the block, the deck might meet the standards.

He asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the masonry work, with the staff to review details, but to deny of the deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, which stipulates that decks should be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2322 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kyle Wharton

Applicant: Scott Woodruff

History: 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as proposed, but approval, with the staff to ensure no visibility of the additions from Pine Street, provided the following:

- the inclusion of a window and door the south façade of the addition,
- the relocation of the deck from the addition to the roof of the existing house with a 15-foot setback,
- the removal of the parapet, and
- the relocation of the mechanical equipment to a hidden location not on the roof.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition at the rear and on top of a two-story building that is classified as Contributing to the Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District. The addition would be set back approximately 26 feet from the front façade with a roof terrace at the front. The Committee reviewed a similar application at its January 2017 meeting. In that application, the addition was set back 17 feet from the front façade; the Committee recommended denial and encouraged the applicant to revise the application to set the addition back to a location where it would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, or to limit the addition to two stories, instead of three. The current application sets the addition back, but it remains conspicuous, overwhelming the two-story building.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 1710 PINE ST

Proposal: Replace window sash

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sophia Rosenfeld & Matthew Affron

Applicant: Keith Yaller, Architectural Window Corp.

History: 1845

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the existing one-over-one double-hung sash at the front façade windows and to replace them with either two-over-two or one-over-one double-hung sash. The existing frames and brick mold would remain. Based on the building's date of construction and the existing clamshell brick mold at windows along this block of Pine Street, the original window sash would likely have been six-over-six double-hung sash. However, the application argues that changes to the entry door and transom, as well as extensive renovations at the interior, reflect characteristics of a later period that warrant a later window style.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Thomas commented that the 1963 photograph shows that most of the buildings in the development row have six-over-six windows. He suggested that the staff should approve six-over-six windows, if the owner proposes them. He asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny the application, but to approve six-over-six wood windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION

Emily Cooperman, Chair

ADDRESS: 509-13 DIAMOND ST

Name of Resource: First Mennonite Church of Philadelphia

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Lewis Temple Pentacostal Church of God

Nominator: Daniel Sigmans and Oscar Beisert

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 509-13 Diamond Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 509-13 Diamond Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former First Mennonite Church of Philadelphia satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. The nomination argues that the building housed the largest Mennonite congregation in Philadelphia and provided an urban place of worship for progressive southeastern Pennsylvania Mennonites, who typically left rural Bucks County farms to pursue economic opportunities within the industrialized city. The nomination also contends that Nathaniel B. Grubb, the church's charismatic leader for 38 years, quickly increased membership after joining as its minister and preached extensively to numerous Mennonite and non-Mennonite congregations.

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

Mr. Thomas inquired about the disparity between the Criteria for Designation identified in the nomination and those identified by the Committee. Ms. Cooperman explained that the nomination presented Criteria for Designation A and J, but the Committee found that the significance of the property under Criterion A solely for its association with Nathaniel Grubb was not convincing. The concern, she continued, was that every congregation has an important clergy leader, but that person, in most cases, does not necessarily have citywide significance. She noted that Committee members had strong opinions that the building reflects the environment in an era characterized by a style, though that style lacks a common name. The Committee agreed that Criterion for Designation C would be appropriate and also found that the

church held significance for its association with the city's Mennonite history, which further satisfies Criterion J.

Mr. Beisert stated that he and a member of Philadelphia's Mennonite community collaborated to write the nomination.

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

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the nomination included only the church building or if the flanking building was part of the property. Ms. Keller answered that the boundary description in the nomination includes both buildings and together they comprise the parcel of 509-13 Diamond Street.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 509-13 Diamond Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 516 WHARTON ST

Name of Resource: St. John German Evangelical Lutheran Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: New York-Washington C.M.E. Annual Conference, Inc.

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 516 Wharton Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 516 Wharton Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former St. John German Evangelical Lutheran Church satisfies Criterion for Designation A. The nomination argues that the church provides the only existing evidence of the neighborhood's nineteenth-century German heritage and reflects a period of German unrest during which Germans sought religious freedom in the United States. The nomination further contends that the church typifies a small working-class community of German Lutherans that lived in the neighboring Southwark rowhouses.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Celeste Morello represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman explained that the Committee on Historic Designation recommended Criteria for Designation A, E, and J because of evidence uncovered by Committee member Jeff Cohen, who found a reliable citation that this church is the work of the very important Philadelphia architect Samuel Sloan. The Committee, she continued, determined that the property merited designation under Criterion E, which specifically relates to a prominent architect's work. She reiterated that Sloan was an extremely important practitioner.

Ms. Morello stated that it was her understanding that the building was attributed but that no definitive evidence exists to show that Sloan was the architect. She argued that an attribution to Sloan would be more correct. Ms. Cooperman replied that for this period of time, a newspaper

citation together with the building's appearance is likely the strongest evidence to exist, lacking the church records themselves. Ms. Morello responded that no information in the church records gave credit to any architect. She contended that the record keepers were not interested in the building of the church beyond establishing some type of financial structure for maintaining the building. Ms. Cooperman asserted that that approach is not unusual. In her experience from working in this period, Ms. Cooperman continued, though no bills or drawings survive, there is certainly enough evidence to support a strong attribution to Sloan.

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

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 516 Wharton Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 400 WASHINGTON AVE

Name of Resource: Southwark Iron Foundry/ Merrick & Sons (Sacks Playground)

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: City of Philadelphia, Parks & Recreation

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 400 Washington Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation I.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 400 Washington Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former site of the Southwark Iron Foundry, now known as Sacks Playground, satisfies Criterion for Designation A. The nomination argues that the site is affiliated with Samuel Merrick, a significant nineteenth-century Philadelphian who became the first chief engineer of the Philadelphia Gas Works, served as an elected official, co-founded the Franklin Institute, and established the Southwark Iron Foundry. The nomination also contends that the site is likely to yield information important in history due to the nearly one-hundred-year production of machinery and parts for commercial, domestic, industrial, and military purposes when the Southwark Iron Foundry was in active use.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Celeste Morello represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Morello stated that she felt strongly that Criterion for Designation A should be considered. She explained that she submitted a nomination to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission for a state historical marker to recognize Samuel V. Merrick. She indicated that the marker application would likely be approved. She noted that she hoped the marker would be placed at the site's Washington Avenue side and again argued for the appropriateness of including Criterion A.

Ms. Cooperman responded that it was the opinion of several members of the Committee that, if the building were still extant, Criterion A would be appropriate. However, she continued, since the property largely contains an archaeological site, the Committee found that Criterion I would be most appropriate. Ms. Morello countered that if any artifacts are uncovered from a future

archaeological excavation, they would relate to Samuel Merrick and his factory, since the factory remained on the site for approximately 100 years.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment. Jed Levin, a professional archaeologist and South Philadelphia resident, spoke to support the nomination of Sacks Playground specifically under Criterion I. He noted that he is a member of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum and was at the meeting to represent the organization. He stated that members of the organization feel strongly that the site holds exceptional potential for archaeology and could provide important information on Philadelphia's history, particularly its industrial history. He reiterated his strong endorsement of the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman added for the record that Samuel Merrick was one of the giants of nineteenth-century Philadelphia industry and is both locally and nationally significant.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Farnham how designation would impact the site and whether the Department of Parks and Recreation would be required to excavate prior to undertaking any significant work. Mr. Farnham answered that any work that includes significant ground disturbance would trigger a review by the Historical Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 400 Washington Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation I, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2700 S BROAD ST

Name of Resource: Christopher Columbus Statue

Proposed Action: Object Designation

Property Owner: City of Philadelphia, Parks & Recreation

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Christopher Columbus statue at Marconi Plaza satisfies Criteria for Designation A and B.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Christopher Columbus statue at Marconi Plaza (2700 S. Broad Street) as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the statue is significant under Criteria for Designation A and B, for its depiction of nationally-significant Christopher Columbus, and for its commission by a group of Italian Americans who gifted it to the City for display at the Centennial Exhibition.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Celeste Morello represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Mr. Thomas asked who is responsible for maintaining the statue. Mr. Farnham confirmed that the Department of Parks and Recreation is responsible. Ms. Cooperman commented that the Committee appreciated the extensive effort that Ms. Morello took to try to identify the artist responsible for the statue.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Christopher Columbus statue at Marconi Plaza satisfies Criteria for Designation A and B,

and to designate it as an historic object, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1114-50 S 5TH ST

Name of Resource: George Washington Public School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: School District of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1114-50 S 5th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and H.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1114-50 S. 5th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the 1935 school building is significant under Criteria for Designation C and E, as an example of the popular Art Deco style of the 1920s and 30s, and as a design by prolific Philadelphia public school architect Irwin T. Catharine.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Celeste Morello represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman explained that the Committee added Criterion H owing to the building being particularly conspicuous in its context. Mr. Thomas asked about the public school thematic historic district. Mr. Farnham explained that it is a National Register historic district, not a local historic district. Ms. Cooperman commented that it is particularly gratifying to see Irwin Catharine's work recognized, as he is often under-recognized owing to the School District of Philadelphia being his only client. Mr. Thomas commented that it is important to recognize the historic value of public school buildings. Ms. Morello noted that there are other worthy school buildings nearby. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the former Edward W. Bok Technical High School is now being adaptively reused and is open to the public. Ms. Morello briefly discussed the possibility of writing a nomination for that building.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1114-50 S 5th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E and H, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 111 AND 201 E TABOR RD

Name of Resource: St. James Methodist Episcopal Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: St. James Methodist Episcopal Church

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 111 and 201 E Tabor Road satisfy Criteria for Designation H, I, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 111 and 201 E. Tabor Road as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the church complex satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, for its association with the Saint James Methodist Episcopal Church, and as an example of the growth and development of the community which resulted in the congregation building larger churches on several occasions until the construction of the present church in 1910.

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

Ms. Cooperman explained that the Committee added Criterion I owing to the early cemetery and no other previous development on that site. Mr. Thomas commented that Tabor Road is one of the earliest roads in that area. Ms. Cooperman added that the church is an institution that has been on the site for quite a long time, relative to its context. Mr. Beisert explained that he was contacted by the out-going pastor, who was concerned about appropriate reuse of the buildings, should the congregation cease to exist.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 111 and 201 E Tabor Road satisfy Criteria for Designation H, I and J, and to designate the properties as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 3500, 3504, AND 3508 BARING ST

Name of Resource: Northminster Presbyterian Church and Rectory

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Metropolitan Baptist Church

Nominator: Amy Lambert, University City Historical Society

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J, but not A.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3500, 3504 and 3508 Baring Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former Northminster Presbyterian Church, built in 1875, is a historically significant work by Thomas Webb Richards, a prominent local architect best known for his design of College Hall on the University of Pennsylvania campus. The nomination contends that Webb's design for the church, which was originally clad in serpentine, successfully adapted his polychromatic architectural ideas to the symbolic and practical requirements of a Presbyterian congregation. The nomination further argues that the church design represents the transformation in

Protestant architecture from a rectangular, center aisle volume to a more theatrical exterior expression of the Auditorium Plan. The nomination also asserts that the church and its congregation represent the development of the Mantua and Powelton Village neighborhoods of West Philadelphia. Considered contributing to the property is the attached parsonage, constructed in 1904 by architects Wilson, Harris & Richards.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Elizabeth Stegner, president of the University City Historical Society (UCHS), represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Stegner noted that Amy Lambert prepared the nomination, and that she cannot say anything more about Ms. Lambert's careful and fine research. She explained that her role is simply to be a representative of the University City Historical Society and to show the UCHS's support for the nomination.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3500, 3504, and 3508 Baring Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the parking lot at 3508 Baring Street to be considered as non-contributing. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1647-57 N 3RD ST

Name of Resource: St. Jakobus German Evangelical Lutheran Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Qiong Zhao Schick Tanz, Tiffany Zhao, and Selina Zhao

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1647-57 N. 3rd Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former St. Jakobus German Evangelical Lutheran Church satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the church, built in 1856, has significant interest or value as part of the development, heritage, and cultural characteristics of the city of Philadelphia and its German-American community. As one of the oldest German-Lutheran churches in the city, the nomination contends that St. Jakobus exemplifies the cultural, social, and historical heritage of the larger German community. The nomination further contends that the church embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Georgian Revival architectural style.

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

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the church's steeple was altered. Mr. Beisert responded that he believes there was a storm in the 1970s or 1980s, and that he believes there was some damage to the tower.

Ms. Cooperman noted that the Committee felt that it was highly likely that an architect was responsible for the design of this property. She noted that the design could be by Samuel Sloan

or T.U. Walter, but the highly sophisticated design appears to be done by a professional. Mr. Beisert noted that Trinity Church in Germantown was modeled after this design.

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

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1647-57 N 3rd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 1736 GREEN ST (AKA 1735 BRANDYWINE ST)

Proposal: Construct three-story building on subdivided lot

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Loonstyn Development L.P.

Applicant: John Loonstyn, Wallace St. Construction LLC

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

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

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

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

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 11:51 a.m., Ms. Cooperman moved to adjourn. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

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

14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish.

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§ 14-1004(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

- (a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;

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